** URBS 489 Capstone**

**Ethics in Public Service**

**Values, Morals, and Ethics**

* Values influence Behavior (ethics) and Beliefs (morals)
* Beliefs are the basis of morals, and are *part* of the effect on Behavior
* Behavior is the domain of ethics, which may be
  + rule-driven
  + situation-driven

**Rules for Ethical Behavior**

1. Golden Mean--moderation in all things
2. Utilitarian--greatest good for greatest number
3. Deontological--
   * Aristotle's "Golden Rule"—“Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.”
   * Kant's "Categorical Imperative"--"act always so you can wish your maxim should become universal law.”
   * Rawl's "Veil of Ignorance"—“choose the action which you would prefer if you did not know on which side of the action you would end up.”
4. Situation Ethics--must have motive, means, and consequences
5. Rule-Bound--rules, once accepted, may never be broken

**Individuals in Organizations (**Kathryn Denhardt, *Ethics of Public Service*, 1988**)**

Individuals must:

1. identify rules and objectives
2. determine values and assumptions underlying rules
3. assess ethical foundations of assumptions
4. make ethical judgement

**Democracy and Disagreement** (Guttmann & Thompson, 1996)—The Persistence of Moral Disagreement:

* Three rules especially important to democracy:
  + Reciprocity *(kind* of reasons that should be given) --appeal to reasons that are shared or could come to be shared by participants
  + Publicity (forum in which reasons should be given)--empirical claims consistent with reliable methods of inquiry
  + Accountability (agents)-agents by whom and to whom moral reasons are publicly offered
* Sources of Moral Disagreement

o Self-interest

o The Human Condition

• Scarcity

• Limited generosity

• Incompatible values

• Incomplete understanding

* Need for Moral Deliberation
  + Fundamental moral ideals lie at the foundation of democratic institutions (Basic Rights and Equal Respect)
  + Deliberative democracy offers a moral response to moral conflict-it addresses the problem of moral disagreement directly in its own terms

o Four general reasons in favor of deliberative democracy:

• Scarcity: Contributes legitimacy to decisions made under scarcity. Citizens strive for a consensus that represents a genuinely moral perspective, one they can accept on reciprocal terms.

• Limited Generosity: Creates forums in which citizens are encouraged to take a broader perspective

• Incompatible Values: Promotes an economy of moral disagreement in which citizens manifest mutual respect as they continue to disagree about morally important issues in politics

• Clarifies the nature of a moral conflict,

• helps sort self-interested claims from public-spirited ones,

• identifies among the public-spirited ones those that have greater weight

o Moral arguments can arouse moral fanatics, but it can also combat their claims on their own terms. Extending the domain of deliberation may be the only democratic way to deal with moral conflict without suppressing it.

[**AICP Code of Ethics**](https://www.planning.org/ethics/ethicscode.htm)Key Provisions:

* clear and accurate information;
* disclose any conflicts of interest;
* do not accept favors from others:
* do not disclose information obtained from client
* do not misstate qualifications or accept work beyond competence;
* do not coerce planners to conduct analysis not supported by evidence

[**ICMA Code of Ethics**](http://icma.org/en/icma/ethics/code_of_ethics)Key Provisions:

* effectiveness & democracy
* efficiency & practicality
* public interest
* policy/administration distinction
* merit principle in personnel relations
* professionalism, refraining from political activity, public trust

**Considerations in Making Ethical Judgements**

* Marcuse--Accountants (rules) vs. Lawyers (interpretation)
* Regime values
* Public Interest Criterion
  + what do people want
  + what do people need
  + what *should* people have
* Values of Professional Administrator
  + efficiency
  + equality
  + equity
  + loyalty
  + responsibility
* Primacy of the Public (Ventriss)--publicness of inquiry
* Marcuse's dilemmas
  + Do you do *anything* to get client's plan approved?
  + Do you change recommendations or hold data private at request of mayor?
  + Are you ever justified in working on a project which is not in the public good (e.g., Pan Am building exaccerbating congestion in midtown Manhattan)?
  + Can a consultant represent *both* sides of an issue?
* Other Issues
  + Citizen participation--is it only "cooling out the marks"?
  + Truth-telling--is there a positive duty to tell the truth, or only not to lie?
  + Mandatory drug testing--how does one balance an employer's right to know against an individual's right to privacy?
  + Equal Employment Opportunity--at what point does redressing past injustice create new injustice in the present?
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