

Leder

Introduction

The cost of change and the value of authenticity

Allen Alvarez, May Thorseth

Different things are at stake when organizations face difficult decisions amidst value conflicts. Individuals who participate in those decisions bring their own values to the table that they weigh against the values that their organization promotes. How should we weigh personal values versus collective values when they are in conflict? Our personal values should first have public relevance or should not merely be personal at the expense of the collective good. The value of personal integrity lies in its connection to various aspects of an individual's life. Personal integrity is important because it is closely linked to autonomy, identity (selfhood), self-respect, and moral agency (Lenta 2016). Personal integrity allows individuals to live in accordance with their perceived moral duties, which contributes to their sense of self-worth and fulfillment. Without personal integrity, individuals may feel a sense of meaninglessness, apathy, and cynicism, leading to a lack of motivation and the inability to pursue their conception of the good. Preserving personal integrity is crucial for individuals to freely form and pursue their own values and beliefs.

However, the relationship between an institution's pursuit of its own integrity and its members' personal integrity is complex and contingent. Breakey, Cadman and Sampford (2015) suggest that there is no definitive answer to whether an institution's integrity encourages or thwarts personal integrity. However, they provide insights into the likely effects of institutional integrity on personal integrity. On one hand, an institution with integrity can facilitate the personal integrity of its members. The institution's Public Institutional Justification (PIJ), which involves asking hard questions about values and living by them, can create an environment where members can perform their required activities sincerely. The public nature of the PIJ ensures that clients, stakeholders, and the community are not misled by the institution or its members. Additionally, the institution's commitment to its PIJ and its transparency can help prospective members make informed decisions about joining, reducing the likelihood of moral tornness. On the other hand, there are potential challenges and threats to personal integrity that can arise from the institution's pursuit of its own integrity. Real-world institutions operate under resource and time constraints, which may create tensions between individual members wanting to do their jobs according to their own convictions and the institution's pursuit of its goals within those constraints. The solution an institution develops for a particular task, as guided by its PIJ, may not align with the considered ethics of every member. This clash can pose challenges to personal integrity, such

as moral distress or fragmentation. Furthermore, Breakey, Cadman and Sampford highlight the risk of a member becoming a "single-minded workaholic" due to the institution's pursuit of its PIJ. While an institution with a reasonable PIJ would try to avoid encouraging such behavior, the important work performed by the institution may lead a member to prioritize their institutional role over other values and commitments, potentially compromising their personal integrity. While an institution's pursuit of its own integrity can have positive effects on personal integrity by providing a sincere and transparent environment, it can also pose challenges and threats to personal integrity. The relationship between institutional and personal integrity is contingent and depends on factors such as the specific type of institution, the alignment of values, and the ability of the institution to strike a balance between its goals and the needs of its individual members.

But then again we go back to stating that personal integrity is valuable because it is closely linked to autonomy, identity, self-respect, and moral agency. Lenta (2016) argues that personal integrity is still valuable even when individuals with personal integrity may be wicked and wish to engage in harmful activities or when individuals with personal integrity may be wrong about their moral duties. Lenta claims that accommodations in these cases should still be considered on a case-by-case basis. The author also addresses the objection that accommodating conscience is unfair to those without conscience-based claims, arguing that the value of personal integrity outweighs the claims of others in some cases because of the right to freedom of conscience and the importance of protecting personal integrity. In the end, it all boils down to the reasonableness of the values defended on personal integrity grounds versus the values that align with the collective good. Reason giving and reason analysis are the kind of discussions we would like to feature in the papers we publish in this journal.

This open issue of *Etikk i Praksis: Nordic Journal of Applied Ethics* features six papers that explore ethical considerations in various contexts. Each article delves into different ethical dimensions and issues, ranging from the debate on financial compensation for egg donation, justice in energy transition scenarios, the relevance of personhood in the morality of war, the morality of personalized advertising, the permissibility of forming defensive alliances in war, and the responsibility of supervisors in supporting inexperienced researchers. These articles collectively highlight the importance of ethical analysis and decision-making in different fields, emphasizing the need for comprehensive frameworks, awareness of marginalized groups, and the inclusion of diverse perspectives.

The first article is Joar Røkke Fystro's *Fra samstemt altruisme til motstridende feminisme: en analyse av høringen om kompensasjon for eggedonasjon* (From harmonious altruism to conflicting feminism: an analysis of the consultation about compensation for egg donation). Fystro analyzes the consultation process regarding compensation for egg donation in Norway. He examines various arguments presented in the Norwegian debate on financial compensation for egg donation and emphasizes the importance of defining key terms such as *altruism*, *volunteering*, and *financial motivation*. The article discusses the revision of the Biotechnology Act in Norway, which allowed for egg donation, and the subsequent need to determine the amount of compensation for egg donors. The author analyzes the consultation draft, consultation responses, and final guidelines for compensation for egg donation. Three main themes are identified in the consultation documents: form and content of motivation, justice, and the

concept of a "donor shop." There is a consistent concern about financially motivated donation, while there is broad agreement that egg donations should be altruistic. Altruism is understood as the absence of financial motivation, but other non-altruistic motives are not problematized or further discussed. The analysis reveals how similar arguments were used to support both higher and lower compensation amounts, with different perspectives on women's rights playing a role.

The second article by Patrik Baard, Anders Melin, and Gunnhildur Lily Magnusdottir is titled "Justice in energy transition scenarios: Perspectives from Swedish energy politics." The article examines the concept of justice in energy transition scenarios and investigates whether Swedish parliamentary politicians consider justice in their energy policies. The authors argue that justice should be considered in energy transitions, and they identify three dimensions of justice that should be taken into account: distribution, recognition, and procedural justice. They compare these dimensions with the views of Swedish parliamentarians obtained through interviews. The findings reveal that while there is some overlap between the principles of energy justice and the issues raised by Swedish politicians, several important issues are being overlooked. For example, procedural justice and the recognition of Sámi interests are not adequately addressed. On the other hand, economic issues, which are often brought up by respondents, are not explicitly included in the principles of energy justice. The authors suggest that justice issues should be given more consideration in energy transitions, as they are not adequately recognized by Swedish parliamentarians. They emphasize the need for further empirical work to draw stronger conclusions. The article highlights the discrepancies between the research literature on energy policies and the discussions among elected parliamentarians, indicating a gap in understanding and prioritization of justice in energy transitions. Overall, the study underscores the importance of considering justice in energy policies and calls for a more comprehensive approach that includes economic, procedural, and recognition dimensions of justice. It also emphasizes the need for greater awareness and recognition of the impacts on marginalized groups, such as the Sámi people, and the importance of involving all stakeholders in decision-making processes.

Luís Cordeiro-Rodrigues titled the third entry "African Ethics, Personhood, and War." In this article, the author explores the African theory that the concept of personhood is relevant to the morality of war. The author argues for the decolonization of war ethics and the need to incorporate diverse philosophical traditions, including African perspectives, into the discourse. The concept of personhood in African philosophy is understood as something that is acquired through positive interactions with others and the environment. Personhood is seen as crucial for the moral progress and learning of communities. The author discusses how the concept of personhood is relevant to the principles of *jus ad bellum*, *jus in bello*, and *jus post bellum*. In terms of *jus ad bellum*, the author suggests that wars can only be morally justified if they can lead to reconciliation between opposing parties. Wars that undermine the development of personhood are considered immoral. The author also argues that war should only be used as a last resort, as it is not the best means to develop personhood and should be proportional and conducted in ways that do not sabotage the development of personhood. In relation to *jus in bello*, the author explains that the African perspective endorses the principles of discrimination and proportionality, but with a different justification.

Legitimate targets are not limited to soldiers but can include civilians who are involved in immoral acts that undermine the development of personhood. The most significant contribution of the personhood theory to war ethics is in the context of *jus post bellum*. The author proposes a model of reconciliation and forgiveness in post-war scenarios. This approach emphasizes the rehabilitation of both victims and wrongdoers and aims to foster friendship and positive relationships. Truth-telling is seen as an essential part of the healing process, as it helps wrongdoers recognize their actions and allows victims to properly mourn and forgive. The author concludes that there are moral and political reasons to decolonize war ethics and incorporate African perspectives. The concept of personhood provides a unique lens through which to assess the morality of war, emphasizing the importance of positive relationships and the development of character. By considering African perspectives, the discourse on war ethics can be enriched and more inclusive.

Sebastian Jon Holmen's "Is it getting too personal? On personalized advertising and autonomy" examines the claim that personalized advertising is more morally worrisome and an affront to autonomy compared to generic advertising. In this fourth article, the author argues that the reasons put forward to support this claim are unpersuasive and that personalized and generic advertising should be treated as morally on par in terms of their potential to undermine consumer autonomy. The paper explores three argumentative avenues that defenders of the asymmetry between personalized and generic advertising can choose from, but none of these avenues is likely to be attractive. The author concludes that there is little reason to believe that personalized advertising poses a greater threat to consumer autonomy than generic advertising. However, this does not mean that there are no autonomy-based objections that can be raised against personalized advertising, but rather that these objections should apply equally to generic advertising. The author suggests that critics of personalized advertising on autonomy grounds have three options: deny the moral parity between personalized and generic advertising based on intuition, argue that both types of advertising are equally morally dubious, or abandon the view that advertising is an affront to autonomy. However, none of these options is likely to be attractive for critics of personalized advertising. The implications of this analysis are that future work should consider the question of whether personalized and generic advertising are morally on par, and if not, provide a rationale for the moral distinction.

The fifth article by Benjamin D. King is titled "Proportionality, Defensive Alliance Formation, and Mearsheimer on Ukraine." The article explores the permissibility of forming defensive alliances, which is a topic often overlooked in the literature on the ethics of war and peace. The author argues that if the use of defensive force requires that its expected harms be counterbalanced by its expected goods, then the same principle should apply to defensive alliance formation. The author advocates for a value pluralist understanding of proportionality, where the expected gains in certain values justify the expected losses in others when compared to the alternative expected trade-offs of not forming an alliance. To illustrate the implications of this argument, the author examines John Mearsheimer's account of the causes of the Russo-Ukrainian War. According to Mearsheimer, the West's strategy to assimilate Ukraine and Ukraine's pursuit of NATO membership post-annexation of Crimea were disproportionate, as they provoked Russian aggression that resulted in unjustifiable harms. The author acknowledges that Russia's

aggression is still unjust, but argues that the West and Ukraine bear partial responsibility for the war and acted impermissibly in attempting to expand/join NATO. The article emphasizes the importance of considering responsibility and the potential for mediated harms when assessing proportionality. It suggests that defensive alliance formation should be continually reassessed, as the proportionality can change over time. The author also highlights the role of necessity or "last resort" in determining the permissibility of using force, as less harmful alternatives should be considered before resorting to defensive alliances or force. Overall, the article calls for more attention to be given to the ethics of military alliances and offers a framework for assessing the proportionality of defensive alliance formation. By applying this framework to the case of Ukraine, the author argues that attempts to expand/join NATO were disproportionate and contributed to the escalation of the Russo-Ukrainian War. However, it acknowledges that each case must be evaluated individually, considering specific circumstances and potential trade-offs between values.

The sixth and final article is by Rannveig Beito Svendby and is titled *Forskeres sikkerhet i felt: Om veilederes ansvar for å hjelpe uerfarne forskere med å redusere risiko i møte med studiedeltagere* (Researchers' safety in the field: On supervisors' responsibility to help inexperienced researchers reduce risk when encountering study participants). This autoethnography discusses the author's experience of feeling in danger during fieldwork in Norway and highlights the lack of attention given to researchers' safety in ethical guidelines and research practices. The author argues that supervisors have an ethical responsibility to support inexperienced researchers in reflexive processes about the risks of participating in fieldwork and to help them take precautions to reduce risk. The article emphasizes the importance of a culturally responsive, relational, reflexive ethic in fieldwork and suggests that supervisors should engage in discussions with researchers about their safety and provide guidance on risk reduction. The author shares a personal case study of a challenging situation during fieldwork and reflects on the potential consequences of overlooking researchers' safety. The article concludes by advocating for the inclusion of researchers' safety as a central concern in research ethics discussions and practices.

We hope that these new articles will help stimulate deeper thinking about the various topics presented. We welcome submissions from different disciplines that give voice to different perspectives.

References

- Breakey, H., Cadman, T., & Sampford, C. (2015). Conceptualizing personal and institutional integrity: The comprehensive integrity framework. In Michael Schwartz, Howard Harris, and Debra Comer, eds. (2015). *The Ethical Contribution of Organizations to Society* (pp. 1-40). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1529-209620150000014001>
- Lenta, P. (2016). Freedom of conscience and the value of personal integrity. *Ratio Juris*, 29(2), 246-263. <https://doi.org/10.1111/raju.12126>.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5324/eip.v17i2.5821>



This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.