Freedom of Information and Compliance Investigations
Page 4

Professional Liability Insurance for Ethics and Compliance Professionals
Page 6

Meet Patricia J. Harned, PhD President, Ethics Resource Center
Page 20

Protecting Attorney-Client and Attorney Work-Product Privileges
Page 24
What is the appropriate relationship between business ethics and corporate compliance? To what extent are these two fields destined forever to compete with, and even contradict, each other? And, what are the points of convergence that do or could exist between them?

The two are certainly distinct, both in concept and practice, but I have long believed that many of the claimed points of conflict between ethics and compliance are exaggerated. Moreover, failing to see how each can support the other often weakens both. This article will review some of the often-cited tensions between compliance and ethics, and also explore ways in which the two are increasingly “joining hands.” It will then examine practical strategies for fortifying a compliance and ethics program with appropriate elements of each.

What’s the difference?
The field of ethics – whether in business or elsewhere – is often characterized as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Focusing on individual decision making in the absence of rules}\\
\text{ Constituting a philosophical discipline}\\
\text{ Resting values/principles}\\
\text{ Requiring autonomy}
\end{align*}
\]

By contrast, a characterization of corporate compliance might include:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ It consists of organizational policies and procedures to prevent violations of law, regulation, or rules.}\\
\text{ It focuses on process and enforcement.}\\
\text{ It serves as an internal legal system for an organization.}^1
\end{align*}
\]

What is the perceived tension between the two fields?
First, some ethicists are concerned that a compliance perspective promotes conformity and a non-principled approach to issues of right and wrong – and thereby undermines the conditions and habits of mind necessary for ethics to flourish.

A second source of tension is resource-based. Specifically, ethicists have expressed the concern that compliance can “squeeze out” ethics, as a matter of both resource allocation and organizational attention span. That is, if companies feel they do not have the capacity to address both, when forced to choose, they tend to select the “necessity” of compliance over the “luxury” of ethics.

The third type of concern, which is the harshest, and is less commonly mentioned than the others, is similar to the Marxist concept of “false consciousness.” Specifically, some ethicists feel that by addressing relatively straightforward issues and doing so in a mechanistic, rule-laden way, companies avoid dealing with harder and more meaningful questions of right and wrong that would have to be faced when using a more values-focused approach.

Is ethics unrelated to law?
Before examining whether these perceived differences are indeed irreconcilable, it is worth considering the role of law which, after all, is the foundation for the compliance perspective. Are the realms of ethics and law, in fact, unrelated to each other?

Clearly, they are not. One obvious point of convergence lies in the Federal Sentencing Guidelines, which in 2004 were revised to encourage companies to have a “compliance and ethics program” (emphasis added). Previously, the Guidelines had spoken of a “program to prevent and detect violations of law.” Another is a regulation promulgated under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX) which, in effect, requires codes of conduct for publicly listed companies to provide for the ethical handling of conflicts of interest.

Also worthy of mention here is the New York Stock Exchange Listing Requirements Mandate, which says that codes of conduct should include fair treatment of employees, shareholders, suppliers, and competitors. Like the Sentencing Guidelines and SOX regulation, this contemplates some consideration of ethics.

Of course, the concerns go in both directions. Indeed, those reflecting a compliance perspective are, in effect, the mirror image of all three of the ethicists’ worries. That is, a traditional compliance view is that an ethical perspective is largely a distraction (in terms of real issues of right-and-wrong facing most companies) and can lead to wasted time and resource allocation, as well as wrongheaded thinking. A compliance-oriented practitioner might, for example, dismiss many ethics issues as a variation of “My boss isn’t being nice to me,” which distracts attention from preventing more hardcore corporate misdeeds.
a law-based system of approaching issues of right-and-wrong (which the U.S. is often said to epitomize) need not be seen as unwelcoming of ethical thought. And, the same is true in reverse, as the approaches of countries outside of the U.S. are, to some extent, increasingly embracing a law-related approach to preventing corporate wrongdoing. For instance, effective compliance programs can be a defense to corruption charges under an Italian statute passed in 2001, and Italian courts have indeed published decisions under that law with more useful compliance guidance for companies than can be found in many cases issued under the Sentencing Guidelines. Similarly, a policy document issued in 2005 by the United Kingdom's Office of Fair Trade provides more competition-law compliance program guidance than anything ever promulgated by US enforcement personnel. And an Australian compliance “Standard” which has semi-official status, is more detailed on compliance program requirements than any generic US policy.

Moreover, it seems likely that the US legal system will increasingly focus on ethical issues. This is due, in part, to the mounting concern with corporate culture that is found not only on the Sentencing Guidelines, but also the expectations of various regulators. The increased attention being paid to ethics may also flow from the heightened risk-assessment expectations of regulators, as well as boards of directors and senior managers. Specifically, utilizing a narrow legal framework is, as a practical matter, not always sufficient for an effective legal risk analysis, because such a framework is often a “lagging indicator” of true legal risk, given the dynamism of US law. Indeed, the various major cases brought by Elliot Spitzer as New York Attorney General – regarding securities research analysts, mutual fund trading, mutual fund sales, and insurance brokerage compensation – all concerned practices that were relatively well known, but assumed by many to constitute “only” ethics-related risks, not legal ones. A fuller, ethics-based risk assessment addressed to these practices might, in fact, have revealed the legal peril that they posed. More generally, these and other examples suggest that a broader ethical focus can help an organization stay ahead of the law risk curve.

Globalization is yet another phenomenon likely to lead more US-based companies to adopt ethics-based, as well as law-based, approaches. Among other things, for many companies doing business outside of the U.S. now means paying greater attention to:
- the rights of employees
- other human rights
- sustainable development

These are, generally speaking, more reflective of a traditional ethical view, rather than a legal view.

A final consideration pushing US companies to take a more ethics-minded approach arises from the fact that employees do not always distinguish between law and ethics. (This is frequently evident from reviewing the types of misconduct that are reported through help lines, and also what is raised in focus groups, much of which tends to be ethics-related, rather than law-related.) Given how employees often tend to view compliance and ethics as all of one piece, it is not surprising that when management fails to act ethically, it often sends a message that compliance requirements are hypocritical or even a sham. In other words, here, too, a focus on ethics may be necessary to maximize the effectiveness of the compliance part of a program.

Making it work
Properly understood, ethics and compliance are not necessarily antithetical to one another. Each can be essential to completing the other. What then, are some practical approaches for “joining hands” between ethics and compliance?

First, companies should assess ethics, as well as compliance, risks. Several ways to assess risk include:
- Based on lessons learned from the Spitzer cases (which, it is not sufficiently appreciated, are often applicable beyond the realm of financial services) a company should examine whether it has any relationships of trust in which the need for candor or good faith generally might not be sufficiently understood by employees or others acting on its behalf. Relationships such as these may be rife with ethics risk possibilities. (An example would be a manufacturer that starts offering services and must ensure that customers are not misled into paying more than they should.)
- Determining whether there are areas where the pursuit of good ends might lead to wrongful means (i.e., issues of “right versus right.”)
- Asking employees the broad questions regarding: (a) What types of conduct have occasioned criticisms that the company has acted in an unfair manner? and (b) What are other areas of discomfort of a “right-and-wrong” nature?

Second, ethics should be prominently featured in training and communications. This means, among other things:
- providing true ethics training on methods for ethical decision making,
- using values-based communications,
- giving real-life (and ideally company-specific) examples that go beyond what the law requires/prohibits, and
- otherwise deploying training and other communications to show that ethical action is attainable in business.

Continued on page 34
Indeed, an ethics-based message may be more appealing to employees, who often do not like programs that appear to be aimed mainly at “catching” people, than a narrow, compliance-based one. Messaging in this manner can thus positively impact the likelihood of employees reporting/raising compliance (as well as ethics) issues.

Third, following the old adage that what’s measured is what counts, companies should measure ethics-related, as well as compliance-related, conduct. Such conduct should be included in personnel evaluations, employee surveys, and program assessments (self or external).

**Body and soul**

Baron Thurlow, an English jurist of the 18th century, memorably expressed an early, traditional view of corporate social responsibility:

> “You never expected justice from a company, did you? They have neither a soul to lose, nor a body to kick.”

Clearly we now do expect more, but exactly how to pursue “justice” from modern corporations is still something of a challenge, albeit more of a practical than metaphysical one.

However, and in the interests of meeting that challenge, one might still borrow from Baron Thurlow to say that an ethics-based approach can give compliance “soul” by harnessing internal policies and procedures for more noble ends than the lowest common denominator of mere law abidance. And, operating within a compliance program framework can give an ethics approach “body” by utilizing effective organizational initiatives, and not just aspirational talk. Ethics in companies can be seen as less of a luxury and more of a necessity, which in reality, it always has been.

This article is based on a presentation at the 2007 SCCE annual conference, “Joining Hands: The Convergence of Compliance, Ethics and Risk.”
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