STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

A CODE OF ETHICS FOR ARMY CIVILIANS - THE TIME IS NOW

BY

MAUREEN O. VIALL
Department of Army Civilian

19970623 045

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

USAWC CLASS OF 1997
U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

A CODE OF ETHICS FOR ARMY CIVILIANS - THE TIME IS NOW

by

Maureen O. Viall
Department of Army Civilian

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited.

Chaplain (Colonel) John Brinsfield
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Maureen O. Viall

TITLE: A Code of Ethics For Army Civilians - The Time is Now

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 4 April 1997 PAGES: 21 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

Changing missions, downsizing, reorganizations, base closures and a vision of different roles augur a new perspective on the current and future responsibilities of Army civilians. Deploying to assist in Operations Other Than War, participating in support functions on tomorrow's non-linear battlefields and teaming with employees from non-governmental organizations as well as private contractors will be only part of the challenge. Flatter organizations, increased individual decision making, departure from traditional hierarchical structures and new work flexibilities will require a determination to adhere to the highest right. Army civilians are the only service component employees currently evaluated on key institutional values on their annual appraisals. Commensurate with the recent issuance of seven core Army values, appraisal forms will be modified. The time is ripe to adopt a Code of Ethics for Army Civilians. It should not be a bureaucratic document embedded in law. Sufficient Federal regulations and statutes already exist. Rather, it should be an evolutionary credo, challenging all Army civilians to discuss, dialogue and recognize the necessity for making the right choices. Army civilians are truly unique.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION....1

HISTORY SETS THE STAGE FOR TOMORROW....3

TERMINOLOGY / DEFINITIONS ESSENTIAL TO THE ISSUE....6

SURVEY OF TARGET AUDIENCE....9

CURRENT PROVISIONS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES....12

ONE TEAM, ONE OATH....17

RECOMMENDATIONS....19

PROPOSED CODE....20

CONCLUSION....21

APPENDIX A....22

ENDNOTES....23

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY....25

"When values are clear, decision making is easy"

Roy Disney

An unsettling introduction to the impact of ethics and values on Army civilian employees occurred for Karen Smith when she was appointed to the position of Civil Service examiner in 1978. In essence, she was commissioned to administer, monitor and evaluate examinations of U.S. citizens seeking federal employment. Working in the personnel office of a large Army Research and Development installation, she was pleased to receive that tasking because it provided her post with direct hiring authority in the scientific, engineering and clerical arenas. The arsenal was a growing organization and the expanding missions required rapid fill of positions. Until then, only the regional Office of Personnel Management (OPM) could administer and certify examinations and it took months to fill jobs. Karen's elation over improved hiring time was short-lived when she witnessed first-hand the variety of questionable, unethical, and in rare cases, attempted illegal procedures people used to obtain employment. How many were able to persuade unknowing teachers to certify their clerical skills incorrectly? How many indicated they had college degrees and yet could not provide transcripts? How many touted references from some of the senior graded civilians on post? What caused some candidates to do the right thing and others to fall short? What made some candidates think that any means justified the ends when seeking a job? Clearly, those were not the people she wanted to recommend for hire.

Two decades of human resource management experience with Department of Army civilians have since permitted Karen Smith to assess a myriad of work

environments. Assignments in high achieving organizations with dedicated workers were interspersed with those on installations plagued by low morale, significant grievances, high claims for job-related injuries and leave abuse. What factors influenced the workers in those juxtaposed environments? What value base and ethical construct appeared relevant in those work settings? What guidance existed to motivate acceptable behaviors in those diverse labor spheres?

Changing missions, downsizing and reorganizations, base closures and realignments and a vision of different roles augur a new perspective on the responsibilities of Army civilians. Commensurate with these changes is a constantly expanding total team emphasis which stresses that military **and** civilians are held to the highest standards. This paper will assess the importance of ethics and values on the future of our Army civilians. It also compares existing federal guidance with a proposal to incorporate a Code of Ethics unique to Army civilians.

A Code of Ethics for Army civilians could help not only to clarify roles and expectations but also to provide the missing link with behaviors and decision making representing the enduring values now listed on annual evaluations. Titled the Total Army Performance Evaluation System (TAPES), the evaluation forms mirror those used for the military. Tomorrow's Army civilians may come from environments with even less structure than Karen Smith's initial candidates for employment. They may be the products of schools and neighborhoods where crime, drugs and distressed families are the norm rather than the exception. They may suspect the motivation behind attempts to coach, counsel and mentor. This proposal is substantiated by research, discussions,

anecdotal evidence from human resource management experiences and a survey of the student body in Class 96-3 at the Army Management Staff College, Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

History Sets the Stage For Tomorrow

Army civilians have been in place since the Army began. Employed as clerks, blacksmiths, messengers, quartermasters and munitions forgers, the earliest workers served to support soldiers in peace and in conflict. Uniforms distinguished different appearance but the conditions, time, hazards and commitments were often the same. The first recognized civilian employee of what was to become the War Department was Richard Peters of Pennsylvania, a clerk who was appointed in 1776. Employees were required to take an oath, writing it out first to demonstrate their penmanship and reciting it second. [1] The oath appears to be the earliest guidance provided regarding duties and expected behaviors.

> I,_____, do solemnly swear, that I will not directly or indirectly, divulge any matter or thing which shall come to my knowledge, as (secretary or clerk) of the Board of War and Ordnance, for the United Colonies, without leave of the said Board of War and Ordnance, and that I will faithfully execute my said office, according to the best of my skill and judgment. So help me God.[2]

The above oath was later modified to include a requirement to swear fidelity and the first law passed by the first Congress under the Constitution in 1789 required "all

employees to take an oath... before they acted in their respective offices."[3] Records indicate it was not before the turn of the century that employees began to receive the benefits and considerations linked to today's civil servants. However, it is beneficial to note that an oath, recognized as a "solemn appeal to God to witness one's determination to speak the truth or to keep a promise,"[4] was in fact required. This evidences early value system recognition and substantiates the significance of the roles of War Department civilian employees.

Ironically, some of the same conditions that the earliest Army civilians encountered are witnessing significant repetition in the late 1990's. Just as today's workers observe political debate about the size of the force during the aftermath of the Cold War, the civilians employed after the American Revolution heard debates about the necessity for a War Department and some insistence that it be renamed a Peace Department.[5] Just as the earliest civilians served as teamsters, road builders and medical aides, today's Army civilians are deploying in large numbers to support soldiers in operations other than war. Following the direction of The 1996 National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement, our current National Military Strategy lists these areas of responsibility: nation assistance; security assistance; humanitarian operations; counterdrug and counterterrorism; military to military contacts and peacekeeping. [6] Supporting soldiers in those arenas are civilians who serve as logistics specialists, engineers, education specialists, morale and recreation specialists, medical specialists, ammunition and surveillance specialists, research and development

specialists, computer specialists, air traffic controllers, safety specialists and public affairs officers, to mention but a few categories.

> Deployment is one of many areas where civilians are critical to the success of the Army. As in Operations Desert Shield and Storm, Somalia, Haiti and other military operations, civilians have contributed greatly to the Army's peacekeeping mission.[7]

That we are going to see more and more civilians participating in military operations, is the prediction of Dianna Skelton, a mobilization planner from the Army's Training and Doctrine Command at Fort Monroe, Virginia. Not only are those civilians issued Geneva Convention identification cards and dog tags, but they may also be issued weapons. In the past, civilians were pretty much found in the rear, as opposed to the forward areas of the battlefield. Those distinctions do not exist in the nonlinear battlefield today so any civilian deploying where there are hostilities, or where there may be hostilities, needs the same protection as a soldier.[8] Substantiating the above involvement, the Honorable Edwin Dorn, Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, recently emphasized the need to refer to civilian employees as "Partners in Defense."[9] In light of the above roles, strong consideration of what overall ethos describes and guides Army civilian actions is required. Are Army civilians not entitled to a positive set of aspirations, endorsing cultural cross-links with their military peers? Currently, Army civilians can be called on to perform duties (due to location and consequent responsibility) which are vastly different than those employees perform at the Internal Revenue Service or the Departments of Agriculture and Education. Accordingly,

shouldn't Army civilians have a "set of signposts" [10] unique to their professions?

Terminology and Definitions Essential to the Issue

In preparing an argument to justify a codification of ethics, it is first necessary to cite opinions and beliefs posited by professionals in the field of ethics and values. Posner and Schmidt attempted to compare the managerial values of federal government executives with those of business executives in a recent study published in *Public Personnel Management*. They cited Brent Wall's definition of values as applicable to both systems. "Values are at the core of personality, influencing the choices individuals make, the people that are trusted, the appeals heard, the strategies which will be enacted, and the way individuals and organizations alike invest their time and energy. In turbulent times especially, personal and organizational values provide a sense of direction amidst conflicting views and demands."[11] Wall's definition would endorse the Army definition from FM 22-100. "Values are attitudes about the worth or importance of people, concepts, or things. Values influence your behavior because you use them to decide between alternatives."[12]

The five individual values that all soldiers are expected to possess are courage, candor, competence, commitment and compassion. Army civilians have also adopted those values and are rated on them annually. Michael Josephson, who heads the Josephson Institute of Ethics in California, challenges the military guidance somewhat by saying that "there are **two** aspects to ethics, the first involves the ability to discern right from wrong, good from evil, and propriety from impropriety." He says that the second aspect involves the "commitment to do what is right, good and proper," based on ability

to do the first.[13] Josephson's emphasis is well-taken when one realizes that a military construct was affixed to a civilian evaluation form encouraging an assumption that the civilian worker had the knowledge and ability to link himself with the organization's, i.e. the Army's ethos. Josephson further opined that the terms values and ethics are not interchangeable. "Ethics is concerned with how moral persons should behave, whereas values simply concern the various beliefs and attitudes which determine how a person actually behaves. Some values concern ethics when they pertain to beliefs as to what is right and wrong. Most values do not." [14] Teaching a course called Professional Ethics for Senior Leaders at the U.S. Army War College at Carlisle, Pa., Chaplain (Colonel) John Brinsfield concluded, "Values are qualities of character or of society which are highly prized; values are what binds Americans together."[15] Echoing Chaplain Brinsfield's advice, Professor Milton Rokeach of Washington State University said, "A value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence.[16] The Chief of Staff of the Army, General Dennis J. Reimer recently approved a new construct for values for leadership: duty, selfless service, courage, respect, loyalty, integrity and honor.[17] In light of the fact that the Army recently proposed new values based on its long-enduring ethos,[18] it is interesting to review Rokeach's perspective on changing values.

> If values were completely stable, individual and social change would be impossible. If values were completely unstable, continuity of human personality and society would be impossible. Any conception of human values, if it is to be fruitful, must be able to account for the enduring character of values as well as for their changing character.[19]

Chaplain Brinsfield called the Rokeach quotation interesting but said that "the first sentence is debatable in light of many enduring religious values thousands of years old. What may change are the circumstances in which values are affirmed or ignored."[20]

Continuing an evaluation of definitions of ethics as part of an argument for a civilian code of ethics, consider the perspective of Sissela Bok, noted medical ethics instructor and Harvard professor. "One of the simplest and best definitions of ethics was that of Epicurus. He claimed that ethics deals with things to be sought and things to be avoided, with ways of life and with the telos."[21] Telos as used here refers to the chief good, the aim or the end of life. [22] Neither ethicist Josephson nor the compilers of FM 22-100 disagreed on the obligations endemic to values. "Ethics is about character and courage and how we meet the challenge when doing the right thing will cost more than we want to pay."[23] "Ethics are principles or standards that guide professionals to do the moral or right thing -- what ought to be done."[24] Even the late Communist philosopher and author Ayn Rand provided a link between ethics and the impact of our value system on them. "Ethics is a code of values which guide our choices and actions and determine the purpose and course of our lives."[25]

Sam Sarkesian, former Chair of the Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society, said: "Ethics is, in part, the behavior expected of individuals to conform to culturally based guidelines. Ethics also presumes that individuals actively seek enlightenment about their moral values and critically examine their behavior in that light."[26] Accepting Sarkesian's premise, one must admit that the need for a civilian code

of ethics presupposes that Army employees are in fact seeking enlightenment and guidance. Concern for the fit of their personal values with the behaviors expected by their organization, in this case, the Department of Army, would be legitimate countenance. "We should be willing to assume that most men have sufficient desire to live a moral life, that they will profit from instruction that helps them to become more alert to ethical issues, and to apply their moral values more carefully and rigorously to the ethical dilemmas they encounter in their professional lives."[27] Supporting the soldiers of today and tomorrow will require far more than knowledge of the Army, it will demand adherence to its culture.

Survey of Target Audience

The students in Class 96-3 at the Army Management Staff College (AMSC), Ft. Belvoir, Va. were surveyed in November of 1996 to gain their opinions on a need for a code of ethics unique to Army employees. This audience was selected because they represented a readily available group of civilian leaders, grades 11 through 14, representing widely diverse career fields and programs, geographical locations and length of service. The respondents indicated that 47 percent were currently supervisors and 50 percent were not. Fifty-three percent had prior military experience, 44 percent did not and three percent did not indicate. They applied to and were competitively board selected for attendance at the College. (A copy of the survey is enclosed at APPENDIX A).

Of the 162 students receiving the survey, 92 responded to questions one through four and 93 responded to questions five and six. A Likert scale containing choices of:(1) Strongly Agree (2) Agree (3) Neutral (4) Disagree and (5) Strongly Disagree was the rating tool provided for their replies. An explanation of the numerical (percentage) responses to the six questions follows.

When asked if Army civilians needed a formal Code of Ethics to capture the direction and organizational integrity of their segment of the Total Army Team, 92 replied. Twenty-four percent strongly agreed and 36 percent agreed. Nine percent were neutral, 17 percent disagreed and 14 percent strongly disagreed. Combining the two opposite ends of the spectrum, **60 percent agreed** and 31 percent disagreed.

When asked if a Code of Ethics for Army civilians would strengthen our importance as the institutional support of the military force, 92 replied. Twenty-two percent strongly agreed and 36 percent agreed. Ten percent were neutral, 20 percent disagreed and 12 percent strongly disagreed. Combining the two opposite ends of the spectrum, **58 percent agreed** and 32 percent disagreed.

When asked if a DA civilian Code of Ethics would enhance a better understanding of why values are important to every member of the total force, 92 replied. Twenty-two percent strongly agreed and 39 percent agreed. Seven percent were neutral, 19 percent disagreed and 13 percent strongly disagreed. Combining the two opposite ends of the spectrum, **61 percent agreed** and 32 percent disagreed.

When asked if a DA civilian Code of Ethics could provide a linkage with the values portion of civilian annual evaluations (TAPES), 92 replied. Seventeen percent

strongly agreed and 38 percent agreed. Fifteen percent were neutral, 18 percent disagreed and 11 percent strongly disagreed. Combining the two opposite ends of the spectrum, **55 percent agreed** and 29 percent disagreed.

When asked if most DA civilians understood Army values, 93 replied. Fifteen percent strongly agreed and 40 percent agreed. Thirteen percent were neutral, 27 percent disagreed and five percent strongly disagreed. Combining the two opposite ends of the spectrum, **55 percent agreed** and 32 percent disagreed.

When asked if a formal DA civilian Code of Ethics was **not** needed, 93 replied. Twenty-two percent strongly agreed and 15 percent agreed. Twelve percent were neutral, 37 percent disagreed and 15 percent strongly disagreed. Combining the opposite ends of the spectrum, 37 percent agreed and **52 percent disagreed**.

Clearly, some conclusions can be reached from the resultant statistics. The students favored adopting a code of ethics. They favored a code unique to their own professions as Department of the Army civilians. They agreed that a code of ethics could provide linkage to the values portion of their own annual evaluations.

The insertion of Army values on civilian appraisals occurred four years ago. The intent was to parallel the formats of the military and civilian appraisals and to forge a common understanding between the two components (military and civilian) concerning the significance of mission, ethics and values. Initial civilian acceptance was not without some cynicism and skepticism. A few Army installations were even slow to adopt the new appraisal because of workforce and labor union reluctance. However, in the relatively short period since the incorporation of values on the annual evaluations, two

interesting observations are noted. First, among the students surveyed at the Army Management Staff College, 55 percent agreed that most Department of the Army civilians understood Army values. Second, the most recently published Army Civilians Annual Review showed that there were recognized reductions in grievances and unfair labor practices. [28] Moreover, the review also showed that in the four largest MACOMs employing civilians, the time lost for injuries was down in each area from FY 94 to FY 95.[29] Army Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) complaints went from 722 in FY 94 to 426 in FY 95. Of the 722, only 21 sustained findings of discrimination and of the 426, only 20 findings of discrimination were sustained.[30] Moreover, the recent publication of Army's labor relations program evaluation showed that grievances and unfair labor practice complaints were down from fiscal year 95. [31] More time is needed in order to verify the actual correlation between insertion of values and affect on the workforce. While the numbers indicate much remains to be done, a link between the insertion of values on appraisals and impacts on behaviors and attitudes should be considered. With the recently issued definitions of Army ethics in seven central or core values,[32] the time is now ripe for a civilian code of ethics.

Current Provisions For All Federal Employees -- Will They Meet Future Needs ?

> The interesting distinction between laws and ethical codes is that laws require obedience without any understanding as to why the law is necessarily is as it is. Ethics, on the other hand, sets forth general statements about what one ought to do and requires that an individual know why the precepts constitute obligations. Moreover, codes of ethics require the application of judgment in order to decide how a precept applies in given

> circumstances; laws require no such judgment. Laws are only the dictates of the state; they may or may not have ethical content. Ethics, by its very nature addresses the moral content of human action. [33]

There is not a shortage of formal regulations and laws describing the basic do's and don'ts of civil servants. There are 14 basic principles requiring adherence by all public servants. Additionally, all agencies must appoint a Designated Agency Ethics Official to coordinate and manage the agency's ethics program. That individual has responsibility for answering questions regarding conflicts of interest, financial disclosure, and standards of conduct. The principles listed below demonstrate the legal intention and somewhat negative emphases. They are embedded in law and can be found in Title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 2635.

1. Public service is a public trust, requiring employees to place loyalty to the Constitution, the laws and ethical principles above private gain.
2. Employees shall not hold financial interests that conflict with the conscientious performance of duty.
3. Employees shall not engage in financial transactions using nonpublic Government information or allow the improper use of such information to further any private interest.
4. An employee shall not, except pursuant to such reasonable exceptions as are provided by regulation, solicit or accept any gift or other item of monetary value from any person or entity seeking official action from doing business with, or conducting activities regulated by the employee's agency, or whose interests may be substantially affected by the performance or nonperformance of the employee's duties.
5. Employees shall put forth honest effort in the performance of their duties.
6. Employees shall make no unauthorized commitments or promises of any kind purporting to bind the Government.
7. Employees shall not use public office for private gain.
8. Employees shall act impartially and not give preferential treatment to any private organization or individual.
9. Employees shall protect and conserve Federal property and shall not use it for other than authorized activities.

10. Employees shall not engage in outside employment or activities, including seeking or negotiating for employment, that conflict with official Government duties and responsibilities.
11. Employees shall disclose waste, fraud, abuse, and corruption to appropriate authorities.
12. Employees shall satisfy in good faith their obligations as citizens, including all just financial obligations, especially those that are imposed by law.
13. Employees shall adhere to all laws and regulations that provide equal opportunity for all Americans regardless of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age or handicap.
14. Employees shall endeavor to avoid any actions creating the appearance that they are violating the law or the ethical standards promulgated pursuant to this order. [34]

Assessment of the above leads to a conclusion offered by Dr.Richard Gabriel. "Often it is much easier to know what one ought not to do than to know what one ought to do."[35] While the principles listed provide a stable platform and cannot be ignored, interpretations could differ without discussion, debate and a positive emphasis on the guidance intended. For example, principle one requires employees to place loyalty to ethical principles above private gain. Without an established values baseline, such as that currently offered by Department of Army, how would employees know the derivation or reference point? In a future work environment laden with incentives such as family leave programs, credit hours,and flex schedules, to mention but a few of the worker friendly innovations, how do leaders sensitize their organizations to seek the highest right? In a military environment where appearance and rigid physical standards encourage civilians to sometimes emulate their service peers, how do managers promote the benefits of positive life style achievement? This latter point is important in light of the fact that many Army positions traditionally reserved for officers may be civilianized. "The Army is now looking at moving more of its green suiters into combat and combat support roles and converting into civilian positions a lot of positions that were held by officers."[36]

Does principle five capture what honest effort truly means? By whose standards? What work practices do employees observe that help them define what honest effort should encompass? In today's flattened work environments, supervisors have a wider span of control and may be rarely present. Are peers and team leaders mentoring new employees? Are people abusing the absence of a formal supervisor by taking longer lunch breaks, playing computer games or surfing the internet? Honest effort includes the willingness to keep learning, both formally and informally about the functional attributes of a job. Moreover, honest effort includes the desire to seek knowledge about the totality of the organization in order to elevate the functional contributions tomorrow's Army civilians can offer.

How is preferential treatment to a private organization or individual defined? Recognizing that this issue derived both from the necessity to apply merit practices and to adhere to fairness and equity when dealing with potential customers, principle eight, nonetheless, warrants further consideration. Tomorrow's Army civilian will work side by side with members of non-government organizations, contractors and potential contractors. Many of their former co-workers and managers will be employed by contractors. In theory, some Army civilians could end up working with former employees who lost jobs through reductions in force and ended up as welfare recipients. 1 Work will be accomplished by teams representing several different sources. Team members will not all be receiving the same salary and benefits. Information sharing will have to be emphasized as a team goal, removing the unaffordable and unfortunate past practice of "knowledge is power." The first Army employee, War Department Clerk

Richard Peters, would undoubtedly be amazed at the empowerment granted today's and certainly tomorrow's Army employees.

How does an Army civilian deploying in military operations other than war interpret principles six, eleven and fourteen? Working in alien, hazardous environments within cultures where Western traditions and mores are not the norm, Army civilians need the leverage to fulfill their institutional loyalty while not being punished for independent judgments at cross purposes with Federal guidelines. Tomorrow's Army civilians, just as their military counterparts, will be in settings such as Bosnia and Africa. They may be directly involved in negotiations, conflict resolution and on the spot decision making. The ever-present bureaucratic security and the protection of the hierarchical staffing process may be anachronisms or, at minimum, less then ever present. Contingent workers, hired as term appointees, are predicted to be a mainstay of the future civilian workforce. "Contingent workers do not come with a sense of the organization's culture, and many of the tacit and informal understandings are not immediately accessible to them."[37]

One of the largest differences between the military and civilian personnel systems focuses on the up or out policy of the former and the seniority or retention rights of the latter. During periods of extensive downsizing, which are projected to continue in the future, both components witness the unplanned departures of friends and co-workers. Because the civilian with many years service is favored during reductions in force it will be more important then ever that he "willingly" assume new responsibilities commensurate with his institutional knowledge. Because the senior civilian may be

perceived to have more job protection then his military peer, the future will demand that the civilian be willing to take risks and wear the hat of the honest broker.

One Team, One Oath

Newly commissioned Army officers and newly appointed Army civilians repeat the same oath.

> I (full name) do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same, and that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.[38]

Professor James H. McGrath of Central Michigan University conducted a survey of oaths and describes the above as a voluntary, public vow by which one consents to be bound by others. [39] While it is an impressive method of initiation, McGrath takes umbrage that people other then newly commissioned officers take the same oath. Department of Army civilians, proud of the shared oath, would undoubtedly disagree with him. McGrath further argues that the oath is one of acceptance or consent; the oath has substance only when the individual reciting it is told what his duties will be.[40] Accepting McGrath's stance, one might argue that Army civilians need more than an oath of office to remind them of the significance of their duties. James H. Toner, author and professor of military ethics at the Air War College put it succinctly. "True faith and allegiance depend on a well-formed conscience."[41]

Two recommended tests for insuring that our actions might evolve from a well-formed conscience emanate from three highly different sources, a management consultant, a minister and a military ethicist. They offer, however, basically the same advice. Management guru Kenneth Blanchard collaborated with the late Normal Vincent Peale in *The Power of Ethical Management* to provide the following ethics check: (1) Is it legal?(2) Is it balanced?and (3) How will it make me feel about myself? [42]

James Toner, a military ethics professor, offered his methodology for determining the rightness or wrongness of an action. (1) The shame test asks whether this action, if publicized, would embarrass, discredit, or humiliate me. (2) The community test asks whether, in addition to your closest relatives, you would want people in your community - your professional peers - to know about your action. (3) The legal test asks whether, if authorities found out, you would likely be put on trial for the action. (4) The situation test asks whether there are peculiar or special circumstances requiring extraordinary action. If time and opportunity presented themselves, would you be able to give a satisfactory response to everyone you care about? (5) The consequences test asks whether the results of your action are likely to be good. Will the benefits of the action justify the costs? (6) The God test asks if you believe in God, what would his commandment be in this circumstance? Does the Golden Rule apply? Would you want the action done to you? If you do not believe in God, is the action universalizable; that is would you want everyone in the world to be able to do what you are about to do? [43]

Recommendations

Department of Army civilians should have a code of ethics unique to their profession. Complementing the dual oath-taking, the 14 Principles for Federal Employees and existing legal requirements, the code would serve to guide civilians of the future. The goal of a well-formed conscience would be inherent. What General Maxwell Taylor said regarding a military code of ethics applies to the Army civilians of the future. "Without a common ethical center, there can be no profession. The creation of a community within the profession requires a special calling and uniqueness and should be formalized in a code of special ethics for all to see."[44]

The Army Civilian Code of Ethics need not be embedded in law. "The central point of a code of ethics is the necessity for choice. The very specificity of law removes choice and substitutes obedience for obligation."[45] Perhaps Senator William Fulbright said it best when defending why law was not sufficient to guide men.

> One of the more disturbing aspects of this problem of moral conduct is the revelation that among so many influential people morality has become identified with legality. We are certainly in a tragic plight if the accepted standard by which we measure the integrity of a man in public life is that he keeps within the letter of the law.[46]

The code should incorporate the recently released seven central values of Army as the platform. It should provide a baseline for continuous discussion and dialogue and serve as a constant reminder that Army civilians are truly unique. The code should be proactive, inspirational and intellectually challenging. Lastly, because Army civilians are

the only service component civilians to be assessed on values through their annual evaluations, the code should serve to foster heightened image, prestige, and pride.

Proposed Code

As Federal civil servants, Army civilians experience a public status different from private sector counterparts. Army civilians, moreover, support and sustain the soldier -- truly a particular honor. Offered below is a proposed code of ethics. It should evolve and be a work in progress for the future.

We will strive daily, in performing our approved missions, to provide a climate where the Army values are everywhere in evidence. Our work places, encompassing a world wide presence, will be models for the continuous pursuit of the highest quality service to the soldier and the nation. Our duty will be a constant commitment to the loyalty we swore: to uphold and defend the Constitution and to support our Army, our organizations, our leaders, our peers and our families. We will serve selflessly for the privilege of being a member of a top-performing team. Our honor will compel us to perform to the highest professional standards, seeking always to learn more in order to contribute more. Our courage will require us to challenge candidly and proactively while aspiring to contribute beyond the norm. Our integrity will serve as a model to establish the respect and compassion we owe to all.

Conclusion

The Department of Army Civilian Code of Ethics could be recited annually during special ceremonies, such as the Army birthday or installation recognition days. It could be a featured part of new employee orientations and included as a baseline for discussion during all segments of civilian leader development education. Posted on the walls of our garrisons, arsenals, engineer districts and installations worldwide, it would reinforce a positive aspiration, that to be an Army civilian is truly a great privilege.

The proposed code might even be considered as a credo of sorts. "A credo or creed is a statement of values, expectations and responsibilities of a group of people."[47] The intent of the code is to reinforce and enhance the seven core values. It could preclude dilemmas for Karen Smith's human resource management successors. In no way is it meant to separate the community endemic to the Total Army Team. It is intended, rather, to strengthen the bond of that already outstanding partnership.

APPENDIX A - SURVEY OF STUDENTS AT Army Management Staff College

(1) **Army civilians** need a formal Code of Ethics to capture the direction and organizational integrity of our segment of the Total Army Team.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

(2) **A Code of Ethics for Army Civilians** would strengthen our importance as the institutional support of the military force.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

(3) A **DA Civilian Code of Ethics** would enhance a better understanding of why values are important to every member of the total force.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

(4) A **DA Civilian** Code of Ethics could provide a linkage with the values portion of civilian annual evaluations (TAPES).

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

(5) Most DA civilians understand Army values.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

(6) A formal DA Civilian Code of Ethics is not needed.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Your Grade_____ **Are you a supervisor**? Yes No

Prior Military Experience ? Yes No

ENDNOTES

[1] Edwin H. Steiner, *Civilian Personnel Management Newsletter*, No.2-76 (Washington, D.C.: ODCSPER, April-July 1976) 1-2.
[2] Ibid., 2.
[3] Ibid.
[4] *Random House Dictionary of the English Language* (1966), s.v. "oath."
[5] Steiner, 8.
[6] General John M. Shalikashvili, *National Military Strategy of the United States of America, A Strategy of Flexible and Selective Engagement*, (Washington,D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office,1995) 8-9.
[7] The Honorable Sara E. Lister, "Maximizing The Army's Most Important Asset - People," *Army 1996-97 Green Book*, Association of the United States Army, (Washington, D.C., 1996) 40.
[8] TRADOC News Service, "*More Civilians Will Deploy Along With Soldiers*," Nov.1996.
[9] The Honorable Edwin Dorn, "A Memo From the Under Secretary of Defense," *HQDA Civilian Personnel Bulletin*, No.96-44. 8 Nov 1996, (Washington, D.C. ASAMRA) 1-2.
[10] Harold F. Gortner, *Ethics For Public Managers*, (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991) 136.
[11] Barry Z. Posner and Warren H. Schmidt, "The Values of Business and Federal Government Executives:More Different Than Alike," *Public Personnel Management*, (Alexandria, Va.: Fall, 96) 277, quoting from B. Wall, "Assessing Ethics Theories from A Democratic Viewpoint," in J.S. Bowman (ed), *Ethical Frontiers in Public Management*, (San Francisco,CA: Jossey-Bass,1991).
[12] FM 22-100, *Military Leadership*,(Washington, D.C., HQDA, 1990) 23.
[13] Michael Josephson, *Making Ethical Decisions*, 3rd ed., (Marina del rey: Josephson Institute of Ethics, 1995) 2.
[14] Josephson, 4 .
[15] Chaplain (COL) John Brinsfield, Professional Ethics For Senior Leaders, (Lecture delivered 15 Jan.1997 at Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pa.)
[16] Milton Rokeach, *The Nature of Human Values*,(New York: Free Press, 1973) 5.
[17] LTC William Clewe, "Values," 30 Oct.1996. E-mail: clewew@leav-emh1.army.mil
[18] LTG F.E. Vollrath, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Draft Memo. Subject: Staffing Guidance for Army Leadership Doctrine. Nov.1996, references proposed new values: duty, honor, integrity, loyalty,courage, selfless service and respect.
[19] Rokeach, 5-6.
[20] Notes from Chaplain (COL) John Brinsfield to Maureen Viall on 28 Feb. 1996 containing his opinion of the Rokeach quote cited in Strategy Research Project.
[21] Sissela Bok, *Lying, Moral Choice in Public and Private Life*,(New York: Random House, 1978) xix.
[22] Bok.
[23] Josephson, 2.
[24] Field Manual No. 22-100, *Military Leadership*,(Washington: HQDA,31 July 1990) 30.
[25] Josephson, quoting Ayn Rand, 2.
[26] Sam C. Sarkesian, "Moral and Ethical Foundations of Military Professionalism,"quoted in *Military Ethics and Professionalism,* ed. James Brown and Michael J. Collins, (Washington, D.C., NDU Press, 1981) 3.
[27] Derek C. Bok as quoted in Richard A. Gabriel, *To Serve With Honor*, (Greenwood Press: Westport, CT.1982)
[28] Office, Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower & Reserve Affairs) *Army Civilians Annual Review FY* 94-95. Even though TAPES, the Total Army Performance Evaluation was in place for less then a year at some installations at the time of this data submission, grievances were down 12.9 percent and unfair labor practices were down 11 percent, reflecting the fewest filed since FY 86. x.
[29] Ibid. 6-9.
[30] Ibid. 6-17.

[31] David Helmer, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, "FY 96 Labor Relations Program Evaluation," *HQDA Civilian Personnel Bulletin,* No. 97-07,14 Feb.1997.(Washington, ASAMRA) 7.
[32] Vollrath Memo.
[33] Richard Gabriel, *To Serve With Honor,*(Westport, CT:Greenwood Press,1982) 42-43.
[34] Susan McGuire Smith, *Practical Ethics for the Federal Employee,* (Huntsville, AL: FPMI Communications Inc. 1992) Second Edition. Executive Order 12674, Apr.12,1989. This EO led to the Government Ethics Reform Act of 1989.(Public Law 101-94, Nov.30,1989). The regulation was effective as of 3 Feb 1993. 2-4.
[35] Gabriel, 27.
[36] Chet Bridger, "The People Game: Hit or Miss - What Happens When Military and Civilians Work Side by Side," *Army Times*, 4 Apr. 1994. 12.
[37] Michael Burr, "Permanent Temps," *Government Executive*, March 1997, 41.
[38] James H. Toner, *True Faith and Allegiance, The Burden of Military Ethics*. (Kentucky: University Press, 1995). Officer's Oath of Office.
[39] James H. McGrath, "The Officer's Oath: Words That Bind," *Ethics and National Defense,* edited by James C. Gaston and Janis Bren Hietala (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press Feb 1993) 3.
[40] McGrath, 20.
[41] Toner, 28.
[42] Kenneth Blanchard and Norman Vincent Peale, *The Power of Ethical Management,* (New York: William Morrow and Co., 1988) 27.
[43] Toner, 130-31.
[44] Gabriel, 120.
[45] Ibid. 126.
[46] Senator William Fulbright, Speech before the U.S. Senate on Jan 28, 1967. Quoted by Richard Gabriel, *To Serve With Honor*, 126.
[47] Ronald E. Berenbeim, *Corporate Ethics*, (New York: The Conference Board, Inc. 1987) 21.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bass, Bernard M. *A New Paradigm of Leadership: An Inquiry Into Transformational Leadership*.Alexandria,Va.:U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 1996.

Berenbeim, Ronald E. *Corporate Ethics*.New York: The Conference Board, Inc.,1987.

Best, Geoffrey Dr. "Civilians in Contemporary Wars," *Air University Review,* March-April1984.

Blanchard, Kenneth and Dr.Norman Vincent Peale, *The Power of Ethical Management*.New York: William Morrow and Co., 1988.

Bok, Sissela. *Lying, Moral Choice in Public and Private Life*.New York: Random House, 1978.

Bowman, James S., ed. *Ethical Frontiers in Public Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1991.

Bridger, Chet. "The People Game: Hit or Miss - What Happens When Military and Civilians Work Side by Side," *Army Times*, 4 April 1994.

Brinsfield, John Chaplain (COL). Professional Ethics For Senior Leaders. Lecture. Carlisle, Pa.: Army War College, 15 January 1997.

Burr, Michael. "Permanent Temps," *Government Executive*. March 1997.

Clewe, William LTC. *Values* . E-mail: Leavenworth, Kansas. 30 October 1996.

Denhardt, Kathryn G. *The Ethics of Public Service: Resolving Moral Dilemmas in Public Organizations*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1988.

Dorn, Edward Honorable. "A Memo from The Under Secretary of Defense," *HQDA Civilian Personnel Bulletin.* Washington: No. 96-44, 8 November 1996.

Ethics Resource Center. *Creating a Workable Company Code of Ethics*.Washington:1984.

Field Manual No. 22-100. *Military Leadership.* Washington: HQDA, 1990.

Frederickson, H. George, ed. *Ethics and Public Administration*. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1993.

Gabriel, Richard Dr. *To Serve With Honor*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1982.

Gortner, Harold F. *Ethics For Public Managers*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991.

Helmer, David. "FY 96 Labor Relations Program Evaluation," *HQDA Civilian Personnel Bulletin*.Washington: No. 97-07, 14 February 1997.

Josephson, Michael. *Making Ethical Decisions*, 3rd ed.Marina del rey: Josephson Institute of Ethics, 1995.

Lister, Sara E. Honorable. "Maximizing The Army's Most Important Asset - People," *Army 1996-97 Green Book*. Washington: AUSA, 1996.

McGrath, James H. "The Officer's Oath: Words That Bind," *Ethics and National Defense*.Washington: NDU Press, 1993.

Naylor, Sean D. "The Core of the Matter," *Army Times*. December 1996.

Office, Assistant Secretary of the Army, (Manpower and Reserve Affairs). *Army Civilians Annual Review FY 94-95* Washington: 1996.

Pasquerella, Lynn, Alfred G. Killilea, and Michael Vocino, ed. *Ethical Dilemmas in Public Administration*. Westport: Praeger, 1996.

Posner, Barry Z. and Warren H. Schmidt. "The Values of Business and Federal Government Executives: More Different Than Alike," *Public Personnel Management*. Fall, 1996.

Rokeach, Milton. *The Nature of Human Values*.New York: Free Press, 1973.

Sarkesian, Sam. "Moral and Ethical Foundations of Military Professionalism," *Military Ethics and Professionalism*. James Brown and Michael J.Collins, ed. Washington: NDU Press,1981.

Shalikashvili, John M. General. *National Military Strategy of the United States of America, A Strategy of Flexible and Selective Engagement*. Washington: Government Printing Office, February 1995.

Smith, Susan McGuire. *Practical Ethics For The Federal Employee*.2nd ed. Huntsville, Alabama, FPMI Communications Inc., 1992.

Steiner, Edwin H. *Civilian Personnel Management Newsletter*.Washington: ODCSPER, No.2-76,April-July 1976.

Taylor,Robert L. and William E. Rosenbach.ed *Military Leadership*.2nd ed. Boulder: Westview Press, 1992.

Toler, Larry L. "Civilians on the Battlefield," *Army Logistician*.November-December 1994.

Toner, James H. *True Faith and Allegiance, The Burden of Military Ethics*.Kentucky: University Press, 1995.

TRADOC News Service. "More Civilians Will Deploy Along With Soldiers," November 1996.

Trickett, David. "How To Use A Values Audit," *Training and Development*.March 1997.

Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual For Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*.6th ed.Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Vollrath, F.E. LTG. *Draft Memo, Subject: Staffing Guidance for Army Leadership Doctrine*.Washington: Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff Personnel U.S. Army, November 1996.

West, Togo D. Honorable and General Dennis J. Reimer. *A Statement on the Posture of the United States Army Fiscal Year 1997*. Washington: Office of the Chief of Staff U.S. Army, Congressional Activities Division, 1996.