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I would do the commercial because there is no indication that I will actually be forced to lie, and if I do not do the commercial someone else in my department likely will. It seems likely that it will be possible if not easy to answer the questions in such a way that they were truthful, but also painted our product in the best possible light. The interviewer and my boss are trying to make a commercial with the intention of selling tablets, not of slandering a company that is probably one of the biggest employers of lawyers in the world. If an interviewer asks a question that would require a factual lie to make our product look good, I could simply tell him that the question is probably not one that he should ask in a commercial for our product. The fact is that it is not possible for a product to be worse in every way, so it should be relatively easy to highlight the areas in which our product is better. Maybe the operating system is better, maybe it is lighter, maybe it is waterproof, maybe it is simply cheaper so if it breaks it is easier to replace. As long as I don’t have to lie about factual things, which is unlikely because lying about easily verifiable facts is a quick way to a lawsuit, I don’t see this as a morally questionable thing to do. If I don’t do the commercial, someone else is going to do it anyways and get the raise. It may even be someone that has fewer qualms about lying about the iPad or our product on television. At least if I do the interview, I can steer it in such a way that we can stick to the truth in factual areas.