CHAPTER 1

Critical Thinking and Ethical Reasoning

LEARNING OUTCOMES

After completing this chapter, you should be able to:

- Understand the importance of ethics in your own life.
- Define values and explain the significance of values as they relate to ethics.
- Define integrity and explain its application to ethics.
- Distinguish between moral philosophy and ethics.
- Describe the importance of reasoning and critical thinking in ethics.
- Describe the importance of motivation in ethics.
- Grasp how loyalty should be understood in public safety roles.
- Understand how personal morality may conflict with professional ethical obligations.
- Identify the existence of a professional ethical dilemma.

CHAPTER OUTLINE

Introduction

Getting a Sense of Ethics

You may be reading this book because you are studying for a career in policing, corrections, or security, and you want to understand the role of ethics in the criminal justice and public safety field. Alternatively, you may have already started a career as a police, correctional, or security officer, and you are reading this book to improve your understanding of ethics and its application to your profession.

In the past, law enforcement officers (for example, police, border services, customs, commercial transportation, conservation, wildlife officers), correctional officers (for example, federal, provincial, court services officers), and security officers (private or public) were seen as having separate occupations. But the Law Commission of Canada (2006, p. xiii) observed that policing around the world is transforming into an integrated task undertaken by a variety of public and private groups that are increasingly "overlapping, complementary and mutually supportive," making it "difficult to distinguish between public and private responsibilities." These interrelated professions—policing, corrections, and security—have public safety as their common goal and thus share many ethical considerations. Such considerations are the concern of this text.

The book is divided into two parts: the first includes four chapters and examines principles of ethical reasoning, while the second part focuses on the applications. Chapter 1 requires you to consider and critically examine a number of matters that are fundamental to society and life in

general. You will also need to become familiar with some of the basic terms and concepts that arise in the discussion of ethics (on both the personal and professional levels) and to apply the kind of reasoning relevant to ethical issues. Once the conceptual and critical reasoning foundations have been established, Chapter 2 will introduce you to some of the dominant theories that are encountered in ethics and demonstrate how these theories can assist you in understanding, resolving, and responding to ethical issues in the criminal justice and public safety field. Knowing and understanding some theory is essential to any ethics education. If you think about it, having to learn theory about ethics is no different from being required to know theory as it relates to using force, driving a patrol vehicle, using equipment (such as firearms, pepper spray, handcuffs, radios, and computers), and performing other operational functions (for example, establishing legal grounds for an arrest, conducting a search, or drafting documents to obtain judicial authorization to undertake an activity).

With the theoretical foundation established, Chapter 3 provides an important component of ethical decision-making by examining past and current ethical obligations, codes, or statements in relation to the police (both public and corporate); special constables; and peace, corrections, and security officers. The codes of ethics and obligations applicable to lawyers and judges are also examined. It is important not only to be generally knowledgeable about ethics and ethical codes in policing, corrections, and security, but also to be able to identify similarities and distinctions in how certain ethical issues, such as confidentiality, are treated within other criminal justice professions connected to the public safety realm. Being aware of other ethical codes and professional obligations helps public safety officers perform better.

Chapter 4 begins the transition from the theoretical to the practical by providing you with a framework in which to resolve ethical dilemmas. It is important to have a theoretical understanding of ethical theories and codes. But most educational initiatives in the area of criminal justice and public safety ethics have provided only rudimentary frameworks for making and evaluating an ethical decision. This text provides a more robust framework for such decisions.

Part II of the book will then move to a broader consideration and application of ethics in the context of contemporary issues, commencing with a consideration of several controversial social issues in Chapter 5. Contemporary issues in the public safety professions will be considered in Chapter 6, followed by Chapter 7, which examines how corruption occurs in policing and corrections, as well as security organizations, and applies ethical constructs and theories to explain why corrupt acts occur within these professions. Chapter 8 considers several ethical issues relating to the officer's role in the public safety context, and the final chapter looks at the courtroom and focuses on ethical issues confronting lawyers and judges.

Let us turn, then, to the conceptual quest. You might expect a book on ethical reasoning in criminal justice and public safety to start with a definition of ethics. But at this preliminary stage, any definition we might provide would be either so broad as to be unhelpful or so specific as to be highly contestable. At this point, it is sufficient to recognize that ethical questions are central to many situations facing us in both our personal and professional lives. These questions address the value and meaning of our lives and are at the core of being a good person and officer.[1]

The Meaning of Life

The birthplace of philosophy was in the town of Miletus, located across the Aegean Sea from Athens, Greece; hence, the first philosophers are known as the Milesians. These philosophers

1 Throughout this book, when we use the term "officer" without any qualification, it should be taken to mean a police officer, a special constable or peace officer, a correctional officer, an investigative or security officer, and an officer of the court (that is, lawyer or judge). In short, the term "officer" stands for all criminal justice and public safety officers, whether a sworn peace officer as defined in section 2 of the *Criminal Code*, RSC 1985, c C-46, or not.

concerned themselves with nature and sought answers to such questions as "What are things really like?" Following the Milesians, the Greek philosopher Socrates (469–399 BCE), shifted concerns about the natural world to the study of how humans ought to live. Socrates had a lifelong interest in determining right from wrong and good from evil. From Socrates, Plato (429–347 BCE), and Aristotle (384–322 BCE), ethics has been concerned with the great questions of human life. For these ancient philosophers, the central ethical question was: what is the well-lived and flourishing human life? In other words, what makes life worth living and what is the meaning of life?

The School of Athens *is a fresco by the Renaissance artist Raphael that depicts Plato and his student Aristotle making their way down the stairs at the centre of the painting. Look closely and you will see the younger Aristotle carrying his masterpiece,* Nicomachean Ethics *(see page 115).*

The thrust of the Greek philosophers' answer was that human lives are worthwhile when they are thoughtful and reflective, when people choose activities on the basis of good reasons, and when people care about their friends, families, and communities.

For those of us raised with more contemporary ethics and morality, the broad scope of early philosophical inquiries into the meaning of ethics may come as a surprise or seem vague and impractical. You may expect that a book on ethics should simply contain a list of rules and regulations prescribing the conduct we expect every criminal justice and public safety officer to follow. Indeed, in Chapter 3, we will examine a variety of codes of ethics, and we will also spend some time looking at the basic expectations we have of officers. However, the first task is to put all of that into context by developing a better conceptual sense of what ethics is about and by considering various ways of understanding ethics.

The Importance of Values

values
beliefs and opinions about matters that we, individually or collectively, decide are beneficial, desirable, and important

As a starting point in our examination of ethics, it is important to consider that individuals, groups, and communities all have **values**. What are values? Generally, they are beliefs and opinions about matters that we, individually or collectively, decide are beneficial, desirable, and important to an individual, group, or community. Values, in general, are not necessarily related to distinguishing good and bad in an ethical sense: it may be that an individual's values are premised purely on self-interest or doing what is best for that individual and not what is ethically right or good.

ethical values
important values based on a moral perspective that are related to determining what is right or good, that will shape a person's life and career, and that influence how decisions are made

Ethical values are values that are related to determining what is right or good, and they will shape a person's life and career and influence how a person makes decisions. If you are considering, or already have, a career in criminal justice or public safety, this probably indicates that you have formed a set of ethical values. For example, you are sufficiently concerned about your community and the safety and well-being of others that you are prepared to devote your career to achieving those goals. And you are also prepared to risk your own safety and well-being in doing so. Ethical values are distinguished from values in general in that *ethical values are based on a moral standard* that is concerned with distinguishing right from wrong or good from bad. If you properly consider and apply ethical values when making decisions, at the end of your career, you will be able to look back with pride on your accomplishments.

In order to broaden our understanding of values and their intersection with ethics, imagine that we are writing our individual life stories. The choices or decisions we each make reflect our own character and form the plot of our personal story. Each of us is different, and we will each make different choices and consequently take different paths. Our general and ethical values form the background to those choices. Ethical values are concerned with what is good, right, just, and virtuous. Ethical values govern how a person determines right and wrong and interacts with others in society.

Any contemplation of ethics requires you to consider a number of questions in order to better understand the importance of values and what is good in life. For example, what would a good career look like? What would a good relationship or family look like? What are the values we need to possess, and the actions we need to perform, in order to lead good lives and have rewarding careers? This is the essence of ethics.

ethical dilemma
a situation where an individual must choose between competing ethical obligations that flow from personally or professionally held ethical principles; it can be defined as a situation where you are unsure of the right course of action, or where the course of action you select is difficult to follow or unpalatable, or where the wrong course of action is very tempting

There are times, however, when an individual must choose between two or more competing ethical principles or values. This is known as an **ethical dilemma.** These types of situations can be very difficult as you may be faced with obeying a law, yet conforming to the law may offend other deeply held values such as compassion or a sense of equality. Consider the movie *Schindler's List*, where Oskar Schindler routinely broke the law by misleading the Nazis in order to save the lives of his Jewish neighbours. Most of the time, breaking the law is wrong, but occasionally it is necessary and the best option.

Another example of an ethical dilemma comes from Plato, where he recounts an encounter between Socrates and Euthyphro. Socrates is astonished that Euthyphro would be willing to prosecute his own father. In the story, Euthyphro's father is charged with murder, and for Euthyphro, if a person acts unjustly, then it is his duty to bring the person to justice even if the murderer is a relative. There is a clear dissonance between Euthyphro's duty as a prosecutor and his loyalty to his father. This is not a far-fetched story from ancient philosophy as these ethical dilemmas do occur and often have life-or-death consequences. Consider David Kaczynski, who recognized that the person mailing bombs to scientists with the intent to kill them was his brother, Ted. Should he stay loyal to his brother, or should David notify the authorities? Fortunately, David chose honesty over loyalty as he notified the FBI of his suspicions.

Let's consider another example of an ethical dilemma that resulted in tragedy. In June 2005, a four-man Special Reconnaissance element of the US Navy Seals was in Afghanistan in search of a Taliban leader who was associated with Osama bin Laden. While in position, the four men

were approached by two local Afghan sheep herdsmen and a 14-year-old boy. Notably, the Afghans were unarmed. The American soldiers apprehended them at gunpoint and then debated what to do with them. Since the soldiers did not have any rope to tie them up, the soldiers were faced with the difficult decision to either let them go or kill them. For one of the soldiers, the right thing to do was to kill the herdsmen and the boy. After all, it was their duty to save their own lives, as they were on a mission, and to let them go could run the risk of the herdsmen notifying the Taliban, jeopardizing the mission. In contrast, Petty Officer Marcus Luttrell said, "Something kept whispering in the back of my mind, it would be wrong to execute these unarmed men in cold blood" (Luttrell & Robinson, 2007, p. 205). His Christian faith told him that killing is wrong. If you were in this unfortunate position, what would you do?

Shortly after the soldiers released the herdsmen, the four soldiers were attacked by Taliban fighters armed with AK-47s and rocket-propelled grenades. In the subsequent battle, a US helicopter that was dispatched to rescue the 4 soldiers was shot down by Taliban fighters, killing all 16 soldiers on board. Of the four men in the Reconnaissance unit, only Luttrell survived. He managed to escape to a Pashtun village where local residents helped him. For Luttrell, although he thought he was doing the right thing by following his Christian values, "it was the stupidest" decision that he has ever made, and he will have to live the rest of his life knowing that his decision resulted in the death of 19 fellow Americans (Luttrell & Robinson, 2007).

From these examples, you can see how individual values can shape an individual's choice. You can also see how values can create the criteria for the good and bad elements in a person's personal life or career. Doing good means acting in accordance with accepted ethical values (which, as we shall see, may come from a number of sources). The greatest failures in our lives and careers can occur when we fail to live up to ethical values or, perhaps, when we choose to uphold general values that are not related to doing what is right or good. If we consider the dilemma the soldiers faced, we can conclude that some dilemmas are so difficult that we are often uncertain of what may happen when making a decision.

BOX 1.1 Dilemmas of Loyalty

Chapter 2 will discuss some of the dominant theories of ethics, and we will see that one of the most influential concepts is utilitarianism. Briefly, utilitarianism states that we should strive to do the greatest good for the greatest number. This means that when deciding what to do, you should do so by using an impartial calculation. That is, you should have the same concern for the well-being of strangers as you do for your own family members.

This ethical theory was illustrated in the 18th century by utilitarian philosopher William Godwin (1756–1836), who asked us to imagine what we would do if faced with choosing to save only one person from a burning building. Imagine there are two people who need to be rescued: one is an archbishop, the other a chambermaid. The archbishop is a pillar of society and is about to publish a masterpiece on human rights. The kicker is that the chambermaid is your mother. According to Godwin, you should save the archbishop as his contribution to society will produce the greatest good for the greatest number. However, from a biological perspective, the idea that we can adhere to the strict demands of an impartial spectator as described by Godwin seems unattainable. It is part of human nature to have a greater concern for family members and friends in our decision-making process, a situation that philosopher Robert Nozick calls "ethical pull" (1981). Nevertheless, there will be times when we are faced with the dilemmas of choosing between family members and the greater good. Two brothers highlight this dilemma best. As mentioned earlier, David Kaczynski came to realize that the Unabomber, who had sent bombs through the mail for almost twenty years, killing 3 people and seriously injuring 23 others, was his brother, Ted. For David, it was better to notify the authorities about his suspicion than to stay loyal to his brother. In contrast, let's look at two other brothers. One is a lawyer, serving as the president of a university and the president of the State Senate; the other brother is a dishonourable crime boss. William Bulger's brother, James, was wanted for a number of murders

(Continued on next page.)

and was on the run for 16 years. William refused to assist the FBI and admitted to a grand jury that he would never do anything that would lead to the arrest of his brother. After his brother was finally apprehended and convicted of 11 murders, William was forced to resign from his university position, and according to a Boston Globe columnist, "faced with a moral dilemma, William repeatedly made the wrong choice, putting loyalty to his felonious brother over responsibility to his neighbourhood, his constituents, or the larger public community whose university he led" (Seelye, 2013, p.14). Loyalty is an admirable quality and staying loyal to family and friends is an attribute that many of us hold dear. However, at times one's loyalty may have to be re-examined depending on the circumstances. As public safety officers, you may also face dilemmas of loyalty. How do you think you will choose?

Sources:

Nozick, R. (1981). *Philosophical explanations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Seelye, K.Q. (2013, November 24). Sticking by a murderous brother and paying for it dearly. *New York Times*, Section A, p. 14.

Application to Relationships

Another way of approaching ethics is to identify the areas of human life that ethics is typically understood to cover. Ethics certainly covers our interpersonal relations and the principles that govern those relationships. **Ethical principles** are precepts or concepts that inform or underlie what is considered to be good, bad, right, or wrong conduct. They are the principles that underpin how individuals determine what is good conduct in society, such as treating everyone fairly. Limiting ethics to interpersonal or social relationships is probably too restrictive because we now accept that we have ethical obligations toward animals and, in some cases, toward the physical environment. In other words, it is no longer possible to limit ethics to the interactions or relationships between humans since many believe there are broad ethical considerations that apply equally to the interaction of humans with any other creature, plant, or environment.

ethical principles
concepts that underlie what is considered to be good, bad, right, or wrong conduct and that help individuals determine what is good conduct in society

Structure Versus Content

Yet another approach to understanding ethics, and one that is perhaps more useful, is to think about the structure or form of ethical obligations, statements, or values rather than their content. For example, it can be stated that ethical judgments, statements, values, and obligations have the following three essential qualities:

- *universal/impartial* An ethical judgment, statement, value, or obligation applies impartially to any relevantly similar person in any relevantly similar situation.
- *motivating* An ethical judgment, statement, value, or obligation provides a reason or motivation for acting.
- *overriding* An ethical judgment, statement, value, or obligation supersedes other reasons for acting.

We will examine these qualities in more detail later, but, taken together, these three points are obviously concerned with an extremely important element of human life. We typically think of **ethical obligations** as obligations applying to everyone that provide reasons for acting that supersede or override other reasons. By focusing on structure or form, rather than content, we receive some guidance in understanding ethical obligations in contrast to other, more general obligations.

ethical obligations
important obligations applying to everyone that provide reasons for acting that supersede or defeat other reasons

Personal Integrity

Personal integrity is another element that must be given some consideration when discussing ethics. On one level, personal **integrity** may be seen as the quality of acting in accordance with values. If either Oskar Schindler or David Kaczynski had acted other than the way they did, they would have failed to act with personal integrity. This highlights a potential problem with

integrity
the quality of acting in accordance with ethical values; a person with integrity is prepared to stand up for what they believe in

integrity. Acting with integrity can mean acting in accordance with your own personal values, but this definition does not say anything about the content of those values. If the values are good, such as the brave acts of Oskar Schindler and David Kaczynski, then the results are positive. However, if they are bad, such as the loyalty of William Bulger, then actions in accordance with those values will turn out to be bad. Thus, as an officer, it is essential to link integrity to acting in accordance with accepted professional or ethical values—that is, doing what is right, just, good, or virtuous, not just upholding general or personal values that may not relate to or result in correct ethical conduct in a professional context.

A person with integrity is also a person who is prepared to stand up for what they believe in and defend those beliefs. Acting with ethical integrity means speaking out when you see things that are wrong: it means critically reflecting on your own actions and the actions of others and also being able and willing to act appropriately and explain why you acted in a certain way. People, particularly officers, are constantly faced with tests of integrity. Sometimes those tests are significant events, but more often, they are the little events that arise every day. When we decide how much of the truth we will tell our partners, or whether we will return the incorrect change given to us by a cashier, we are choosing just how important our ethical values are in our lives—are ethical values important enough to make a difference in your everyday life, or do you just pay them lip service?

The Essence of Ethics

As you will have no doubt concluded, ethics is no small matter, for it concerns how we should conduct our lives. **Ethics** is about understanding the difference between good and bad, and being ethical is about living good and worthwhile lives. As such, ethics warrants our most careful attention to both the personal and the professional aspects of our lives.

ethics
a subject matter of moral philosophy that is generally concerned with constructing a theoretical framework in which a person may understand morality, or goodness, and by which a person may live a "good and worthwhile life"

The terms "moral philosophy" and "ethics" are often used interchangeably by philosophers. However, in order to clarify the conceptual discussion, we think it is useful to distinguish between these two terms. **Moral philosophy** (or morality) is broadly concerned with the *idea* of what is good or right (for example, the injunction *do no harm* reflects a moral philosophy). Moral philosophy contemplates what we mean when we speak about the *idea* of good versus bad motives and intentions; right versus wrong actions, behaviours, and omissions; virtuous versus evil character traits; and just versus unjust decisions. Moral philosophy is generally concerned with *theories about ethics*. Ethics, on the other hand, is concerned with providing a coherent *theory of morality*. Therefore, ethics is best understood as a subject matter of moral philosophy and generally directs itself to constructing a theoretical framework in which morality, or goodness, rightness, virtuousness, and justness, may be understood and determined. As we shall see in Chapter 2, John Stuart Mill's utilitarianism, Robert Nozick's libertarian ethics, Immanuel Kant's deontological or duty-based ethics, John Rawl's principles of justice, and Aristotle's virtue ethics provide theoretical ethical frameworks that explain what is considered to be good, right, and just, and, from a practical standpoint, may help you make the correct decision in a particular ethical circumstance. Accordingly, as a matter of practice, a theory of ethics is essential to determining what is good, right, virtuous, and just. Morality or moral philosophy is generally concerned about such matters as goodness, fairness, and justice, while ethics provides the means by which judgments or decisions on such matters are made (for example, the greatest good for the greatest number); in other words, ethics tells you how to make a decision. Although moral philosophy is distinguished from ethics in a theoretical sense, in discussions and writings, you will frequently find the terms "moral" and "ethical" used as synonyms for "good." It seems that there is a unity in ethical and moral values since if ethics seeks to describe a theory of living well, then to live well, there must be some consideration as to how we treat others.

moral philosophy
the contemplation of what is meant by good intentions, right behaviour, virtuous character, just decisions, and the like

Where do our ethical values come from—our *moralness*? The easy answer is to say from religion, from the law, or from our families, but that is too simple. While many people gain their first ethical insights from religion, and while ethics is frequently discussed and presented in

religion, ethics and religion are not the same thing. If ethics and religion were the same, no non-religious person would have any ethical concerns or values. But, of course, those without religious beliefs usually do have very strongly held ethical values and principles.

Morals or ethics also cannot necessarily be equated with laws. First, we can always ask, even of a legal act, whether we *should* do it or not, since not all *legally* permissible acts are *ethically* permissible. For example, at one time, owning slaves was legally permissible in certain parts of Canada and the United States, but that did not make it permissible in ethical terms. Second, we can always ask whether a legal prohibition against an act is ethically justified. As we shall see, current debates around torture, medical assistance in dying (MAID), safe injection facilities, management of terrorism, and even about policing during the COVID-19 pandemic and police interaction with Black and Indigenous people and people of colour (BIPOC), rest on moral or ethical arguments about personal freedom and autonomy. So, conversely, while an act may be illegal, that does not mean that it is unethical or that the law should prohibit the act. Engaging in a civil rights march against slavery or discrimination without the necessary municipal permit may be illegal, for example, but it is not unethical.

Ethical Reasoning

While we acquire values from many sources—including religion, our families, the law, our work experience, sports activities, school, friends, television shows, and so on—each value we hold is itself subject to critical reflection and evaluation. For example, we can all think of cases where our values differ from those of our parents. We may be brought up in a family that is prejudiced against a certain ethnic group or that firmly believes that a woman's place is in the home. However, our experiences with men and women or with members of other ethnic groups may bring us to understand that the elements of humanity that unite us are far greater than the elements that divide us. Accordingly, this should lead us to start asking some critical questions. For example, is it justified to exclude some people from access to opportunities based on their sexual orientation? How is it fair to treat certain people differently from others because of such characteristics? The process of asking and answering questions about our moral beliefs and judgments is the essence of ethical reasoning. **Ethical reasoning** is the application of formal logic to questions of right and wrong, good and bad, justice and injustice. In effect, you are engaging in the process of thinking critically about what the right thing to do is and questioning assumptions about the way things are done. When examining ethics, we are always entitled or even obliged to ask "why?"

ethical reasoning
the application of formal logic to questions of right and wrong, good and bad, justice and injustice

It has been our experience that officers and students traditionally have not made enough effort to think critically, reflectively, and systematically about the ideological (political or social), personal, or professional biases they rely on; their conclusions are often not premised on disciplined reasoning. As noted by Paul and Elder (2012):

> As a [critical] reasoner, you should come to your own conclusions. At the same time, you must be prepared to state your reasoning in detail, explaining what ethical concepts and issues seem to you to be relevant and why. You must be prepared to demonstrate that you have given serious consideration to alternative perspectives on the issue, that you are not ignoring other reasonable ways to think through the question at issue. You must be ready to present what you take to be the most relevant and important facts in the case. You must be prepared to do what any good thinker would do in attempting to support reasoning on any issue in any domain of thought. The fact that an issue is ethical does not mean that you can abandon your commitment to disciplined, rational thought. (pp. 350–351)

We cannot emphasize enough the importance of being able to consider and evaluate an opposing position, even if it is fundamentally at odds with your personal beliefs, and we encourage you to think about the assumptions and inferences you are relying upon when considering ethical issues. Doing so will force you to reason more clearly.

Now, let us look at an example of ethical reasoning as it relates to Canadian criminal law. In *R v Butler* (1992), the Supreme Court of Canada unanimously upheld the censorship of obscenity laws. At issue was whether section 163(8) of the *Criminal Code* defines obscenity as "any publication a dominant characteristic of which is the undue exploitation of sex, or of sex and any one or more of the following subjects, namely crime, horror, cruelty and violence" offends the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Obscenity is an expression that is protected by section 2(b) of the Charter, so the question for the court was whether the obscenity law was a "reasonable limit" on freedom of expression.

In order to determine whether the law was unconstitutional, the justices had to determine whether the law had the kind of "pressing and substantial" purpose required of a "reasonable limit" prescribed by the *Oakes* (1986) test. Writing for the majority, Justice Sopinka wrote, "the prevention of dirt for dirt's sake is not a legitimate objective which would justify the violation of one of the most fundamental freedoms enshrined in the Charter"(*R v Butler*, 1992, para. 79). The justices went on to distinguish three categories of pornography: (1) explicit sex with violence; (2) explicit sex without violence but that is degrading or dehumanizing; and (3) explicit sex without violence that is neither degrading, nor dehumanizing. The justices reasoned that the first two were harmful according to modern community standards, but the third kind would be considered as "good pornography" or "erotica." They reasoned that bad pornography is harmful for both women and children.

This feminist reasoning and interpretation of section 163(8) of the *Criminal Code* was celebrated by a number of prominent feminists, and the decision attracted international attention. For instance, the *New York Times* suggested that the Supreme Court decision made "Canada the first place in the world that says what is obscene is what harms women" (Bateman et al., 2017, p. 76). We will see in Chapter 2 that a feminist reading of law and policy may at times lead to innovative interpretation and result in more just and equitable laws. Additionally, in Chapter 5, we will find that by including the voices of minorities and disenfranchised people in our ethical decisions, we may arrive at a different perspective.

The debate around pornography, obscenity, and censorship continues. Not only have developments in technology made accessing and distributing pornography easier than ever, but disagreement over what should and should not be prohibited is ongoing, as evidenced by another pornography case, the Supreme Court of Canada case *R v Sharpe* (2001). In *Sharpe*, which dealt with the *Criminal Code* offence of child pornography, the court sought to balance society's interest in protecting children from sexual abuse with the Charter-protected right of individuals to freedom of expression (for example, the freedom to create artistic works). The court upheld most of the law but said that people could not be prosecuted for creating visual or written works for their own use, as long as the acts depicted in the photos are not unlawful.

Hopefully, you will have noticed that we started by asking questions and looking for reasons rather than by providing answers. There is no infallible formula for generating ethically correct answers to moral problems; instead, the process is often open and fluid. The first step, however, is to recognize that you are faced with an ethically troubling situation. This may not always be obvious. Ethical problems do not come with labels, but, as we shall see in Chapter 4, there are signs and cues we can look for. A cue that the situation needs to be considered in ethical terms is if a person is being harmed physically, emotionally, or financially. Debates about fairness often tell you that ethical considerations need to be raised. Once an ethical issue is identified, we can move to the decision-making and reason-giving processes. We will look at a framework for ethical decision-making in more detail in Chapter 4. For now, it is enough to emphasize that our ethical choices are only as good as the reasons we give for them since they supply the link between the ethical principle or value and our choice or decision. In other words, an ethical choice is no better than the principle or value it's based on, and our reasoning must help to support that choice.

It is important to emphasize that in many cases involving significant ethical decisions, there is no choice that will satisfy everyone. If we return to the pornography and censorship example, any restrictions on freedom of expression will upset some people, and any publication of sexual material will upset others. The task for ethical reasoning is to make the choice that is supported by the best reasons and then to be prepared to explain and defend that choice. The purpose of this book is to help you make better ethical decisions and enable you to articulate clearly the reasons for those decisions. These are crucial abilities for any criminal justice or public safety officer.

Ethics in Action

So far, our discussion has focused on the importance of ethics in our lives and the sorts of reasoning processes we go through as we decide what is right. There remains one more vital consideration—the transformation of a decision into action. We can all think of cases where we know what the right thing to do is, but we lack the desire or the will to actually do the right thing.

Why should we do what is right even when we really do not want to? This is an ancient problem in ethics—in fact, it may very well be *the* crucial problem in ethical theory. If we could do something we wanted to do and not get caught, would it be rational to do it? Why should we not just do whatever we desire? The moral challenge is to show why a person should act ethically even though they probably will not get caught. In other words, the basic question is, why act ethically if you believe you can get away with **unethical** behaviour? Acting unethically or **immorally** is freely choosing to do what you know is wrong.

unethical
not ethical, unscrupulous; a person who is unethical has freely chosen to do what they know is bad

immoral
morally wrong, not conforming to accepted standards of morality; a person who is immoral has chosen to do what they know is incorrect or wrong

This problem is especially acute if we see ethically good actions as being in conflict with our own self-interest. If, at one level, we simply think of ethics as a set of rules (like the Ten Commandments) for doing the right thing, those rules can get in the way of achieving another goal that we might want. For example, it is not unethical to want to be rich, but it is unethical to lie, cheat, or steal to get rich. The ethical prohibitions against lying or stealing prevent us from using certain methods to achieve a perfectly respectable objective. Why, then, if we thought we could get away with it, would we bother to follow the ethical rules?

Ethical actions often involve private activities. In many cases, no one will ever know what we have done. What makes people act ethically when no one will ever know? One answer is religious belief. If we believe that there is a God watching our every move, one who will punish us for our transgressions, then acting ethically becomes a matter of self-interest, a means of avoiding future punishment.

But this approach has a couple of crucial drawbacks. First, it does not apply to those who do not have religious beliefs. Do we really want to tie the applicability of ethical or moral rules only to those who espouse religious beliefs? Many **secular moralists** would say no, as they see some of the beliefs espoused by religions as anything but moral. Morality applies to everyone, regardless of personal religious convictions. Second, if we are acting ethically only out of fear of future punishment, we are, arguably, not necessarily acting ethically at all. We often think that an essential part of an ethically good action is the motivation for that act. To act rightly, a person has to have the proper intention for doing the act (for example, a drug dealer providing information against another drug dealer so that the other drug dealer's area can be taken over is not motivated by an ethically good intention). Action motivated by fear of divine punishment lacks an ethical motivation or an ethically good intention. Therefore, grounding ethical motivation in fear actually takes away an essential component of our moral being—the assessment of our intention for the way we act.

secular moralists
those who believe that morality is not solely determined by religious beliefs

Thus, we come right back to the same question: Why should we act ethically? We can only offer the first hint of an answer here (much of the rest of the book will try to flesh out this

answer). The ancient Greek philosophers' concern with a well-lived and flourishing life is a concern we all share—it matters what kind of life we lead. As humans, we think and reason about our actions. Thinking and reasoning are essential elements to good human lives. The ancient Greek philosophers called these elements "excellences of character"; we often call them virtues. **Virtues** are the elements of conduct recognized by a society as being the standards that all individuals should use to guide their moral life.

virtues
elements of a person's character that are considered good and worthy of cultivation and that should guide a person's ethical life

According to Aristotle, the four cardinal or primary virtues are wisdom, justice, courage, and self-control. The ancient Greeks believed that a good human life would have to exhibit these excellences of character in harmony and balance. And because we all want good lives, we should all want to live in accordance with those virtues; we should all want to act ethically.

It may be that you are feeling somewhat skeptical at this stage, particularly if you have been an officer for a while. You have just been asked, perhaps contrary to most of your experiences, to believe that people actually want to do the right thing. You are right to be skeptical: this book will help explain the connection between self-interest and doing good, and it will demonstrate why, especially for criminal justice and public safety officers, the behaviour of those around us should not affect our own commitment to ethical behaviour.

Professional and Personal Ethics

At this stage, it is perhaps best to acknowledge that any consideration of ethics must also take into account that professional and personal ethical values or perspectives may appear to differ or conflict on certain issues. Moreover, not all ethical problems are alike, as noted by Winch (1972):

> [I]t is necessary for me to emphasize the very wide variety of situations, arguments and judgements to which it is natural to apply the term "moral." These should be distinguished with care and it should not be assumed that logical considerations which hold of one category of judgement will hold of others. (p. 159)

Any account of our ethical lives includes a variety of situations and problems. There is also diversity in purposes, interests, and levels of involvement. This may mean that our decisions will differ depending on which ethical principles or values we engage in and on the relevance of competing interests and facts. It is also important to recognize that personal morality may occasionally clash with professional ethical obligations. Determining how you will respond to such conflicts will be a critical feature of your education in professional ethics.

Thus, it is evident that our moral lives are complex, multifaceted affairs and that our ethical obligations arise from a variety of sources. Ethical obligations arise from our participation in communities, from commitments to family and friends, from religious beliefs, and from our occupations. For example, a senior executive in a publicly traded corporation has an obligation, just as the rest of us do, to be a good friend and loving parent, but they also have a special, role-related obligation to maximize the wealth of the shareholders of their corporation. Similar ethical obligations are created by membership in other professions or occupations. The academic has an ethical obligation to grade fairly, and ought to be committed to the pursuit of truth, regardless of where that truth may lie. As officers, you will have many professional ethical obligations.

It may be helpful to illustrate these principles by looking at a dilemma from everyday life. Ann, who has a graduate degree, is a uniformed constable with a medium-sized police department, and is in the relatively early stages of her career. She is also married and has two children. She is ambitious and wishes to contribute both to her department and to the advancement of women in policing. She is a member of an important committee struck by the department to look at restructuring the delivery of police services by the uniform officers of the department.

The committee chair unexpectedly calls the first meeting for a Saturday. The committee members had previously agreed that anyone who could not attend all of the meetings should resign from the committee because of the short timeline imposed to prepare a report, and to avoid wasting time rehashing completed work for the benefit of the absent members. Ann, however, has scheduled a family trip for that Saturday. To make matters worse, Ann's life, like the life of any other person with children and a career, has been one of constant compromise between fulfilling her professional responsibilities and caring for her family. Ann's problem is that she has to act, yet she faces an impediment to action. She does not know the answers to the questions: "What action should I take?" and "Why should I take this action?"

Although we have not yet fully discussed what makes something an ethical problem, we can all agree that Ann has a dilemma. Even though she has not uttered the words "I promise," she has made a commitment, both to her family and to her committee. She also sees the situation as one where she has to choose between actions that represent two different but deeply held values. However, as Winch points out above, not all ethical problems are alike.

As mentioned earlier, as police and correctional officers, public safety communicators, and all human beings, you will constantly be faced with ethical dilemmas—problems where you have to make a decision or take a course of action in the face of two or more conflicting ethical principles or values. As public safety officers and employees, you will encounter situations where you have to make personal and professional choices, and, as a result, you will encounter two types of ethical problems. First, you will confront *personal* ethical dilemmas that will call on you to make personal choices about how you will respond to a situation. Your personal ethical dilemmas may concern issues such as your commitment to your career and caring for your family. Sometimes those personal dilemmas will arise because of your role as an officer; because you have considerable discretion, you may be asked to do "favours" for friends. What do you do when the person you have pulled over for impaired driving turns out to be a friend, neighbour, colleague, or family member?

The second type of ethical problem you will encounter is a *professional* dilemma where, as part of your operational and administrative duties, you will have to decide on behalf of an agency or institution what decision or course of action will be adopted.

Personal or professional ethical problems can have a number of different elements. The objective or goal will always be an important element or consideration. Some ethical problems readily fall under a means–end model of reasoning where the desired outcome is specified, and the task is to identify a method of reaching that outcome. Other problems, however, may contain a quite different element, that of determining what the objective should be in the first place.

To complicate matters further, the scope of responsibility in making and implementing an ethical decision can vary from problem type to problem type. For example, when faced with a personal ethical dilemma, the person who must make the decision may choose to act in a way that affects others. While the consequences of an action may form part of a person's decision-making process, the considerations are limited to the decision-maker because they are answerable to no one else when making a personal ethical decision. In this case, the decision-maker and the person to whom the decision-maker is responsible are generally the same.

Professional ethical problems, on the other hand, may involve different considerations regarding the scope of responsibility. In responding to a problem, an individual or group must often make a decision or policy that will govern the practices of an institution (for example, hospital, government agency, police service). In this case, as a professional, the decision-maker's scope of responsibilities extends beyond the person's own moral life to include broader social responsibilities.

Social or policy responsibilities may sometimes create dilemmas for the decision-maker. There are instances where the obligations of a person's professional role may conflict with their

personal ethical values. There are also situations where necessary policy objectives can only be attained through unsavoury means—cases of "dirty hands."[2] With professional problems, the decision-maker or makers are often different from those to whom they are responsible for their decisions. If we bear these varying responsibilities and distinctions in mind, we will see that what someone may or may not take for granted regarding questions and problems will vary widely when grappling with an ethical problem. However, in the criminal justice and public safety context, the public trust is the crucial consideration in most, if not all, of an officer's professional ethical dilemmas, and many of their personal ones.

As already alluded to, being an officer brings with it a set of professional ethical obligations and responsibilities. As you will see in more detail in Chapter 3, criminal justice and public safety functions, such as court responsibilities and law enforcement, have a long history of traditions and values. As an officer, you are expected to administer the law impartially, fairly, and without fear or favour. Yet you are also a person, with friends, neighbours, and a family, and personal ethical values. A clash between your legitimate personal ethical values and your professional ethical obligations as an officer can occur in various ways. The primary purpose of **professional ethics** is to provide guidance for making decisions about what to do and judgments about how it is to be done, whether on a personal, individual, corporate, or collective level. Professional ethics is distinguished from ethics in general in that professional ethics focuses on ethical issues that are unique to professional or employment situations. While many ethical issues cut across professional boundaries and may even be universal in scope, every profession has certain ethical issues that must be addressed with some specificity and clarity. An example of this would be the use of force in policing, corrections, and security work.

professional ethics
distinguished from ethics in general in that the focus is on those ethical issues that are unique to professional and employment-related situations; it provides guidance for making decisions about what to do and how it is to be done, whether on a personal, an individual, a corporate, or a collective level

However, as an officer, you will often be called on to exercise discretion or judgment in situations that do not involve any of your own personal ethical values. Imagine that you have to decide how to handle a sit-in at a bank. A group of young people has occupied the bank protesting against social injustice and what they consider to be extreme bank profits. They have not caused any damage, although they are obviously disrupting business and causing considerable inconvenience. The officer's choices are to send in a trained unit to remove the protesters by force, or to wait them out. In this situation, personal ethical values may not be engaged, but it is still necessary to recognize that important professional ethical values are at play. In deciding to use force, one is placing a high value on personal property and the right of individuals to conduct their business as they wish. And conversely, waiting out the protesters reflects the belief that a certain amount of disruption or expressive conduct should be tolerated for the sake of not using force or violence.

The types of considerations you use, and the methods of reasoning you need to employ, for resolving personal ethical dilemmas may well be quite different from those used for addressing professional problems. In the next chapter, we will survey some of the major theories of ethical philosophy, and our goal will be to derive the tools of ethical evaluation and reflection from those traditions. We will also find that some ethical traditions lend themselves more readily than others to the analysis and solution of different types of personal and professional ethical problems.

In addition to the complications that come with a career in public safety, you must keep in mind that even if an officer follows training and does what they honestly believe was the right thing to do, they still may face criticism.

2 The problem of dirty hands in political life is discussed in Walzer (1973).

Case Study

Decisions in Unpredictable Circumstances

On May 27, 2020, at about 5:13 p.m., the Toronto Police received a number of 911 calls about a domestic dispute between members of a family. One of the calls was from Regis Korchinski-Paquet, who told the police operator that she was a victim of assault as her mother and brother had attacked her with knives. In contrast, Ms. Korchinski-Paquet's mother told the police operator that it was her daughter that had attacked her with bottles and that she wanted the police to remove her daughter from the home. This is the information that the police had to take into consideration when attending the call.

The police arrived on the scene and, as trained, separated the family members in order to calm everyone involved and get each person's side of the story. During this interview stage, Ms. Korchinski-Paquet indicated that she wished to go to the washroom. The officers allowed her to do so, while encouraging Ms. Korchinki-Paquet to speak with the paramedics as they would be able to help her. She resisted the advice of the police and went out onto the balcony and attempted to climb to the balcony next door, slipping and falling to her death.

This incident occurred just two days after the death of George Floyd, who had died at the hands of a Minneapolis police officer who knelt on Mr. Floyd's neck until he could no longer breathe. Journalists and politicians equated the two incidents, and there was even the suggestion that the police officers had thrown Ms. Korchinski-Paquet from the balcony, although there was absolutely no evidence of such an occurrence. After a lengthy investigation, the Special Investigations Unit (SIU) released their report. The report clearly indicated that the police acted professionally and tried to de-escalate the situation as they thought was right—just as they were trained to do. The officers tried to get Ms. Korchinski-Paquet to speak with medical professionals and calmly tried to help her. Imagine if you were the police officer in this situation accused of unsubstantiated reprehensible acts even though in your mind you did everything you could to help this individual. Police are trained to talk and try to calm individuals who are suffering from mental distress. This is what the police did in this situation. This is what the police in Toronto do approximately 20,000 times a year, with some incidents resulting in tragedy. Even after the police were exonerated, Jagmeet Singh, a Member of Parliament and the leader of the NDP, took to Twitter to write, "Regis Korchinski-Paquet died because of police intervention. She needed help and her life was taken instead. The SIU decision brings no justice to the family and it won't prevent this from happening again" (Singh, 2020).

There is no question that this was a heartbreaking story that was devastating for the family. Undoubtedly, the police too were affected by this incident. The initial incident would have been difficult in itself, but the officers were also faced with protests, incautious headlines and controversial comments by politicians who should know better. The officers had a difficult decision to make. Should they calm the situation by attempting to communicate with the victim while allowing her to roam freely as they are trained to do, or should they quickly resort to arresting the person? The officers chose the former as the most ethical decision to make, and unfortunately, it did not turn out the way that everyone involved had wished.

Source: Singh, J. [@theJagmeetSingh]. (2020, August 26). *Regis Korchinski-Paquet died because of police intervention. She needed help and her life was taken instead. The SIU's decision brings* [thumbnail with link attached] [Tweet]. Twitter. https://twitter.com/thejagmeetsingh/status/1298800506018689024?lang=en

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter began by observing that ethics requires a critical examination of a number of matters important to society and human life, and proceeded to discuss the importance of reasoning in ethics. Rather than providing a definition of ethics, we examined a number of approaches to understanding it. We began by examining the "meaning of life" ethical perspective espoused by three Greek philosophers. We then examined in considerable detail the importance of values, particularly ethical values, and how they influence our lives and careers. As part of understanding ethics, we learned that the structure of an ethical judgment, statement, value, or obligation applies universally and impartially to a situation; provides motivation for acting; and supersedes other reasons for adopting a course of action. We also identified personal integrity and loyalty, if properly considered and applied, as keys to ethical decision-making and conduct.

We noted that moral philosophy is primarily concerned with what is meant by good intentions, right behaviour, just decisions, and the like, and that ethics is best understood as an attempt to construct a theoretical framework in which morality or goodness may be understood and determined. A theory of ethics is essential for determining what is good, right, virtuous, and just. Ethics provides a framework for making ethical judgments and decisions. The essence of ethics is about understanding the difference between good and bad, and being ethical is about living "good and worthwhile lives."

Examined next was the importance of reasoning and its application to ethics. When considering ethical issues, officers must be conscious of the assumptions, facts, and evaluations underlying their decisions. There may be many ethical issues involved in a situation, and officers need to use ethical reasoning to ensure that they think critically about a course of conduct. Such reasoning provides a basis upon which the officer can articulate why a certain course of action was adopted. We also learned that one of the most fundamental challenges when analyzing ethics is explaining why it is important to do the right thing, even when it is possible to get away with doing the wrong thing. The role and importance of self-interest in ethics, and the tension it can create when an individual is deciding upon a course of action was discussed, as was the importance of motivation in relation to acting ethically. We examined the tension that can arise between personal and professional ethics, and we distinguished some of the features of personal and professional issues related to making ethical decisions. Finally, we also noted that even when you demonstrate professionalism and act with personal integrity and have a clear motive to help others, you may still face criticism. This is something that you must be prepared to face when choosing a career in public safety.

KEY TERMS

ethical dilemma, 6
ethical obligations, 8
ethical principles, 8
ethical reasoning, 10
ethical values, 6
ethics, 9
immoral, 12
integrity, 8
moral philosophy, 9
professional ethics, 15
secular moralists, 12
unethical, 12
values, 6
virtues, 13

EXERCISES

Case Analysis

Case 1.1 Family or Job?

(The following scenario is reprinted by permission of Waveland Press, Inc from Miller, L., Braswell, M., & Whitehead, J. (2010). *Human relations and police work* (6th ed.) (pp. 153–155). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press. All rights reserved.)

It's 9 p.m. and you are on your way home from police headquarters. After working twelve hours on a burglary detail, you are bone tired. As a detective working in the property crimes unit of the Criminal Investigation Division (CID) for the past seven weeks, you have been involved in a sting investigation attempting to break a burglary ring that has been operating in your city. You enjoy your work, especially since you were transferred from Traffic Division to CID nine

months ago. Investigative work seems to be more exciting and rewarding for you than the Traffic Division had been.

Pulling into your driveway, you notice that the family car is gone. "They must have gone out to eat," you think to yourself as you rummage through your pockets for the house key.

When you enter the house, you notice dishes in the kitchen sink. Suddenly, you remember that your nine-year-old son is participating in a school play. There's a PTA meeting and school play scheduled for tonight. You were supposed to go with your family but somehow it slipped your mind. You even forgot to call and inform your wife that you would be late getting home tonight.

"Damn," you think, remembering how important it was for your son that you attend. It is too late for you to go to the school now. The meeting and play are supposed to be over at 9:30. You open a soft drink, sit down in a living room chair, and begin to think about how you are going to apologize to your son.

Working investigations seems to take much more of your time than when you were in Traffic Division. Your schedule in the Traffic Division was more structured. You worked eight hours and came home, the same thing every day. But you were not happy in the Traffic Division. You really enjoy investigations work because you are actually doing something that you feel is important. You are making major arrests and getting "real" criminals rather than traffic offenders; nevertheless, you realize that your new position has been hard on your wife and son. A couple of weeks ago you had to stay out overnight on surveillance. It just happened that the night was your 10th wedding anniversary. You remember how understanding your wife was. Sure, she was hurt and disappointed, but she seemed to realize how important the case was to you—especially since you have been working so hard, over 60 hours a week for the past seven or eight weeks. You chuckle to yourself, thinking of your work as work. It is more fun than work, and you are getting something accomplished that is worthwhile.

You hear the family car entering the driveway and you go to the door to greet your wife and son.

"Sorry, this case is really big. We've got 30 or so people we can get closed indictments on already, but we're going to get to the big ones at the top of this ring." You stop short, noticing that your wife does not seem to be very interested in hearing about the case.

"Hi Daddy, how come you didn't come to my play?" your son asks.

"Sorry Josh, but I had to work late. How was your play?" you ask, kneeling down to him.

"You always have to work late," Josh says sadly, walking away.

"Honey, just as soon as this case is over, I'll make it up to you and Josh. I promise," you explain to your wife.

"As I recall, that's what you said during your last big investigation, and then this one came up. For the past nine months it's been one big investigation after another. Josh and I are both getting a little sick of it. Apparently you would rather be at work than here with us," your wife states, almost in tears.

You walk away, not wanting to get into an argument. Your wife is upset now and you decide to let her "cool off." Maybe you can talk to her tomorrow.

Your cellphone awakens you at 6:30 the next morning.

"Hey, it's time to get up. Remember you've got to get down here to relieve Martin at the surveillance site."

The voice at the other end of the line is your partner, Mac. You remember that you asked him to call you this morning to make sure you were awake. You are supposed to relieve Detective Martin, who has been on surveillance all night. You decide not to wake your wife and go into the kitchen to make some instant coffee.

"I'm going to try and take off early today," you say to yourself, realizing you should spend some time with your son and maybe even take your wife out to dinner.

Later that day you ask your partner if he will cover for you so you can take the afternoon off. Mac agrees to the arrangement, and you go home at 2 o'clock that afternoon.

Your wife and son are not home. Josh must be at school and your wife is probably out shopping. You change into some comfortable clothes and gaze out the window. "Lawn needs cutting. I'll cut it this weekend if I have a chance," you mumble to yourself.

You receive another call. You think about letting it go to voicemail but you answer it. It is your friend Vince who reminds you that you promised to help him move. With some reluctance, you tell him that you will be over shortly.

Arriving back several hours later, you notice that the family car is in the driveway. You wish now that you had stayed home and arranged to help Vince some other day. Your wife approaches you as you enter the house.

"Where have you been? I've been miserable worrying about you. Mac called several times wanting to know where you were and said you were supposed to be home. I didn't

know if you had been shot or what," your wife states, growing angrier by the minute.

You remember turning off the cellphone when you were at Vince's house.

"I was with Vince, helping him move," you sheepishly try to explain.

Your wife begins to explain that Mac wants you to call him. Apparently, something is wrong at the surveillance site and you are needed. As you reach for your cell to call Mac, your wife makes another comment.

"Before you call and rush out again, let me tell you something. I can't take anymore of this. I am worried about Josh and I am sick of the way your work dominates our lives. It has come to the point that you're going to have to decide between your big important investigations or us. I mean it. I'll take Josh and leave you," your wife warns, tears streaming down her face.

You find yourself feeling more frustrated than angry. Mac is waiting for your call. Your family is waiting for your time. You have got to make some hard decisions.

Take some time to jot down a few ideas about this case. How would you respond to the dilemma described? Decisions about what is really valuable in your life are entirely your own (although you will probably discuss them with the people you care about). The intention is to get you to think about the values that you hold most dear.

1. What values are being expressed in this officer's life?
2. How do our actions express our values?
3. Do you think it is always possible to avoid tensions between family and career?
4. How would you try to deal with tensions between family and career?
5. What would you do in this circumstance?

Short-Answer Questions

Read each question carefully. Drawing on the material in this chapter, provide a brief answer of one or two paragraphs (no more than 300 words) to each of the following questions.

1. Imagine that you are writing the script for *My Life: The Movie!* How would you script your deathbed scene? Here is an example of what you could write: "I imagine my deathbed scene with my family surrounding the bed, my grown-up children and my wife crying, my grandchildren playing outside, oblivious, and the library, containing my collected works, next door."
   a. How do the features of your scene represent your values?
   b. What actions would you have to take in order to achieve the sort of scene you have described?
   c. What personal characteristics would you have to develop to make the sort of life and death you have described happen?
2. Imagine that you are creating an online dating profile. Insert five personal characteristics to describe yourself and five to describe your desired partner, and describe the sort of relationship you want.

Example

Single female, fantastically intelligent, witty, physically active, sophisticated, and devastatingly beautiful, seeks single male who is exceptionally intelligent, ruggedly handsome, powerfully independent, physically active, and unerringly reflective, for total partnership.

   a. What do the values you have used to describe yourself say about you?
   b. What values did you leave out, and what do those values say about you?
   c. Answer questions a and b as they relate to your prospective partner.
   d. What sort of relationship have you described?
   e. What would you have to do to exhibit the characteristics you have given yourself?
   f. What would you have to do to maintain the sort of relationship you have described?
3. Socrates said that ethics is concerned with _____.
4. What does the answer to question 3 mean?
5. The chapter suggests that ethical judgments have which three essential features?
6. Write one or two sentences explaining each feature noted in question 5.
7. Based on your current understanding of the role of a criminal justice or public safety officer, consider whether any personal ethical values you hold may conflict with your professional ethical obligations as an officer. Identify the values that may conflict, outline why, and explain how you will resolve the conflict.

Multiple-Choice Questions

Read each question carefully. Decide which is the *best* answer in each case.

1. When we say that ethical principles apply to everyone, we mean that they are
   a. *prima facie*
   b. *eudaimon*
   c. universalizable
   d. obligatory
   e. rational
2. Making judgments
   a. should be an ethical or a moral process
   b. is a reasoned process requiring justifications
   c. is a way of expressing one's taste
   d. is a matter of personal opinion
   e. a and b
3. When morality and self-interest conflict, one ought to
   a. act in a way that maximizes profit
   b. resolve the problem according to moral dictates
   c. avoid making any decision
   d. act in a way that protects self-interest
   e. seek advice from a legal expert
4. This chapter has suggested that we normally assume that ethical considerations override other considerations. This means that
   a. ethics is the highest field of human endeavour
   b. ethics and police work do not mix
   c. ethics and self-interest coincide
   d. ethics and self-interest can sometimes conflict
   e. if ethics and self-interest conflict, one should perform the action dictated by morality
5. An ethical dilemma is defined as
   a. a serious ethical difficulty
   b. a situation where morality conflicts with self-interest
   c. a situation where a person is faced with more than one course of action, and those actions are incompatible
   d. a situation where incompatible courses of action follow from ethical principles the person holds
   e. b and c
6. An ethical dilemma can sometimes be solved by
   a. flipping a coin
   b. calling in an ethics consultant
   c. determining which of two conflicting principles is more important
   d. determining which ethical principle or value the agent holds most dear
   e. c and d

Discussion Questions

Prepare an answer of about 500 words (2–4 double-spaced pages) for each discussion question.

1. Imagine you are chatting with your friends one evening. You each tell a story of an event about which you are embarrassed (perhaps some youthful shoplifting or the time you cheated on an exam). What was said during the evening gets you thinking, and when you get home that night, you cannot sleep. You want to understand what integrity means to you, so you begin by writing the following: For me, integrity means…
2. You have just completed recruit training, and you are working your second night shift in uniform patrol without your trainer. An officer in another zone requests assistance with a traffic stop, and you are assigned to provide backup. It is past midnight, and you arrive and find a car with one occupant, which has been stopped in an isolated industrial area. The officer tells you she wants you to cover her while she searches the vehicle. She tells you that the driver is a major problem in the community and is known to sell drugs. The officer states she does not have any grounds to justify the search and stopped the car solely to see if she could find anything. You know the search is not lawful, but the officer only wants you to cover her.

   What do you do? Record your answer and save it and see if it would be different after you have finished this text.
3. Imagine you have been asked to speak to an audience of new recruits, and you have been asked to explain the meaning of "ethics" and "morals." What do you say?
4. Finish the story of the officer described in the "Family or Job?" case above.

REFERENCES

Bateman, T., Hiebert, J., Knopff, R., & Russell, P. (2017). *The court and the charter: Leading cases* (2nd ed.). Toronto, ON: Emond.

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Part I of the *Constitution Act, 1982,* being Schedule B to the *Canada Act 1982* (UK), 1982, c 11 [Charter].

Criminal Code, RSC 1985, c C-46, as amended.

Law Commission of Canada. (2006). *In search of security: The future of policing in Canada*. Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services.

Luttrell, M., & Robinson, P. (2007). *Lone survivor: The eyewitness account of operation redwing and the lost heroes of seal team 10*. New York, NY: Little, Brown and Co.

Miller, L., Braswell, M., & Whitehead, J. (2010). *Human relations and police work* (6th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2012). *Critical thinking: Tools for taking charge of your learning and your life* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

R v Butler, [1992] 1 SCR 452, 1992 CanLII 124.

R v Oakes, [1986] 1 SCR 103, 1986 CanLII 46.

R v Sharpe, 2001 SCC 2.

Walzer, M. (1973). Political action: The problem of dirty hands. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, *2*, 160–180.

Winch, P. (1972). *Ethics and action*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.