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Indeed, it is hard to perceive in what respect the interrogation of the perjurious client in a courtroom is not greater participation in the client's perjury than his interrogation in the office of his attorney. The author's footnoted "distinction" between active participation in a false defense and "accepting a client's decision to commit perjury, and presenting that perjury to the court," id. at 73 n.*, is so flimsy as to be intellectually invisible. 1976]. Lawyers' ethics. Second, what is the adversary system, and how is it distinctive? And third, how might one go about justifying the adversary system on two types of moral theory — consequentialist and deontological? The lawyer's ethical view of the world. The lawyers did not believe they were exempt from the demands of ethics. Rather, they believed that they were following a set of ethical principles that was worthy of their respect. Certainly, the law, in the form of the duty of confidentiality within the rules of professional, required them to respect Wilson's decision not to admit publicly that he had killed the security guard. See this image. Lawyers' ethics in an adversary system Hardcover 1975. by. Monroe H Freedman (Author).