



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **Ethics on the radar: exploring the relevance of ethics support in counterterrorism**

Kowalski, M.

### **Citation**

Kowalski, M. (2020, March 12). *Ethics on the radar: exploring the relevance of ethics support in counterterrorism*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/86282>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/86282>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/86282> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Kowalski, M.

**Title:** Ethics on the radar: exploring the relevance of ethics support in counterterrorism

**Issue Date:** 2020-03-12

## **7. Relevance of moral case deliberation to the practice of counterterrorism**

International comparative research suggests that the tool of moral case deliberation could be of added value to the practice of counterterrorism, like it has been to other societal sectors. The method of moral case deliberation has been recommended by researchers of RAND Europe as a suitable method for the practice of counterterrorism. In their previously mentioned explorative study, they look at methods for handling ethical problems that are available and helpful in other societal sectors (Reding et al., 2013). Moral case deliberation is already broadly applied in the health care sector in the Netherlands and other parts of Europe, with a special focus on the Nordic countries Norway and Sweden (Svantesson et al., 2014).

This chapter explores the relevance of moral case deliberation to the practice of counterterrorism. Doing so, the method of moral case deliberation will be situated within the empirical context of the practice of counterterrorism of this thesis. Therefore this chapter precedes the chapter on the explorative application of moral case deliberation and is part of the empirical part of this thesis. The following research question will be addressed in this chapter: What is the relevance of the method of moral case deliberation to the practice of counterterrorism?

This chapter can be divided into three parts. To begin, the first section will explain what moral case deliberation is, how it works and which general lessons have been drawn from the use of moral case deliberation in the medical field. Then, the philosophical roots of moral case deliberation will be clarified in the second section. Finally, the relevance of the method of moral case deliberation to the practice of counterterrorism in general and to the pilot case of an explorative application of moral case deliberation at the Office of the Dutch National Coordinator for Counterterrorism in particular will be explored.

## 7.1 Introducing Moral Case Deliberation

### **Method of Moral case deliberation**

Moral case deliberation is a method for ethics support that has been implemented in various professional sectors such as health care, military, police, youth care and prison (Van Baarle, 2018; Hartman et al., 2016; Reding et al., 2013; Stolper, 2016; Spijkerboer, 2018). Currently, the health care sector appears to be the sector where this method is used most frequently. In the Dutch context it seems that more than half of the health care institutions are using this method to support professionals in dealing with ethical issues (Dauwerse, 2014). There are different methods for moral case deliberation like: the Amsterdam VUMC dilemma methods (see box below), the Utrecht Roadmap or the Socratic methods. The differences amount to the procedural steps that need to be taken into account. The most important difference is whether to work around two different options of a dilemma (option A and option B) or to consider one ethical question as the core of further ethics deliberations.

## The VU Dilemma Method for Moral Case Deliberation

The dilemma method consists of 10 steps:

### 1. Introduction

- Participants introduce themselves
- Brief discussion of the aim of the deliberation
- Brief discussion of procedure (dialogue, confidentiality, making a report)

### 2. Presentation of the case

- Focus on a specific moral problem experienced by a participant
- Description of the situation by the participant, focusing on facts, actions, and feelings (the 'film' of the case)
- Defining the moment in which the problem is experienced most intensely (the 'moment of heat')

### 3. Defining the moral dilemma

- What is the dilemma (A <-> B)?
- What is the damage when I do A?
- What is the damage when I do B?
- What is the moral question?

### 4. Questions for clarification

- Aim is to enable participants to put themselves in the shoes of the case presenter
- Only questions about facts

### 5. Analysis of the perspectives in the case

- Define perspectives in the case (relevant person or larger group (the general public, the healthcare institution))
- For each perspective, make explicit values (core motivations) and norms (concrete guidelines for action following from the values)

### 6. Exploring alternatives

- Brainstorm on (real or fictional) alternatives to deal with the dilemma

### 7. Making an individual judgement

Each participant answers the following questions:

- I consider.... (A, B, or an alternative C) the morally right action
- Because of value...
- This does damage to value...
- In order to repair the damage, I will do...
- For this I need...

### 8. Dialogue

- Comparison of the individual judgement and values involved
- Do we understand each other's position?
- What can we learn from the differences?

### 9. Conclusion

- What is the best answer to the dilemma?
- What core insights have we gained?
- What actions follow from that? Which follow-up is needed?

### 10. Evaluation

- Content: what did we learn as a group?
- Process: how do we evaluate the deliberation? What can we do better next time?

Source: Van Dartel and Molewijk, 2014: 301-302; Hartman et al., 2016: 261-262.

In order to explore the relevance of ethics support, I will clarify what moral case deliberation is and how it works. Roughly speaking, there are five characteristics constituting an ideal-typical moral case deliberation that will be explained below (Molewijk, 2014). Before doing so, I will turn to an example from the practice of counterterrorism in order to illustrate the working of a moral case deliberation.

### **Example of moral case deliberation**

A further explanation of moral case deliberation will be introduced by a concrete example from the field of counterterrorism that I have dealt with outside the empirical part of this thesis. This example can help to understand the steps taken within a moral case deliberation (Graste, 2003; Stolper et al., 2016). The session of the moral case deliberation will start with an introduction of the facilitator, the participants and a brief discussion of the session and the procedure. The facilitator of a moral case deliberation has to be qualified and ideally certified by an institution like the UMC Amsterdam in facilitating this deliberation in order to guarantee quality in running this method. The next step would be the selection of the case to be dealt with. This could imply that different cases are presented by the participants who eventually have to choose one case that one of the participants has been dealing with or still is experiencing. The example to be mentioned here is that a counterterrorism professional is aware of classified information about a potential concrete threat against a specific target where one or more members of his family will be in the upcoming days as well. Does he warn his family members from going there (option A) or does he uphold the confidential nature of the information, which was only provided for professional use and forbids sharing with others (option B)?

In the remainder of the dialogue the participants figure out what values are at stake and which alternatives are available to deal with this dilemma. Before doing so, the participants would clarify all circumstances and details of the case, testing often implicit assumptions as well. Finally, the participants would be put into the position to make their own individual judgements, to compare them with the views of other participants and to come up with suggestions for what would be needed as professional, team or organization to deal with the complexities of the case. The latter is often not necessarily confidential and therefore widely used as a take-away to the work floor and management.

In the upcoming parts of this section I will explain the five main characteristics of moral case deliberation in general. Afterwards, I will present the general lessons from the use of moral case deliberation in the medical sector.

### **Concrete experienced case as basis**

First, as the name of the method - moral case deliberation - already suggests, a concrete case is at the core of such a deliberation. According to specific philosophical roots of moral case deliberation, the concrete case to be discussed in the session has to be a case experienced by one of the participants of each separate session. It can be a case that the participant in question has experienced in the past or is still in the midst of the moment the session is taking place. Fictional cases or cases someone heard of but did not experience themselves are thus excluded. After recounting the case, the ethical dimension of the case is put into the spotlight by formulating an ethical question attached to the specific case or by identifying two opposing options A and B.

### **Inquiry into facts, assumptions and values**

Second, during a moral case deliberation it is important to get facts, assumptions, and values very clear. The inquiry during a moral case deliberation is focused on the presented case in question and the identified ethical question. In a moral case deliberation it is crucial to continue to ask questions about what happened and who said or did what and why. One of the rationales behind this is to differentiate between assumptions, interpretations, and facts and especially to clarify the latter eventually. Another rationale is to subsequently identify values at stake in the specific case. Although the starting point would be the values held by the one who presented the concrete case, the values of other actors that play a role in the concrete case are part of the dialogue as well. In sum, through the moral case deliberation the relation between facts, assumptions regarding the facts and the underlying values will be clarified. Done thoroughly, this part of the ethical inquiry could provide a brief analysis of all relevant options to act on in the face of an ethical dilemma. Many alternative options to deal with a specific

case could be investigated against the background of their underlying values (Molewijk, 2014; Stolper, 2016; Weidema, 2014).

### **Dialogue instead of discussion**

Third, the entire session is based on the principle of a dialogue rather than a discussion. The main principles of a dialogue are the equality of all participants regardless of their position, age or any other characteristic. Besides, it is important that all participants are committed to postpone judgements during the session and to talk as freely and as honestly as possible. Since many professional contexts are designed to exchange arguments in order to win a dispute by the means of discussion, it might be uncommon, if not difficult, for many professionals to apply the principles of a dialogue. This is not only a matter of observing certain rules during the session. In fact, the underlying mind-set and judgemental customs are at stake, as it is important whether participants have an opinion or judgement readily available, are open to other views and are able to pose open questions. Once properly applied, the principles of a dialogue can lift the group interaction to a higher level than most professional encounters (Bohm, 2014/1996).

### **Explorations of options to act**

Fourth, part of the ethical inquiry during a moral case deliberation is to identify answers to the formulated ethical question and to explore potential options of action. This part of the deliberation is confined to the case in question as well and all participants are invited to answer the ethical question by themselves. Each participant is put in a position to reflect on what he or she would do, what values would be at stake, and determine what he or she would need as an individual, team, or organization to realize their individual choices. Collecting all the different considerations can not only enrich the understanding of the values at stake but also provide a comprehensive overview of different options to act and the values and downsides attached. In doing so, a broader perspective on the issue at stake can be reached. The reflection on a specific case often provides rich perspectives on that case that can be used to inform considerations on ethical issues beyond the specific case on a more abstract level. Where one individual case seemed to be part of the deliberation in the beginning, a more



general take on ethical issues related to the concrete case of the deliberation can be harvested in the end and enrich options to act (Kleinlugtenbelt and Molewijk (2011); Molewijk, 2014; Stolper, 2016; Weidema, 2014).

### **Guiding conditions**

Fifth, several conditions, like the quality of the facilitator, the confidentiality of the deliberation and purity of the purpose of holding a moral case deliberation, have to be met to guarantee a true moral case deliberation. To start with, it is important to have a qualified facilitator when holding a moral case deliberation. An effective facilitator is not only skilled to run through the process and reach results, but would also be aware of potential pitfalls and would be prepared to handle trouble and emotions arising in the dialogue. The facilitator would also ensure that all conditions for a fruitful and free dialogue will be fulfilled. To meet the quality standards of a moral case deliberation it is important that the facilitators are properly educated. An assurance for their quality can be their certification by a recognized educational institution (Molewijk, 2014; Stolper, 2016; Weidema, 2014).

Another condition would be the issue of confidentiality. This implies that all thoughts shared during the moral case deliberation, as well as the content of the case and the attached ethical dilemma discussed, remain within the group. This is important to enable a free exchange during the moral case deliberation without fear of being quoted outside the moral case deliberation, being the subject of gossip or to be held accountable. Often participants agree unanimously to share the general topic with others, while others only feel comfortable to share some elements of the harvest when suggestions addressed to the organizational or professional context are at stake. The only reason to breach confidentiality would be the unlikely case in which a participant would present a case in which a serious crime has been, or is about to be, committed.

Last but not least, the purity of purpose implies that the use of moral case deliberation should be only driven by an open inquiry into a moral issue without predefined answers or strategic goals. Such goals or other hidden agendas, like unveiling or blaming certain behaviour, an upcoming reorganization or any other interest not related to the ethical inquiry should strictly be avoided.

Before turning to the reflection on applying moral case deliberation within the practice of counterterrorism, the experiences with moral case deliberation in the medical sector will be explored first.

### **General lessons from use of moral case deliberation in medical sector**

Experiences in the medical sector found that holding a moral case deliberation can strengthen professionals in general: "Through the methodology and the codes of conduct of the moral case deliberation sessions, participants became more open-minded, constructive and still critical. A concrete example is the reflection on the conceptual and moral status of 'making an agreement' and on the process of decision-making in general" (Molewijk et al., 2008: 60). Similarly, the added value of moral case deliberations has been indicated in the related field of the inspectorate on health (Seekles et al., 2013). The explorative application of moral case deliberation to the practice of counterterrorism, however, would be unique as of now.

Moral case deliberation has been applied extensively in the medical sector. When discussing the relevance of this method of ethics support to the practice of counterterrorism, it is insightful to learn more about the general lessons from the use of moral case deliberation in the medical sector. First of all, it seems that moral case deliberation can be considered as an ethical conversation method that facilitated practical knowledge raised within the professional practice as a source of moral wisdom (Abma et al. 2009: 232). Second, the use of the dialogical practice in which professionals are fully involved in the process of reflection and analysis, turned out to be a powerful tool for empirical ethics as a cyclical process between empirical data and ethical theory (Widdershoven et al., 2009: 244). This practice enables an interactive learning process between theory and practice and marks the shift from external critique of practices towards embedded ethics and interactive ethics improvement (Abma et al., 2010).

For the use of moral case deliberation within the field of clinical ethics support an evaluation instrument has been developed, founded on literature review and interactive Delphi panels. The development of an evaluation instrument identified six domains suitable for measuring the outcome of moral case deliberation: enhanced emotional support, enhanced collaboration, improved moral reflexivity,

improved moral attitude, improvement on organizational level, and concrete results of the specific dialogue (Svantesson et al., 2014: 1).

Concrete experiences with moral case deliberation widely reflect aspects of the evaluation instrument and show the various contributions of this tool in dealing with ethical dilemmas (Dauwerse, 2014; Janssens et al., 2015; Spijkerboer, 2018; Stolper, 2016; Weidema, 2016). Moral case deliberation – and especially the dilemma method of moral case deliberation – both supports and structures the dialogical reflection process of the participants (Stolper et al., 2016: 8).

The general lessons can be summarized by seven observations: First, moral case deliberation helps in finding answers to concrete moral dilemmas professionals are dealing with. Second, participants of moral case deliberation learn how to differentiate between different perspectives when approaching a moral issue. Third, it is clear that moral case deliberation can improve decision making processes within the professional practices at stake. Fourth, moral case deliberation can support collective learning processes of professional practice. Fifth, through moral case deliberation cooperation and communicative skills are improved and strengthened. Sixth, the application of moral case deliberation empowers individuals, especially underrepresented individuals within professional practices. Last but not least, the more general insights raised through moral case deliberation can contribute to the development of policies in the professional field or guidelines of the professional practices at stake (Weidema and Molewijk, 2017: 95).

With the general lessons from the medical sector in mind, I will turn to the practice of counterterrorism. In the following section I will examine the philosophical roots of moral case deliberation in order to consider their relevance to the practice of counterterrorism at a later stage.

## 7.2 Philosophical roots of moral case deliberation

In this section I will identify and explain major philosophical roots of moral case deliberation. Based on these insights, I will be able to explore the relevance of the method of moral case deliberation to the practice of counterterrorism in the following section. When turning to major philosophical roots it is important to stress that holding a moral case deliberation demands neither the use of a philosophical discourse or language nor specific knowledge of philosophy or ethics. What is needed is a concrete case, a qualified facilitator and participants to the moral case deliberation session. At the same time, the kind of moral case deliberation which is practiced in this study, as a specific kind of ethics support, has philosophical roots that can inform interested participants about underlying philosophical viewpoints of moral deliberation. Further engagement with the philosophical roots of moral case deliberation can inspire those involved in ethical inquiries as they can get more acquainted with philosophy as science as opposed to their engagement in practical wisdom during the moral case deliberation. The bottom-line, however, remains that knowledge of these philosophical roots of moral case deliberation is not necessary to participate in a moral case deliberation.

Roughly speaking, there are four philosophical roots of moral case deliberation as currently applied in Europe (Molewijk, 2014). These are pragmatic hermeneutics (Gadamer, 1960), practical wisdom going back to *phronesis* of Aristotle (Shotter and Tsoukas, 2014), Socratic inquiries regarding claims on knowledge (Nelson, 1994; Kessels, 1997) and the principles of dialogue (Bohm, 2014/1996). These four roots will be explained and related to the practical setting of moral case deliberations.

### **Pragmatic hermeneutics**

Pragmatic hermeneutics implies, first and foremost, that the interpretation of experiences depends on time, context, and subject. Hermeneutics considers experiences as an epistemological source of morality (Widdershoven and Molewijk, 2010). Therefore, the validity of interpretations and opinions is relative

and goes automatically along with an openness regarding other interpretations and opinions. Ideally, this openness and diversity of interpretations leads, in a certain context and at a certain point of time, to a melting or fusion of different horizons in which actual, personal and historical horizons fuse into an overarching horizon (*Horizontverschmelzung*) (Gadamer, 1960). The focus on concrete cases within a moral case deliberation mirrors the focus on experiences in a specific context and period of time which can strengthen the real world use of ethics support. At the same time, it is inherent to moral case deliberations to engage in an open exchange from different perspectives and to explore the extent to which a common perspective or way forward could be prepared.

### **Practical wisdom (phronesis)**

The notion of practical wisdom, going back to the concept of *phronesis* of Aristotle, can be considered as the second philosophical root of moral case deliberation. As described above, *phronesis* can be considered – besides science (*techne*) and craftsmanship (*episteme*) - as one of the sources of knowledge, putting practical wisdom of individual practitioners at the core (Flyvbjerg, 2011). Here the expertise and wisdom of practitioners is seen as a crucial source of inspiration and guidance. Practical wisdom is generated by professionals and is nurtured and reproduced by their professional experience. Being part of a dilemma and representing a position in a concrete situation makes use of the potential power of practical wisdom. The perspective of practical wisdom is reflected within a moral case deliberation by involving professionals themselves instead of falling back on scientists or experts (as other sources of wisdom). Ideally the professionals come from different hierarchical levels, as only their individual and professional contributions count, and status, rank or standing within the group are neglected.

### **Socratic inquiry**

Third, the Socratic way of challenging assumptions and knowledge claims play a key role in the Socratic attitude of the facilitators of the moral case deliberations. The main point of reference is the characteristic behaviour by Socrates, who reportedly challenged foundations of knowledge and opinions. By continuing to

ask questions, Socrates challenged the assumptions and positions of others and eventually led them to find the right answers themselves. Reconsidering opinions and positions contributes to a fruitful dialogue and critical examination of perspectives on how to handle dilemmas. During the inquiry into the facts, assumptions and values at stake in a specific case, the Socratic method of asking questions and finding questions is both present and instrumental. The Socratic idea of obstetrics is illustrative for this approach. Obstetrics is the art of midwives in facilitating a mother to give birth to a child. The mother of Socrates was a midwife and, according to some scholars, he may have been influenced by her. While she helped others to give birth to a child, he stimulated others to give birth to knowledge based on their own thinking (Sluiter, 2014: 61). Transferred to the field of moral case deliberation, this implies that a moral case deliberation is not about bringing an ethicist in but about drawing thoughts and ethical positions out of the individual participants. The practical wisdom of the participants will be at the core of the moral case deliberation.

## **Dialogue**

Fourth, the dialogical character of moral case deliberations can be traced back to thoughts on dialogue as developed by Bohm (Bohm, 2014/1996). An open attitude towards others' expressions, as well as an honest willingness and thorough means of exploring the views of others, are at the core of a real dialogue. Written before the impact of social media was felt in society, Bohm located the roots of many conflicts and problems in superficial listening, the lack of dialogue, and the predominance of winning all battles and taking down opponents in discussions. In a moral case deliberation it is key to establish a dialogue among the participants instead of a discussion. A dialogue ensures the free exchange of open thoughts among equals who postpone their judgements longer than normal in order to come up with a nuanced and well-thought-out position. The intended effect of having a dialogue is indeed to discover individual thoughts, assumptions and values, and to strive towards finding answers to ethical questions.

The relevance of these philosophical roots of moral case deliberation for the implementation of this tool of ethics support within the practice of counterterrorism will be explored in the next section.

### **7.3 Relevance of the method of moral case deliberation to counterterrorism**

In this section the philosophical roots of moral case deliberation will be discussed in the light of their potential relevance as far as application within the practice of counterterrorism is concerned. The relevance will be considered based on the insights raised so far in this thesis about the context and practice of counterterrorism on the one hand, and what is known in the literature on the other hand (Reding et al., 2013; Weidema and Molewijk, 2017). The discussion will follow the four major philosophical roots as presented in the previous section.

#### **Hermeneutics and concrete terrorism cases**

To begin with, pragmatic hermeneutics responds well to the importance of contexts to be considered in each single concrete case in counterterrorism. The practice of counterterrorism is predominantly linked to different cases in which potential terrorist individuals and terrorist networks constitute potential threats. The case-based counterterrorist practice corresponds with the case-oriented philosophical underpinnings of moral case deliberation in which interpretations are dependent on time, context and subject.

In addition, there is a diversity and multiplicity of teams and institutions involved in counterterrorism. Professionals operating in those teams and institutions will be eventually in need of a common vision, threat assessment or operational plan to counter potential threats. Developing such a common approach needs openness towards other interpretations and opinions, as the validity of separate interpretations and opinions is relative to the individual. The potential of melting or fusion of horizons from the philosophical perspective is mirrored by the relevance of the fusion of intelligence and information. The latter is often realized through all-source threat assessments, like those performed by counterterrorist fusion centers as part of the coordination community presented in Chapter 6 (Abels and De Roy van Zuijdewijn, 2017; Bakker and De Roy van Zuijdewijn, 2015; Persson, 2013) Running a moral case deliberation would therefore offer fertile soil to bring insights to the practice of counterterrorism.



### ***Phronesis* and practice of counterterrorism**

The concept of practical wisdom (*phronesis*) implies, second, a theoretical perspective that is relevant for the practice of counterterrorism. As has been clarified in Chapter 5, there is a whole range of ethical issues counterterrorism professionals are facing. Their role and expertise is often crucial in finding the right balance or solution in concrete ethical dilemmas. Having practical wisdom at the core of moral case deliberation offers a rich potential for applying this method of ethics support to the practice of counterterrorism. The potential fruitfulness of *phronesis* in counterterrorism would be in contradiction with the general role of *phronesis* in society. As mentioned above, *phronesis* is nowadays not only largely underrepresented in the realms of social sciences, but also in societies in general. A striking example is the lack of attention devoted to professionalism in general (Sennett, 2009). Nevertheless, the philosophical root of *phronesis* offers a rich potential to discover and encounter practical wisdom within a moral case deliberation and benefit from it.

### **Socratic inquiry and counterterrorism reality**

Third, the importance of a Socratic inquiry into assumptions and claims on knowledge seems to be, to a large extent, tailor-made for the practice of counterterrorism. In this practice, working with incomplete information and different hypotheses are part of daily business. This daily routine goes along with the necessity to challenge, check and re-check assumptions available by asking questions and applying the principle of 'devil's advocate'. In other words, this conceptual underpinning of moral case deliberation seems to provide a rich potential for the practice of counterterrorism.

At the same time, it has to be remembered that the time sensitivities that particularly shape the practice of counterterrorism can correspond less with the Socratic way of challenging assumptions and claims on knowledge. This can be due to a lack of room for reflection or due to a reluctance to turn operational realities upside down and potentially trigger multiple future pressures. However, the time constraints of counterterrorism professionals are not always present. After a period of stress and unrest there is normally enough time to get detached from stressful operational practices. This leaves enough room to engage in a

Socratic style of practical ethics and to consider moral case deliberation as a potentially useful method in the practice of counterterrorism.

### **Dialogue and counterterrorism dynamics**

The notion of dialogue seems, fourth, to be less intrinsically related to the practice of counterterrorism. Although a dialogue might be ideally useful to set the different cases straight and to come up with the “right” assessment or operational strategy, daily practices, due to time constraints, are rather less receptive to dialogue. Professional discussions under time constraints in multi-institutional settings with different kinds of secrets known to different kinds of professionals do not constitute an environment conducive for dialogue (Reding et al., 2013). In spite of that, there are indications from the interviews with counterterrorism professionals in Chapter 6 that the application of dialogue through moral case deliberation could be of benefit to the practice of counterterrorism. The interviews have shown a willingness of counterterrorism professionals to reach out on different levels in order to reflect on ethical issues. In spite of the time constraints, however, there are some prospects for dialogue within the practice of counterterrorism as time for reflection can be organized. The use of moral case deliberation within the often hectic and time constrained health sector reflects those prospects.

### **Overall assessment**

Three of the four philosophical roots seem to be relevant to the practice of counterterrorism. The importance of context and concrete cases, the application of the Socratic approach of knowledge and the drive towards practical wisdom are all reflected in the philosophical roots of moral case deliberation and the practice of counterterrorism. The fourth philosophical root of moral case deliberation, dialogue, is not as strongly reflected in the practice of counterterrorism at this time. This is mainly due to the structural lack of time for reflection and exchange when ethical issues occur in practice. As far as the professionals’ drive of strengthening their internal goods is concerned, however, it is likely that time-consuming dialogue can be of use during downtime like in the health sector.

The philosophical roots of moral case deliberation, their characteristics, as well as their relevance to the practice of counterterrorism have been summarized in Figure 4.

**Figure 4**

**Philosophical roots of moral case deliberation, characteristics and relevance to practice of counterterrorism**

Philosophical roots	Characteristics in general	Relevance to counterterrorism
pragmatic hermeneutics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• experience as source for moral epistemology</li> <li>• interpretation of experiences depends on time, context and subject</li> <li>• validity of interpretations and opinions is relative</li> <li>• an openness regarding other interpretations and opinions</li> <li>• melting or fusion of different 'horizons'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• responds well to importance of contexts of concrete cases</li> <li>• reflects diversity and multiplicity of teams and institutions involved</li> <li>• offers outcome of common vision, challenging assumptions before delivering common assessment</li> <li>• corresponds with relevance of fusion of intelligence and information</li> </ul>
practical wisdom, phronesis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• expertise of practitioners crucial in finding the right balance or solution</li> <li>• being part of a dilemma rather useful than disturbing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• corresponds with the responsibilities of practitioners as the practice of counterterrorism evolves</li> </ul>
Socratic way of challenging assumptions and claims on knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• continuous challenge of assumptions and claims on knowledge</li> <li>• reconsidering opinions and positions</li> <li>• fruitful dialogue, harvest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• fits with the necessity of perpetual questioning of assumptions given the incompleteness of information available</li> <li>• fits less with time sensitivity of CT-operations but off-peak moments offer sufficient room</li> </ul>
Dialogue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• open attitude</li> <li>• non-competitive orientation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• less receptive to decision and action-oriented part of CT-practice under time constraints but off-peak moments offer sufficient room</li> </ul>

## 7.4 Conclusions

In this chapter, the nature of moral case deliberation has been explained and its relevance to the practice of counterterrorism in the Netherlands has been explored. It is important to note that there is no other method of ethics support that is applied in the practice of counterterrorism in the Netherlands thus far. The introduction of the method of moral case deliberation within the practice of counterterrorism can be useful because of three reasons. First, the use of moral case deliberation has been suggested by a study into the methods of handling ethical problems in counterterrorism. Second, the added value of moral case deliberation has been proven in the medical context. Third, three of the four philosophical roots of counterterrorism fit well with the practice of counterterrorism: the focus on contextualizing concrete cases on a hermeneutical basis, the important role given to practical wisdom (*phronesis*) and the Socratic way of challenging assumptions and claims on knowledge. One philosophical root – dialogue – responds less to the time sensitivity of counterterrorism but still has the potential to be useful in downtimes situations. In sum, there is fertile ground within the practice of counterterrorism to have moral case deliberation implemented as a method of ethics support.

With the findings of this chapter in mind, it will be interesting to observe if and to what extent the assumptions regarding the potential usefulness of moral case deliberation will materialize in practice. In the next chapter, a first explorative application of moral case deliberation in a specific part of the counterterrorism practice in the Netherlands will be discussed.