

The Ethics of the Science of Ourselves

James W^{*}

Department of Bioethics, University of Texas, Texas, USA

INTRODUCTION

Scientists make a career commitment to objectivity as a sacred value, but nowhere are it more lacking and needed than in the study of human behavior. While behaviorists profess an ethic of objective analysis of empirical data, as practitioners, they often make a mockery of old time, small town academic values in their commitment to succeed in the post-modern world of spin and PR.

Scientific objectivity is a property of various aspects of science. It expresses the idea that scientific claims, methods, results and scientists themselves are not, or should not be, influenced by particular perspectives, value judgments, community bias or personal interests, to name a few relevant factors. Objectivity is often considered to be an ideal for scientific inquiry, a good reason for valuing scientific knowledge, and the basis of the authority of science in society.

Much fundamental progress in medicine and, more broadly, in medical sciences has required or benefited from self-experiments. This review provides a definition of self-experiments in which experimenters themselves are subjects for their research, and it considers the logical steps which such experiments require.

DISCUSSION

Our notions of human evolution have always and still suffer from the wishful thinking of people who should know better. Wallace and Darwin offered a natural, causal mechanism which explains “How” not “Why” we developed from earlier living forms. The intellectual challenge this presented to the Western mind itself evolved through the three classic stages of effrontery: It is wrong; It is against the Bible; We all knew it anyway. Although essentially no one in the scientific community knows it, there really is no conflict between Darwin and Jesus, who had

no ideas about scientific matters whatsoever. The standard conflict in this case is really between Darwin and St. Peter, who constructed a theology to explain why God let his son be crucified. Thus, the long-standing dispute between science and religion regarding human origins has no real ethical basis nor is it necessary. Anyone can be a Christian (Jesus-loving) scientist by the simple expedient of dropping St. Paul’s bit about original sin in the Garden of Eden. In the contemporary world, the American Psychological Association provides an unfortunate example of an excellent public relations organization misplaced in the scientific community. It has a great code of ethics, although it is difficult to find anyone in a position of authority who abides by it. Repeatedly over the past several decades errors have been left uncorrected and the reputations of psychologists who fail to toe the official APA line have suffered for the sin of living up to the stated creed of the group. Likewise, the police are notorious for breaking the law they swear to uphold. Naturally, they get a free ride from the prosecutor’s office, because DA’s regard the cops as the front line troops in the battle against crime. This whole problem harkens back to Plato and the issue of who polices the police. He assumed “No one”, because the police would simply do what they should do. It is a sad commentary on the contemporary behavioral sciences that everyone would be much better off if we all did what we should do. But, that is what ethics is about.

Objectivity and ethics are very crucial in empirical research for improving knowledge and contributing to decision making related to society and nature. However, intrusion of personal, participants and funders’ values (i.e. bias, belief, presupposition about the research findings) in research is unavoidable during all of the stages of empirical research process. Knowledge obtained through objective and ethical empirical research can play important role for benefit of the society and nature.

Correspondence to: James W, Department of Bioethics, University of Texas, Texas, USA, Tel: 954-531-5392; E-mail: JWelles103@aol.com

Received date: June 10, 2021; **Accepted date:** June 24, 2021; **Published date:** July 01, 2021

Citation: James W (2021) The Ethics of the Science of Ourselves. J Clin Res Bioeth. S10: 003

Copyright: © 2021 James W. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.
