**My Code of Ethics - Final**

My perspective of the world is greatly influenced by society and culture of India as well as the U.S. I was born and raised in India, later moved here, to the U.S, when I was 13. I believe in being honest in what I do and working as a member of society over striving for individual success. I also believe that to work as a member of society doesn’t always mean giving up individual rights since they complement each other. In a way, you could say that I am a utilitarian with respect to ethical theories.

My family also plays an important role in my perspective of the world in helping me prepare for various situations that I might face in my life. I remember my father preparing me for the worst case scenario after my years at Berkeley. He once came to me and asked for my plans after Bachelors and I replied that it was obviously getting into med school, in one of the Indian languages we speak at home. He then continued, what if you don’t get into a med school, I was completely shocked. Up until that moment I never thought of any alternatives and after that conversation I had an alternative in mind, teaching.

They have also provided me with basic tools, using which I could achieve anything I set my mind to. They always tell me that they will support me no matter what, my mom especially says yes to anything I want to do. As a child I wanted to be a police officer in India and she was fine with that and helped me join some camps and groups. When I changed my mind to be an engineer she used to send me to a compute café; later when I changed my mind to finance, she used to take me to her office. This to me shows extreme support and I always know that I have my family to support me which gives me an additional boost to achieve anything I set my mind to.

Some tools they have given me are simply basic views and sense I should have for the things I do. As a child my grandmothers and my uncle would tell me many Hindu myths which basically ended with truth and right prevailing over wrong. As I child I would just accept them for what they are but now I make it my responsibility to understand the things I believe in so that I can actually connect with the things in a deeper sense and have greater respect for it. One way I try to achieve this even to this day is learning more about the things that I was told as a child with a scholarly view so that I can understand their origins and motives, for example, of the Hindu myths and epics. And this code of ethics is simply an extension of things I believe in and how I would act to a particular situation without breaking my core beliefs.

1. Personal
   1. **Be honest to the best of your knowledge unless it hurts someone else**

I will always speak the truth when talking to someone and will not lie unless it is deemed necessary. I wouldn’t consider lying if the truth would directly result in someone being harmed. I believe lying is acceptable if it results in a net positive result. For example, if my brother stole my mom’s phone I would lie to my mom that he did not, to protect him. But if he were to steal money from someone I would definitely be a witness for that act and be willing to speak the truth no matter what.

* 1. **I will give my health the proper attention since individuals’ health is very important for the great good of the society**

I will take good care of my health and seek necessary help when needed. That is, I will not be hesitant to go to a doctor if something seems to be wrong. This would collectively help the greater good of the community since any infections would ideally be stopped early on in its stage. For example, I would definitely get tested for malaria if I ever visit any malaria-infected country, so that I can take necessary action without infecting others in the community. And would not be hesitant to get vaccinated. To the best of my ability I will also get others of my family vaccinated if they ever encounter a situation where vaccination would help them and the society.

* 1. **Prioritize assisted dying to individual’s wishes and advance directive and then quality of life**

When considering assisted dying, one should decide based on the individual’s statements that were previously given in advance directives, if any. If one doesn’t exist or cannot find one, the decision should be based on conversation with the individual that hints at the decision the individual would have made. For example, if a person is in a vegetative state for about 10 years now, I would first look for an advance directive by that person to see what he/she has stated. If no statement regarding this is clear, I would see if any previous encounter with the person hints at his/her decision and proceed as required.

If I cannot conclude based on the events, then I would prioritize quality over quantity of life. That is, if the person is known to live in the vegetative state for next 25 years and never return to being normal. I would pull the plug. Similarly, if I were told that a person close to me would live 6 mother with a surgery and 2 without. I would ask not to proceed with the surgery given that the person would be in pain after the surgery.

1. Professional
   1. **I will hold true to my religious beliefs but at the same time will not allow them to interfere with my professional life**

Holding my religious beliefs is essential to my culture and to me since they are an integral part of the society in which I grew up in. In my professional life, however, I will not let my religious beliefs intervene. For example, I will not let creation ideas of the religion intervene with scientific theories such as The Big Bang, in such a situation I will give the widely accepted scientific theories credit over religious beliefs.

* 1. **Follow the set hierarchy in a professional setting in order to raise any complaints or issues and reserve public attention as a final option**

Any complaints or issues regarding inner workings of a system that doesn’t directly affect the public, should go through the hierarchy of the setting. For example, if I have an issue regarding my pay or benefits or segregation, I will take steps to raise complaints to levels above me one after another, starting from my immediate supervisor.

If the issue, however, directly affects the public the issue should be expected to proceed faster through the same hierarchy and when this fails public attention should be called. Taking the same issue further, if the segregation is extending to public where certain groups are denied services from the company I work for, I would follow the same hierarchy and ultimately call for public attention for the issue if it is not resolved.

* 1. **Documents should not be consciously altered and any such acts should not be encouraged or supported**

Any piece of a document should not be alter by author or the public in any sense. This alteration includes introducing any piece of data to add strength to the point, removing of data to hide irrelevant information, but this would not include the specific method or analysis performed to show how the data proves a point. For example, in a research setting, I will collect and analyze data points in a specific way but will not add points that I do not record, nor will I remove any data points. More specifically, I could opt in for z-test over t-test but within the analysis I would not alter any values.

* 1. **Harming animals should be avoided when an alternative to the purpose exists or when the result is uncertain**

Hurting an animal should be the last reserve for any purpose, whether it be food or research. With regards to food, when I have vegetarian options for food, I will not rely on animals for my food. In terms of research, I would find other ways we can test a hypothesis, such as GWAS, and would only find animal research acceptable if it is necessary to further test the results.

Animal research should not be acceptable when we do not have a certain outcome in mind. That is, I wouldn’t let people experiment with chemicals when there is an uncertainty with regards to the side effects. This situation should also be applied to Genetic modification of Animals and Plants. If the outcome is well analyzed and has a net positive outcome with very minimal side effects, research in this field should be continued. If not alternative methods should be explored. For example, if a genetic modification of plants to produce insulin to be injected into diabetic patients might introduce many allergens, an alternative option – such as using cows! – should be explored.

* 1. **Any research is acceptable to explore as long as it has very minimal side effects and higher potential for net benefit of the society**

I will perform any research including but not limited to, animal research, and human subjects research as long as it has minimal side effects and high benefit for the society compared to alternatives. Additionally, the outcome should be known or at least have a reasonable expectation and the selection process should treat everyone equally. One other thing to keep in mind is that the experiment should be tested in lower order animals first before being implemented in higher order animals.

For example, If I were given the ultimate authority over the Tuskegee Syphilis Study: I would consider alternatives first and since they were no viable alternative at that period I would consider human subject research acceptable if it had very small number of subjects that were given full information with regards to the design and the inner working of the study. I would also make sure the selection process of the subjects would be inclusive and not exclusive to African Americans, as in the original study.

The acceptable form of research and its implication also applies to Human germline modification since it does have a greater net utility for future generations. However, this research should be further analyzed and experimented on lower order animals such as flies, fishes, and mice before higher order animals such as monkeys and humans.

1. Societal
   1. **Treat everyone equally when making individual decisions but in making decisions that affect the community as a whole, greater good of the society should be given priority.**

I will treat everyone equally and will not discriminate against sex, age or any differences between humans. This is because as humans we are all equal and thus one person or group doesn’t inherently have advantage over another. Differences between humans, however, can be violated when a large group – consisting of people with varyign factors discussed above – is under a direct threat. For example, if a nuclear attack on White House is inevitable, I would first protect secretaries and the President over tour guides and tourists since the protection of the former has greater advantage to the society. I would still try and protect the later to the best of my ability, but the priority will be given to the former.

* 1. **I will help others with everything I have unless it requires breaking of my core beliefs**

I will help others in the society with anything I have. However, I might deny helping if the requiring help shows that I would have to break other codes. For example, if I were one of the members of the STAP paper and if my team came up to me to alter the documents in order to help in them in their growth, I would refuse the help since it is in direct violation of my canon regarding Professional integrity (2.3).

This can be further extended to Organ Donation where I have already signed up to donate my organs upon death. Since I would cease to exist after my death I would like to dedicate my organs to the people who need them. It’s the last help I can offer to the society. However, I am not willing to donate my organs when I am living because I regard helping others with everything I have as long as it doesn’t hurt myself or my family.

* 1. **I will respect other religions with the same respect I expect from others to my religion**

I have great respect for my religion and expect others to give a similar respect to it. In a similar way, I will respect others’ religion as well. I will also provide others to hold their beliefs true to them. For example, I will respect Islam despite the rising negative connotations to the religion and will respect others who believe in it. When needed, I will help another person rise his/her voice for their belief.

Applying this situation to real life, if a person in my workplace is facing segregation problems I would help file a complaint and escalate it to higher level following my code regarding Complaint Resolution in a professional setting (2.1).

* 1. **Any technology that does not show a societal benefit should not be extensively encouraged**

New technology in the 21st century includes a lot, any new technology that is currently being worked on or any that might come in the future should be able to strongly justify its uses. The public voice should also be hear in this issue with regards to further exploration of the technology; if public decides that it is useful for them and show great support its exploration should be continued. New technologies includes, but not limited to, Human Cloning and Self-driving Cars. This is essential considering the financial limitations we – as a society – have.

Applying this canon to the technologies above, I would greatly support Self-driving cars since it shows that it could benefit the society by providing more time for the drivers as well as, ideally, reducing traffic incidents.

Human cloning, however, does not show any direct benefit for the society. Therefore, public voice should be heard by the means of voting and if the public votes in favor of human cloning it should be further explored. If not its exploration should be kept to minimum unless it is deemed useful for the society in future. This, therefore, makes room for other technologies that currently needs attention.

* 1. **Technology regarding reintroduction of the extinct animals should be used to resurrect species that do not pose any threat to current species**

Reintroduction of extinct species should be evaluated under two terms: 1) How much does it influence the current ecosystem, 2) Does the introduced species still hold true to its original.

If the introduced species greatly affects the current ecosystem, which has evolved to live without the extinct species, then the benefit of reintroducing is no longer present. New species should not be introduced since we would force re-adaption. One great example of this would be dinosaurs, we have evolved to live without them and if we did reintroduce them we might have to face problems of protection; they should, therefore, not be reintroduced.

If the newly introduced species does not efficiently replicate its original then the purpose of reintroduction would not be fully met and thus it should not be proceeded. For example, if we were to clone Pyrenean Ibex and reintroduce it. And if the cloned animals doesn’t have its distinguishing horn, then it doesn’t completely represent our original species and therefore the purpose would be void.

1. **I will follow above canons with the highest priority unless a conflict arises and do my best to improve them over the course of my life**

In formulating these canons I have documented few of the most important items that I follow and would like to follow in future. This particular canon reinforces other canons and thus motivates me to follow all other canons with equal priority unless a conflict arises. All of the canons above are merely extensions of my beliefs and thus it is important to consider each one as such.

In any case of conflict, canons that are most appropriate to the situation would take higher priority. If a situation is highly connected to professional behavior, canons in the “Professional” section takes higher priority over any other canons. For example, in a professional setting canon, Religion in a professional setting (2.1) would take higher priority over Equality (3.3), meaning I wouldn’t follow canon 3.3 when another person following a different religion disregards Big Bang Theory due to his religious concerns. All members of the society, despite their religious beliefs, would need to agree to the scientific theories for future scientific progress under a professional setting.

Likewise, a canon in “Societal” category takes higher priority over other canons in a social context. This does not, however, prohibit referring to canons of one section when present in another context. For example, when eating in a restaurant with my friends, I would not eat any meat referring to Animal Welfare canon (2.4) in “Professional” category.