

Conflict of Interest Policy

Because I am involved in a particular form of public “blogger journalism” that invokes both factual reporting and commentary, I follow certain rules to avoid conflicts in possible employment.

Generally, I don’t accept employment involving authority over direct reports, or involving making underwriting decisions about potential or actual clients or customers. I don’t accept employment that requires behaving in a partisan or biased manner.

And I prefer not to work in situations that require contact individual people and manipulating them to do someone else’s bidding.

If I were to have direct reports in a position that had resulted as a result of sale of rights to my writings or a similar event related to my writings, I would reassess my presence online in accordance with what myself and a potential “employer” agreed to, by contract.

I have discussed this issue on the doaskdotell site in several places before, with stated blogging and site persistence policies, and will be reviewing these documents soon.

Since the emergence of social networking sites, especially those that tend to merge social and professional networking (we all know that I am referring to the success of Facebook), a different concept of “publishing” on the Web has evolved, specifically, posting content primarily intended for a specified list of “friends” or “followers” and not the public. Of course, care must be taken when using these sites. But this policy does not apply to social networking when privacy controls are used.

A Note about Names and Trademarks.

My legal name is John William Boushka, or John W. Boushka, and the “quasi pseudonym” that I use for my books, “Bill Boushka”, may be used interchangeably online, as with Internet searches.

I have not applied for a trademark for “Do Ask Do Tell” because I haven’t really used it in a way that the USPTO would regard as sufficiently commercial. I also wonder about how appropriate it is (ethically) to trademark phrases of common words that have a political or social context (here, relative to the military gay ban, which has been repealed). I would hate to see someone else try to trademark the phrase for something “silly”.

So far, the name has not been used for a major film, but I am seriously considering trying to make such a film, as I have noted elsewhere on the site. In the movie business, it’s acceptable for multiple films to use the same name, unless the name becomes a “franchise” of sequels (like “Transformers”). I would also be interesting in using the name for an indie motion picture production and/or distribution company, with an emphasis on films that tackle tough political or social issues. If anyone wants to take this up, contact me.