CENTER FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ETHICS

ETHICS ROLL CALL



WINTER

2012



Register Now for the Upcoming Contemporary Issues and Ethics Conference "Police, Protests and Public Places: Balancing Rights and Obligations"

The Institute for Law Enforcement Administration and the Center for Law Enforcement Ethics have this year joined forces to offer the CONTEMPORARY ISSUES AND ETHICS CONFER-ENCE, "Police, Protests and Public

Places: Balancing Rights and Obligations."

This annual assembly has, for more than 25 years, challenged police managers and executives to explore emerging topics and issues that confront the law enforcement profession. It is a highly acclaimed two-day forum designed for senior-level police personnel, interested attorneys, and city managers from across the nation to engage in extensive, practical discussions and debates concerning one of the most pressing ethical issues facing civic leaders today. This year's conference is designed to provide valuable lessons and discussions concerning the ethical and legal issues that surround the "occupation" movements that have risen across the nation and it is focused on participants being able to carry away good advice and best practices into their own spheres of influence and professional activity. The following speakers are kind enough to offer their reflections about this critical issue:

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

 • Occupy Movements: Where We Have Been and What is To Come Darrel Stephens Executive Director, Major Cities Chiefs Assn. Owner, Darrel Stephens Group, LLC

- First Amendment Rights and Police Obligations Timothy J. Longo, Sr. Chief of Police, Charlottesville, VA
- The Movement, the Police and the Media Merrie Spaeth Spaeth Communications
- The City Manager Perspective: The Dallas Experience Mary Suhm City Manager, Dallas, TX
- The Occupy Movement and Civil Rights
 Litigation
 Mike Betz
 City Attorney, Garland, TX
- The Occupy Movement and the LAPD Experience

Commander Robert Green Assistant Commanding Officer Operations South Bureau Los Angeles Police Department

continued on page 2

INSTITUTE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION (THE CENTER FOR AMERICAN AND INTERNATIONAL LAW) 5201 DEMOCRACY DRIVE PLANO, TX 75024 972.244.3430 972.244.3431 FAX WWW.THEILEA.ORG

 CONTEMPORARY ISSUES CONFERENCE continued from page 1

- Ethical Perspectives Concerning the Police and the Occupy Movement Thomas Meloni, Ph. D. Deputy Chief, Wheaton Police Department, IL
- Ethical and Practical Reflections on the Issue

Dr. Gary W. Sykes Vice President of the Center for American and International Law Director of the Institute for Law Enforcement (Ret.)

Please join us for this fine learning experience as we work our way through some of the more prominent ethical and practical issues concerning these topics. For additional information and/or to register, visit www.theILEA.org.



To Bear the Radiant Shield -Achieving Ethical Behavior in Law Enforcement

By Max A. Lewis

A Policeman is a composite of what all men are, mingling of a saint and sinner, dust and deity — Paul Harvey

Police Officers are human and therefore capable of unethical behavior. As a natural consequence of employing imperfect beings, law enforcement departments conduct thorough background checks and psychological evaluations of applicants and the theory behind those two practices is sound. Unethical behavior has no place in law enforcement and preventing those who are inclined to unethical behavior from joining the ranks is a prudent and necessary precaution. However, no system is perfect and at this moment there are law enforcement professionals being disciplined, terminated and in some cases prosecuted as a result of unethical behavior.

Some posit that this is the result of a failure of the hiring process to successfully weed out bad candidates. Others believe it is due to the ability of applicants to deceive and conceal unethical behavior or tendencies. Of those two possibilities the latter is perhaps the most attractive as skepticism is a common, if not instinctual, trait in the law enforcement culture. However, neither scenario offers a plan to combat unethical behavior once an officer candidate joins the ranks. Whatever the scenario the remaining question is "who in law enforcement is capable of unethical behavior?'" A reasonable question with an unfortunately simple answer: "Everyone."

Since the formation of modern law enforcement departments, their members from the patrol officer all the way up to the chief have been caught behaving in unethically. Which demonstrates the most insidious characteristic of unethical behavior: dishonor knows no rank. Unethical conduct in law enforcement is both reported in media coverage for the public and chronicled and retold as cautionary anecdotes among officers. In both cases the grotesque details of shameful behavior are laid bare and the whole of law enforcement suffers a blow to its credibility and honor. An especially frustrating irony is that in a few of these cases these fallen professionals were celebrated pub-

continued on page 6

Meister Eckhart

Questions Concerning the "Occupy" Movement and the "Morality of the Commons"

By Dan Primozic

The "Occupy" movement, especially in New York City has taken a new target for their protests: bigtime corporate environmental polluters. This has raised some ethical questions for me that tend also to find their way into other questions about the protester's plethora of other targets: campaign finance reform, corporate welfare, funding for health and education, unemployment, police activity, economic disparities and social justice. But where does the environment fit into this?

> A visitor to the Occupy Wall Street protest in New York City will see a number of environmental concerns being raised — in addition to a lot of street musicians, wellorganized labor union representatives, babies in strollers, bespectacled grandmothers and ad hoc protest signs scrawled on cardboard pizza boxes.ⁱ

Then I noticed other reports that produced an ethical question or two for me:

> City officials say they're bracing for tens of thousands of protesters. At a City Hall briefing Wednesday, they said people have the right to assemble and protest, but they can't break the law. They said police are prepared to handle the protests. The city also said that dealing with the protesters at Zuccotti Park for the past two months had cost an average of \$3 million a month.^{II} Occupy Wall Street Plans Subway Protests, City Said Movement Has Cost \$6 Million: After being cleared from Zuccotti Park, protesters organized a Day of Action.^{III}

And from the LAPD website:

In preparation for the dismantling operation, the LAPD declared a citywide tactical alert about 10:30 p.m. Tuesday, enabling it to hold over officers from earlier shifts and move officers around as needed. It was cancelled about 6:30 a.m., said Officer Norma Eisenman, an LAPD spokeswoman. As the LAPD moved out the last of the protesters arrested outside City Hall, crews from the L.A. Department of Recreation and Parks this morning began delivering concrete K-rail and fencing to block off access to the lawn."The park will be closed to everyone for awhile, so that the Parks Department can do an assessment of the damage done to the area," Maiberger said. "... Part of the irrigation system has been compromised, the lawn was destroyed and some of the trees were damaged, so they have to figure out a plan for repairs." City Councilman Paul Krekorian called for the city to consider installing environmentally friendly landscape for the City Hall Park. Krekorian introduced a motion during today's council meeting requesting a report on the cost and feasibility of "applying the principles of the Low-Impact Development ordinance to the park restorations, and making the park a model for sustainable urban landscaping."

The ethical questions came forth in terms of whether it was largely inconsistent for the

continued on page 4



NON SEQUITUR ©2012 Wiley Ink, Inc. Dist. By UNIVERSAL UCLICK. Reprinted with permission. All rights reserved.

IF I AM WHAT I HAVE AND IF I LOSE WHAT I HAVE WHO THEN AM I? ERICH FROMM OCCUPY MOVEMENT continued from page 3

"Occupation" protesters to seemingly abandon "being green" while they were exercising their right to protest environmental pollution caused by others. Or perhaps I am just missing something important that would smooth out this rather apparent contradiction?

Another question surfaced when I noted that this is a movement initiated on the basis of the injustice of the adverse economic conditions that punish the people and not the fortunate few, while at the same time causing millions of dollars of cleanup and damage to public places that must be paid for come from the same monies and tax resources that the unemployed are now competing for.

So, not really knowing where to personally stand on these issues concerning the "Occupy" movement, I decided that it might be worth my while to dig more deeply than surface sensationalism to seek in my philosophical tool chest some moral foundation that can be applied to this situation for both the protesters and to the police and municipal officials engaged in it. I think I found that in the writings of John Locke, in his *Second Treatise of Government*,^{iv} in what I now like to call the "morality of the commons."

In that work, John Locke neatly articulates the concept of "private property." He says that what makes something your property is your labor mixed with a raw material that you have obtained from the "commons." Briefly, for example, this means that the handmade chair that you produced from a tree you cut from the commonly held forest is "yours" because you mixed your labor with the tree that you chopped down and dragged away. As a result, that chair becomes yours, and that judgment is indisputably fair and just. And equally fair and just is the requirement that you leave enough trees behind in the forest (the commons) for others to do likewise and make an equally excellent chairs from equally accessible and equally excellent timber. Locke says it this way:

> Through the earth, and all inferior creatures be common to all men, yet every man has a property in his own person: this nobody has any right to but himself. The labour of his body, and the work of his hands, we may say, are properly his. Whatsoever then he removes out of the state of nature hath provided, and left it in,

he hath mixed his labour with and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property. It being by him removed from the common state nature hath placed it in, it hath by this labour something annexed to it, that excludes the common right of other men. For this labour being the unquestionable property of the labourer, no man but he can have a right to what that is once joined to, *at least here there is enough, and as good, left in common for others.*^v

Applied to the occupy protests and the governmental responses to them, I think Locke would advise us to look at it this way: There is a public place, a city park let's say. It is paid for with taxpayer dollars and, therefore, the people of that city should have free access to that park (within the rules and laws of usage thereof). That understanding makes the public places of the protests parallel to the idea of the "commons" and my analogy of the forest. In that park, an individual or set of individuals from that community have the right to go into it and put it to their use (especially a legitimate "first amendment" use). They have that right because they have bought it with their tax dollars, the product of their labor (or, at least, someone's labor). To follow my analogy of the forest, they have legitimately taken out their timber to make their chair (that chair, then, is their own, according to Locke). But one other important application of Locke's ideas to the occupy situation remains: i. e., "at least there is enough, and as good, left in common for others." How does that look when applied to the occupy situations, especially as they have been reported in the quotations above and in other reports since then?

It seems to me that If the occupy protesters are using the total space of the city park or such a significant portion of it that non-protesting citizens are afraid to or cannot use it for their purposes, then clearly they have violated the "morality of the commons" that I have tried to describe above. In short, there is not enough quality of it left for others to use as well. And if the protesters have destroyed significant portions of the city park, then it is even more obvious that they have not left *enough* and *as good for others* to use for their purposes, thereby violating the "morality of the commons," (or publically held places). In short, firstly they have taken

NO MAN ACQUIRES PROPERTY WITHOUT ACQUIRING WITH IT A LIT-TLE ARITHMETIC ALSO.

RALPH WALDO EMERSON OCCUPY MOVEMENT continued from page 4

too much and secondly the also have not left *enough* as good for others.

If we look at the what I propose as the "financial commons," i.e., the public tax monies that support things like public city parks, and the protesters have used too much of those monies to clean up, replant, reclaim and restore the park, and used those monies for police response and oversight of the park protests, I think the violation of the "morality of the commons" is equally evident.

Another aspect of the "commons" at play here is an equitable use of police services. In those locales where the protests have either gotten so large or so violent (or both) the use of police services to maintain order and safety has grown proportionally, leaving other parts and citizens of the cities with scarce or inadequate levels of police services for the inevitable burglaries, rapes, murders and other sorts of criminal activities and victimizations of other, non-protesting members of the community. There too, I think it clear that there are violations of the "morality of the commons."

On the outlines that I have provided above I think it at least logical to conclude that whereas the occupiers have a perfect first amendment right to protest in a public place (the commons), they do not have the moral right to do so at the level of preventing others from using that public place, nor do they have the moral right to do so at the level of using an excessive amount of the public treasury to oversee, respond to, reclaim or restore the public place in which they are holding their protest, nor do they have the right to overuse already overused police services. I believe that this is a sound conclusion, again, unless I am missing something very important that would prevent this conclusion from following from the situations I have been able to gather and understand.

Of course, none of this addresses the appropriate police use force to maintain order in these public places and neither does it say anything concerning the morality of protesting on private properties (such as private university or college campuses). Those are separate issues and cannot be dealt with in this limited

space. And again, I am very willing to be shown other ways to interpret the moral context of these important ethical questions and resolutions. In fact, I am really looking forward to the days in the near future when the Center for American and International Law, the Institute for Law Enforcement Administration and the Center for Law Enforcement Ethics host the fine and timely Contemporary Issues and Ethics Conference, which this year is called "Police, Protest and Public Places." These and many other ethical issues that surround the Occupy protests will be discussed in a much wider scope, in much more depth, and according to much brighter lights than mine.I look forward to learning much from the presenters and the participants of that event. Details about the conference can be found elsewhere in this publication.

ⁱ Marc Lallanilla, Occupy Wall Street: An Environmental Protest? What Do the Wall Street Protests Have to Do with the Environment? About.com Guide, November 2, 2011

ⁱⁱ NBC New York, Thursday, November 17, 2011.

ⁱⁱⁱ Ibid.

^{iv} John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, as seen in *Classics of Modern Political Theory: Machiavelli to Mill*, Steven M. Cahn, ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

^v Ibid., p. 225. Italics mine.

LEADERSHIP SYMPOSIUM "Police Leadership from the Outside-In" May 21-23, 2012

This three-day forum is designed for senior-level police personnel from across the nation to engage in extensive, practical discussions concerning some of the most pressing issues facing law enforcement leaders today.

This year's Leadership Symposium invites prominent, prestigious and effective leaders from professions outside of law enforcement to provide top police leaders the most important and valuable lessons that all leaders must know. After hearing, reflecting upon and discussing those ideas, we hope that they can integrate those lessons into their own organizations and practices to help them continue on their journeys to leadership excellence.

Keynote Speaker: General Edward A. Rice, Jr. Commander, Air Education and Training Command Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio

THE FIRST RULE TO TIN-KERING IS TO SAVE ALL THE PARTS.

PAUL ERLICH

THE PRICE OF POWER IS RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD.

> WITHROP ALDRICH

TO BEAR THE RADIANT SHIELD continued from page 2

licly, respected privately and were regarded as pillars of the force. Unfortunately, even the most outwardly virtuous are not immune from the temptation and consequences of unethical behavior. Good people can do bad things.

Rather than join the legions of affected cynics, both in and outside the ranks, who perceive unethical behavior as some unassailable force of human nature, the whole of law enforcement must instead take the initiative and collectively commit itself to the personification of ethical behavior in order to see it manifest in all department members. Part of this commitment is in preparing and composing both officers and command staff to be ethical professionals. This is done in two distinct steps.

First, there must be an understanding and appreciation of how the structure of command and supervision influences the presence or absence of ethical conduct. Secondly, efforts towards creating ethical conduct on the supervisory and officer level must be composed of two separate and unique approaches, one for leadership and a separate one for the troops. As these ideas are explored it is important to keep in mind that while there are common denominators of ethical behavior between the ranks, the mission and challenges of management are different than the mandate and role of officers.

The Architecture of Command

The guiding *ethos* of American law enforcement generally lends itself to ethical behavior. Most people who answer the call of civil service join thelaw enforcement collective for noble reasons and most do their duty by conducting themselves ethically. While the traditions, mission and ideals of law enforcement compliment ethical behavior the structural design of a police department does not inherently guarantee ethical behavior among its members. That observation should be construed as a broad observation of human nature rather than a specific criticism of law enforcement.

Ironically, while the American police institution is a mechanism of democracy it does not behave like a democracy. The police are a paramilitary organization, which exerts power in the form of a classic "top down" structure by way of obedience to superiors and deference to authority. Officers do not vote for their superiors in the way that citizens vote for their leaders. Collective desires and individual needs of officers are not afforded vigorous representation or consideration outside labor unions.

Under this power structure leaders are not inherently accountable to those beneath them in rank. Presidents can be impeached, senators can be recalled and other civic leaders can fail to achieve re-election. However, command staff in a paramilitary organization possesses the autonomy of unilateral autocracy and therefore wield the authority to self-author their goals, values and relevance. The result is a leadership cadre that is unencumbered by, if not inherently immune from, constituency-generated criticism.

Such a power structure can create a moral hazard because in any system that lacks checks and balances at every level there exists the risk of abuse. American police departments don't manage people like a government and don't create or distribute a product like a corporation. Police departments exist to enforce the social contract and, for better or worse, default to a leadership paradigm similar to the military. Regardless of specific characteristics, all organizations directly influence the presence of or lack of unethical behavior among those they supervise.

This observation is not without its merits. There is a wealth of data on corporate strategy, organizational transformation, business ethics and corporate social contracts, which provide support for the claim that moral climates in any organization emerge mainly from management (Pagon 2003). That observation is not an attempt to assign the aggregate burden or culpability of unethical behavior to leadership. Dishonor knows no rank and it would be shortsighted to assume that on the officer "side of the coin" the risk for unethical behavior is nonexistent.

A cop on duty wields an immense amount of power as an agentof the government. It is the only profession in the domestic American workforce whose employees are granted the authority to search persons and property, detain individuals, restrict liberty and exercise deadly physical force in the course of their duties. *"A patrolling officer on his beat is the one true dictatorship in America" –Detective Jimmy McNulty -The Wire.* The risk of unethical behavior is the same for labor or management. Understanding how the TO BEAR THE RADIANT SHIELD continued from page 6

structure of law enforcement command operates, combined with an appreciation for the power and responsibilities officers possess, we can intelligently explore ways in which to foster ethical behavior at every rank.

Ethics for Leadership

In order to create a climate of ethical behavior, first and foremost, departmental leadership must lead by example and avoid questionable behavior. It is disingenuous, contradictory and frankly juvenile to demand ethical conduct for a select group of people but not require it of all people.

Second, ethical behavior is determined by actions not words. Ethical conduct is not achieved by edicts nor is it achieved by abstaining from certain behaviors. We do not define our ethical integrity solely by abstaining from certain behaviors. Ethical conduct is defined by what behaviors we willfully engage in, default to and adhere to. Ethical behavior requires willful, rigorous and committed engagement of moral action not passive avoidance of behavior that is collectively accepted as unsavory.

Third, in order to cultivate ethical behavior among leadership there must be mechanisms by which meaningful third party scrutiny is allowed in a climate free from retaliation. This is perhaps the most difficult hurtle that any command structure must traverse. Since humans first formed the concept of leadership and deference, uncritical allegiance to command has been the holy grail of power structures. There is something innately distasteful about insubordination. Seven hundred years ago it was Dante who mused that betrayal was more sinful than murder.

It makes sense that leaders of any organization find exposure to criticism and scrutiny uncomfortable. Pulling back the curtain on the decision making of any power structure can be embarrassing. But it is important to keep in mind that embarrassment is the least of your worries if your behavior were to attract the attention of the Department of Justice, FBI or State Police. Those sorts of inquiries into the behavior, conduct, culture and command of a police department frequently result in shame and disgrace for more than one agency representative. This tragic outcome is avoidable. Command staff who are consistently held to a high standard of accountability and transparency are less likely to fall prey to impulsivity and selfdeception. Accountability is a critical motivation for ethical behavior because people rarely discipline themselves. Examining actions and decisions must be as rigorously pursued on the leadership level as on the rank and file level.

The key to accountability is transparency because it requires that we demonstrate how we arrived at our decisions. It is the "show and tell" portion of decision- making and must be present with equal intensity and integrity at all levels of a department. There is no logical reason for the least senior reserve officer to be held to a different standard of conduct than the chief.

A cornerstone of an ethical institution is the presence of consistency and fairness of action for every member of the collective.Issues of fairness, consistency, accountability and transparency are not only necessary for ethical leadership, they are also necessary because officers take their cues from the institution they work in. Climate, culture and common practices of the collective influence the behavior of the individual.

Further, anyone seeking to encourage ethical behavior among officers must move beyond simply telling officers to do the right thing; ethics training should ideally empower officers to anticipate the complex ethical and moral choices they must make in the field (Grant 2002). Complex decisionmaking cannot be based on a strictly prescriptive model that determines and establishes acceptable levels of ethical conduct depending on context. Officers need training that is based on sound principles of ethical behavior that are presented, reflected and reinforced by leadership staff.

Principles of ethical behavior for the patrol officer are partly formed by an overall concern and humane empathy towards the public. Similarly, department leadership must demonstrate thosesame ideals to those under their command. Just as officers must remember that their efforts must always be in service to the health, safety and preservation of the public, department leaders should not endeavor to serve their own individual or collective desires and agendas.

Creating Ethical Officers

If we can agree that self-awareness and arrogance rarely go hand-in-hand,then we can entertain the notion that people who possess a well-

continued on page 8

BUT THE RELATIONSHIP OF MORALITY AND POWER IS A VERY SUB-TLE ONE. BECAUSE ULTIMATELY POWER WITH-OUT MORALITY IS NO LONGER POWER.

> JAMES BALDWIN

TO BEAR THE RADIANT SHIELD continued from page 7

developed sense of self-awareness and emotional intelligence will have a greater immunity to hubris, narcissism and impulsivity, all of which contribute to unethical decision-making.

Ethical decision-making is not based only on strong values, personal character and principlebased leadership. It requires understanding how stress, prejudice and negative emotions can influence personal behavior. Refusing to recognize our immense capacity for self-deception, poor impulse-control and emotionally charged decision making is to discount the possibility that our thoughts and actions, based on that trinity of destructive proclivities, can result in unethical behavior. However, when officers reflect on what they want their efforts to achieve and who they want to be and they hold those as goals, they are practicing self-awareness. Ethical behavior is the result of a consideration not just of the totality of the facts and contextually relevant information, but it is also the result of the ability to be emotionally present in those moments and at the same time to reflect upon personal values.

It is that "presence" that gives officers the ability to reflect on what it means to be a police officer and to demonstrate fair and reasonable treatment of others. This self-awareness fosters a sustained confrontation between personal valuesand the demands of situations we are navigating, rather than personal desires. However,officers cannot simply will these traits into existence. Part of being a cop is an ongoing and sustained development of the tenets of ethical decision making; to be gracious and humane while being effective and formidable. Departments must champion the value of training that includes strengthening the core values of public service and social justice.

Further, training in ethics must highlight the personal connection required of officers in the work they do. Investing in one's work, beyond a means of economic survival, is the result of a passionate commitment to higher ideals.Ideals based solely on the static notions of "take bad guys to jail, write tickets and hold the guilty accountable" do not comprise a complete ethical code.

Codes of ethical conduct are as much about personal commitments as they are about under-

standing and believing in the mission. Frankly, a lack of passion in an officer's daily efforts should be considered vulgar given the larger sacrifice some officers make everyday. Being shot, stabbed, beaten up or run over are very real risks and they must ask if those risks are worth taking if only as a side-effect to writing the most citations or making the most arrests. Even the most myopic and narrow-mindedofficer can committhemselves to a cause but that by no means guarantees ethical behavior. Those who commit themselves to a mission while simultaneously personifying positive values and higher ideals are likely to engage in ethical behavior as well as inspire the same in others.

Holistic Wellness: The Mindful Approach

Part of maintaining physical wellness is listening to your body. When something hurts, doesn't feel right or isn't working properly we pay attention and seek remedy. The same should be true of our emotions. When we "feel bad" or "off" emotionally we should be paying attention to those feelings. They will manifest as negative actions if they are ignored or denied. This "listening to our emotions" is true self-awareness and is found in the practice of "Mindfulness," which teaches practitioners to be mentally present in the moment and to resist being guided and influenced solely by emotional responses to stress.

While the concepts of Mindfulness come from Eastern religious traditions, mental health professionals have been prescribing Mindfulness based practices for treatment of anxiety, panic and depression disorders as well as Post Traumatic Stress Disorder for some time. Survivors of sexual and physical trauma have also benefited from the incorporation of Mindfulness into their recovery strategies. As someone who has worked in and around the mental health field I have seen firsthand how Mindfulness can be a "game changer" for those experiencing stress. Mindfulness practice is also getting attention from the military, which has started using it as a tool for helping soldiers transition back into civilian life after combat tours.

In broad strokes, Mindfulness is about being aware of one's thoughts, actions and motivations while under stress. Paying attention, in a particular way, deliberately focuses attention on the decision making process.For police officers the ability to reflect on one's attitudes, perceptions and intentions are the ultimate "look in the mir-

CHARACTER IS THAT WHICH REVEALS MORAL PURPOSE, EXPOSING THE CLASS OF THINGS A MAN CHOSES OR AVOIDS.

ARISTOTLE

TO BEAR THE RADIANT SHIELD continued from page 8

ror" to assure that they are in line with ethical conduct. With Mindfulness the officer is empowered to assess his thoughts and feelings and measure them against what he or she is preparing to do in a given situation. Since behavior, ethical or not, is about reactions to stimulus, environmental conditions, situational contexts and personal values, giving officers tools to reflect on who they truly are can be a powerful force in combating and ultimately preventing unethical behavior. Mindfulness doesn't necessarily make "bad people good" but it does offer officers a mechanism by which to constantly remindthemselves that they have not only the obligation, but the ability to resist unethical behavior.

Conclusion

The American concept of justice is arguably the most highly developed in the world. As a result, unethical behavior by our law enforcement representatives is an unacceptable contradiction which many people find offensive. The way forward is not found in the strengthening or dulling of our tolerance for unethical conduct, nor is it found inendless rumination on unethical behavior's macabre implications for human nature.

While two distinct entities, law enforcement officers and leadership personnel are both reaching for the same goal. Ideally when a person or group or persons are faced with an ethical dilemma the individual or group will automatically consider the alternatives available. Rather than make decisions based on prejudice or impulsively the individual or group will instead submit decisions to reason and make reasonable adjustments. Above all, equal consideration should be given to the rights, interests, and choices of all parties represented in the situation. It is not a breach of integrity, but a moral obligation, to change one's views if it turns out the idea is wrong. It is a breach of integrity to know that one is wrong and then proceed, usually with the help of some rationalization, to defy the right practice (Pagon 2003).

Law enforcement ethics training cannot rely solely on verbose or eloquent rhetoric to inspire the higher ideals of justice. Instilling ethical behavior in law enforcement officers is only possible by an unwavering commitment to prepare all members of the department for the intimate challenges of their work. Although the need for ethical conduct is obvious, its power to positively affect situations and people cannot be overstated. The true power of ethical behavior is evident in its singular and aggregate potential. Even a miniscule light source can penetrate the darkness, especially when it is reflected.

Works Cited:

Professor Milan Pagon, *Police Ethics and Integrity*-College of Police and Security Studies University of Maribor, Slovenia 2003.

Ethics and Law Enforcement- Kevin J. Grant. The FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin December 2002.

Max A. Lewis is a trainer, consultant and a respected author in the field of law enforcement from Oregon and very kindly contributed these thoughts to the profession of policing through this publication.

Ethics Roll Call is published quarterly by the Ethics Center at the Institute for Law Enforcement Administration, 5201 Democracy Drive, Plano, Texas 75024. Telephone: 972/244-3430. Fax: 2/244-3431. This publication is not operated for pecuniary gain, and articles may be reprinted provided due credit is given to the Ethics Roll Call. Signed articles are accepted with the understanding that the Institute for Law Enforcement Administration possesses the exclusive right of original publication. Authors are requested to assign copyright to the Institute for the collected work, while permitting the author unlimited use of the article and ordinary copyright protection. Opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of the The Center for American and International Law.

Editor	Daniel T. Primozic
Staff Assistant	Tracy B. Harris

All of the past and present staff and contributors to the Ethics Roll Call would like to note their deep appreciation to Tracy Harris, who has been with this project from the very beginning and without whom there would have been no publication, or a very inferior one to say the least. Tracy is moving to many other duties and will be missed from this project. Thanks so very much, Tracy!

NOTHING DESTROYS AUTHORITY MORE THAN THE UNEQUAL AND UNTIMELY INTERCHANGE OF POWER STRETCHED TOO FAR AND RELAXED TOO MUCH.

FRANCIS BACON