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I. Forward—Location of Problems

The purpose of this paper is to touch upon the response of corporations and universities to the present corporate ethics of Japan, and to review the direction of education and research at universities.

Presently, attention has focused on the studies of ethics, and especially on the applied studies of ethics. Publications concerning environmental ethics, bioethics, information ethics, and corporate ethics have rapidly been on the increase, and discussions concerning these subjects have become lively. This has now become increasingly clear that the changes and reforms of various relations, which shape our society, are not unrelated. Ethics is thought to fall under “an establishment of various healthy relations,” looking to lead value attitudes, and wisdom. The growth in interest of ethics and in the studies of ethics is surmised due to the people’s aspirations to “an establishment of various healthy relations.”

Environmental ethics, bioethics, and information ethics have been discussion topics for the past 10 years, however, they are considered relatively new compared to corporate ethics which have already been in discussion for the past 30 some odd years. The importance of corporate
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ethics, however, has increasingly gained ground as new ethical problems of this nature are brought up. These new ethical problems have been greatly influenced by the details of corporate ethics, and unless these corporate ethics do not involve environmental ethics, bioethics, and information ethics, it will become void. Furthermore, unless corporate ethics are not perceived in relation to environmental ethics, bioethics, and information ethics, their meaning diminishes, almost to the point of being meaningless.

Taking this under consideration, this importance of corporate ethics has suddenly increased. However, the problems plaguing Japan's corporate ethics problems are thought to be governed by a siege mentality. Various efforts have been made to breakthrough this situation, but this outlook as been restricted to being “Japanese in nature” and is thought to have taken a single form. Until now, it has been said that the origin of these ethics problems stem from being “Japanese in nature” or conversely, in order to breakthrough, there was a need to reclaim a “Japanese sense of morals.” This is a “hang-up” on things “Japanese in nature”, and may be considered a large mistake to be “entangled” in this manner.

I feel that the origin of this “ethical siege mentality” is not in things being “Japanese in nature”, but in the “lack of recognition and response” to the “problems and characteristics of our modern age.” Is the problem, things “Japanese in nature”, or rather a “lacking” in this “attitude”? This is somewhat of a challenge, however, I perceive the direction hereafter of education and research of corporate ethics at universities.

II. Japan’s Corporations and Ethical Problems

1. Japan's “Corporate Misconducts”

Already one age has passed us by, and what vividly remains in our recollections are incidents of insider trading, and the Recruit Co. incident, the collusion between the political and business world. This was 1988. In the following year, the Japanese Federation of Economic Organizations (Keidanren) in February 1989 formed the “Roundtable Conference on Corporate Ethics” and urged the participating corporations to draw up corporate ethics regulations.

Nevertheless, in July 1991, the so-called “Securities Scandals” took place. The four major corporations, namely Nomura, Daiwa, Nikko, and Yamaichi Securities, compensated institutional clients for their loss; and the connections between management and the crime syndicates, the extortionists, were exposed. The Japanese Securities Dealers Association made the list of compensation payments public, however, the payments in compensation were received by 288 corporations and 3 individuals, totaling 128.316 billion yen. Within the 228 corporations, major corporations which represent Japan, such as Toyota Motors, Hitachi, Matsushita Electric, etc., and their affiliate companies were included. Banks and their affiliated companies, general trading companies and their associated companies, various benefit associations, and public financing institutions were also included. This was a composition of “an amalgamation of ‘Japan as a joint stock company’.” To such a “structural misconduct”
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1) The information about “Corporate Misconducts” is based on the article in the then newspaper.
and furthermore, as numerous member companies with board members were also involved, the Keidanren had to enact the “Keidanren Corporate Behavior Charter” (September 1991).\(^3\)

In spite of these efforts, after this incident, “corporate misconducts” did not cease. Even after entering 1996, the illegal trading of Daiwa Securities’ New York branch was revealed, and Midori jyugi Medicine Manufacturing was accused of criminal homicide through untreated blood products. The exchanges between Takashimaya, Japan Airlines, Ito-Yokado, and Kirin Beer, and the corporate extortionists (SOKAIYA), and payoffs were revealed. The Keidanren revised the “Keidanren Corporate Behavior Charter” in December 1996, after taking on the current state of affairs.

However, there seems to be no end to “corporate misconducts.” The year after the Keidanren revised the behavior charter, it was a year where numerous “corporate extortionists payoff” incidents were uncovered. This included a whole line of prominent companies, such as Ajinomoto, Nomura Securities, Daiichi K Anglo Bank, Yamaichi Securities, Nikko Securities, Daiwa Securities, Matsuzakaya, Mitsubishi Motors, Mitsubishi Electric, Hitachi, and Mitsubishi Estate. In 1998, even though there were several cases of fraudulent payment incidents, attention was given to the NEC’s excessive billing, concerning the financing of equipping the Defense Agency. In the year 2000, once again, there were outbreaks of incidents that startled society. In June, there was an incident of a food poisoning outbreak from the Yukijirushi Milk Products, and Mitsubishi Motors concealed a recall. Especially in the former incident, due to a delay in product recall, over 10,000 people were poisoned. In addition, management did not promptly respond to allegations from consumers of symptoms of poisoning. The company was greatly criticized when they commented, “As the total sales of the goods in question were proportionally low, its influence is minimal.”

2. **Truth on How Corporations deal with Corporate Ethics—Summary**

    We wonder if such “corporate misconducts” will continue. Investigating these causes, if counter-measures to eliminate these are not found, the 21st Century for Japanese corporations and society will be very dark.

    Taking this into consideration the Keidanren had drawn up and continually revised the implementation of the above-mentioned “Keidanren Corporate Behavior Charter.” However, the year following the revision of the behavior charter, exceedingly, “corporate misconducts” that are “Japanese in nature” continued to occur. How are we to look at these? Should we consider them as “cynical phenomenon”? Their form appear as such. However, “Was not the source of information which gave way for society’s incidents of misconduct, from within the organization itself, 70-80% of the time?”\(^4\) Taking this into consideration, it is possible to think that the formulation and revision of the “Keidanren Behavior Charter” worked upon the “moral awakening” of the organizational member within the corporation, and was the result, induced from “exposure within,” that is “whistle-blowing.” It should not be forgotten that the factual surfacing of “misconducts” places organizations at the start of the turning point from unethical to ethical management. In this sense, the drawing up and revisions of the “Keidanren
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Behavior Charter” have a definite significance.

Actually, one of the platforms that transformed the “design of corporate ethics principles” rapidly started growing from 1990, and is assumed that it has concentrated especially after 1997. This can be confirmed from the Association of Corporate Executives’ “Questionnaire survey associated with the ‘Norm of Corporate Behavior’” (April 1997: Targeting the corporations to which the members belong, there were responses from 403 companies, a recovery rate of 30%). In addition, looking at the examples of “Ethical Principles” numerous published by each corporation, many of them had been drawn up, taking the opportunity to do so, from the “Keidanren Corporate Behavior Charter” or the “corporate misconducts” by their own or other corporations.5)

What is the design and application of Japan’s corporate “ethical principles,” and the practical truth? Based on these? It is difficult to grasp this truth, however, let us look at the characteristic trends from the most recent questionnaire survey related to the subject. The most recent is the “Contributions to Society by Powerful Value Corporations Classified in the New Era 2001” from the Asahi Newspaper Cultural Foundation’s “Corporations’ Contributions to Society Survey” Committee.6) America’s, The Council on Economic Priorities models this investigation after the investigation methods used in publishing “Shopping for a Better World”. There were 11 items in the investigation, and the last item was, “Corporate Ethics.” The period of investigation stemmed from September 2000 to January 2001. The investigation targets were 418 companies, and with a response from 184 corporations, the recovery rate was 44.02%. The following were 6 items questioned in “Corporate Ethics.” “1. Code of Ethics” (Are there documentation and publication of policies/regulations, and documentation of compliance manuals?) “2. Stipulated Range” (Does it cover numerous areas?) “3. Permeation Efforts” (Is this common knowledge to all corporate employees? And what about their education?) “4. Preparedness for Implementation” (Are there specialist managers, general managers, and consultation/reference systems? “5. Actual Effect Management” (Understanding the risk, checking compliance status, and prevention measures of unfair practices for top management?) “6. Improvement in Preparations” (Publication of information on compliance activities, and references to external standards?) There were a maximum of 181 and a minimum of 174 responses of ethical items.

The questions “Whether or not corporate ethics policies existed,” “whether or not there were detailed provisions in objectifying the methods,” and “whether a compliance manual existed for each workplace to obey regulations and procedures,” were posed in “1. Codes of Ethics.” Of 181 corporations, 124 have established “policies of corporate ethics,” and within them 79 have published their policies. Of 181 corporations, 101 have established “Details of Ethics Provisions.” Their decline stopped somewhat, but the numbers that have published their details, drops sharply to 32 companies, and those that have not increases to 69. Surprisingly,

of 180 corporations, 141 have responded that they have documented their "Compliance Manuals", and with those who are "being incorporated into the ethical regulations," the number is 160.

Excluding other items, there are 22 wide ranging items established in the "Stipulated Range." Most of the 181 corporations, from 80 to 140 corporations have answered affirmatively, however, items with affirmative responses are relatively small. They are "Provisions of responsibility to the investor" (59), "Provisions concerning the Unfair Competition Prevention Law" (56), "Prohibitive provisions of child and forced labor" (32), and finally, "Restrictive provisions of reprisals to those who report foul play."

Looking only at "3. Permeation Efforts," a considerable amount of investigation is thought to have taken place. Out of 181 corporations, there were 125 corporations where "Ethics Regulations" were distributed among all the employees, and some form of education has been implemented among most of the corporations. The number of those that have not implemented any education has ceased at 17 corporations. However, the details of education have mostly taken the form of lectures and problems have been pursued through case method discussions, but the permeation level of problem-solving education is still insufficient.

"4. Preparedness for Implementation" unfavorably compares with "Permeation Efforts." There are only 36 corporations that have "arranged specializing managers," and only 14 that have assigned "full-time executives." In addition, there are also 71 corporations which "have not established a consultation desk."

"5. Actual Effect Management" is evaluated from the three points: "Understanding violations of law/risk of deviating from company standards," "Check mechanism of compliance/violation circumstances," and "Prevention plans of unfair practices by top administrators." Surprisingly, "Understanding the risk" can hardly be considered aggressive, and systematic efforts are weak. There were 178 corporations that answered this item. From a total of 106 corporations, 25 stated, "No special measures have been taken," 41 stated, "We are leaving this to each worksite," and 40 stated, "We are entrusting this to each department's ethics regulations/law compliance manager." As background to "Ethics Regulation" development, separating the degree of awareness, generally speaking a reduction in risk is unexpected. The number of replies to "Check mechanism" was the same, 63 corporations stated, "No special measures have been taken," while most other corporations are using some sort of method to prepare implementation of check. There were 180 corporations that answered the final, "Prevention plans of unfair practices by top administrators," and there was more or less an indication of effort from "Utilizing an external auditor system" (83). However, "Strengthening internal audits (54)," and "Welcoming an attorney to function as a third party checker," has ceased at 30 corporations.

"6. Improvement in Preparations" is being observed from the degrees of "Information disclosure of actions in compliance," and "Utilization of external standards." The number of corporations which answered to the former was 175, and 144 answered, "As actions taken are within the corporation, we are not specially publicizing it." The number of corporations which answered to the later was 174, and 87 corporations stated they "were not in utilization," and 73 stated they "were referring to the precedent cases of other companies."
3. Their Characteristics and Problems

From the above, several characteristics and problems can be seen revolving around the corporate ethics of corporations in Japan. Even though information is lacking up to this point, the points below will indicate certain approximate tendencies.


The second point that can be seen in "1. Code of Ethics," "5. Actual Effect Management," and "6. Improvement in Preparations," is a non-openness and non-disclosure. This closed nature is also said to be characteristic of Japanese corporations, however, the ethics problem is a problem between self and others, or concerning an organization; between an organization and another organization; or surrounding the relations with an individual. As the acting subject is "different," when considering that the problem of "awareness or attitude" of the subject has the ambivalence or the polysemy, that is "multiple meanings", this subject is exceedingly heavy for us.

"2. Stipulated Range" was the item, which relatively had few affirmative responses: "Provisions of responsibility to the investor" (59), "Provisions concerning the Unfair Competition Prevention Law" (56), "Prohibitive provisions of child and forced labor" (32), and finally, "Restrictive provisions of reprisals on those who report foul play" (21). Even though the question of "Prohibitive provisions of child and forced labor" is thought to be unrealistic in Japan, if globalization is a precondition of corporate activities, some concern is justified. When taking this lack of concern together with the details of the previously mentioned "corporate misconducts," there are reservations of weakening feelings of "fair competition" and "risk taking," which are fundamental postulations in a capitalistic economy. When taking into consideration that "understanding risk has not been systemized," which was looked at in "Acutual Effect Management," this is amplified. This is the point identified as the third.

The fourth point has been continually stated as, "Composition of official stance and true intentions," in Japanese, "Tatema To Honne." The first point, aggressively tries to prepare the form of "Systemization of corporate ethics," and from a comparison of implementation and improved efforts of "4. Preparedness for Implementation," "5. Acutual Effect Management," and "6. Improvement in Preparations," the attitude identified is speculated. The point that the search for problems in ethics education and the permeation of problem-solving education is not yet adequate, in addition, the point that understanding risk has not been systematic and the weak point of securing efficiency of "top engagement," when the interest of "Development of ethics regulations" is high or the degree of "particulars" concerning various regulations is high, there is more of an impression of a "gap between the official stance and true intentions."

The final point to be identified is hypothetical, when the second and fourth points are associated. This point is, "Is not the unconscious 'pressure of the organization', which includes the practice of corporate ethics, working strongly?"7) As the details of this point cannot be
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7) Yoshihiko Kobayashi and Iwao Taka, "Kigyorinri No Genjiyo To Shakaiseido No Saikento:
verified by the survey of the Asahi Newspaper Cultural Foundation, it will be reinforced by other surveys.

The Kansai Economic Federation completes surveys of great interest. One of which was an “Attitude Survey” in the “Questionnaire survey concerning the practice of corporate ethics,” in 1998. This targeted the employees of the Kansai Economic Federation’s corporate members, numbering 3,155 (631 corporations x 5 people), and replies from 797 people were acquired (recovery rate of 25.3%). Yoshihiko Kobayashi/Iwao Taka, “Re-examination of the Present State of Corporate Ethics and the Social System: based on practical investigations of corporate ethics and the results of attitude surveys,” is analysis of this report. Referring to this, the survey had interesting results, as seen below. Even though general employees strongly recognized the “need to connect ethics and profits,” they did not think this had any connections with actual society. In addition, there is a tendency to come up with points such as, “Unethical corporations also profit,” or “Even though the methods and policies of a company may go against my conscience, ultimately this must be accepted.” This tendency is especially strong among the range of 26 to 35 year olds and among women. The inclination of the “source of problems” of an ethical nature is, “Those ranked higher think it is with the lower people,” while “those ranked lower think it is with the people higher up.” Kobayashi and Taka have read this as, “Unconscious ‘pressure of the organization’ working strongly.” Taka later rereads this as “the pressure of the unspoken,” as he expresses the characteristic of the Japanese corporation well.

III. Corporate Ethics and University Education

1. Corporate and University Educational Cooperation

As we have been observing in the above, corporate establishment and “Design of ethics principles”, in other words, the “Systemization of corporate ethics” is becoming the general trend in Japan. However, it is a fact that difficult problem remains. How can we conquer this? As corporations have greatly influenced the way of society and lives of people, conquering this problem is indeed difficult and large.

Presently, Japanese corporations are gasping at changing from the Japanese Standard to the Global Standard, in the middle of the Globalization wave. In the face of “Frequently occurring corporate misconducts,” and confusion over “Systemization of corporate ethics,” previously held “confidence” has now disappeared. When placed in this predicament, Japanese society and corporations have always “revived education.” Reforming and reviving education has saved society and corporations from situations of adversity, and reviving has been a strategically chosen. Following this lead this time around, the Japanese Federation of Economic Organizations, the home of the business world, held the perception, “The economic-social system, ‘Catch-up and overtake model’ that has supported Japan’s development, has completely met its demise. Reviving individuality and creativity, a new economic system is being con-

Kigyourinri No Jissenchosa Oyobi Ishikishosa (Business Ethics and Perceptualized Social Environment in Japan: A Survey of Institutionalizing Business thics and Business People’s Sense of Morality), Nihonkeieiinrigakkaishi (Journal of Japan Society for Business Ethics Study), No. 6, March 1999.
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structured, upheld by a sense of ethics and responsibility." In March 2000, they announced that they were, "Training personnel for the era of globalization." Certainly, as corporations identify the need for self-reforms, they recommend the educational cooperation of corporations, universities and society.9)

The cooperation between corporations, universities, and society is necessary and essential. For example, if corporations are placed at the center of society and largely influence our lifestyles and universities, it may be thought that they were the ones to bring about today's situation of difficult problems, assuming As Takayuki Yanagawa has stated, although "unethical top management" have boundlessly been apparent, as seen in "corporate misconducts," social sanctions against such actions have been extremely weak, and they "have not learned to be responsible," resulting in an observation of a "socially structured unethicalness."

In this sense, we are also responsible, as well as, the universities and society. Therefore, society and especially the educational cooperation of universities and corporations need to be aggressively developed.

Luckily, there are two establishments that are important organizations in advancing the educational cooperation between universities and corporations, concerning corporate ethics in Japan. One of them is the Japan Society for Business Ethics Study, established in 1993. The chairman is Kazumasa Mizutani, a Kanagawa University professor, and the present number of members exceed 300. This society is characterized by the striving for an integration of academic studies and practical application. From this perspective, the members are not only composed of university researchers, but also those experienced in actual businesses in numerous corporations, from corporate ethics managers to attorneys, etc. As the chairman himself is a researcher and educator at a university, he also has experience in top management at a long-standing corporation. One organization developing the practice of corporate ethics in Japan and diffusing specialized organizations is the Business Ethics Research Center, established in 1997. The director is Yoshiharu Fukuhara (chairman of Shiseido), and the chairman is Kazumasa Mizutani, the chairman of the Business Ethics Study. This membership of this organization is composed of corporate members. There are two standing research sub-committees (code design/compliance research and ethics research sub-committees) of corporate ethics officers, which are the hubs of mutual exchange and research for members of each corporation. And in response to the demands of each corporation's members, they are guided in the technical expertise of code design and lectures. For those interested in the later service, a managing researcher, a member of the Business Ethics Study, and a full-time lecturer are positioned at its center. For other center activities, the in-house records, "Business Ethics," is published, and occasional seminars and research meetings are opened, targeting employees of member corporations and members of the Business Ethics Study. A combination of both organizations is extremely favorable. This is the cornerstone of educational cooperation between universities and corporations and is expected to be the propelling force in its further

9) Keizaidantairengoukai, http://www.keidanren.or.jp
10) Takayuki Yanagawa, "Nihongata Corporate Governance To Kigyorinri (Japanese Modeled Corporate Governance and Corporate Ethics)," Nihonkeiteiriinrigakkaishi (Journal of Japan Society for Business Ethics Study), No. 6, March 1999.
development.

2. **Meaning and Significance of Corporate Ethics Education at University**

In the past, educational cooperation between universities and corporations did not exist in the sphere of corporate ethics, however, this must be aggressively advanced, hereafter. This is a fact and a task, however, the problem is, "What sort of cooperation is to be the objective?"

The relationship between the universities and corporations should healthy. University education should not only be to train practical managers to process ethics problems in corporations, and corporations should not only be unilaterally utilizing the universities as an organ to assure essential personnel. In addition, the university should not be seen as a place for collecting research data and seizing corporations, unilaterally sampling examples. The educational cooperation of universities and corporations should form a positive, gradual cycle of, "Practicality of ethics to ethical practices," and "Ethical practices to practicality of ethics." "Ethics" and "Practicality" will always appear to be the "problem," and each time their details are be "deepened", and should be the subject of conversation, that which "must be deepened." We are not speaking of each side working on their respective problems: the university aiming at the "improvement of theory," and the corporations looking to "improve practicality." By the cooperation of universities and corporations, there is a need for each side to aim at a mutual "improvement in theory" and "improvement in practicality." In this perception, we are able to stand on the platform to conquer "socially structured unethicalness."

However, the seeds to actualize the formation of a “positive, gradual cycle" are "personnel", and their training. Just as Keidanren has pointed out. As mentioned above, the Keidanren has recognized, "The economic-social system, 'Catch-up and overtake model' that has supported Japan's development, has completely met its demise. Reviving individuality and creativity, a new economic system is being constructed, upheld by a sense of ethics and responsibility."11) "Fundamental knowledge" from "individuality," "professional awareness," and "wisdom," and "Internationally valid knowledge," are raised as the knowledge needed to "construct a new economic system." Excluding details, there are not that many divergent views. However, the contents of those skills and training methods, as affirmed in chapter 2, are the characteristics and problems of the Japanese corporations. Whether or not taking into consideration, "closed nature," "weakening sense of fair competition and risk taking," "composition of official stance and true intentions," and "organizational pressure of the unspoken," will result in large differences. Skills training is to be considered, "void," if these characteristics and problems are ignored, and training of skills based on these characteristics and problems, will be considered, "meaningless." Skills training have to be done while conquering problems held by Japanese corporations, and have to be relevant.

An important point here is "Analysis of Present Situation." There is a need to question the fundamentals, in connection with the above-mentioned various problems, why "the economic-social system, 'Catch-up and overtake model' has completely met its demise," and why up until recently, this succeeded. When advancing with these many question, an association between

11) Keizaidantairengoukai, loc.cit.
things “Japanese in nature” and “characteristics of modernization” will be observed. Is it not necessary to clarify the conditions and workings of “the construction of a new economic system, upheld by a sense of ethics and responsibility,” and the methods in overcoming the various problems held by Japanese corporations: “non-disclosure”, “weakening sense of fair competition and risk taking,” “composition of official stance and true intentions,” and “organizational pressure of the unspoken”? Places to clarify these problems are to be created in universities, and involving students and corporate persons, should be the way corporate ethics is taught in university.

3. Current Condition of Corporate Ethics Education and New Approaches in the Concept of Organizational Ethics

How are universities responding and trying to respond to the demands and expectations in university education, as mentioned above? I would like to raise two study results. One of them is the “Fact investigation concerning the present state of business ethics education in our country’s universities and graduate schools,” of Kanagawa University International Business Research Institute, completed in 1997 by Masakazu Mizutani (Kanagawa University), Mitsuhiro Umezui (Keio University), Yuinori Okabe (Kanagawa University), and Reiko Uchida (Kanagawa University). The other is an investigation of the syllabus targeting all universities in the 1998 school year, by Nobuo Tsuno (Kanagawa Graduate School).

The investigation of the former was a questionnaire set out to 370 departments, targeting universities throughout Japan, of which 170 department questionnaires of 131 universities were recovered. The following are observations of implementation situations according to universities. Studies on business and corporate ethics, and studies on organizational ethics are titled differently, however, the number of universities providing a full-credited lecture course concerning corporate ethics is 20 (about 15%) out of 131 universities. Even though a course concerning corporate ethics is not specially provided, the number of universities which lecture in part, concerning corporate ethics is 24. Totaling these numbers, there are 44 universities (about 34%) which lecture on some scale, concerning corporate ethics. The number of universities which are planning to start providing, from scratch, lecture courses concerning corporate ethic is 18. Furthermore, the number of universities that are already giving lectures concerning corporate ethics, which are investigating the introduction of new lecture courses, is 6. However, the number of universities which have not established such courses is close to 90.

The investigation by Nobuo Tsuno is an analysis of syllabuses from Commerce/Business departments throughout Japan. There were syllabuses from 105 departments. Similar to the investigation mentioned above, under a different name, number of departments which have established independent courses concerning corporate ethics, is 18. This is approximately 17% of the targeted investigation. Tsuno also compares to see if the themes concerning, “social


responsibility," "corporate (business) ethics," and "corporations and society," within the course relating to general business studies, business management, and corporations, exceed one lecture hour. He makes assumptions on the "degree of permeation of education concerning corporate ethics," of each course. The degree of permeation only in general business studies will be taken up. The degree of permeation in the general business study courses of "social responsibility," "corporate (business) ethics," and "corporations and society," are 24%, 14%, and 5% respectively. Below are Tsuno's comments on the results. "Even though this totals 43%, there may be two or more lecture themes, from above, which overlap, while lecturing on only one of the themes is common. As all three themes were not lectured on at the same time, the permeation degree in the education of business studies is between 20-30%, concerning corporate ethics of general business studies of the person responsible for the course."

Looking at the two results above, the education of corporate ethics in Japanese universities has to be stated as lagging compared to the West. In Japanese universities and business world, the importance in recognizing corporate ethics, mentioned above, is still low, and is accepted as a minor field. However, the research and education relating to corporate ethics deconstructs the corporate, business, organization, people, and worldview. There is a possibility of creating a new reality of important agents and opportunities. Research and education of corporate ethics in the West, identifies the adverse effects of modernization and organization of society and pursues ways to conquer them. On the other hand, by maintaining the advantages of modernization and organization of society and considering its growth, it should be well understood.

In the Momoyama Gakuin (St. Andrew's) University, Faculty of Business Administration, to which I belong, heeding the importance and necessity of corporate ethics in this sense, new life has been breathed into the education and research of this field. Plotting Organizational Ethics, in the 1993 school year, became the department's central and symbolic course. This is the concept of education at the Momoyama Gakuin University, and is the core in realizing the goal of "Fostering Citizens of the World."

We are earnestly working to establish this organizational ethics as the foundational theory of education, research, and practicality of corporate ethics. The person in charge since its establishment is the president of Momoyama Gakuin (St. Andrew's) University, Haruo Murata. Murata assumed the office of director during the 2000 school year, and had to call off classes. However, unable to cancel intentions to establishment organizational ethics, from the 2001 school year, I became the coordinator and began the lectures in an omnibus format. The lecturing staff totals 9 persons. Including Murata and myself, there are 5 university researchers from outside the department, and 2 corporate people, who are also members of the Business Ethics Study. In the 2001 school year syllabus, the object and details of these lectures are described as below:

14) ibid., pp. 234-235.
Man has limits to his abilities. From the days of old, we humans, to conquer these limitations, have worked in cooperation with others, that is to say that we have practiced “cooperation of labor.” Through this cooperation of labor, organizations were established, however, we have come to recognize these organizations as organizations only in the 20th Century, and have established a great variety of such and have managed to improve our lifestyles through it. The 20th Century was the age of the organization. It is only through some sort of organization that we are able to live a life with meaning; we cannot live, disconnected with different organizations. However, there are also problems situated there. For an organization to realize an effective cooperation of labor, the self must be sustained. For this, standard values, including ethical and moral values, were created. The contributors of these organizations (various individuals and other organizations) welcomed this and used their influences. On the other hand, the various individuals and other organizations that were the contributors, held various characteristic standard values. This is an opportunity where many contradictions and confrontations may occur between these organizations and contributors. These problematic conditions have to be processed in one way or another. And there are four ways. First, reject the standard values characteristic to the contributors, and coerce those of this organization. Second, reject the standard values of these organizations, and have these organizations accept the standard values of the various contributors. Third, after coming to a concession between these organizations and their contributors, create compromised standard values. Fourth, the organizations and their contributors mutually create anew, standard values that do not contradict. The first method deals with coercion; the second method negates the reason d'être of the organization and will lead to the eventual collapse of cooperation of labor. To realize an effective and meaningful cooperation of labor, either the third or fourth method must be selected. It does not need to be said that the later is the ideal. These standard values must be created and adjusted with the view of commonality and public unity.

This lecture will aim at recognizing the above-mentioned problematic conditions and present a theoretical framework to analyze the present condition. In addition, in adjusting and creating standard values to settle problems, a framework of thought is essential when considering the continuity of “What is commonality and public unity?” as commonality and public unity change with the times. Through the cooperation of everyone attending this lecture, we would like to strive for such a new framework.

The composition and schedule of the lectures is as the following.

Organizational Ethics
Teruo Taniguchi (Momoyama Gakuin University)
Saturday, April 14, 2001

I. Modern Society and Organizational Ethics
Haruo Murata (Momoyama Gakuin University)
Saturday, April 21, 2001
II. Nature of the Organization

Kazuhiro Fujii (Koshien University)
Saturday, April 28 and Saturday, May 12, 2001

III. Corporate Organizations that Represent Modern Society and the Conditions of Ethical Problems

Takeo Nishioka (Otemon Gakuin University)
Saturday, May 26 and Saturday, June 2, 2001

IV. Ethics and Applied Ethics—Responses and their Limitations to the Condition of Ethical Problems Concerning Organizations and Corporations

Mitsuhiro Umez (Keio University)
Saturday, June 9 and Saturday, June 16, 2001

V. Development of Corporate Ethics—Concentrating on Theory

Hiroshi Iwata (Osaka Sangyo University)
Saturday, June 23 and Saturday, June 30, 2001
—Concentrating on Examples
Takuichi Ohmura (Dabai Espec Co. Ltd Auditor; member of Business Ethics Study)
Saturday July 7 and Saturday, September 22, 2001

VI. Development of Environment Ethics—Concentrating on Theory

Teruso Taniguchi (Momoyama Gakuin University)
Saturday, September 29 and Saturday, October 6, 2001
—Concentrating on Examples
Hiroshi Kenmochi (Osaka Gas Co. Ltd, Environment Department Assistant Director; member of Business Ethics Study)
Saturday, October 13 and Saturday, October 20, 2001

VII. Necessity and Fundamental Point of Organizational Ethics Development

Teruso Taniguchi (Momoyama Gakuin University)
Saturday, October 27, 2001

VIII. Organizations and “Structure of Authenticity”

Yoshikazu Niwamoto (Kounan University)
Saturday, November 24 and December 1, 2001

IX. Organizational Responsibility and Creating Organizational Ethics

Teruso Taniguchi (Momoyama Gakuin University)
Saturday, December 8 and December 15, 2001

X. The 21st Century and Potentiality of Organizational Ethics

Haruo Murata (Momoyama Gakuin University)
Saturday, January 12, 2002

IV. New Aspects of Corporate Ethical Problems

Alan Kitson and Robert Campell express “that there are two pitfalls in the research of Business Ethics,” and “the strategies to avoid falling into those pitfalls.”16) The “two pit falls”

16) Alan Kitson and Robert Campell, The Ethical Organization: Ethical Theory and Corporate Behavior,
are "the polarization between the theoretical and philosophical elements," and "the extreme pragmatic approaches taken." There has to be an appropriate balance between "theorizing Business Ethics" and "describing actual ethical problems," when coming up with a "strategy to avoid falling into those pitfalls." And the mutual importance of the organization cannot be overemphasized. This is because, "Our ability to live an ethical life is profoundly affected by the ethics of the organizations." We also, basically, agree with the opinions of Alan Kitson and Robert Campbell. It, however, would have been better if the two enhanced our recognition of "the unethical aspects of organizations..."

In the research of corporate ethics, more of a focus must be placed on the possibilities of changing the unethical organization, ethical; on the degree of influence on the activities of the people working there and other interested parties concerned; and on the degree of influence on the organizational activities of the people working there and other interested parties concerned. The intention of the organizational ethics mentioned-above is this. New aspects of corporate ethics problems that are to surface focusing on these points be expressed in Section IV.

Ethical issues in Japanese corporations such as "non-disclosure," "lacking a sense of fair competition and risk taking," "composition of official stance and true intentions," and "organizational pressure of the unspoken," generally have a tendency to be seen as "Japanese in nature." However, this is a combination of things "Japanese in nature" and the "mechanism of modernization," and accordingly, to conquer these various problems, needs to address "the problems the mechanism of modernization involves." What I have tried to show In Section IV is triple doors to the challenge tower. They are also the fundamental viewpoints to be respected in education and research for corporate ethics, hereafter.

1. "Ethics without Morality" and "Morality without Ethics"

"The bureaucratic structure inherently tends to 'transfer' ethical responsibility from individual organizational actors to the organizational structure."\(^{17}\) For sometime, many people have identified this point. There are two things that are implicated there. There are those who say responsibility is shifted to the structure of the organization, however, it is not the structure of the organization that bears the responsibility. Accordingly, the one point that is connoted there is the "diffusion and/or rarefaction of responsibility." In addition, "The feeling of personal responsibility is a prerequisite for moral action."\(^{18}\) With this point as a premise, the second implication can be said to be, "The organization induces the unethical actions of individuals."

How is it that this sort of situation occurs? The origin is a rationalistic mechanism of a "bureaucratic organization." Generally, a "bureaucratic organization" is considered as the structural core of modern society, or as an administrative organization. However, the rationalistic characteristics it posses is fundamentally common to modern and other organizations, as long as it is an organization. Modern organizations have repeated organizational reformations, and are thought to be different from a "bureaucratic organization." However, this is single-
track way of thinking. Without fear of misunderstanding, the difference between “modern organizations” and the so-called “bureaucratic organization,” is the use of “rationalistic mechanisms” according to the circumstances of the times, and the difference in environmental circumstances of the times and their regulations.

The characteristics of “rationalistic mechanism” are, as pointed out by the English sociologist Zygmunt Bauman, “the widespread functional division of labor,” and “the replacement of moral responsibility with technical responsibility.” In the former, a meaningful objective has been established in a fixed environment, and various means have been analyzed to achieve this. Forming a “link between objective and means,” this is a mechanism that allows projections, as planned. Although the “link between objective and means” has come thus far, after the means is “justified” by the objective, the “objective and means are separated” and the “objectification of the means” is completed. Only the rationality of the objectified means is the problem, and only the efficient implementation of duties is requested. Overall effects and the type of effect on the outside environment, by the actions, go unquestioned. Distancing from the perspective emerges from the objective, as well as, connections to the outside. Increasingly, this strengthens the self-objectifying of the means, and directs the “replacement of moral responsibility with technical responsibility.” Only technical responsibilities, as the pursuit of efficiency, are left in the organization, and have rid “moral responsibility” from the organization.

However, those people who carry out the organizational activities are humans of flesh and blood and are not machines. Naturally, people will continue to wonder why their work exists and what sort of effect it has on the environment. Bauman has stated, organizations have “skillfully utilized ’a moral sleeping pill’, facing these misgivings.” This is an emphasis on the “objectification itself of the means” and in a broad sense, is an efficient pursuit of technical responsibility. In short, “rules of professional conduct” and/or “a sense of professionalism” compensate, and depending on the situation, “the means may be justified again by the objective.” According to the strength of misgivings, a minor “sleeping pill” may be used, and there may be cases where stronger ones are necessary. There comes to exist, “organizational pressure of the unspoken” and “authoritarian organizational pressure.” According to this thought, it must be stated that this world is “ethics without morality.” If corresponding efforts of ethical problems that surround corporations are inclined to solely “systemize ethical principles,” there is a large possibility to enter into this sort of “world.” The organization, originally held properties of “non-disclosure” and “restraint.” The “composition of official stance and real intentions” can be logically explained as contradicting problems of the “links between the objective and means” and the “separation of objective and means,” but will be omitted due to limitations of space.

Bauman advocates a world of “morality without ethics” from the perspective that this type of “ethics” will not only unable to establish people’s morality, but can destroy morality. For this, connections with the outside is recovered within the organization, and a dynamic

20) ibid., pp. 26–27.
"connection between the objective and means" is established in the actual environment, while its meaning has to be always re-questioned. To liberate the people from the "non-disclosure" and "restraint" of an organization, an environment where people can come in contact with "double and multiple meanings (ambiguity and polysemy)" is to be created. The most important factor there is that each person thinks and decides for himself. Bauman states that morality must be self-founding\(^{22}\).

Agreeing with Bauman's opinions, I would, however, like to advance this point of view another step from a actuality perspective. I would like to go beyond "morality without ethics" to "ethics within morality" and to the path leading to "morality within ethics." Moreover, I would like to pursue the possibility of an upward rotating process between the two themes, from the later. Bauman stated, "Bureaucracy and business were never famous as shrines of ethics and schools of morality\(^{23}\)." These may be overbearing words, however, we must steadily take these seriously. But I would like to pursue the problem presented earlier. We have already partially taken up this problem, however, due to space we will cease here.

2. From Literacy to Creative Activity

While reflecting on the meanings of Bauman's words mentioned above, corporations must be willing to challenge. For this, corporations and members of the organizations have to mutually acquire functional/technological literacy, cultural or civic literacy, and ethical <within morality> literacy\(^{24}\). Furthermore, there is a need to acquire it combining functional/technological literacy and cultural or civic literacy, and ethical literacy. However, literacy cannot be attained by methods of acquiring literacy. As Bauman has pointed out, this is not possible without self-founding morality by coming in contact with "double and multiple meanings (ambiguity and polysemy)." This means that we have to practice "creative activity" ourselves. Presently, "vital habitue" and/or "attitudes" to live within this type of activity, is sought after. Actively confirming the original meaning of responsibility is thought to make this evident.

Such speculation circulates our human activities as the most basic of changing factors and its examination is convenient. One of these changes has already showed signs 20, 30 years ago; the change of "uniform needs" to "diverse and multi-layered needs" in the lives of humans. In the 21st Century, these "diverse and multi-layered needs" will increasingly bear more importance to us.

Response to the needs is not only meant for the so-called corporations, but other various organizational bodies, and furthermore, is meant for the basic working lives, itself, of individual people. Reciprocal action is formed there, and the raison d'être of corporations and other various organizations become clear. And we, individual people, can also live lives with meaning. However, the point that has to be carefully confirmed in response to needs, is the necessity to start with the assumption of that "something," when one "feels something is missing."

\(^{22}\) ibid., p. 18.
\(^{23}\) ibid., p. 278.
Needs is the feeling that something is missing (feeling deficient), and as that “something” is undefined, ambiguity is left behind. As this “something” is assumed and as it is presented as information or as tangible goods or services, the wanting of “this” occurs. Therefore, needs are “things assumed,” and wants are “things created.” To “assumptions,” there are the “simplistic,” as well as, the “difficult”, and there are the “right,” as well as, the “wrong.” When the assumptions of needs are easy, its “rightness” is also simple, and the assumed is overlapped by the wants.

“Uniform needs” boost the “assumption possibility of needs” and lowers the “needs diversity and multi-layers.” Therefore, the former will lower the probability of “being wrong,” and the later will raise it.

In the 20th Century, as the common goods necessary to human lives were relatively missing, the assumption of needs was largely simple. Moreover, comparatively most of these were on-target. Needs and wants overlapped, and were common to most people. Consequently, in the 20th Century, the problems to solve by individuals and society and the methods of their accomplishment were comparatively clear. The characteristics of the 20th Century, “mass production/mass consumption” and “increasing scales of capital, businesses, and organizations,” were basically based on these facts. Because of these conditions, corporations were able to focus on the “scale of competition” and were able to “create added value according to the working methods inherent to the company.” American corporations are thought to have placed their emphasis on the former example, and the Japanese on the later.

In the 21st Century, assumptions of needs have become more difficult and the possibility of missing with the assumptions has magnified. Furthermore, the problems which accompany “diverse and multi-layers of needs” and their methods of attainment have become more diverse and complicated. In this situation, together with recognizing problems and the methods of their attainment, practical flexibility is demanded.

For this reason, each person, and also many people are to cooperatively work; and “sensitivity” and “capability of response” must be made more abundant through a variety of cooperation. When considering various points of the characteristics and the diverse and multi-layered needs, in the 21st Century, “depth” and “extent” of sensibility and “strength” and “flexibility” of capability of response is demanded. In addition, a broad “new cooperations” were indispensable for its acceleration.

To make “sensitivity” abundant, “imagination” is required, and to actualize “capability of response,” “creativity” is indispensable. The possibility to attain such ability is high, through various and broad cooperation. The cooperation is a social “place” where people foster various abilities. And not only this, but it also greatly contributes to the formation of “beliefs” which is the foothold of people’s activities. With the “place” for cooperation as the foundation, an image of rhythmic transitions from “beliefs” to “sensitivity”, from “sensitivity” to “capability of response”, and from “capability of response” to “beliefs,” is formed. In the final transition, the evaluation problems are: whether or not the “establishment of various problems in response to needs and their implementation,” is compatible with “beliefs”; whether or not to maintain the “beliefs,” looking at it from the practicality and experience of cooperation; and whether or not to amend it. This may also said to be an “exercise in the ability of self-criticism.”
Accordingly, "self-transcendence" is necessary in for this transition. The rhythm of each transition, from "belief" to "sensitivity," from "sensitivity" to "capability of response," and from "capability of response" to "belief," is decided by "imagination," "creativity," and "self-transcendence." The illustrated connections are as Figure-1. It is important note Figure-1 is also an illustration for the conception of responsibility.

The 21st Century must be a more enriched age. The construction of a platform towards this is our present urgent necessity. For this reason, a penetrating comprehension of the "nature of needs" and "changes according to diverse and multi-layered needs" is indispensable. Upon this, recognizing the above-mentioned device and its necessity, I feel that the conscious formation of vital habitue to move this, is necessary.

3. From Risk Management to Responsible Management

Many corporations have lost social confidence through "corporate misconducts," and there have been cases of corporations that have had discontinue business because of this. In these types of conditions, from the perspective of risk management, it is inevitable that numerous corporations will engage in the systemization of corporate ethics. To protect corporations, risk is predicted and constructing a management system to avoid risk in advance, is extremely natural. However, predicting risks relating to ethical problems is incredibly difficult. Accordingly, it cannot be denied that there is a tendency to limit this to predictable "risks."
Management risk must be considered. There may be a need to confirm the necessity of a decision, rather than a prediction. This is nothing but taking responsibility for the future.

To form the upward rotating process of “ethics within morality” and “morality within ethics,” mutual responsible “vital habitue” of the individual and organization, mentioned-above, is indispensable. Once these are well connected, the road to responsible management is opened. The “connection” above, has an important role in converting risk management to responsible management. However, the founding of this direction is in understanding the environment of the people and organization. It is in the comprehension of the relationship between the self and environment. The details will determine all the directions. After all, a deeper response to ethical problems is thought to start with a return to this problem.

What concept is thought to be a determining importance in understanding our environment? If we are to express the conclusion, the following can be said. Stating E. Morin’s expression as a reference, he says, “The environment is not an environment minus individuals or agents, but is an environment where both individuals and agents exist. And, the individuals and agents are not individuals and agents minus the environment, but is an environment with individuals and agents together.” Theorizing on these concepts and schematizing is important in the understanding of our environment. Here, I am schematizing that these differences of “responsible management and management that is not,” “the upward rotation process of ethics within morality and morality within ethics, and ethics without morality”; “responsible vital habitue and mere habits and/or force of habits,” are explained from the understanding our environment.

If, from the basic concepts mentioned above, the corporation is perceived as the organization, the following can be stated. The corporation is created by its environment and from a reciprocating process, and also exists within this environment. This process is also a link of definitions, of environment and corporation. Accordingly, the corporation’s understanding of the environment is the interpretation and comprehension of the connection in synchronic definitions of the environment and corporation, while confirming and foreseeing the connection in diachronic definitions of the environment and corporation. Traditional environment classifications, where interested parties, namely, stakeholder would classify or classifications would be elemental and/or spatial, the understanding of definition links between the environment and corporations would be insufficient. These will teach us what is perceived as its environment, however, it will not tell us how or why it is understood as such.

As already clarified, the definition of environment to the corporation is to have risen from “reciprocal action between the environment and corporations.” A definition of the “meaning” aside from this, is a mere data change in historical view points or the restrictions of generalized experiences, unable to rid its arbitrariness. The corporation’s semantic environment classification, “reciprocal action between the environment and corporations” were the definition links of both parties, and was interpreted from the corporation’s standpoint alone. At least 4 points can be brought up as the points of view of environment classification, as listed below. Firstly, the distinction and link between “the environment’s definition of the

objective process” and “the environment’s definition of the subjective process,” is problematic, when attention is given to the point that the corporation, as agent-like existences, is in the synthesis process of the objective and subjective processes. Moreover, if standing on the position that the corporation “lives,” secondly, it is necessary to interpret the meaning of the corporation’s “reciprocal action,” from the point of view of “conditions for existence.” In addition, thirdly, it is vital to interpret “reciprocal action” from the “structure of time.” Finally, according to the “reciprocal action” itself, the points that the corporation and environment change, and the points that recognition limits and/or “understanding the environment is an incomplete program,” must be taken into consideration.

Based on the first point of view, the “fundamental environment” and the “action and/or function environment” can be considered the corporation’s semantic environment. The former is a “parental body” environment to the corporation. The later is an environment where the corporation “is subject to move,” or a “place for action.” In the second point of view, the “symbiotic environment,” “resource environment,” and/or “competitive environment” become the problems. “Interdependence” is the prerequisite in “living.” Traditionally, the environment was a “place for symbiosis” and/or a “place for cooperation.” However, at the same time, “to live” means there is a necessity for “food[26].” “To live,” corporations make “resources” their food. Accordingly, the environment becomes a “resource environment” and furthermore, as the “living” beings multiply, and if the resources are scarce, this becomes a “competitive environment.” In the third point of view, a “diachronic environment” is distinguished from a “synchronic environment.” From the last point of view, a comparison can be made between “actual environment” and “real environment.” In the later, this becomes even more of a “realistic” environment to certain corporations, and an “understood” environment to the self. In the former, unrelated to the above, is a “real appearing” environment that actually exists, and to the corporations “remains problematic” or is a “potential” environment.

Furthermore, the semantics of the various environments can be classified into two other categories. In short, from the subject of corporate organization, it is possible to distinguish the various environments where the “aspects of being kept alive” and the “aspects of living” are linked. The former includes, the “fundamental environment,” “symbiotic environment,” “diachronic environment,” “actual environment,” and the later includes, the “action and/or function environment,” “resource and/or competitive environment,” “synchronic environment,” and “real environment.”

The corporation’s understanding of the environment can be said to be the contrast of the “aspects of being kept alive” and the “aspects of living,” belong to the various environments, and how the links are perceived. By doing so, corporations decides its management behavior and management philosophy. The contrasts of “fundamental environment” and “action and/or function environment,” and how their connection is perceived, will determine the quality of independence of the corporate organization. The contrasts of “symbiotic environment” and “resource and/or competitive environment,” and how their connection is perceived, will determine the “degree of self-transcendental subjectivity” and “degree of sympathy” of the

corporate organization. Under the contrasts of “diachronic environment” and “synchronic environment,” and how their connection is perceived, will give a fixed “historical viewpoint.” In addition, under the contrasts of “actual environment” and “real environment,” and how their connection is perceived, will give a fixed “ontological viewpoint.” The “historical viewpoint” will consider the contrasts of “fundamental environment” and “action and/or function environment,” and how their connection is perceived. The “ontological viewpoint” will consider the contrasts of “symbiotic environment” and “resource and/or competitive environment,” and how their connection is perceived. However, we must not forget that the influential connection is not a one-direction link, but can also influence connections in the opposite direction. The illustrated connections are as Figure-2.

Traditionally, the corporation’s understanding of the environment only looked at the “living aspects” concerning various environments. The historical viewpoint in understanding the environment is “short-term thinking”; the ontological viewpoint is strengthened by the “self-sufficient principle,” and the environment of the corporate organization is only perceived from the “utilization value.” The environment works for the profits of the corporation, is its place of activity (use and/or function environment), and for that purpose, is the subject and situation (resource and/or competitive environment) of use. A certain width of “present” (synchronic environment) is important to the corporation, and to the self, which perceives this, things beyond this “real” environment so not exist.

On the other hand, the problems of the corporation’s understanding of the environment hereafter, are: “long-term thinking” from the historical point of view; planning to change ontological viewpoint to the “interdependence principle”; heightening the sensitivity of the corporate organization body to the “outside”; enlarging the “awareness” horizon of the
organization; always going beyond the self and perceiving the environment as a "place" to broaden self-identity (I perceive this as the environment’s value of interdependence). We have amassed a "repertoire of definitions." If the corporations take this stance, the environment is an "action and/or function environment" at this same time it is a "fundamental environment," and is a "resource and/or competitive environment" together as a "symbiotic environment." The "present" in a "synchronic environment" has an integrated meaning as "past" and "future," to the business subject, and its location within a "diachronic environment" is important. The business subject is "rarefied" in the present, and even though it is "rarefied," a "real" and "actual environment" is reviewed and foreseen in "the process of diachronic reciprocal action between the environment and corporation." And it is essential that the "real environment" perceived at the moment (by the self) is compared and connected.

V. Summary-Towards the Future

The era has changed from the 20th to the 21st Century. On the one hand, firmly evaluating the achievements of the modern era, we are facing its adverse effects and have welcomed an age when we must conquer these effects. This also means that we have switched from a corporate-centered society to a relative society. The 20th Century was an era when the words, "Business of business is business" were clearly and loudly stated. Even though the expression of these words could not said to have been distinct, the meaning was. One of the meanings was, "Business and ethics don't mix." As Richard DeGeorge had stated, these words are to be accurately pointed to as "myths" and dismissed. Explaining actual situations, the interpretations were not meaningless, but were rather harmful. By combining and speaking about corporation and ethics, for the first time, we are able to stand on the viewing platform overlooking a new society of a pleasant 21st Century.

This manuscript, in preparation to stand on that viewing platform, outlines the tendencies concerning corporate ethics in Japan. Efforts have been made to confirm the fundamental viewpoints to be respected, hereafter.

Presently, looking back, even though many points of regret can be recognized, I would just like to touch upon one point. The present investigation, of course, has limitations in its utilization. With a framework that follows the problem awareness of the self, this time there was a full realization that there was a need to collect necessary material, personally. However, even if this was accomplished, there were other problems at hand. Although devices of different investigational methods were necessary, the most important point was the practice of educational connection between the universities and corporations. Through the "formation of this field," the condition of ethical problems of Japan can be shared. It is thought that nothing can surpass this.

Current Trends in Corporate Ethics of Japan:
A Study of University Education and Research Topics

Teruso TANIGUCHI

The purpose of this paper is to touch upon the response of corporations and universities to the present corporate ethics of Japan, and to review the direction of education and research at universities. In the body of the paper, I examine the subject under three headings: First, Japan’s Corporations and Ethical Problems (Section II); Second, Corporate Ethics and University Education (Section III); Third, New Aspects of Corporate Ethics Problems (Section IV).

Section II survey “Japan’s corporate misconducts and truth on how corporations deal with corporate ethics.” It will also make clearer “their characteristic and problems.” Section III, after consideration of needs and importance for “corporate and university educational cooperation,” explain that we are earnestly working to establish the organizational ethics as the foundational theory of education, research, and practicality of corporate ethics in Momoyama Gakuin University. In the research of corporate ethics, more of a focus must be placed on the possibilities: of changing the unethrical organization, ethical; on the degree of influence on the activities of the people working there and other interested parties concerned; and on the degree of influence on the organizational activities of the people working there and other interested parties concerned. The intention of the organizational ethics mentioned above is this. New aspects of corporate ethics problems that are to surface by focusing on these points be expressed in Section IV.

Ethical issues in Japanese corporations such as “non-disclosure,” “lacking a sense of fair competition and risk taking,” “composition of official stance and true intentions,” and “organizational pressure of the unspoken,” generally have a tendency to be seen as “Japanese in nature.” However, this is a combination of things “Japanese in nature” and the “mechanism of modernization,” and accordingly, to conquer these various problems, needs to address “the problems the mechanism of modernization involves.” What I have tried to show in Section IV are triple doors to the challenge tower. They are also the fundamental viewpoints to be respected in education and research for corporate ethics, hereafter.