**ARE LEAKY CONDOMS BETTER THAN NONE?**

Dr. Joycelyn Elders as Director of the Arkansas Department of Public Health in the early 1990’s intensely sustained the distribution of condoms to high school students in order to avoid venereal diseases and unwanted pregnancies. The strategy seemed to be accomplishing its goals until Dr. Elders was informed that the condoms were breaking at an alarming rate. She decided to keep the program running because this information could challenge the program or the use of condoms itself. Geuras (2005) explained that she based he decision on “that the net effect of the distribution was positive because, in the end, more good than harm would result. While some unwanted pregnancies would result and some venereal diseases, including AIDS, might be transmitted, more pregnancies and infections would occur without the distribution.”

I would have taken a different ethical decision in regards to the Condoms program. The withholding of information has very negative consequences. Once the deception is discovered the society loses faith in the honesty and transparency of government officials, dishonesty would become part of the agency’s setting, and the end results of this program were more pregnancies and venereal diseases. Government officials should be transparent and allow society to make its decisions. In my belief the interest of the whole override the individual interests but not even that was accomplished. The program gave the citizens a sense of confidence that actually may have prompted unsafe practices. My conscience would have made me stop the program to access on how it could be corrected. I will feel good with myself in that it would show my honesty and respect for the individual citizens.

**OPTIMISTIC PROJECTION OR OPPORTUNISTIC DECEPTION?**

Gordon Chase as the head of New York City’s Health Services Administration faced a serious heroin addiction problem in the population. Up to 200,000 New Yorkers had a heroin addiction in the late 1960’s. Chase understood that he had a responsibility to the addicts and the victims of heroin related crimes. He put all his hopes in a methadone treatment that would replace the heroin addiction. The project was controversial but he really believed in it. As a political strategy, Chase inflated the addicts’ numbers to be treated. He believed the inflated figures would catch the attention of the public.

The results of the project were very positive. The numbers showed that even though the problem was not totally solved, it exhibited great improvement. The long term effect of the project promoted the greatest happiness. The end justified the means and nobody was put in any danger. The political sphere made Chase deceive the public for its benefit. It would be a hard decision for me to make based on the information given. I understand that the project benefited the public overall but it would come at a price. I do not know if I could live with myself by having to deceive the public. I could not consistently apply this principle. I would not like to be seen as deceptive in nature.

**MASSACRE OR BE MASSACRED**

Morality is very important for an individual throughout his personal and professional spheres of life. Administrative Responsibility should be a standard for all public servants. Per Starling (2008), “its ideal relates to values. Most Americans would agree that government should be responsive, flexible, fair, accountable, honest and competent. Ethics is the branch of philosophy that is concerned with what is morally good and bad, right and wrong.”

Jones (2008) explained that:

“Watergate is a tale they would tell of hubris, abuse, presidential power and violations of legal ethics. Watergate was attributed to blind loyalty to the president, pure incompetence and an absolute arrogance about the law. The latter was exemplified by Nixon’s famous statement, “When the president does it, that means it’s not illegal.”

In the Watergate case there was a combination of amoral individuals and some that let the power of the presidency get to them. Nixon involved many people in Watergate because he engraved in them that what he was doing was because national security was at stake. Watergate brought very dark times for Public Administration. The citizens of the United States got a feeling that they could not trust public administrators. But not everything that came out Watergate was negative. There were some positive signs of how ethics are carved in our political system.

As Jones (2008) concluded:

The First Amendment allowed stories in the Washington Post to break Watergate open and also led to stories about other abuses of power; the Senate hearings headed by Sen. Sam Irvin and the house impeachment proceedings showed the importance of the Congressional oversight responsibility; the independent judiciary was able to initiate an investigation, which a non-independent judiciary likely could not have done; and the Saturday Night Massacre resulted in the largest spontaneous outpouring of outrage from the public that the White House had ever experienced. “It was the public exercising their right to petition the government for redress of grievances that made … an enormous difference”.
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