

The Servant of the People: On the power of integrity in politics and government

Muel Kaptein



The Servant of the People: On the power of integrity in politics and government

*"Hard as it may be to believe,
most politicians are pretty likable folks."*

Barack Obama¹

"Becoming a good person is a lifelong effort."

Bill Clinton²

*"The things that go wrong are what make this
the second toughest job in America. But the things
that go right are what make me still want it."*

John Lindsay³

September 2014

Contents

Introduction	11
I. Rules, morality, and ethics	13
1. Integrity begins with knowledge of the position	15
2. Integrity demands knowledge of the rules	17
3. Integrity is about both the letter and the spirit of the law	21
4. Integrity is complying with the rules	24
5. Integrity also means compliance with the unwritten rules	27
6. Integrity is about ethics, not just popular morality	30
II. Behavior and character	33
7. Integrity is about why you do what you do	35
8. Integrity is about who you are	38
9. Integrity is about what you have	41
10. Integrity is visible in patterns of behavior	44
11. Integrity can only be built up in office	48
III. Approaches to evaluation	51
12. Integrity carries over from one situation to another	53
13. Integrity is defined publicly as well as personally	55
14. Integrity is how you are perceived by others, not just how you perceive yourself	57
15. Integrity is about appearance, not just the facts	60
16. Integrity arrives on foot and leaves on horseback	64
17. Integrity is revealed by minor as well as major transgressions	66
18. Integrity in the past predicts present and future integrity	69
19. Integrity is judged by individual identity	72
20. Integrity today is judged by that of tomorrow	75

IV. Role models	79
21. Integrity requires role models, not exemplary behavior	81
22. Integrity demands the most exemplary behavior from those with the most power	83
23. Integrity issues are not limited to personal enrichment or unfair advantage	85
24. Integrity in free time is relevant to integrity on the job	88
25. Integrity is others expecting from you what you expect from them	91
V. Ideals and standpoints	95
26. Integrity is mainly about having ideals	97
27. Integrity is the common thread of the job, career, and life itself	99
28. Integrity must fit the person	102
29. Integrity is expressing well-thought-out viewpoints	104
VI. Risks from environment and power	107
30. Integrity is threatened by ambition: the greater the ambition the greater the threat	109
31. Integrity is threatened by multi-tasking: the more tasks the greater the threat	111
32. Integrity is revealed by relationships with others	113
33. Integrity is threatened by the environment	115
34. Integrity is nurtured by the environment	118
35. Integrity demands insight into the effects of power on integrity	121
36. Integrity sours with cynicism	123
37. Integrity shows more in good times than in bad	126
VII. Faithfulness	129
38. Integrity is being faithful to a cause	131
39. Integrity comes down to the answer “I can’t do that”	134
40. Integrity comes down to the price you are willing to pay	136
41. Integrity is impossible without power	138
42. Integrity is undermined by vulnerability to blackmail	140
43. Integrity requires self-control	143

VIII. Willingness to serve	145
44. Integrity requires humility	147
45. Integrity is preserving the dignity of the job	149
46. Integrity means subordination of personal interests but not servility	151
47. Integrity does not require impartiality or independence	154
48. Integrity requires intellectual as well as moral qualities	156
49. Integrity requires respect for the integrity of others	159
IX. Responsibility and accountability	163
50. Integrity gains attention when you shape the collective conscience	165
51. Integrity means demanding responsibility	167
52. Integrity is the link between responsibility and accountability	169
53. Integrity demands truth, but not complete openness	172
X. Between standards and practice	177
54. Integrity does not exist	179
55. Integrity does not reduce standards to practice	181
56. Integrity is not moralistic	184
57. Integrity is about what you aspire to, not how you are	186
58. Integrity is not like pregnancy	188
XI. Dealing with dilemmas	191
59. Integrity is expressed in the battle over moral dilemmas	193
60. Integrity does not exclude compromise, but compromise compromises integrity	196
61. Integrity allows you to get your hands dirty, but only in special circumstances	199
62. Integrity is the good you achieve, not just the wrong you avoid	201
63. Integrity can be sacrificed for good reasons	203
64. Integrity resides in what you do not do, not just what you do	205
65. Integrity is only relevant if there are alternatives	207
66. Integrity is the midway between two evils	209

67. Integrity benefits from the “not-unless” principle	211
68. Integrity benefits from moral intuition	213
69. Integrity is impossible without self-reflection and role distancing	215
70. Integrity benefits from moral luck	218
XII. The importance of integrity	221
71. Integrity is more important than what becomes publicly known	223
72. Integrity on a slippery slope is difficult to stop	225
73. Integrity becomes more difficult to improve over time in office	227
74. Integrity is all	230
75. Integrity generates power	232
76. Integrity reveals beauty	234
77. Integrity is a deadly weapon	236
78. Integrity is a silent killer	239
79. Integrity can be calculated formally or informally, but the accounts are not always settled	242
80. Integrity becomes more important when transparency increases or decreases	245
81. Integrity must not cross over into integritism	248
XIII. Dealing with wrongdoing	251
82. Integrity becomes more problematic if wrongdoing is hushed up, denied, or hidden	253
83. Integrity is investigating suspected wrongdoing	256
84. Integrity is like being a lady: if you have to tell people you have it, you do not	259
85. Integrity is not responding badly to accusations of wrongdoing	26
86. Integrity is responding well to accusations of wrongdoing	265
87. Integrity is revealed by the magnitude of punishment for wrongdoing	270

XIV. Before and after service	273
88. Integrity provides good reasons for resigning	275
89. Integrity does not stop when you stop	279
90. Integrity is put to the test during selection processes and elections	283
XV. Other levels	287
91. Integrity is an important policy touchstone	289
92. Integrity of decision making is at the heart of integrity	292
93. Integrity is revealed in the design of an organization	294
94. Integrity is about the design of society	296
XVI. Finally	301
95. Integrity only exists now	303
About the author	305
Notes	307

Introduction

Servants of the people, abbreviated to SPs, are those who hold a position, paid or unpaid, in the public sector. SPs gain power in office in order to be able to serve, and they must handle this power with integrity. This book aims to offer insight and assistance for this.

Whether we are talking about politicians, government officials, semi-officials, or volunteers for political parties, about mayors, prime ministers, or monarchs, they all have at least one thing in common: they are ministers in the Latin sense of the word, which means servants. They are chosen, appointed, or elected to serve the people, society, or their community. As Tony Blair rightly said to his campaign team after he first won the UK national elections, “The people are the masters. We are the servants of the people. We will never forget that.”⁴ For the same reason Russian presidents take an oath: “I swear in exercising the powers of the President of the Russian Federation ... to faithfully serve the people.”⁵

In order to be able to serve, servants of the people, in this book abbreviated to SPs,⁶ are given power in their positions to make, execute, or control policy. They have the power to influence something or someone.⁷ That is why the Russian president’s oath makes the connection with exercising power. There is a risk that this power SPs have will not be used for its intended purpose, that of service. Aristotle, one of the first and greatest philosophers and political scientists, said that because rulers have power they will be tempted to use it for personal gain.⁸ This applies not only to rulers but to all SPs: power brings with it the temptation of improper use or abuse. It is important that SPs withstand this temptation, and that requires integrity. But what is integrity, why is it so important, and what demands does it make on SPs?

This book is written for SPs and aims to answer these questions.⁹ Each of the 95 chapters discusses one of the many facets of integrity.¹⁰ The central message is that there is great power in integrity for SPs. Those acting with integrity gain power, whereas a lack of integrity undermines or destroys power.

The book is divided into 16 parts. Part I is about important sources for determining what integrity is, namely rules, morality, and ethics. Part II shows that SPs' integrity rests in both their behavior and their character. Part III is about the ways in which SPs' integrity can be assessed. Part IV proposes that SPs should be expected to show a higher level of integrity than the average citizen. Part V argues that integrity is contained in SPs' ideals and viewpoints. Part VI describes the factors which put the integrity of an SP under pressure. The following three parts deal with three important traits SPs need to handle this pressure with integrity: faithfulness, willingness to serve, and responsibility. Part X describes an important dilemma for SPs, namely the gap between standards and practice, while part XI offers rules of thumb for handling dilemmas. Part XII describes the importance of integrity for SPs and part XIII suggests ways of tackling behavior lacking integrity. Part XIV shows that integrity is important both before and after holding office. Part XV argues that the importance of integrity extends beyond the personal level. Part XVI closes with a call for readers to put integrity into practice without delay, because, as prime minister Lee Hsien Loong of Singapore said, "good politics is first and foremost about integrity."¹¹

I. Rules, morality, and ethics

The six chapters of Part I are about what rules, morality, and ethics mean for SPs' integrity.

1. Integrity begins with knowledge of the position

SPs should know what their position entails, because integrity is related to their position, and since positions vary, the required integrity also varies. Integrity as a citizen is therefore no guarantee of integrity as an SP.

What is a monarch, president, or mayor? What is a member of a national or provincial congress, or a municipal council? What is a chairman or committee member of a political party?

It is not necessarily a problem if we are unable to answer these questions. However, it becomes a serious problem when SPs cannot answer such questions about their own positions, as in the case of a recently elected municipal councilor who, when asked by a reporter to explain his job, was lost for words.

Not knowing what your own position involves is an essential, even existential failing. Without knowledge of your job you cannot determine what it means to succeed. After all, what is good depends on the position, what it stands for, and the reason it was created. If people are unable to define good work, they cannot determine whether and to what extent they are successful, or whether it would be better to act differently. In such cases they can only get down to work at random, and success is a question of coincidence and luck.

Likewise people cannot act with integrity if they do not know what the position entails. If members of congress wish to act with integrity, for instance, they must first know the function of congress before they can determine what behaving with integrity means. The fact that we link integrity with public service shows that the position plays a part in determining what integrity means for the individual official in context. If the position were irrelevant, we would only be able to talk about acting with integrity as a citizen and not as an official. However, since integrity is linked with specific positions, SPs must know what their positions entail in order to act with integrity.¹²

Integrity therefore varies in different positions. Different kinds of integrity apply to mayors and councilors, for example. In principle mayors in the UK are not supposed to apply party political views to matters in their own local areas, whereas a county councilor should.¹³ However, where mayors can or even must be members of political parties and can or must behave party politically outside their own local areas, in a monarchy a monarch must stand back from party politics and cannot be a member of a political party. County councilors will consequently be criticized for failing to express party political views, whereas monarchs will be criticized if they do express such views.

The fact that the position in part determines what counts as integrity means that SPs' integrity is not equivalent to that of ordinary citizens.¹⁴ Citizens are permitted to do things that SPs are not. Citizens are generally free to have second houses wherever they want, but SPs have been discredited for having vacation homes in areas with which their own local authorities had special relationships, located in parks where their officials owned shares, or in countries with bad human rights records, corruption problems, or tax havens. SPs should therefore realize that they are not just ordinary citizens, and that acting with integrity as a citizen in no way guarantees acting with integrity as an SP.¹⁵

In order to function with integrity SPs must therefore gain an in-depth understanding of their position. Why was it created and with what aim? What is the function of the position? What does it have in common with similar, related positions, or their own past jobs, and where do these differ?¹⁶

SPs should always take their job descriptions to heart. What do the rules and regulations say about the function of their position, what was stated in the vacancy advertisement, and what does the job profile say about this? For anyone who takes integrity seriously, an in-depth investigation into what has already been said and written about the position is indispensable. Without a grasp of history it is impossible to properly understand a position and place it in context.

In sum, SPs' integrity begins with knowledge of the job.¹⁷

2. Integrity demands knowledge of the rules

Rules serve to allow SPs to handle their power with integrity, providing clarity as to what counts as integrity and offering others possibilities for guiding and correcting SPs' behavior. Since the rules are inextricably bound up with the job, an SP in a particular position must accept the associated rules. Not knowing or recognizing these constitutes a denial of the position. SPs must therefore be proactive in finding out about relevant rules in advance and while in office.

SPs may be scornful of the rules that apply to them, dismissing them as not to be taken too seriously, there to be broken, a sign of weakness, or generally burdensome and no fun. All kinds of reasons are given for non-compliance. SPs may say that the rules are antiquated, unnecessarily complex, impractical, oppressive, overly extensive, or patronizing. Even if this is true, it is a dangerous way to think.

Laws, codes of conduct, procedures, rules, regulations, and protocols do not exist by nature. They have been developed for a reason, with a function. That is because of the power all SPs possess. SPs receive power by dint of their positions, power that they would not otherwise have, such as the power to decide, judge, speak, make promises, execute decisions, and check and sanction others. SPs may be empowered to make laws, award licenses, and invest money, or more concretely, to deport asylum seekers and refugees, declare war, and expropriate land from citizens.

It is essential that this power is used for the intended purpose, otherwise it would not have been granted with the job. It would be contradictory to allow SPs to act against the interests of those who put them in power. However, when people receive power, this gives rise to the possibility of misuse, in forms such as personal enrichment, favoritism, and inappropriate infringement of the rights of others. Rules are there to limit the chance of abuse of power.

Their aim is firstly to make it clear to SPs what they should and should not do. Secondly, rules enable enforcement, providing grounds for calling SPs to account and imposing consequences where necessary. So rules are not only useful for those they apply to, but also to those who benefit from SPs going about their work with integrity, offering them a way to guide and correct the behavior of SPs. This is why Scottish philosopher and political scientist David Hume said, "The law always limits every power it gives."¹⁸

Rules therefore have a function that is inextricably bound up with the SP's position. In taking office, SPs accept that the associated rules apply. After all, it is neither honest nor consistent to accept the job but not the associated rules. It is a single package, all or nothing. Not knowing or acknowledging rules is therefore a denial of the job, and of those who created it, those who appointed or elected the SP, and especially those who should be served by it.

It is just like participating in a sports competition. Without rules there is no game. In fact, the rules make the game. Anyone who participates in the game must know the rules. Those who do not are denying the game, defying the referee, and disrespecting the public, thereby disqualifying themselves. They put themselves above the job as well as the rules, rendering themselves unsuitable. To put it a different way, if an SP shows no appreciation of the rules that apply to his or her own position, then those whose interests are represented by these rules will not appreciate the SP holding office. This is why many SP positions begin with swearing an oath or promising to comply with the law (in some cases with a hand on the book of law, as with the Russian president). If you wish to say yes to something, you need to know what you are saying yes to, requiring knowledge of the rules and regulations.

"Integrity has no need of rules," stated French philosopher and writer Albert Camus.¹⁹ He meant that where there is integrity, in the sense of the intention to use power well and not to abuse it, rules are unnecessary. However, it does not follow from this SPs who have integrity are allowed to ignore the rules. One of the meanings of integrity is unity. Being one with the position means knowing what it entails and the associated rules. Not knowing or recognizing the rules therefore indicates a lack of integrity.

Neither should Camus' statement be taken as meaning that rules and integrity are in conflict. This needs not be the case. Rules are intended to protect and promote integrity,

encouraging SPs to use their power properly. Many SPs have been discredited because they were unfamiliar with the rules. For instance, a mayor got into trouble when he took his wife overseas on official business at the government's expense without knowing that the internal rules allowed this only when it would benefit official business, a condition the trip in question did not fulfill. A governor was discredited when it emerged that he had signed a side letter with a project developer regarding a guarantee by the state for the development of business premises without knowing he was not authorized to do so, and a state president when it emerged that he had deleted potentially incriminating emails from his own computer, as he claimed not to have known how long he was meant to keep them.

Rules not only set limits but also create room for maneuver because they define the powers and rights of SPs in their jobs. Rules allow mayors to invoke emergency decrees, politicians to propose motions, and presidents to grant pardons. Rules do not only limit the power to do what you want; they also give power to do what would otherwise be impossible. In this respect it would be inconsistent, and therefore lacking in integrity, for SPs to accept the rules giving them power and ignore those limiting that power.

So integrity demands knowledge of the rules. SPs must find out the rules and study them in depth, from decision making and authorities to additional jobs, gifts, dealing with information, private investments, security, and etiquette. There may be many sources of rules. For instance mayors are subject to the constitution or national laws and guidelines, as well as party codes of conduct, and detailed rules and instructions within their own local organizations.²⁰

It is not enough for SPs to wait to be informed of the rules. It is unworthy of their position to appeal to ignorance due to lack of communication when they are accused of transgressions. After all, it is not about what SPs know, but what they can and should know. SPs should know that there are many rules that apply to them. Knowledge of the rules therefore demands a proactive approach: SPs are always responsible for establishing whether there are applicable rules that have not been communicated to them.

It is particularly important that SPs gain an in-depth knowledge of the specific rules of their jobs before accepting them (assuming that they are already aware of the rules applying to all citizens). There may already be relevant rules, such as those regarding conflicts of interest and

additional jobs that are not permitted, past business that must be reported, and the decision making process regarding the appointment. Many candidates and recently appointed SPs have been tripped up because they did not find out the relevant rules in good time, leading to dismissal or starting out on the wrong foot. For instance an SP who announced his appointment too early was stripped of his title before he started, and an SP was dismissed shortly after he was appointed because he failed to report financial interests in a company.

Another reason to find out the rules before accepting a job is that it is still possible to determine whether you are able and willing to comply, and to withdraw or raise issues for discussion. If you do not take the trouble to immerse yourself in the rules ahead of time, once in the job, with a full schedule, you will probably not take the time to learn them. Barack Obama recalls the most useful advice he received when he became senator. Long-serving senator Robert Byrd said to him: "Learn the rules... Not many people bother to learn them these days. Everything is so rushed, so many demands on a senator's time. But these rules unlock the power of the Senate. They're the keys to the kingdom."²¹ Perhaps that is why in his book *The Audacity of Hope* Obama takes an entire chapter for the constitution.

At the same time learning the rules is not only relevant before and at the start of a new position. Given the constant, often irregular changes it is important to check periodically that that knowledge remains up to date. It also takes time to absorb new rules as they are announced. Once they have been announced SPs are expected to know them, and no SP's excuse for not having studied them will be accepted.

Finally, rules express an interest, something that is considered important and which is worth protecting and promoting. If this were not the case, no one would have taken the trouble to write them. Ignoring rules therefore damages an interest. However, rules do not only express an interest. They also express trust, and specifically trust in those for whom the rules are intended, which is trust that they are able to comply. Otherwise rules would have no purpose and they would not have been drawn up. So rules are a sign of trust.

3. Integrity is about both the letter and the spirit of the law

Since SPs can stumble over a single detail of the law, they need to know exactly what is required. If SPs care about the rules, then they understand the spirit behind them, otherwise integrity becomes mechanical and minimalist. Rules are limited by definition. However, this does not mean that SPs can put their own spirit into their interpretation of the law.

As discussed in the previous chapter, integrity demands knowledge of the rules that apply to the position. This entails that anyone wanting to fulfill that position must know what the rules say in literal terms and what they mean. It is important to have an eye for the details, as these may conceal the essence and the risks. There is a reason why they say, “The devil is in the detail.” An SP can run into integrity issues over a single detail. For example, whether the cost of a dinner can be declared may depend on the time of day, purpose of the dinner, cost, and location. SPs may get into trouble simply by failing to comply with the rules on one of these points, for instance by declaring the tip when the rules do not allow it, if spoken permission has been granted when written permission was required, or if the receipt is handed in when the check itself was required. It is therefore important to view the rules through the lens of a lawyer. What do they really say, what are the details, and what is in the small print?

In striving for integrity, knowing the details of the rules is a good start, but it is far from sufficient. If you only take into account the letter of the law, this quickly becomes mechanical and minimalist, ignoring the fact that rules are limited and integrity goes further, thereby missing a significant part of integrity. How does this work?

Rules set down on paper are by definition limited, not only in their meaning but also in their range. After all, it is impossible to capture all desirable and undesirable behavior in rules and set

them down on paper. Even if such a description were possible, it would be so extensive that it would be impenetrable and unworkable for the users. Even detailed rules always demand interpretation by users to apply them to their own behavior in practice. SPs are not computers that can be programmed by rules and then automatically do the right thing. Finally rules are limited because they often lag behind developments in practice: after all, it takes time to draw up and introduce new rules as things change.

Since rules are limited, it is a problem when SPs limit integrity to the rules, thinking that as long as they comply they are behaving with integrity.²² A councilor was rebuked when he accepted a gift for less than €50. The sum may have been permitted by the code of conduct, but it was felt that the councilor should have known better than to accept a gift the day before making a decision on a big tender for which the giver was a candidate. Similarly a councilor in spatial planning was dismissed when it emerged that he had properly complied with the rules in declaring his other jobs to the mayor but omitted to mention a close private friendship with the biggest project developer in the municipality and regular free use of his vacation home.

When it comes to integrity the spirit of the rules is as important as the letter. If you really care about rules and the job, you will pay attention to their spirit,²³ the question of deeper meaning, underlying purpose, and intended application. The spirit brings the rules to life. By paying attention to the spirit of the rules you show that you understand them and have absorbed them. More than that, it shows that you intend to comply and by extension to serve the interests they are designed to protect. It shows that you not only understand the rules but also put them into practice. This is the reason why it is often claimed that integrity begins where the rules and regulations stop.

The spirit of a rule can be ascertained by considering its function. What did the initiators, founders, and drafters have in mind, what is the rule intended to achieve, what interests and principles lie at its foundation, who is served by it? For this reason, Obama often mentions the Founding Fathers, as in his first inaugural address, where he said, "Our Founding Fathers, faced with perils that we can scarcely imagine, drafted a charter to assure the rule of law and the rights of man – a charter expanded by the blood of generations. Those ideals still light the world, and we will not give them up for expedience's sake."²⁴

A warning is in order here. When focusing on the spirit of the rules some people fall into the trap of focusing too much on their own interpretation. For example you might feel entitled to accept an expensive invitation from a third party because you personally value it less (“I don’t care about sport so I can accept any invitation to a sports competition”), because you see it as something personal (“It’s for my birthday”, “It’s a sign of friendship”), the costs to the giver are within the rules (“Using an associate’s vacation house doesn’t cost them anything extra”) or there is no question of a relationship (“The rules about gifts from associates only apply to associates, so if there is no association the rules don’t apply”). This kind of free interpretation makes a mockery of the spirit of the law and so too of the SP’s integrity.

4. Integrity is complying with the rules

Integrity means consistency between rules and behavior. Strictly disciplined compliance with the rules shows that SPs respect them and those served by them. SPs who ponder whether to comply are already failing to act with integrity. Other important considerations for compliance include the fact that (1) the position is an honor and a privilege; (2) integrity only counts when no one is watching; (3) if SPs fail to comply where rules exist, this offers even less confidence in their behavior where rules are absent; and (4) non-compliance is an indication that SPs fail to take themselves seriously.

Integrity is not limited to knowing the letter and spirit of the law: it is also necessary to act accordingly. Besides unity, as we saw in chapter 2, integrity also means consistency. Rules and behavior show integrity when they are in agreement, when rules are converted to behavior, and when rules and behavior are consistent. It would be inconsistent to know the rules but fail to apply them, or to do so unevenly. Behavior is an affirmation of the rules, like a signature. For SPs who understand this, it is a question of applying the rules and continuing to do so, but for many this is easier said than done.

Many SPs fall because they break a rule, losing their positions because they have no valid excuse for transgression. They knew the rule, but thought they could make an exception, it really applied to others, they could bypass it in favor of greater interests, or the consequences of transgression would not be so bad.

A minister was aggressively criticized when it emerged that he had privately awarded the task of organizing an event to friends in his party, as the rules stated that an open tender should have taken place. Another minister was permitted to stay on when it emerged that he had accepted a job on the side without asking permission from the prime minister, but was later dismissed when it was discovered that he had entered into an extramarital affair

with his personal aide and failed to report this, which was in conflict with the rules of his department. Similarly, a senator was dismissed for violating the rules by privately accepting gifts from a company in exchange for supporting a plan to the company's advantage, and another was fired for submitting inflated expenses for years.²⁵ A councilor was also fired for passing on information from a mayor's nominating committee to one of the candidates, which was against the rules in that country, and a former president, Carlos Menem of Argentina, received a prison sentence for illegal weapons trading.²⁶

Compliance with the rules of a position is often a question of simply getting on with it without hesitation. SPs who continually ponder whether to comply are already failing to act with integrity. They allow themselves to be guided by calculating, opportunistic considerations and give no indication of conformity. This is similar to continually considering embarking on an extramarital affair: it is no way to express true, unconditional love for one's current partner. Such calculating SPs also risk miscalculating and thereby breaking a rule without a convincing excuse. Even if there are good reasons for not complying with a particular rule, generally it is not worth treading thin ice by making exceptions.

Complying with the rules is sometimes viewed negatively by SPs as conformist, and breaking the rules may be viewed positively as a conscious choice. This view, however, is erroneous. Complying with the rules does not imply indiscriminate obedience. Proper compliance is a conscious choice to respect the rules and to honor one's position. By strictly complying with rules in a disciplined way SPs show that they consider them important, along with that which the rules serve.

Nevertheless SPs who find themselves in a situation in which they are considering breaking a rule would do well to realize how others will judge their transgression. There are at least four arguments that others can use which weigh in favor of compliance.

Firstly, it is a privilege to be able to comply with the rules. In other times, places, and circumstances, people might well have wanted to do so, but could not or were not permitted to due to circumstances such as dictatorship, anarchy, or war. Non-compliance denies this honor and privilege. Furthermore it denies those who have spent or laid down their lives creating and protecting the constitutional state, the freedom to make rules, and the freedom resulting from compliance with the rules.

Secondly, integrity is complying with the rules when others are not looking. Only in cases where no one can discover the transgression does the extent of compliance become apparent. If the transgression becomes visible then other motivations can figure in compliance, such as status and sanctions. An American delegate once said, "Character is doing the right thing when nobody's looking. There are too many people who think that the only thing that's right is to get by, and the only thing that's wrong is to get caught."²⁷ A former member of the British cabinet similarly expresses it as follows: "The measure of a man's real character is what he would do if he knew he would never be found out."²⁸ It is when people have the power and reason to transgress that we see the extent to which they care about the rules.

Thirdly, breaking a rule raises the question of what this says about situations in which no rules apply. Will the SP handle interests and principles so casually and frivolously then too? Moreover others may think that if SPs cannot comply with the rules, they will abuse their power even more in the absence of rules. Rules might provide some check, whereas without them there will be nothing to hold them back.

Fourthly, SPs who break the rules fail to take themselves seriously. After all, rules are an important instrument for SPs: in many cases SPs will be in a position to draw up, introduce, execute, or check compliance with rules. SPs who break rules do not take the system or themselves seriously, and this undermines their credibility and authority. For example, when the mayor of Toronto, Rob Ford, was discredited for public drunkenness and illegal drug use, among other offences, the comment was: "He has disgraced not only himself and his family name, but the laws of Ontario he vowed to uphold and the people he claims to serve."²⁹ Transgressions also particularly undermine the credibility and authority of those SPs who believe the number of rules should be strictly limited. The fewer rules, the easier it should be to comply.

In sum, there are diverse reasons why it is good that SPs comply with the rules that apply to their positions.

5. Integrity also means compliance with the unwritten rules

Compliance with the letter and spirit of the rules is insufficient for integrity. In addition to the written rules, SPs should comply with the unwritten rules, such as etiquette, conventions, and implicit values and norms. If integrity were purely complying with the written rules, then it would not exist in their absence. By knowing and following the unwritten rules, which vary from one culture to another, SPs show respect for their position.

“I followed the rules obediently. You can’t accuse me of anything.” This is a common defense from people accused of lacking integrity. If you want to behave with integrity, it is necessary to follow the letter and spirit of the rules. However, there are not only written rules but also unwritten rules. Integrity demands that SPs also comply with these unwritten rules.

Unwritten rules go beyond the spirit of the rules. The spirit of the rules encompasses the values and norms surrounding them. Unwritten rules can also relate to behavior for which no written rules exist. This behavior relates to implicit codes that are not formalized or set down on paper, such as morals, manners, and customs. For instance, mayor of New York Bill De Blasio met with fierce criticism when media photos appeared of him at a restaurant eating a pizza with a knife and fork. According to many New Yorkers true New Yorkers eat pizza with their hands.³⁰ As the wife of the US president, Michelle Obama was also criticized when she went on a summer vacation in Spain with her daughter. In the US there is an unwritten rule that the incumbent of the White House does not go overseas for summer vacations. Reasons for this unwritten rule are the extra costs of transport and security, as well as the denial of the beauty America has to offer.³¹ Similarly, despite there being no rules on the matter, municipal councilors have been criticized for being dressed untidily or offensively for meetings.

Unwritten rules can relate not only to etiquette, such as how SPs should eat, where they should go on holiday, how they should dress, and who should sit or stand where during meetings, but also to conventions such as the way SPs should treat one another. For instance, SPs should not turn to hand to hand fighting in a meeting when they disagree, and colleagues should not kiss on the mouth to show appreciation. When Italian prime minister Silvio Berlusconi paced back and forth with his phone in front of cameras at the entrance of the location of a NATO summit, while German Chancellor Angela Merkel stood waiting on the red carpet to welcome him as hostess, this was seen as contemptuous behavior.³² Similarly a candidate for chancellor was criticized when he was photographed during the elections with a raised middle finger as a sign of condemnation of his opponent's policy. Many people felt that this fell short of standards of decency.

There are also unwritten rules on time management, team work, dealing with information and third parties, keeping promises, and taking responsibility, things that one should or should not do. In many countries there is an unwritten rule that ministers should offer their resignation if congress loses confidence in them, that politicians should not publicly express opinions on the issues represented by other party members, that verbal agreements should be fulfilled, and that SPs should not conspicuously deal with private matters during public meetings (sending a private email can be acceptable, whereas conspicuously filling out crossword puzzles is not). A party leader was discredited when he wrote to the minister of health, who was a member of his own party, appealing for the admission of two medicines to the market. There was uproar when congress found out, because the party leader was also a member of the supervisory board of the manufacturing company wanting to introduce these medicines onto the market. Despite the fact that no explicit rules had been broken, personal and professional interests and relationships had become mixed up. The party leader stated in his defense that this was his duty as supervisor and that everything was permitted that was not excluded by the law. His party saw it differently, considering it damaging to his integrity and that of the party. Similarly a politician came under fire when it was discovered that he had set up multiple Twitter accounts so that he could retweet his own tweets, thereby increasing his impact and popularity on social media. Again, his defense was a statement that he had not broken a single rule.³³

The idea that anything not prohibited by the rules is permitted is not consistent with integrity. That would mean that integrity was restricted to the existing rules. Anyone who thinks that way should imagine what would happen in the absence of rules. Would everything then be permitted? If you think not, that implies that there is something beyond the rules. Rules are there to establish certain values and norms. It is felt that SPs should at least observe the rules which enforce those values and norms. However, that does not imply that all values and norms are expressed in rules. Values and norms are broader (they cover more terrain) and more fundamental (deeper rooted) than rules. That is why integrity in the sense of behavior consistent with one's position, entails compliance with the unwritten rules as well as the written rules.

Integrity demands that SPs engage in in-depth study of the unwritten rules. The only way to do this is to reflect on one's environment and get to know it. What are the customs and norms here? How do people behave? What is "not done" and what is appreciated? What are the unspoken commands and prohibitions? What behavior is seen as functional (exhibiting integrity) and dysfunctional (lacking integrity) in the position? What is specific to this culture?

The cultural specificity of values and norms is something everyone should be alert to. After all, values and norms vary from culture to culture. What one culture views as intimate, for example, might be seen as intimidating in another culture; what one culture views as considerate, might be seen elsewhere as an attempt at corruption; what one culture views as openness, might be seen as indiscretion, leaking information, and disloyalty in another; what one culture sees as decisive, can be seen as dictatorial in another.

Studying the unwritten rules can also involve observing the behavior of others. What do they do and what do they refrain from doing? What is valued and what is censured? You can also be informed by former SPs, other interested parties, high profile figures, confidants, and experts. As a newly elected senator, Obama consulted the longest serving senator, whose most important piece of advice was to learn not only the rules but also the precedents.³⁴

6. Integrity is about ethics, not just popular morality

Integrity is acting consistently not only with what is generally accepted as moral, what others think, but primarily with what is ethical, what SPs should do based on reasonable arguments. Ethics may place higher or lower demands on SPs than morality does. Integrity therefore demands that SPs not only conform to what is ethical, but also have ethical arguments for it.

Integrity is not only a legal concept, in the sense of behavior consistent with the rules of the job; it is also a moral concept, in the sense of behavior consistent with the applicable moral values and norms. JSPs must therefore know not only what the relevant legal norms mean for them but also what the moral norms mean.

Still, the common view of morality does not take priority. Popular opinion is not good or defensible by definition. What fits in with public mores is not automatically ethical, and integrity is behavior that is consistent not only with public perceptions of morality, but also and even primarily with what is inherently ethical.

Ethics reflects on morality, functioning as an impartial and independent judge, determining what is good and what is bad, responsible and irresponsible, acceptable and unacceptable. Ethics is more than a matter of taste. Ethics makes an appeal to general acceptance, an appeal to everyone in the same situation to act in the same way.³⁵ This is not a matter of what people think, but what they should think based on reasonable arguments. Majority views may therefore be unethical. For SPs used to democratic decision making, this is a different logic: it is not the majority but ethics which decides.

Ethics may place higher demands than common views of morality. For instance if public morality in a particular country approves the payment of bribes or torture of terrorists, this

does not make it ethical. Ethics can, for example, state that bribes damage the integrity of decision making and that interrogation by torture violates human rights. On the other hand morality may make higher demands than ethics. If public morality holds that an SP should resign for being unfaithful in marriage, this is not necessarily ethical. Ethics might state that an extra-marital affair is a private matter, unconnected with good performance in office. So behavior that is judged as moral by public opinion is not necessarily ethical by definition, and ethical behavior does not automatically define public views of morality.

Even if an SP adheres to ethically responsible moral values and norms, this is not necessarily ethical. There is another important dimension to ethics. When someone acts according to habit, convenience, or impulse, and their behavior coincides with what is good from an ethical point of view, this cannot be seen as ethical, as the concept of ethics is missing. Notions such as “I just think that’s the way it is”, “That’s what I’m used to”, and “That’s what’s expected” are ethically unconvincing. People should think from an ethical perspective about why that might be the case, looking for arguments and considerations that are convincing and reasonable, forming a legitimate justification of behavior. Integrity therefore demands that SPs not only conform to what is ethical, but also have ethical arguments for it.

The discussion above shows that SPs behaving opportunistically are not acting with integrity: they use ethical arguments only when it suits them. Selfishness cannot be seen as integrity because it prioritizes individual interests without allowing room for ethical arguments and considerations. The discussion above also shows that chameleon-like behavior cannot be seen as showing integrity: SPs who do this adapt to what others think, rather than being guided by ethical considerations, which should have priority over the opinions of others.³⁶ This is also the reason that SPs who behave bureaucratically fall short from an ethical standpoint. People like this may comply with the rules, but are not open to ethical considerations, which in some cases can justify breaking or bypassing the rules (necessity knows no law).

Ethics goes beyond finding good arguments to uphold current public views on morality. It is first and foremost about SPs determining what is ethical. In reaction to US president Bill Clinton’s statement, “It’s all about the economy, stupid!” Dutch prime minister Ruud Lubbers argued, “It’s all about ethics, stupid!”³⁷ In politics the important thing is ethics, because people behaving unethically run the risk of doing wrong. Moreover, ethics can supply SPs with

arguments for explaining to others as well as themselves why they are or are not following public morality, convincing others as well as themselves of a better way, and motivating others as well as themselves for what is ethical. At that point ethics becomes public morality and that morality (in part through policy and rules) becomes behavior.

From the perspective of integrity it is therefore important that SPs do not indiscriminately accept public morality, but reflect critically on whether public morality is ethically founded.³⁸ US president Franklin Roosevelt emphasized the importance of this point for the presidency: “The Presidency is not merely an administrative office. That’s the least of it. It is more than an engineering job, efficient or inefficient. It is pre-eminently a place of moral leadership.”³⁹ Moral leadership begins with determining what is ethical, and this starting point applies not only to the president of the US, but to every SP.

II. Behavior and character

Part II, consisting of five chapters, is about what integrity means for SPs' behavior and character.

7. Integrity is about why you do what you do

Integrity is about SPs doing the right thing, but it is also about good intentions. Intentions are relevant because they form the basis on which SPs' behavior can be assessed as worthy of reward or blame. Intentions are good or bad depending on the extent to which SPs aim to do their jobs as well as possible. Other interests and intentions are admissible as long as they do not impede the SP's work and associated interests.

The strength of integrity is that it is action-oriented. It is a matter of following the rules, public morality, and ethics. As stated by Junius, pen name for a writer, probably a civil servant, who accused the British cabinet of abuse of power many times in the newspapers, "The integrity of men is to be measured by their conduct, not by their professions."⁴⁰ SPs tend to be pulled up on their actions, rather than their words, but when it comes to integrity it is not just a matter of doing the right thing. Integrity is also about the reasons, motives, and attitudes behind actions. As British prime minister Winston Churchill said on the importance of attitude, "Attitude is a little thing that makes a big difference."⁴¹

How does attitude, intention, come into it if behavior remains unchanged? Intentions are relevant because this is how a person's behavior is attributed to them, enabling us to assess the extent to which they should be praised or censured. Good intentions often constitute extenuating circumstances when rules are broken. For example, it is careless to declare false costs by accident, but it is cheating if it is done knowingly. For that reason a senator admitted to having been careless when it emerged that he had broken the rules for expenses claims in an attempt to counter accusations about his behavior. When it emerged that Australian minister Kim Hames had submitted false claims he countered by stating that he had not claimed for many things he was entitled to claim for.⁴² On the other hand acting on the wrong motives will not readily be seen as praiseworthy. According to the

philosopher Lynne McFall doing right for the wrong reasons is not acting with integrity.⁴³ In such cases behavior and motives are not unified, consistent, or reconcilable.

Whether intentions are right or wrong depends on a person's position. People who focus on doing the job as well as possible have pure intentions. People who focus on interests other than those served by their positions have impure intentions. Impure intentions lack integrity by definition, because they are not consistent with the demands of the position. Berlusconi, for example, has often been criticized for having impure motives, using his position as president for his own gain, for instance becoming president to escape prosecution for tax fraud, and expanding his power over the media by exercising his influence as president on the public TV channels alongside his own commercial stations.⁴⁴

So in determining and evaluating SPs' behavior, their intentions are important. From the perspective of integrity, SPs' intentions should be pure and honest. Are SPs primarily focused on doing what is expected of them in their positions? Are they fulfilling their role and serving the people? Italian Niccolò Machiavelli, longtime secretary of the Second Chancery of the Florentine Republic, attached considerable importance to honesty and purity. In his view citizens expected their leaders to exercise their roles as well as possible and not to use their power for the wrong purposes.⁴⁵

However, that does not mean that there is no space for other interests or ulterior motives. Integrity does not imply complete moral purity, after all.⁴⁶ This would be one-dimensional and would not do justice to other interests. SPs do not need to sacrifice themselves completely; they can take their own interests into account. What matters is that other interests do not impede them in serving their positions. It would be asking too much of fulltime SPs to ask them to hold office unpaid, or spend all their time, including free time, on their public role, although Aristotle in fact argued that rulers should distance themselves from their families and private property to achieve unity in the state.⁴⁷ At the same time from an ethical perspective SPs can reasonably be required to take payment proportionate to their position. This is not only a matter of appropriate public spending, but also of preventing earning money from becoming a higher priority than serving the people, leading to self-enrichment and disunity, meaning a lack of integrity between the functionary and his or her function.

Similarly, even SPs with a fulltime position have free time. Nevertheless free time threatens SPs' integrity if it hinders them from fulfilling their roles. Many SPs have been discredited because they were unavailable or could not be contacted when an urgent work situation arose, as in the case of a chair of a national party who could not be reached for days when a crisis occurred in her party. She was on a cycling holiday abroad with her severely ill husband. Despite the fact that people have a right to vacations and that it can be ethical for people to prioritize their private lives and care for families, she was discredited because she had given the impression that she gave too little priority to her position. This was why her party leadership lost confidence in her (although she came to an agreement with her vice chairman about her replacement during her vacation). For the same reason prominent US politicians do not leave the country on vacation so that they can get back quickly in an emergency.⁴⁸

It is worth noting that political reasons are often associated with impure motives. This effect is typified by a statement by American entertainer Will Rogers: "I love a dog. He does nothing for political reasons."⁴⁹ Political reasons are seen as improper and undesirable. This may come from the image in society that politicians act on impure motives. However, political reasons need not be impure or undesirable. In politics, political reasons are functional. It would even be suspicious if reasons other than political ones were used in politics.

In sum, from the perspective of integrity, it is important that SPs always pay attention to their motives, evaluating them based on their integrity, the purity with which they focus on fulfilling their roles, preventing other interests gaining the upper hand in their positions.

8. Integrity is about who you are

Integrity is not just about why an SP acts in a certain way, but also about who the SP is. Questions about a person's integrity cast doubt not only on their intentions but also on the source of those intentions, the person's character. That is why expressing such doubts is a serious accusation, and praising someone's integrity is a strong form of appreciation. The fact that integrity is applied in this way in practice shows its value. Since integrity comes from inside, it cannot be imposed on SPs.

A person's integrity is not the same as integrity of behavior. This becomes clear from the difference between how SPs respond to doubts about the integrity of their behavior and character. In the latter case SPs usually respond with greater indignation, horror, and bewilderment, because they feel more hurt, offended, and damaged. Doubting someone's integrity may be the most serious conceivable offense. As an alderman said when he had to step down because of immoral behavior, "It touched me most of all that there were people that openly doubted my integrity."⁵⁰ Former US secretary of state Condoleezza Rice did not appreciate former vice president Dick Cheney accusing her in his memoirs of naivety in her efforts to forge a nuclear weapons agreement with North Korea. "I don't appreciate the attack on my integrity that that implies,"⁵¹ said Rice. British prime minister Tony Blair also felt injured when the BBC, the biggest broadcasting corporation in the UK, accused the government of exaggerating the urgency of a war against Iraq. In his view there could be no more serious charge than an attack on his integrity.⁵²

Doubting people's integrity hits hard because it concerns the people themselves, what they are made of, who they are, rather than what they do, calling into question both the soundness of their intentions and the source of their motives, their character. Instead calling an action is hypocritical or opportunistic, the person is a hypocrite or opportunist; instead of saying they lie, they are called liars. It is not a question of something that happens

once, or even several times, but of who a person is in the long term, if not their entire lives. Doubting someone's integrity is more fundamental and therefore harsher than doubting the integrity of their behavior.

In the same way praising a person's integrity is a higher form of appreciation than praising their actions. When it was announced that former president of South Africa Nelson Mandela had died, he was praised for his integrity and important merits; as Cuban President Raul Castro said, Mandela was an example of integrity in fighting to reduce poverty worldwide.⁵³ Former president of South Africa, Frederik Willem de Klerk, went further still, stating not only that Mandela had made a great contribution to reconciliation, human rights, and equality, but also that he "was a man of great integrity."⁵⁴ Mandela was able to act with integrity because of who he was as a person.

The fact that people are offended when someone casts doubt on their integrity shows the value attached to it. Similarly the value of integrity is shown in the fact that people see it as a compliment when they are branded by others as having integrity. The fact that others use a lack of personal integrity to portray someone negatively shows the value attributed to this quality, as does the fact that ascribing personal integrity to people is used to portray them positively and even honor them. Personal integrity is evidently something people consider important for themselves and others. This is confirmed in many studies. For instance, research shows that in the UK politicians consider integrity the most important factor for political leadership. Another study shows the importance citizens attach to the integrity of SPs.⁵⁵ *The New York Times* even stated that integrity is the most important virtue in politics.⁵⁶ The fact that all kinds of profiles and job descriptions as well as codes of conduct for SPs call for integrity shows how essential it is.

Integrity is more than ethics. Philosopher Bernard Williams defines integrity as standing for something.⁵⁷ People who act ethically and have ethical arguments for doing so do not necessarily have integrity. If this were all integrity meant, according to Williams, then it would be limited to impartial and impersonal arguments, and as a result ethics would be an imposition, alienating those on whom it was imposed. Integrity is about the person behind the ethics. It is not simply a question of having arguments for why something is ethical, but believing them too, because they fit in with (are integral to) the person.

Integrity is therefore not only about why a person does things, but also who the person is, and who they want to be. If you do not want integrity, you will never have it. That is why integrity begins with the question of how much you want it. Do you aspire to integrity? Do you want to be an SP with integrity? How much importance do you attach to it, and how does that relate to your other ambitions?

9. Integrity is about what you have

Integrity is not only about qualities denoting an absence of behavior, such as incorruptibility or unselfishness. This interpretation may seem powerful, but integrity is also about positive qualities. Integrity can be defined as (1) a single virtue, (2) the connection between virtues, (3) the functionality of virtues, and (4) an overarching virtue. SPs must have this overarching virtue for all their other qualities to be properly focused on fulfilling their role. That is the point at which an SP achieves integrity.

“A colossus of unimpeachable moral character and integrity” was how Archbishop Desmond Tutu described Nelson Mandela after his death.⁵⁸ When speaking of integrity in SPs, one of the first associations is an unbending nature, along with traits such as incorruptibility, irreproachability, unselfishness, or faultlessness.⁵⁹ Seen from this perspective, integrity is the absence of negative qualities. They all involve the absence of a particular quality or abstinence from a particular activity. Integrity is about what one is not.

The power of this interpretation of integrity is that it is absolute. A person who bends to circumstances lacks integrity. There is no leeway: one bend is all it takes. The inherent normative power of these terms is very powerful. People do not want to be associated with terms such as corruption, blame, fault or stain. These are inherently undesirable, emotionally charged, and hard-hitting.

At the same time there is a drawback to these terms. They may make it clear what people should not be, but they are not so clear about what they should be. Besides this negative interpretation of integrity, there are also positive interpretations, such as purity, decency, soundness, and righteousness. Focusing on the positive as well as the negative broadens the spectrum of integrity. The absence of the negative, as in arithmetic, does not mean the presence of the positive. There may be nothing at all, zero. On the other hand the absence of

the positive does not mean the presence of the negative by definition. We cannot say that someone has integrity just because the opposite is not true. Not lacking integrity is not the same as having it. The combination of both interpretations covers the positive and negative sides of integrity.

Often integrity is seen as a single virtue or part of a virtue. Integrity is mentioned as a core value in the British Civil Service Code.⁶⁰ In other codes integrity is an aspect of the core value of honesty or trustworthiness. In all these cases integrity is seen as a desirable trait for an SP. The advantage of this approach is that integrity is delimited, indicating that it is not the only important quality. The disadvantage is that this can create the impression that the other virtues are irrelevant from the perspective of integrity. This is a pity, as at least in three respects integrity is broader and richer than an individual virtue.⁶¹

Firstly integrity can be described in a negative sense as the absence of division or break, and in the positive sense as unity and wholeness. US lawyer Stephen Carter describes a person with integrity as “like a whole number, ... a whole person, a person somehow undivided.”⁶² This definition of integrity, resting on its Latin roots, emphasizes cohesion and consistency between a person’s different qualities. A person has integrity if their qualities are harmonized to form a whole, if they are integrated with one another. A work of music does not attain integrity just by the absence of wrong notes – in that case integrity would be defined as a single virtue – it must also be uninterrupted by unrelated musical ideas. Positively formulated, this means that there is musical unity, harmony. Just as music that has integrity is harmonious, so is a person with integrity.

However, there is a broader definition of integrity. The definition above focuses on consistency and coherence between personal qualities. As long as they are consistent with one another there is integrity. Seeing integrity purely in these terms suggests that virtues are independent of the person’s position. Here it is not only a matter of consistency and coherence, but also of having the relevant qualities to do the job well. Philosopher Immanuel Kant defined a virtue as “die fest gegründete Gesinnung seine Pflicht genau zu erfüllen” (“the deep-rooted inclination to comply strictly with one’s duty”).⁶³ It is not only an internalized tendency, but also the connection between this and fulfilling one’s own duties and obligations. These duties and obligations follow from the job. For that reason all virtues are important from the perspective

of integrity. The question is which virtues are functional and which are not. People lack integrity if they lack the correct arsenal of virtues, making them incapable of doing the job well. This is why there are codes in which integrity is not a separate core value but rather binds the entire code together. Some authorities even give their code the title “code of integrity”.

Finally integrity has another meaning, an even more fundamental interpretation. Instead of being seen as a single quality, the harmony between virtues, or their functionality, integrity can also be viewed as an overarching, second-order quality. Integrity is not only a criterion for evaluating the unity and functionality of qualities; it is also the characteristic that prevents a person, “the self”, from disintegrating, falling apart, or being torn to pieces.⁶⁴ Integrity keeps the virtues together and ensures that they are focused on the job. Philosopher Daniel Putnam expresses it as follows: “Integrity reaches its highest point when it unifies and maintains a balance of virtues.”⁶⁵ Integrity is not only a norm, it is also a function. Integrity is not just about who you are, but also what you have.

This is why accusations of a lack of integrity are so harsh. Based on this definition, someone who is corrupt is unfit for the job. It is like a car: lack of integrity in the sense of a scratch or a dent does not prevent the primary function, of driving, but lacking integrity in the sense of a broken steering mechanism or bent chassis does. If this is irreparable – if the car is corrupt – then it is a total loss. Even if all the broken parts are replaced, the car will not be as it was. Labeling someone as corrupt is therefore a serious accusation: it suggests that that person is a *total loss*, completely unsuitable.

SPs should therefore ask themselves the meaning of integrity as a virtue, the integrity of virtues, and which virtues are important for their own positions. It is also important that they ask themselves how much integrity they have: to what extent are they capable of managing their own qualities or, in other words, do they have power over their own personal qualities?

10. Integrity is visible in patterns of behavior

Virtues and behavior may be related to one another, but there is no one-to-one correspondence. Virtues may be expressed in behavior, but a person may possess a virtue without it being apparent at a given moment. Behavior must also be interpreted to derive the virtues. Behavior can be more easily attributed to an individual when others behave differently in the same situation (lack of consensus), the individual behaves the same way in different situations (lack of distinctiveness), and the individual behaves differently at different times in the same situation (lack of consistency). To achieve integrity SPs should reflect the desired qualities in their behavioral patterns. So integrity is more than just a snapshot.

Integrity is not only a matter of SPs' behavior, but also their motives and characters. Behavior and character, however, cannot be separated. People are honest if they tell the truth in concrete situations, and telling the truth in those situations makes them honest people. Nevertheless, the relationship between behavior and virtues is not straightforward. Psychologist Edward Jones calls it a "rocky road".⁶⁶

Firstly, the relationship between personal qualities and behavior is not easy to pin down. Qualities only come into being when they are expressed in behavior. People are only honest when they show it in their actions. What use is the quality of honesty if a person proceeds to lie? At the same time a person may possess a quality without it being visible at a given moment in their behavior. Qualities can be latent. They need not be exhibited all the time. A person may be decisive without always showing it, for instance because not all situations require it. Some traits in fact only become visible in exceptional situations. A person can be heroic, but never have been in a situation in which this was required. That is why in crises, for example, people may "suddenly" rise to the occasion with the required qualities.

Secondly, the relationship between behavior and personal qualities cannot be straightforwardly established. Behavior reveals motives and with them virtues or vices. The logic seems simple: a good tree produces good fruit and a bad tree produces bad fruit, so bad fruit means a bad tree and good fruit means a good tree. In actual fact, it is not that simple. One good fruit does not make a good tree, and one bad fruit does not make a bad tree. Even several fruits cannot decisively determine the quality of the tree. Whether a tree produces good or bad fruit depends in part on the tree's circumstances, such as climate, soil quality, and care, so the fruit does not tell us anything definitive about the quality of the tree.

There are various factors involved in ascribing behavior to a person. Social psychologist Harold Kelley developed the Covariation Model.⁶⁷ This theory states that in order to ascribe behavior to a person instead of circumstances, the behavior must be compared in different situations and with that of others. This determines the covariation of the behavior. The less the following three factors are present, the more the individual is indicated, rather than the circumstances.

The first factor is *consensus*, the extent to which other people behave the same way in the same situation. If everyone except Pete refuses Christmas presents, then the consensus is low. The more Pete is an exception with respect to the others, the more it says something about Pete. The second factor is distinctiveness, the extent to which a person behaves the same way in different situations. If Pete only accepts presents at Christmas and not the rest of the year, the distinctiveness of Christmas is high. If Pete accepts presents all year round, the distinctiveness of Christmas is low. In this case the fact that Pete accepts presents at Christmas says less about Christmas as a situation, and more about Pete as a person, because he also accepts presents at other times. The third factor is consistency, the extent to which the person does the same every time the same situation arises. If Pete only accepts Christmas presents this year and not in other years, his consistency is low. The fact that Pete suddenly accepts a present must be down to him as a person, because the situation in other years was the same: it was also Christmas.⁶⁸ If Pete is the only one who accepts a present at Christmas as well as at other times of the year, and he refuses Christmas presents in other years, then accepting a present at Christmas can be ascribed to Pete (what is termed internal attribution) and not to the situation (external attribution).

The integrity of a person is a matter of behavioral patterns. Patterns indicate regularity and therefore integrity. Whether that regularity can be attributed to a person depends on the extent to which others behave differently in the same situation (lack of consensus), the person behaves the same in other situations (lack of distinctiveness), and behaves differently at different times in the same situation (lack of consistency). The less the circumstances determine behavior, the more behavior corresponds to individual character, and the more it says about their integrity.

To show where we are heading with this line of thinking, let us look at the different judgments of the integrity of two mayors who committed the same offences. These two mayors were both involved in a street brawl. It emerged that both had been drunk and were on their way to a brothel when they ran into trouble. The minister of foreign affairs reprimanded them for behaving “with little decorum” that night. Consensus was low, because few mayors exhibit drunken behavior in public. This means that their behavior could be attributed more to them. One mayor maintained the confidence of his council, whereas the other did not, and subsequently submitted his resignation. His behavior was not an exception but part of a pattern. It emerged that he had once been caught in his municipality directing traffic while drunk. An agent had also once seen him drunk in his garden, and his spouse had stated that this was a habit. In his previous post he had already been caught and convicted of driving under the influence. It also appeared to be hereditary, as his father had been dismissed from a ministerial position 22 years previously for causing an accident under the influence. What happened that night was not a one-off mistake; he had been under the influence in several different situations at different times. For that reason he received far more blame for what happened that night than the other mayor, for whom it was a one-off mistake.⁶⁹

The situation with the mayors above comes down to one type of transgression and the pattern behind it. Various types of behavior can also reveal a pattern and cause trouble for the culprit. Canadian city councilor Rob Ford was dismissed from his position due to a conflict of interests. He had used municipal writing paper to apply for money for his charity. Soon afterwards he was elected mayor. In subsequent years he featured negatively in the news several times for various transgressions, such as reading at the wheel on the highway, making obscene gestures at citizens, getting into a fight with a journalist, and drunken behavior in public. When it later emerged that he had used drugs, that was the final straw.. The council

decided that he would have to transfer a number of his powers to the deputy mayor.⁷⁰ Without being able to appeal to the circumstances (for instance if the fight was self-defense), the six cases of exceptional behavior (low consensus) in different situations pointed to a lack of essential qualities in this mayor.

From the point of view of integrity, behavior should exhibit virtue, and should correspond to the qualities desirable in the job. It is also important to ensure regularity, a pattern of behavior. The more an SP exhibits desirable behavior in different situations and at different moments, the more this says about the integrity of this SP and the less about the circumstances. Integrity also becomes more visible over time: as the number of situations in which integrity can be evaluated increases, it is easier to determine the degree of consensus, distinctiveness, and consistency. Integrity is therefore more than just a snapshot (although a moment may tell us a great deal – more on that later in this book).

Another implication of the discussion above is that in order to determine someone's integrity you need to look at situations that might reveal the opposite of your current assumption. A person who regularly falsely claims expenses could be seen as a cheat or a fraud. However, if it turns out that someone also omits to claim expenses, and to a higher value than is falsely claimed, this puts the person's character in a different light. Instead of being a cheat or a fraud, the person is sloppy. So SPs that are criticized for their level of integrity can look for situations indicating otherwise in their defense, as did Kim Hames, mentioned in chapter 7, when he stated that he had omitted to claim expenses he had a right to.⁷¹ Nevertheless, when Newt Gingrich called rival US presidential candidate Mitt Romney an "out of touch rich guy" who paid less tax than a "normal" US resident, Romney decided to make his tax declaration public, showing that he was complying with the rules and that he donated a great deal of money to good causes.⁷²

11. Integrity can only be built up in office

SPs can only begin to build up integrity once in office, because it is by exhibiting patterns of good behavior that they are able to show that they possess the qualities needed for the job. They only develop the qualities they need by repetition on the job, thereby discovering the true meaning of integrity in their job. Through this repetition they can also become qualified for positions of greater power.

It is sometimes thought that a person has integrity as long as the opposite has not been proven. This is a limited perspective on integrity, as people can only distinguish themselves in a negative sense, making integrity an issue of avoiding mistakes, errors, or blunders. Under this view integrity resides in the absence of particular actions. However, this is just one side of integrity. The flipside involves earning, building up, and proving integrity. Under this view integrity is gained by positive action.

General views on morality and notions of justice state that people are innocent until proven guilty, rather than guilty by default. In the same way we can say that SPs are not corrupt by default. This is the basis, the point of departure. So a lack of integrity must be proven by the person making the claim. However, if a person is not corrupt, it does not necessarily mean they have integrity. Integrity is not the opposite of corruption. As we saw in chapter 9, integrity is a positive concept that is more than the absence of the negative. That is why integrity is not present by nature, but must be built up and demonstrated.

Integrity becomes visible in behavior. Without behavior we cannot make any claim regarding integrity. Only when we speak the truth do we show that we are honest. By fulfilling a promise we show that we are trustworthy. However, since integrity only becomes visible in patterns of behavior, desirable behavior must be exhibited frequently. We can build up our trust by fulfilling several promises. Frequently telling the truth builds on honesty. People can only distinguish

themselves positively in office if they exhibit positive behavior, and the more they do this the more they show that they possess the underlying positive traits and desired qualities. According to Aristotle people only fully possess virtues through repetition. In his view moral virtues, like intellectual virtues, arise from habit and practice.⁷³ It is only on the job that we can get into the habit of applying the desired qualities. Only in office can we show others that we possess the required virtues.

SPs act high-handedly if they think that they do not need to prove their own integrity, as if others should see their integrity as natural and given, or as if it does not matter what others think of their integrity. However, integrity needs to be proven and built up not only for others but also for SPs themselves. It is through action that we discover what integrity is, what the desirable qualities are, what it means in practice, and which qualities need developing. By practicing in office, people discover what is considered important, what motivates them, and who they are. The job is both a voyage of discovery and a process of creating one's own integrity. Integrity is formed and filled out in office.⁷⁴ People gain integrity in office rather than having it at the outset.

Integrity can therefore be lost or won. At any moment in office the balance can be made up. What have I lost and what have I gained? Am I in the danger zone or am I achieving a rising line of progress? Is my own integrity crumbling or taking shape? How much credit do I have, or am I already in the red? What habits have I made or broken? SPs should regularly ask themselves these questions; this keeps them sharp, encourages improvement where necessary, and prevents them from unconsciously relapsing or weakening.

Growing in integrity has another goal. By showing they are maintaining and developing their integrity, people show not only that they are fit for their current job, but also that they qualify for positions with more power and greater risks to integrity. As Irish statesman Edmund Burke said, "The greater the power, the more dangerous the abuse."⁷⁵ More power means greater repercussions of abuse, demanding greater integrity. This is why every job is a test of integrity for a harder job. Anyone who cannot act with integrity with little power is likely to abuse their power more in a position of greater power. If they cannot hold out with little power, they disqualify themselves from more demanding jobs.

III. Approaches to evaluation

Part III, consisting of nine chapters, is about different aspects that play a role in evaluating the integrity of SPs, such as different situations, definitions, positions, the magnitude of mistakes, identity, and time.

12. Integrity carries over from one situation to another

Since integrity is an overarching, integrating mechanism, it can carry over from one situation to another. Integrity can be carried through to different roles, tasks, and positions, especially when situations are comparable, so it is an illusion to think that integrity can be compartmentalized.

On the one hand with integrity we look for patterns, cohesion, and consistency of behavior. What does an action say about a person's integrity and to what extent is it a rule or an exception? On the other hand we assume that there are patterns, cohesion, and consistency in people's behavior. After all, an action in a particular situation is often carried through to similar situations and even to different ones.

Because integrity is an overarching, integrating, and regulatory mechanism, as discussed in chapter 9, it is a mechanism that ensures connection between situations, tasks, functions, and roles. Without that mechanism people would be unintegrated, purely the sum of their actions, duties, jobs, and roles. This mechanism comes into play when we recognize that SPs are more than officials, that they are also people. How does this work?

When someone lies the lie itself is not the only problem. The perpetrator can apologize and repair or compensate any damage. The fact that they lied, however, raises the question of character, and the less this is down to circumstances, as we saw in chapter 10, the more the answer relates to individual character. The more it relates to character, the more it says not only about who someone is, but also about who they will be, as character is more difficult to change than behavior because character is more about the person, more connected with them, and more deeply embedded. A person's current character therefore speaks volumes about how they will be in the future and what behavior to expect. This is the defining principle of trustworthiness. People are trustworthy if they seem likely to fulfill expectations in the

future. This expectation is based on the idea that character remains constant. With people who always fulfill their promises, there is an increasing expectation that they will continue to do so in the future, for example because they are punctual and loyal. We then extrapolate that the same character will persist in the future.

This applies not only to the future but also to different situations. In the case of false expenses claims blamed on sloppiness, this raises the question of what additional sloppy claims have been submitted, but also of whether the culprit is sloppy in other respects. If they are sloppy with expenses, this may not automatically mean that they are sloppy in other situations, such as policy making or treatment of others, but it increases the likelihood. Similarly people who negotiate boldly on behalf of their party on coalition agreements seem likely to behave boldly in similar situations, such as negotiations within the party, as well as different situations, such as dealing with criticism and resisting political pressure. We apply the quality to different situations because we assume that there is integrity, however minimally, ensuring consistency between situations as a second-order virtue.

The more similar the situations, the better and the more easily the same quality can be applied. A person who is careless with expenses claims is more likely to be careless with other financial matters than in treatment of others, or may be more careless about conflicts of interest than matters relating strictly to their position. For that reason qualities from one situation cannot be directly applied to another.⁷⁶ That would mean there was no individual choice, because future behavior would be completely decided by the past.

Despite the fact that qualities from one situation cannot be directly assumed in another, it is an illusion to think that integrity can be compartmentalized, partitioning off situations, tasks, jobs, and roles. The fact that behavior carries over to different situations underlines the importance of behaving with integrity: integrity says something not only about the current situation but also about the future, and not only about similar situations but also about different ones. For that reason it is a good idea when making decisions to think not only about what they mean for the current situation or position, but also what it means in other cases. For example SPs who boldly put a knife to the throat of another party may be doing their own party a good turn, but colleagues may well wonder whether they will suffer the same treatment.

13. Integrity is defined publicly as well as personally

Integrity is an objective, subjective, and intersubjective concept, so SPs' integrity depends on the definitions of others, individually and collectively. SPs cannot simply define integrity for themselves; they must also know how others define it and how other definitions relate to their own.

As shown in the previous chapters, integrity consists of different elements. SPs behave with integrity in office if they act in agreement with rules and regulations, moral values and norms, showing ethical responsibility and pure motives. Integrity is not only a matter of behavior and motives, but also of character. SPs with integrity have a firm hold on a fully integrated range of virtues necessary to fulfill their roles.

The fact that there are different elements does not mean that they will all be used in practice in evaluating a person's integrity. Integrity is both objective and subjective. Integrity is compositional. Which elements are included and the way this occurs is determined by the people concerned. How people judge an SP's integrity depends on the definition they use. One person might pay more attention to behavior, another to motives, some to integrity as an independent quality in itself, others to integrity as an overarching virtue. In short, integrity depends on the definition others use.

Integrity is both subjectively and intersubjectively defined. Groups, organizations, parties, communities, and trends can have their own shared definitions. In the last century, for instance, integrity was largely defined in public sector policy in terms of incorruptibility. There was a great deal of emphasis on not doing what was not allowed, mainly relating to fraud and corruption. At the beginning of this century the emphasis shifted to the positive aspects of integrity. Integrity was seen more as professional responsibility, relating to doing good, although it was still seen as a single virtue. Integrity is now increasingly seen as the sum of

qualities relevant to a position. Perhaps in the future the emphasis will shift to integrity as a personality trait that regulates the various qualities.

In a sense people are well within their rights to form different opinions on the definition of a concept. A significant advantage is that people then have to decide for themselves how they define integrity and can defend that definition. For SPs that means first deciding their own definition of integrity and then having the opportunity to explain it, with the understanding that others may define it differently. SPs must be aware of different definitions, because these are the criteria with which others will view, judge, and attach consequences to their integrity. Even if there are many objective arguments against subjective definitions, it is the subjective definitions that people use in practice.

A gap between public and personal definitions of integrity can exist in two ways. Firstly others may define integrity more broadly than the SP. For example, a mayor was accused of lacking integrity because he had failed to comply with a generally accepted norm (close private contact with various journalists), whereas the mayor stated in his defense that he had complied with the rules. By making integrity small, people run the risk of defining it too narrowly and suffering related accusations. Secondly, an SP may have a broader interpretation of integrity than others. In that case they may run the risk of being seen as pompous or radical. Both cases run the risk of miscommunication. A mayor who once stated that rewards should be introduced for integrity was misunderstood. He applied a broad definition of integrity, whereas his officials thought primarily in terms of not taking bribes, and therefore thought it strange that they should be rewarded for refusing bribes, because that implied that bribery would not be punished. The officials also thought the mayor was attempting to skirt around burning questions about bribery in their organization by avoiding mentioning it directly.

This is why it is important that SPs immerse themselves in the aspects by which integrity is defined. This starts when they apply for a job listing integrity as a requirement. Once in office, SPs must get to know how each new group they deal with defines integrity, and in the case of discrepancies, they should enter into dialogue and investigate whether a common, shared definition can be achieved, because once accused of breaches of integrity, it may well be too late.

14. Integrity is how you are perceived by others, not just how you perceive yourself

Beyond definitions, SPs' integrity depends on their own perceptions and those of others. People tend to judge their own integrity in a more positive light than others do. This is a natural function of the brain and the difference in viewpoint. SPs should therefore be familiar with and manage the perceptions of others on their own integrity.

A difference of opinion on the integrity of an action or person can arise from a difference in definition of integrity, as explained in the previous chapter, but also in the way integrity is perceived given the same definition. Our integrity is not only determined by our own perspective, but also by that of others, and these two perspectives are not necessarily the same; they may be at odds. How people see their own integrity therefore tells us nothing about how others see it.

For various reasons people generally see the integrity of others in a less positive light than their own.

Firstly people have a natural tendency to think positively of themselves.⁷⁷ This means they take in, store and recall information about themselves in a tinted or distorted fashion. The brain is simply put together that way (making use of strategies known as heuristics). A positive self-image is important for functioning and even survival. We therefore remember good behaviors and traits in ourselves better than bad. On the other hand the human brain is set up so that bad behaviors and traits in others are recalled better than good. This is also important for functioning and survival. Just as people tend to ignore information which does not fit in with their view of things, if people see themselves positively they will be more likely to set aside negative information than if they see themselves less positively, and if they see others in a negative light, they will tend to ignore new positive information.

There is also a difference in position. People only see themselves from the inside, whereas others see them from the outside. Individuals know their own considerations and intentions best. Others see and hear the individual and extrapolate what goes on inside on that basis. Differences in interpretation are therefore possible, especially when others' interpretations are characterized by what is known as lay psychology.⁷⁸ The *Correspondent Inference Theory*, as developed by psychologists Edward Jones and Keith Davis,⁷⁹ reveals different ways in which people interpret the behavior of others. For instance, the greater the consequences of the behavior for others, the greater the tendency to attribute the behavior to a person's intentions. Similarly the more disadvantageous the consequences for others the more they are attributed to the individual. The greater the distance between the person and those judging, the more generic the images of the person being judged. People judging from a distance do so in absolutes (behavior is seen as good or bad), whereas those judging from close by have a more nuanced view. We also see this effect over time. The longer it is since an act was committed, the more general the judgments. For that reason history often only recognizes three variants of SPs: SPs with integrity (the heroes), corrupt SPs (power-crazed), and the rest (neutral, insignificant). The attribution of intentions and virtues therefore does not always occur based on pure, balanced considerations.

The difference in position may also lead to a difference in images of integrity. What people know about the situation and circumstances can differ from what bystanders know. Since integrity is context sensitive (what is desirable depends on the situation) another view of the context can lead to a different judgment of a person's behavior. For instance, SPs might be seen as inconsistent when exhibiting different behavior, because people believe the situations involved are the same, while the SPs think they are being consistent because they see the situations as different, adjusting their behavior accordingly.

The difference in definitions and perceptions of integrity means that it is not a unified concept and that views on an individual's integrity can differ. It is therefore important for SPs to manage the perceptions of others as well as possible. The perception gap can be partially bridged by good communication about the situations in which decisions and actions take place. Good communication of considerations and arguments leads to greater understanding and more positive judgments of the integrity of decisions and those deciding. At the same time, managing perceptions also means looking at one's own perceptions. Those who take integrity seriously will check their own perceptions are not too rose-tinted.

Perception management is not only a matter of what others think about integrity. Machiavelli claimed that being seen as principled was more important than actually being principled.⁸⁰ He was right that it is important to be seen as principled, but integrity is about the inside as well as the outside.⁸¹ In fact integrity is all about consistency between the inside and the outside. An SP who only focuses on the outside would be seen as hypocritical if the inside were revealed.

15. Integrity is about appearance, not just the facts

SPs should avoid giving the impression that they lack integrity, because this damages trust, which is difficult to restore. SPs should therefore (1) avoid seeking out situations that could easily create the appearance of a lack of integrity, (2) take organizational measures that avoid the appearance of a lack of integrity, and (3) avoid an atmosphere of mistrust that could make them vulnerable to suspicions.

The Canadian government's "Values and Ethics Code for the Public Service" talks about avoiding not only behavior lacking integrity but also the impression of such behavior. For instance it states, "Avoiding and preventing situations that could give rise to a conflict of interest, or the appearance of a conflict of interest, is one of the primary means by which a public servant maintains public confidence in the impartiality and objectivity of the Public Service."⁸² Many other codes of integrity also address this subject with the general aim that the target group should avoid giving the impression of a lack of integrity. After all, integrity is not just a matter of fact, but also of perceived facts and fiction, the way the facts are understood, a matter of appearance as well as substance.

There was uproar when a queen spoke out against the threatened closure of a military airport. The airport was near the palace where she lived and worked, so the royal family made extensive use of it for their own travel as well as for receiving guests. The queen created the impression that she was allowing her personal interests to dominate, whereas she argued that members of the government and other dignitaries made use of the airport, and that it was advantageous that it was small, well organized, and secure.⁸³ There was also a commotion when it emerged that a governor had sold a villa belonging to the state to a good friend for €1, a mayor had awarded a license to a charity that he chaired, a municipal authority used a cab company owned by the mayor's son, and a council member's company had received a contract to print the ballot papers for the next elections.

The problem with these “apparent situations” is that no actual violation of integrity need take place. The accused may not have been involved in decision making at all, as in the case of the mayor, who left the decision about the taxi firm entirely to the purchasing department. This can even benefit decision making. People do not take on contractors with whom they have bad private experience when hiring in their public capacity as SPs, because they want to avoid new problems, and they promote those with whom they have friendly relationships because they can trust them to do a good job. People may even do good things they would not otherwise have done, as in the case of the mayor who decided to build his own vacation home in a partner municipality to show support.

Why are such situations so problematic? SPs with integrity are those who serve the interests they should serve in office. A president serves the interests of the country, a governor those of the state, and a mayor those of the municipality. For this purpose SPs should not only comply with the rules, they should also serve as purely as possible. Those for whom SPs work must be able to trust that SPs use their power with integrity rather than abusing it, and there lies the problem. If the different interests cannot be cleanly separated, but run together and become intertwined, this can raise the question of which interests are really served. The purity of decision making can be called into question, because people raise the suspicion that they are misusing their positions for other interests.

A mayor who advised the renovation committee against selecting a particular contractor created the impression of lack of integrity because others interpreted it as use of her power to take revenge for the contractor’s failure on a private job. This suspicion was reinforced when it emerged that the mayor had not fully settled her account with the contractor because of an ongoing dispute. Even if the mayor acted with the best of intentions, her actions gave the impression that she was making improper use of her power due to a conflict of interests.

The criteria for avoiding the appearance of abuse of power and dishonest behavior are problematic, though, since the appearance is fed by mistrust on the part of other people. Suspicious types will always be able to find signs of abuse of power, because there are always multiple interests involved – even in the simplest cases SPs will always be private individuals as well as officials – and because the SP always has power and therefore the opportunity to abuse it. If there is a question of mistrust, the SPs involved can hardly appeal

to people for general trust in SPs, as that trust is absent precisely because they themselves have become objects of mistrust. It is also difficult to show that one has behaved with good intentions, because interests always conflict and can be difficult or impossible to separate. For that reason the criteria for avoiding the appearance of lacking integrity are subjective and can easily be used against people without their being able to defend themselves. The Maltese European Commissioner John Dalli mentioned this as a reason for stepping down: when he was suspected of corruption he felt that the appearance of corruption weighed heavily in his position and refuting it through investigation would take a long time.⁸⁴

Given that the appearance of abuse of power can be refuted, it is important to avoid situations in which it is reasonable, given a healthy dose of suspicion, to assume that abuse of power is going on. Since such appearances arise in an atmosphere of mistrust, the question is how that mistrust came about. Often it is a result of the SP having been discredited in the past. For that reason SPs should realize that if they lose public confidence, they become more susceptible to the appearance of abuse of power, so it is important to restore trust to avoid being discredited later for the same reason.

The appearance of misuse of power can be reprehensible in itself. If SPs allow confidence to wane and take insufficient action to restore it, they are asking for trouble. Similarly SPs should avoid situations where the appearance of lack of integrity is difficult to avoid. An alderman who granted his brother a license to run a nightclub, while refusing licenses to others, would have done better to delegate the decision to someone else, even if his brother was entitled to the license and the others were not. Another alderman, who granted a subsidy to a school where he had previously been principal and where he was guaranteed a job when he returned, would have been better off delegating the decision to someone else, even if the school was eligible for the subsidy and other schools were not.⁸⁵ The greater the interests in question, the more people should be alert to the appearance of abuse of power. The greater the interests the more care and precautions SPs will be expected to take to avoid giving the impression of abuse.

In order to avoid giving the impression of a lack of integrity, in sensitive situations it helps to ask yourself whether your own integrity can be convincingly explained to others, especially those who are mistrustful. That can be difficult, because, as we saw in the previous chapter,

people often think more positively of their own integrity than others do. The mayor who was discredited for having a vacation house built in a partner municipality found it impossible to explain this to citizens in retrospect. It is naïve to think that others see you in good faith as an SP and that you therefore do not need to do anything to avoid the possible appearance of lack of integrity.

There are also various organizational measures for avoiding appearing to lack integrity. Firstly, one can avoid certain areas of business altogether, such as private investments in shares and real estate, or employing family members in one's own organization. A second option is openness, for instance reporting issues (such as gifts from associates and expenses claims) or allowing others to scrutinize what you are doing (the four eyes principle). When the prime minister of New Zealand John Key was suspected of intentionally misinforming the chamber about illegal monitoring by the security service, he promised to take an assistant with him to meetings with the service from then on to avoid a repeat of the situation.⁸⁶ Thirdly, the appearance of abuse can be avoided by allowing others, either lower down or higher up in an organization, to take decisions. There are SPs who leave the choice of contractor for private renovations to a committee and avoid becoming involved. It can also be important to acquire written permission. An alderman ran into difficulties after announcing an overseas business trip to the mayor and other aldermen verbally: when he was criticized for failing to follow procedure, none of his colleagues could remember him mentioning it. This increased the alderman's problems, as he now appeared to have been lying.

16. Integrity arrives on foot and leaves on horseback

One mistake can be fatal for SPs because it exposes a lack of integrity in one go, without giving them the considerable time necessary to recover the defective quality. The extent to which a mistake damages SPs' integrity depends on the extent to which it points to the lack of a virtue essential to the job and whether further errors come to light as a result. Once SPs have been discredited for mistakes, it is all the more important that they watch out for new ones, because these will weigh more heavily.

When it emerged that an Egyptian member of parliament had lied about an operation on his nose – his party prohibited cosmetic surgery so he said he had been injured after a robbery in his car – he was suspended by his party because the lie had brought him and his party into disrepute.⁸⁷ Apparently Spanish philosopher Baltasar Gracián is right when he says, "A single lie destroys a whole reputation of integrity."⁸⁸ Evidently one mistake can be fatal to integrity. That is why it is often said that integrity leaves on horseback. But that is not all: integrity also arrives on foot. It may disappear quickly, but it arrives slowly and takes a long time to build up. Why is that?

Integrity is not only about behavior; it is also a matter of personality. We read a person's integrity from their behavior. Their actions tell us who they are, and that includes wrongdoing. One mistake can expose failings or betray a person's true nature, casting doubt on their integrity, damaging it, or wiping it away altogether. Integrity leaves on horseback because the person fails in one go. Since the bad character or trait revealed by such an event cannot be improved or redressed from one day to the next, the consequences are far-reaching. Even if people adjust their behavior, it is no proof of an improved character. More time is needed for that proof, and that is why we say integrity arrives on foot.

The extent to which a mistake damages a person's integrity depends on various factors. The more the mistake typifies a particular quality, and the more essential that quality is for the job, the greater the harm to the SP's integrity. The more deliberate the behavior the more it is seen as coming directly from the person rather than from circumstances, further damaging integrity. The harder it is to restore the personal quality, the more problematic it is for the future, for others involved, and for the culprit.

A mistake raises the question of whether this is a rule or an exception. Those affected will wonder and may even investigate whether previous mistakes have taken place, looking for a pattern. Innocent, insignificant mistakes in the past may be reinterpreted, now that they are placed in a wider context and form part of a pattern. The combination of mistakes is what forms a pattern. New mistakes can become visible and reveal a longstanding lack of integrity. This is how the media works. The newsworthiness of an event becomes greater when there is a story, a pattern, and a corresponding logical context. Then it is no longer merely a question of a single mistake, nor even several mistakes, but rather a dysfunctional, defective SP.

Since others feel betrayed and realize their trust was misplaced, responses are often violent, and the disappointment and damaged image are long-lasting. In that respect the situation is much like a physical injury. Just as an injury takes time to heal, so does a transgression. Similarly a wound may heal well but still leave a lasting scar, and a mistake may be corrected but remain in memory. Just as a healed wound is more vulnerable than uninjured parts, people remain most vulnerable in the areas of past breaches. Future behavior, after all, will be seen in the context of recorded breaches, meaning that people cannot afford as many new mistakes as those who are undamaged thus far. Moreover a repeated mistake points to a failing that has improved insufficiently since the last time, otherwise there would have been no repetition.

The fact that integrity arrives on foot and leaves on horseback means that SPs must carefully consider the consequences of acting without it. One of the most important liberalist thinkers, English-American philosopher Thomas Paine said, "Character is much easier kept than recovered."⁸⁹ The same goes for integrity. It is because of these consequences that lapses weigh heavily and integrity leaves on horseback. Anyone who knows that integrity arrives on foot and still exhibits dishonest behavior shows little appreciation for integrity, and consequently others follow suit in taking a dim view of that person's integrity.

17. Integrity is revealed by minor as well as major transgressions

A minor transgression can have bigger consequences than major wrongdoing, because it should be easier to resist small temptations than big ones. A minor transgression therefore indicates a lack of integrity more than a big transgression. Moreover, the smaller the transgression the smaller the advantage enjoyed, and so the worse it is that a person has risked serious consequences for it. It is therefore particularly important for SPs to act with integrity when it comes to small matters.

The seriousness of a lapse, a breach of integrity, depends on several factors, such as the number of victims and the extent to which they were deceived. Leaking confidential information is less serious if no one suffers as a result than if lives of soldiers and diplomats are threatened, for example. This means the greater the SP's mistake is, the more the SP's integrity is at stake. It is with good reason that the ten leaders accused of embezzling the most funds from their countries are seen as the world's most corrupt political leaders. Over the past two decades the list has been topped by Indonesian president Mohamed Suharto (between \$15 billion and \$35 billion), followed by president of the Philippines Ferdinand Marcos (between \$5 billion and \$10 billion), President of the Democratic Republic of Congo Mobutu Sese Seko (\$5 billion), president of Nigeria Sani Abacha (between \$3 billion and \$5 billion), and president of Yugoslavia Slobodan Milošević (\$2.1 billion).⁹⁰

However, we must beware of allowing this line of thinking to become a justification for small transgressions, as if only big transgressions matter, not minor lapses. Minor mistakes can in fact have serious consequences. They can even have more serious consequences than big mistakes. There are SPs who have had to resign after errors such as a single instance of a misplaced remark on Twitter, racy photo, carelessness with confidential information, acceptance of a gift that was too expensive, driving an uninsured car, falsely claiming a diploma on their CV, or falsifying a signature.

How can a minor error have such far-reaching consequences? The error reveals a personal failing once and for all. Just as the integrity of a painting is damaged by a large gash or a small scratch, the integrity of a person is damaged, whether their transgression is large or small. The loss of stainlessness is the same, whether the stain is big or small.

However, this in itself is no reason for the consequences of a minor error being greater than those of a major error. The reason for that is that it should be easier to resist small temptations than large ones, so it should be easier to maintain integrity in the face of small temptations, meaning that a small transgression expresses a greater shortfall in integrity. If you abandon integrity for a small temptation, you will do so all the more easily given a bigger incentive, so the thinking goes. Small transgressions say something about the chance of big transgressions, but big transgressions say nothing about the chance of small transgressions.

Furthermore the smaller the transgression the smaller the relationship with the advantage obtained. After all, every transgression carries a risk to reputation, so it is all the more naïve to engage in minor transgressions instead of major ones. It was partly for this reason that there was uproar when Václav Klaus, president and former prime minister of the Czech Republic, stole the Chilean president's pen while at a press conference in Chile, slipping it into his pocket. His action was caught on tape and shown around the world.⁹¹

It was partly for this reason that there was uproar in the UK about the expenses claims of British members of parliament. If a minister claims a few pounds for a porn film rental, it raises the question of why someone would risk their job for such a trifling amount. The minister involved, Jacqui Smith, subsequently resigned.⁹²

There is an alternative explanation for the outrage over false expenses claims in the UK, including claims such as €1.75 euros for a pot of jellied eels, €0.75 for a carrier bag, €1.12 for dust cloths, and €1.45 for tealights. Such claims raise the question of how MPs ever came up with the idea of claiming such expenses, and where they found the time.⁹³ The expectation that MPs should be serving the people is difficult to reconcile with such practices. This behavior creates the impression that MPs are concerned with other business and out for maximum personal gain. For this reason such misdemeanors are not so much exaggerated by others; they are in fact already serious errors in themselves.

A minor transgression can have serious consequences for another reason: it may be the straw that breaks the camel's back, when a new error reveals a pattern of reprehensible behavior. Moreover a misdemeanor may lead to an SP being lumped together with those who have committed greater transgressions, so that they are labeled as fraudsters, bribers, dictators, or liars. Once a person's name is associated with such a group, where there is a lack of nuance, it is difficult to escape. The label once given is hard to remove, because each time a new culprit emerges, the media look back at perpetrators of similar offences in the past. When it became known that the resume of a US internet company CEO had presented incorrect information, a website listed other public figures who had been discredited for falsifying their resumes, including Norwegian politician Liv Løberg, who had falsely claimed to have three degrees.⁹⁴ Similarly a list of politicians who had had affairs was published when it was discovered that US general David Petraeus resigned because he had admitted to an extramarital affair.⁹⁵ The errors of SPs on such lists therefore continue to follow them.

This shows that it is important to behave with integrity in minor issues. If SPs make a minor error they should take care not to trivialize it or nonchalantly pass it off as insignificant. This adds to the integrity issue, showing that the perpetrator does not realize that minor errors are significant in the eyes of others.

18. Integrity in the past predicts present and future integrity

A past error by an SP can have implications for the present and the future, causing them to leave office or not to be selected for new positions. An important reason for this is that transgressions, even in the distant past, give an impression of lack of integrity – because integrity does not change quickly – damaging confidence that SPs can continue to fulfill their roles properly now and in the future. Screening of candidates for office is important, as is self-screening. SPs should consider integrity long before they apply for office.

In the previous chapters we saw how an error damages integrity. In this chapter we discuss how past errors, as well as those of today, have implications for the present and future.

A past error can prevent the perpetrators from being appointed to positions they might otherwise have held. When mayoral nominations were announced, a national newspaper reported that a candidate had been involved in construction fraud as a committee member for a university and tax evasion as chairman of a football club 10 years previously. As a result the candidate was not appointed. Evidently behavior from a decade ago is still relevant for evaluating current integrity and can even be a decisive factor in evaluating candidates for an SP role. Similarly it is claimed that Senator Edward Kennedy's chances of becoming US president in 1980 were significantly damaged by an incident 10 years previously in which he had made insufficient attempts to prevent a female passenger from drowning after a car accident.⁹⁶ The candidate nominated by President Obama as US ambassador to Iraq also had to withdraw when the media learned he had had a relationship with a journalist as advisor to the US government four years previously and leaked emails in which they joked about exchanging sex for information.⁹⁷

Similarly those already in office may be forced to relinquish their positions when errors in previous jobs are revealed. Simply looking for SPs who have been removed from their positions for plagiarism in their PhD dissertations we find many examples, such as German minister Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg,⁹⁸ German minister of education, Annette Schavan,⁹⁹ Taiwanese minister of defense Andrew Yang¹⁰⁰ and Hungarian president Pál Schmitt.¹⁰¹ Similarly a congressman was removed from his post because a historian revealed that he had sympathized with the enemy 10 years before the war, a secretary of state resigned on the day she was sworn in because photos were published a few hours after her appointment showing her parading around in the uniform of a reprehensible regime, and a secretary of state for education resigned when it emerged that in his previous position as professor he had had a job on the side for which he had used university writing paper, while being paid privately for the work. A politician was also sacked when it was revealed that as an activist against nuclear energy he had broken into the ministry and threatened officials, another for having intercourse with female subordinates as a sergeant in the army, subsequently earning a conviction for his actions, and another when it was revealed that she had provided incorrect personal data for her naturalization application.

The present relevance of past mistakes relates to their future relevance. Past mistakes often say a great deal about a person's integrity or lack thereof. Since integrity relates to character traits that are difficult to change, a mistake, even from the distant past, tells us about a person in the present and how they will remain in the future (termed predictive attribution). A past mistake therefore damages confidence that people will be able to do their jobs in future. If a virtue is essential for the job, a vice will impede it.

Integrity problems are exacerbated when SPs keep quiet about their past, indicating a lack of honesty and candor, or if it is done unintentionally, a lack of alertness and care, virtues which are equally important for many SP roles. Silence is also often indirect proof that a person knew that their behavior was unacceptable. If it had been acceptable, it would have been possible to be open about it, or so others might see it. So keeping quiet about a past mistake contributes to condemnation. The longer the mistake is covered up, the more heavily it weighs, not only because it has been covered up for longer, providing more missed opportunities for openness, but also because the dishonesty therefore appears deeper rooted and harder to improve. This is why it weighed heavily against Liv Løberg (see the previous chapter) when it emerged that

she had wrongly held three titles. All the years she held those positions became a permanent mistake for which she received a prison sentence of 14 months.¹⁰² The same goes for the treasurer and senator of a Spanish party who was dismissed when a newspaper revealed that he had paid illicit bonuses of €5,000 to €15,000, funded from business, to top managers in his party over a period of 20 years in exchange for business contracts.¹⁰³

At the same time there is another side to the story. One minister once said of another, "Once a rat, always a rat."¹⁰⁴ A leopard cannot change its spots, so the saying goes. However, this would mean that a person's core integrity could not be improved. As discussed in chapter 11, integrity can be recovered after a mistake, even if this is a slow process. This means the longer ago a transgression took place and the more behavior and associated character traits have improved, the less its relevance for the present and the future. A limitation period, aside from the legal sense, cannot come into force if the mistake has been covered up. Such limitation can only take effect if people confess. If they keep quiet, then when the mistake becomes known it is new, and therefore newsworthy, and a deliberate cover-up for all that time is even bigger news.

Since past integrity is important for the present and the future, candidate screening for SP positions is essential. Screening may consist of checking references and resumes, as well as investigating candidates' integrity. Some parties ask candidates if there is anything in their past that they feel could bring the party into disrepute. People can also screen themselves, ascertaining that they have not committed errors in the past that could bring their integrity or that of the institution they represent into discredit when making their choice of position. They can also ask others to examine their past. Before accepting office one minister went through her past tax returns with an accountant to check that an independent expert agreed that there were no omissions. Ultimately some people will have to conclude that their past is too incriminating for the position in question. That is why integrity is relevant long before people stand as SP candidates.

19. Integrity is judged by individual identity

Integrity is not the same for every SP in the same position because it depends on individual identity. The more SPs commit to something and the more they associate with it, the more readily behavior in conflict with it will be censured. The behavior or even the character of the SP is then seen as hypocritical. To avoid this, SPs should know what commitments determine their identity and should make this visible in their behavior.

The awkward thing about integrity is that expectations and how it is judged differs from person to person. Integrity is not the same for everyone in the same position. After all, integrity depends in part on individual identity. This identity in part determines expectations of integrity by which the person is judged.

Two kinds of commitments are relevant for understanding the relationship between identity and integrity.¹⁰⁵ There are commitments people can give up without losing identity (defeasible commitments) and commitments necessary to one's identity (identity-conferring commitments). This second type makes people who they are. Examples include people throwing themselves into helping the weak in society or improving the environment. When we breach these commitments we are no longer the people we or others thought we were. These defining commitments therefore form a framework for integrity. We create an expectation that we will stand up for something. Behavior that cannot be reconciled with these commitments lacks integrity: it is inconsistent with our identity. In contrast to defeasible commitments, it damages our very being, the image of who we are or profess to be. As a consequence we give the impression of being less committed than suggested or assumed, and are seen as hypocritical: we profess commitment but fail to act accordingly, making it seem as if we have been selective or opportunistic. This is really no commitment at all, and the identity behind it lacks integrity.

Accusations of hypocrisy were leveled at a minister who turned out to be having an extramarital affair after years standing up for the family as the cornerstone of society, at a United Nations special envoy who had always argued for combating poverty when it emerged that she had been receiving double reimbursements for years, at a minister who campaigned to reduce differences in income while substantially boosting personal income from various jobs on the side, and at an alderman who stood up for the world's outcasts as a socialist but who frequently visited illegal prostitutes (thereby abusing outcasts), eliciting the following newspaper quip: "A socialist should stand up for the oppressed in society. In any case he should not lie on top of them."¹⁰⁶

Al Gore, too, was accused of hypocrisy after having served as US vice president, when he went on to campaign fanatically against global warming. He claimed to be an enthusiastic advocate of a better environment, making this a part of his identity. He came under fire when it was discovered that he was a large-scale energy consumer in private. What he campaigned for was incongruent with his actions, thereby damaging his integrity and credibility, along with that of his message.¹⁰⁷

The way French president François Hollande was judged for his behavior reveals the same mechanism of judgment. Hollande had promised in his election campaign to be a normal president. He put this into practice by making one of his first actions a reduction in his own salary, by travelling by train as much as possible, and by owning a modest apartment. When it emerged that his car had been travelling at 140km an hour in a 70km limit this was seen as inexcusable due to his promise. When it was revealed that he had a mistress this also weighed heavily against him because he had promised that, in contrast with his predecessors, he would behave normally and refrain from burdening the people with rumors about women.¹⁰⁸

Things worked out differently for French socialist president François Mitterrand. When the media revealed the existence of an illegitimate daughter he responded with, "Et alors?"; so what? Even the fact that he had housed his mistress and illegitimate daughter in an official residence did not affect his position. In French society at the time it was generally acceptable for public figures to maintain extramarital relationships. This advanced their standing because it created an impression of charm, power, and the ability to conquer the hearts not only of women but also of voters in general, and political opponents.¹⁰⁹

When it comes to integrity it is therefore important that SPs ensure their behavior is consistent with their identity-conferring commitments. SPs should also know what their identity is and how it is formed. In part that identity is shaped by the groups they belong to. For politicians, for example, it is important to establish the identifying elements of their party's agenda and statutes and what these mean for their own behavior. It is therefore a good idea for SPs to reflect on what behavior is specifically appropriate or inappropriate to them.

It is also important for SPs to realize that the stronger the defining commitments they have the less they can afford to deviate. The more we bind ourselves to a cause, the more we are required to convert our commitments to consistent behavior, and the harder we fall if we fail. The more our identities are formed by a cause, the less there remains after a failure of integrity. In this respect a failure of integrity is like falling on one's your sword.

20. Integrity today is judged by that of tomorrow

Because integrity is dynamic rather than static, what is viewed as integrity today may not be seen in the same light tomorrow. Judgments can be made retrospectively: what SPs do today is judged according to tomorrow's adjusted views. SPs are expected to anticipate changes. At the same time a changing integrity cannot automatically be applied retrospectively. It is a matter of knowing what an SP could reasonably have known and foreseen.

We have seen that present and future integrity is in part determined by past integrity. What people have done and who they have been affects what they do and who they are now and in the future. SPs bring their past with them, and today's integrity is not only affected by the future as well as the past. It is dynamic, rather than static, in the sense that what is currently considered to be integrity may not be seen in this way in the future. Changes may be applied in retrospect: what SPs do today is judged by tomorrow's adjusted view of morality. For today's integrity it is therefore important to take the future into account.

Values and norms change. In many countries in the past it was normal to appoint family and friends to public office, whereas now many codes of conduct view this as an undesirable conflict of interest. Accepting expensive gifts and being lavishly treated by companies was quite normal in the past, whereas currently this is seen as problematic and immoral, a reason for withdrawing trust in an SP. A president was criticized when it was discovered that he had taken part in an expensive dinner and stayed in a luxury hotel at a company's expense. Not all standards become stricter over time, though. Some become more moderate and flexible. In the past, SPs were expected to stand down if they were discovered to be homosexual, whereas this is no longer an issue in many countries and for many political parties.

Values and norms for SPs change due to changing organizational principles (from appointing SPs on the basis of co-option to free elections and open application procedures), social developments (such as divorce becoming more common and no longer being seen as morally problematic, or not to the extent that it was in the past), and because negative consequences of practices become visible (for instance expensive gifts from associates damaging clarity of function in markets). SPs, however, are not only expected to adapt to changes in morality, but also to be proactive about this. Knowing that morality changes, they cannot act as if integrity is static. This proactivity is an indication of integrity.

Proactivity shows willingness to go beyond requirements and expectations, taking ownership of one's integrity. However, this is not a matter of choice. Even if we do not strictly need to surpass expectations, we are still expected to do so. SPs are expected to be above the Zeitgeist, to look to the longer term, to rise above current expectations, and to act in a way that is tenable in the future. This is what is expected and SPs will be held liable if they fail, but it is also something many SPs like to boast about when they want to appear visionary, standing up for future generations, and as a leader for a new future. However, that also implies being able to place contemporary morals in a broader time horizon.

Anyone with an eye for integrity therefore also has an eye for tomorrow's integrity. The trick is then to look at today's decisions and behavior through the moral glasses of tomorrow, however difficult that may be, and to take that into account in today's actions. One way to achieve this is to follow developments in morality in other sectors and countries. If the accountancy sector sets standards forbidding an accountant from owning shares in his office's client companies, that signals a possible broader development leading to SPs not being able to own shares in companies from the region where they work. If restrictions are on what SPs can do after resigning their positions are on the up in other countries (for instance preventing them from working for companies with which they have had a dependency relationship as SPs for half a year after leaving), this can signal a development that will affect SPs domestically. Similarly developments for others within the same sector can point to shifts in standards throughout the sector. If a mayor is rapped over the knuckles by his council for having lots of jobs on the side, that might be a reason for other mayors to consider whether the number of sidelines they are involved in is defensible. You might also look at the extent to which a norm has changed in the past, applying this to future changes. In recent years the number of additional jobs a person

holds has come to be seen less as a sign of social involvement and increasingly as a risk of conflict of interest. By extension, additional jobs may become completely unacceptable, or all additional income may be transferred to the institution to which the main job is affiliated. Or if financing political parties through business becomes increasingly restricted due to the chance of undesirable influence, this could, by extension, mean that in the future political parties are no longer allowed to be financed by companies at all.

However, the arguments presented above should not lead to changed morality applying retrospectively to the judgment of all SPs' past behavior. This would be unjust and lead to fear among SPs of being judged according to standards they could not reasonably have foreseen. Moreover it is generally easier to determine in retrospect what should have happened than in the moment itself.¹¹⁰ Evaluation should therefore take place primarily at the time of action and from the perspective of the morals that apply at the time. In 2001 a member of the European Parliament, Daniel Cohn-Bendit, made this argument when accused of pedophilia for a book published in 1975. He claimed that his book should be understood in the context of anarchism and that the battle for personal autonomy had its heyday in the 1970s. He stated that his book was only intended to provoke debate and he had not been guilty of pedophilia or inclinations in that direction.¹¹¹ The issue at stake is what SPs could reasonably have known, understood, or foreseen at the time, if called to account. When it comes to valuing and praising SPs, this is a matter of the extent to which they are ahead of their time. As explained in chapter 6, that is the ethical side of an SP's integrity.

IV. Role models

Part IV, consisting of five chapters, is about SPs as role models for integrity.

21. Integrity requires role models, not exemplary behavior

SPs function as role models because (1) they have power, leading others to identify with them and take them as references for their own behavior, (2) their priority should be serving the people, making it inconsistent if they break rules made for the people, and (3) they lose their moral authority if they fail to lead the way in integrity. Behavior that serves as a model does not need to be exemplary per se. SPs do not need to be superheroes, but they can be expected to work harder than average to exhibit integrity.

“Politicians must be a role model for the entire community;” according to the Irish Councilor John Kelly.¹¹² Research in Germany shows that 55% percent of citizens think politicians should be role models for society.¹¹³ But why would SPs be role models?

There is an important reason why SPs should act as role models, providing a good example rather than a bad one. People identify with those in power. Power attracts, so people reflect and imitate the behavior of the powerful. People with power are points of reference, role models, and symbols of morality, whether they want to be or not. Since SPs have power, other people look to them and use their behavior as guides for their own. When an SP in a high position breaks traffic rules, this becomes a justification for people inside and outside the SP’s organization to do the same. If SPs mislead others, this forms a justification for others to do the same. If SPs are opportunistic and selfish in their work, this is an encouragement to citizens to neglect their own duties to society.

There is a second reason why SPs act as role models. Society expects SPs to serve society above all, and with good reason. After all, they have great power. The government has a monopoly and a substantial influence on the lives of citizens. For this reason Plato states, “We must choose from among our guardians those who appear to us on observation to be most likely to devote their lives to doing what they judge to be in the interest of the community,

and who are never prepared to act against it.”¹¹⁴ SPs are dishonest, lacking integrity, if they are meant to serve the people and only partially do so in practice. Service is unconditional, an act of dedication, as Plato describes it, not a selective activity. How can an SP truly serve the people and at the same time habitually violate laws made for and in the interests of society? This is impossible for an SP with integrity. This is why an SP who breaks a rule is quickly discredited. Examples include a mayor who had not applied for the necessary licenses and exemptions for building her private house, a minister who evaded tax, a prime minister caught driving too fast, and a prince who accepted bribes. For the same reason Spanish Princess Christina was discredited when the judiciary came after her for money laundering.¹¹⁵

The third and final reason SPs act as role models is due to the need for moral authority. If SPs, individually and collectively, fail to take the lead on moral issues, they then have less power and authority in expectations of others and enforcement. German president Christian Wulff lost his moral authority and was politically crippled when it emerged that he had received a cheap mortgage from a bank and subsequently intimidated a journalist who was about to reveal this.¹¹⁶ If several or even all members of congress drove too fast, this would affect the authority of congress, and probably that of politics and government in general, leading to issues such as the police experiencing greater opposition when citizens were fined for speeding.

For SPs who refuse to recognize one or more of these reasons, this raises the question of who in their view should be setting a good example in society. If the answer is nobody, this denies the fact that SPs have power and society is not equal.

Model behavior does not demand exemplary behavior in the sense of being squeaky clean. SPs need not be superheroes. SPs are thoroughly human. Politics is the work of people and everyone makes mistakes. Fortunately SPs do not need to be superhuman, as it is precisely because they are human that they have a moral power of attraction over others. SPs do not have to be better people, either. The difference is primarily in the fact that SPs should work harder to act with integrity and to provide a model for others.

22. Integrity demands the most exemplary behavior from those with the most power

The more power an SP has, the more model behavior is required, because others (1) identify more closely with more powerful SPs, (2) are more dependent on them, and (3) follow their behavior more critically. SPs whose power grows should make sure their integrity grows too.

In the previous chapter we saw that model behavior is expected of SPs because they have power. Model behavior does not apply to every SP to the same extent. It depends on the level of power an SP has. The greater the power, the more model behavior is required, in the sense of being stricter (less latitude between standards and behavior), more proactive (taking the lead in moral development), and more visible (so that others know, see, and experience the model behavior). There are at least three reasons for this.

Firstly the more power SPs have, the more people feel attracted to them, the more they identify with them, and the more SPs' integrity becomes their own integrity. The higher SPs climb in the hierarchy, the more people there are below to look up to them, the more representative their function, and the more their behavior is seen to represent what they stand for. The more power an SP has, the more others identify with him or her and feel that he or she is a part of them, because a powerful SP has more influence on them, and they then receive back some of the power they have given this SP. This is why very powerful SPs are often seen as public property, increasing the expectation that they act as role models.

Secondly, the more power SPs have, the more others depend on them, and the more there is at stake. This makes SPs' integrity all the more important, raising expectations. A single misuse of power can have far-reaching consequences, so every doubt and hint of abuse must be avoided. The more power SPs have, the more is left to their discretion, and the easier it is

for them to act without others knowing or being able to take preventive measures, making confidence in their integrity all the more important. As in the case of tall trees, the more power SPs have, the more exposed they are to the wind, not only because they are more prominent, but also because the damage is greater if they fall.

As a result of people identifying with and depending on more powerful SPs, the more power they have the more critical their integrity, leading people to follow their integrity more critically too. On the one hand such SPs often seek publicity to gain prominence, thereby maintaining or increasing their power. On the other hand they occupy a position of publicity, whether they like it or not, so that the public get to know their characters, and so that their actions can be followed and inspected for integrity. This makes lapses more visible and, because they cannot afford as many slip-ups, there is an increased chance that they will be discredited. The fact that SPs in high positions are more often discredited than SPs with less power is sometimes explained by the claim that such SPs are power-crazed maniacs who do not flinch from abusing their positions.¹¹⁷ Regardless of whether this is true, it is the case that more power leads to higher expectations, closer attention for their behavior, and harsher judgments on their mistakes.

In short, the more power SPs have, the greater the need for model behavior, not only in the sense of behaving with integrity, but also in the sense of doing so visibly. Model behavior stands or falls by its visibility to others. This means that SPs who gain power in their careers, for instance through a higher or more responsible position, must realize that they cannot simply maintain their integrity as it is; they must be ambitious as regards their integrity too, allowing it to grow with their position and fulfill higher demands.

23. Integrity issues are not limited to personal enrichment or unfair advantage

Although personal enrichment clearly indicates a serious lack of integrity, it is not the only indication possible. The same applies to the use of unfair advantage. Neither are necessary conditions for declaring a person lacking in integrity. Even people disadvantaged by their own behavior or acting on good intentions may lack integrity. Behavior may even be deemed to have fallen short if an SP creates a situation involving unacceptable risks to integrity. SPs should therefore avoid placing a limited interpretation on integrity.

When SPs are accused of breaches of integrity, they often defend themselves by saying that there is no question of personal enrichment. For example, a mayor accused of fraud claimed that he had not gained any financial advantage. His political associates leapt to his defense with the same argument. People hope such retorts will take the sting out of the accusations. It may be a mitigating factor, but it does not make the SPs involved innocent. For various reasons personal enrichment is not a necessary condition of a breach of integrity.

Firstly enrichment is an extreme term in the sense that a person is only significantly richer if the sums involved are substantial. We probably would not consider someone who accepts a gift of \$100 to be significantly richer. If we equate lack of integrity with enrichment, we run the risk of limiting the domain of integrity to large-scale transgressions, seeing the rest as irrelevant tinkering around the edges, making everything is permissible as long as there is no question of personal enrichment. This gives SPs who are already rich greater latitude, because it takes more money to make them significantly richer than an SP who has little or nothing.

In order to avoid this, lack of integrity is also defined as behavior that confers an advantage. The benefit of this definition is that every advantage is an advantage, regardless of magnitude, or whether the recipient possesses a lot or a little of it. Another point in favor of this definition

is that it is not only a matter of financial advantage, as implied by enrichment, but also of non-financial advantage, such as status, enjoyment, and convenience.

Nevertheless, this does not necessarily mean that lack of integrity always involves personal advantage. A Dutch Prince attempted to counter accusations of bribery by claiming that the money received was intended for a good cause, a non-governmental conservation organization. The investigatory committee, however, did not see this as a justification.¹¹⁸ Other SPs attempted in vain to combat accusations by claiming that the money they received benefitted their parties, as in the case of German minister Frans-Jozef Strauß.¹¹⁹ However, it is not only a matter of personal advantage but also of conferring an advantage on others who have no right to it.

But we are not quite there yet. Even without advantage, behavior may still lack integrity. In fact, even if people put themselves at a disadvantage, they may lack integrity, for instance if they use confidential information to invest privately in shares. Even if the market then falls, contrary to predictions, and they suffer a loss, that makes no difference to the judgment of the integrity of the action. Confidential information has been misused.

Integrity goes further still. Even in the absence of any question of abuse, behavior lacking in integrity may have taken place. The appearance of abuse or even potential for abuse may have arisen. SPs who own shares of companies that may be influenced by their policies create the impression of potential abuse. The same applies if their immediate family members own shares in these companies, as SPs and their family members have an interest in using the information from their positions for private aims. This can even happen unconsciously and unintentionally. The SP might mention a policy detail (even over the telephone to others) that gives bystanders in the house an idea. On the other hand, SPs' portfolios may lead them unintentionally to make more positive decisions with respect to the companies in which they own shares. Owning shares in such cases makes SPs vulnerable, and this can become an integrity issue if they fail to take reasonable steps to avoid the appearance of abuse. Even if they keep such matters strictly separate, it is difficult to explain away trading in shares by a family member coinciding with an SP's decision (or that of a close associate) that may influence the value of those shares. So creating a situation in which other interests may damage proper, pure execution of SPs' tasks, or indeed creating the impression of such a situation, indicates a lack of integrity.

A breach of integrity therefore does not require demonstration of an original connection between different actions. A mayor was convicted for accepting four international trips from a contractor who later supplied two bulldozers to the municipal authority. Although the court was unable to demonstrate a direct connection, the behavior was nevertheless in conflict with the integrity expected of a member of the administration.¹²⁰ Similarly good intentions are not enough to contradict an accusation of lack of integrity. A mayor was dishonorably dismissed from office for corruption despite claiming to have served the community with heart and soul as mayor.

Integrity is therefore more than the absence of personal enrichment. However, this does not change the fact that when there is a question of personal enrichment this provides important grounds for judging behavior to lack integrity. Personal enrichment is at odds with the position of an SP, because it involves serving oneself and not the people. If, after allegations, no evidence of personal enrichment is found, that is an important finding, but it is not sufficient to declare the accused innocent.

24. Integrity in free time is relevant to integrity on the job

One reason why the private behavior of SPs is important in office is that this offers insight into their true nature and hence the way they do their jobs. Furthermore, SPs hold their position even in private. It is therefore important that they view their private behavior from the perspective of their job and ensure that it is compatible. SPs may well have a right to privacy, but the greater the significance of integrity for their job, the less that right counts.

When it comes to accusations of a lack of integrity, another much-used defense tactic is to dismiss the problem as a private matter, based on the assumption that it is no one else's business what an SP does in private (with an appeal to protection of privacy) and that it is irrelevant (because private and public roles are separate). This was François Hollande's response during a press conference to a question about his alleged extramarital affair: "I have one principle: private matters should be dealt with privately."¹²¹ However, this principle does not apply in all cases. SPs have had to step down due to private behavior, such as extramarital affairs, tax evasion, large debts, driving offences, domestic or public violence, illegal possession of weapons, discriminatory remarks, and possession of child pornography. It is therefore worth asking why and when private behavior is relevant for a position and to what extent SPs have a right to a private life.

One of the reasons why SPs' private lives are relevant from the perspective of integrity is that they offer a better insight into their true nature than when they are on duty. In private time people are able to be themselves (this is really the definition and value of private time), revealing more clearly who they are as people. There are less spotlights or protocols, and less social control. In the absence of duties, it becomes clear what people want for themselves. This true nature is important because the assumption is that how a person behaves in private says something, possibly a great deal, about the person's character, impacting the way they

behave at work. This may not necessarily be the case, but the opposite possibility cannot be eliminated either. Those who hit their life partners may not necessarily hit others while working as SPs. However, the more people hit their partners, the more they appear to lack self-control and respect for the physical integrity of others, which may also affect the way they work, because it forms part of their character. After all, an SP is not a completely different person in private from in public. If that were the case, there would be no connection, no integrity, between the person in office and in private.

Another reason why private behavior is important for the job, is that SPs still hold their positions even in private. SPs generally do not have a job with clearly delimited working hours; work and private life run together. Even if they could be strictly divided, they are still SPs in private. They represent not only what they stand for as SPs, but also their parties, organizations, or the areas of work. Others will see it this way, in any case, as someone who runs into their local mayor on vacation, for example, does not see the mayor as a random individual but as the mayor. For this reason, behavior lacking integrity in free time can damage an SP's integrity. A Chinese party official was discredited when he lost his temper at an airport after he and his family missed a flight. An online video shows him causing havoc, smashing computers at the gate and throwing telephones. Although this occurred in his free time, he was suspended from the party because his integrity as an SP had been damaged. It also damaged the integrity of the party because at the time the party leader was working hard to combat corruption and misconduct.¹²²

It is therefore important as an SP to view one's own private behavior from the perspective of one's position, and not to engage in private behavior that damages the integrity of office. Not every misdemeanor, down to minor traffic offences, will be relevant (because, as discussed above, SPs are not expected to be moral superheroes). However, the latitude for transgression for SPs acting as private individuals is narrower than that of ordinary citizens. The greater the power and public character of the position the narrower that latitude. Irish prime minister Bertie Ahern was discredited when it emerged that he had underreported his income to the treasury, and a German minister of development for not paying import duty for a carpet he had bought during a business trip.¹²³ Both were discredited because of the high positions they held. The space for transgression becomes narrower the more the transgression is related to the virtues and authority demanded for the function. An SP with responsibility for transport

cannot afford as many private driving offences as other SPs, and an SP with responsibility for finance cannot afford as many private financial problems as others.

It is important for SPs to realize that their private behavior influences their position, and to be aware of the room for maneuver. How far over the speed limit do they have to be before they are required to resign? How much alcohol can they drink before they are called to account? How much debt can they afford without getting into trouble on account of their job? These questions should be asked not for the sake of setting specific boundaries with respect to integrity (see chapter 2 on this issue), but to gain an impression of how much private behavior affects the job.¹²⁴

Incidentally, the discussion above does not mean that it is acceptable to rifle through and expose an SP's entire private life in order to determine their integrity. SPs have a right to privacy just like any citizen, but the greater their power and thus the significance of their integrity for their job, the less that right counts, because then there is more at stake for others and they will require more evidence and certainty that "their" SPs are honest.¹²⁵

There is a further complicating factor. A purely private matter, irrelevant to the position, can become relevant if private behavior becomes public. When behavior lacking integrity becomes known, it becomes highly charged (there is outrage, questions are asked) and can no longer be dismissed as a private issue. So SPs should not think that private matters are never relevant to their position, nor can they dismiss matters by appealing to a right to privacy. Once an issue is public, it is difficult to make it private again.

Private behavior can also have a positive effect on an SP's public image. SPs who deliberately feature in the media make use of this mechanism. For instance there are SPs who are known for hobbies such as hunting (creating the impression of someone who can also go after others and eliminate them in a professional capacity), playing the piano (giving an impression of sensitivity), racing (for an image of speed and physical prowess), or canoeing, as in the case of Russian president Vladimir Putin (who established an image of fitness and masculine strength, photographed with his upper body exposed to enhance the effect). The result is of course that the more they use their private lives to gain prominence in their positions, the less they can appeal to privacy if their position raises interest in their private lives.

25. Integrity is others expecting from you what you expect from them

Whatever integrity SPs expect of others they must first apply to themselves for consistency's sake. SPs should therefore make sure they fulfill expectations before imposing integrity on others. However, this does not mean that SPs need to be squeaky clean. It is also a question of the way they impose integrity on others.

SPs are seen as hypocrites if they apply double standards, for instance expecting higher morals of others than of themselves. Integrity in the sense of consistency should be a standard. After all, in order to be consistent, SPs must apply their moral expectations of others to themselves. More importantly, SPs' moral expectations of others must first and foremost be applied to themselves. We cannot expect a given standard of others until we apply it to ourselves. To do otherwise would be inconsistent. In other words, whatever SPs expect of others, others should be able to expect of SPs.

A congressman had to abandon his hopes of re-election after he was caught driving under the influence. The fact that he had pressed for stricter regulation against drunk driving in congress weighed against him. The member was seen as a hypocrite because he argued for stricter rules while acting in contradiction to the rules. By arguing for stricter standards he directly raised the standard on the basis of which others could reasonably judge him. This discrepancy damaged his credibility. In any case, his behavior was interpreted in this way. As an SP he had failed to stand up for what he argued for, or to align his behavior with it.

The notion of integrity as consistency also applies when it comes to enforcing standards. When someone confronts, corrects, or sanctions others over a violation of a standard, this implies that they consider this standard important. Otherwise they would not take the trouble to confront others about it. It is therefore hypocritical and implausible if people consider the

standard important for others and not for themselves. Enforcement of standards creates the expectation that one will comply with the norms one imposes on others. This makes SPs vulnerable, giving others the arguments to go in search of possible hypocrisy. Once found, this hypocrisy undermines not only the credibility of the enforcer, but also the effectiveness of the enforcement. This makes it a proven defense tactic for those who are checked and confronted: to move the spotlight from those who are subject to enforcement to the enforcers themselves.

However, it is not only those who are called to account who use the morality imposed on them to turn the tables. Others who see SPs imposing morals may confront them about it. For instance, several politicians who fiercely criticized US president Bill Clinton for his relationship with Monica Lewinsky, a White House intern, subsequently had to quit when it emerged that they too had had illicit sexual encounters.¹²⁶ Similarly the party leader who accused his opponent of prevarication and dishonesty during an election campaign later paid dearly after the elections when party opinion poll ratings dropped substantially because the party had not consistently kept its election pledges, having previously held up consistency as an important value. The president who called a fellow party member a little penny pincher for having work on his house paid by the government, later became known as a big penny pincher when it transpired that he had acted to the advantage of his own company and those of his friends. The moral he had imposed on others came right back at him.

It is not only specific standards that SPs impose on others that lead to expectations of consistency. The virtues SPs preach to others are also projected back onto them. For instance, SPs who frequently criticize others, implying the importance of giving and receiving criticism, invite others to criticize them in return. This can come back at them like a boomerang. A secretary of state for education had to step down soon after taking office when it emerged that he had carried out private work on university writing paper as a professor. He was specifically criticized because shortly before he was appointed secretary of state, he had been very critical of national politics. Anyone who is so critical can expect others to be critical in return. That is only consistent. Australian prime minister Tony Abbott met with the same mechanism when he was accused of not complying with his election pledges, having previously made the same criticism of his political opponents.¹²⁷

Preaching virtues and standards to others brings with it the risk to integrity of setting oneself up for a fall, so SPs should take measures to avoid such risks. This does not necessarily mean that SPs need to be squeaky clean with respect to the morals they impose on others. It is primarily a question of the way in which the moral is imposed. If this is done from a position of moral supremacy, it increases the likelihood of a subsequent fall. If it is done with appropriate care and an eye for one's own limitations, that chance is smaller. As a minister said when he had to judge improper behavior on the part of a prince, "In this very special case the cabinet is asked for a judgment on a person. Judging a person is always a moving issue and is described in the Bible as follows: in the same way you judge others, you will be judged, and with the measure you use, it will be measured to you. The cabinet must be aware of its limitations."¹²⁸

V. Ideals and standpoints

Part V, consisting of four chapters, is about the meaning of integrity for the ideals and standpoints of SPs.

26. Integrity is mainly about having ideals

Ideals are a matter of what SPs want to achieve for society. SPs cannot have integrity without ideals, because ideals give direction and authenticity. Without these, SPs degenerate into pragmatists and technocrats. SPs with integrity have ideals they really believe in.

In the previous chapters we looked at how personal integrity, in terms of identity and expectations of others, can turn against a person. In this respect integrity is a negative concept: it is a threat, a risk, a danger. However, integrity is also a positive concept. If a person is said to have integrity, this is not so much a matter of what they do not do, but primarily about what they actually do. Ideals are a necessary condition for this. An SP cannot have integrity without ideals, so a pragmatist, someone who does not believe in ideals (or takes pragmatism as the ideal), cannot have integrity.

Ideals are about what motivates people and what they stand for. This is a question of higher personal aims. Ideals relate to people's reasons for taking office and what they hope to achieve, hence going beyond what the position prescribes in terms of rules and behavior. From the perspective of integrity, when it comes to ideals it is a question of what SPs want to mean to others and society, how they intend to serve the people, and where they intend to make a positive contribution. For example, ideals may relate to improving the position of a particular group (such as the disadvantaged, the disabled, or immigrants) or an issue one wants to address (such as the environment, employment protection, or traffic safety). Ideals can also be couched in ultimate values, doctrines, or principles to which people devote their efforts, such as solidarity, freedom, and sustainability.

Having ideals is necessary for an SP because it gives direction and makes people goal oriented. As one party stated in its manifesto, "A politician without ideals is like a ship without

a compass: adrift.”¹²⁹ Ideals give color and authenticity. A role is not carried out mechanically, despite the presence of the required virtues, but is personified: the position is fulfilled through ideals and commitments. The ideals are the connective tissue between personal identity and integrity.

Without ideals SPs degenerate into pragmatists or technocrats, something they are often accused of and criticized for, a common stumbling block. As a disappointed congresswoman said of her own party, “I thought it was about ideas and I had those. But that’s not what it’s about. It’s about feasibility within the coalition. There is not much enthusiasm here.” As another member of congress said, “We talk too little about the Big Issues... We never discuss Higher Matters. We stand for our own little domains.”¹³⁰ At the same time this explains why SPs such as Mahatma Gandhi, Abraham Lincoln, and Nelson Mandela were admired. They had big ideals, ideas about others and a better society.

In order to discover and determine their own ideas SPs can ask themselves why. Why am I taking up this position? Why am I an SP? As a candidate for the US vice presidency Sarah Palin answered these questions as follows: “Politics isn’t just a game of clashing parties and competing interests. The right reason is to challenge the status quo, to serve the common good, and to leave this nation better than we found it.”¹³¹ And US senator Paul Wellstone replied as follows: “Politics isn’t about big money or power games; it’s about the improvement of people’s lives.”¹³² It is also about whether people really believe in their own answers. As one member of congress said, “If you want to become a good politician, you have to believe in what you do.”¹³³

27. Integrity is the common thread of the job, career, and life itself

Integrity is the common thread of the entire job, career, and even an SP's life. After all, integrity is the extent to which a life is integrated. SPs should therefore strive for their ideals systematically and constantly, and this should be clear from their behavior. However, this does not mean that SPs cannot change their ideals. Since every living person has a life, integrity is important and different for everyone, and as long as we are still alive, it is not finished.

Having ideals is a necessary condition, as stated in the previous chapter, but simply having them is insufficient. Ideals should be stable and sustainable. Anyone who switches from one ideal to another will not be seen as having integrity, because there is no evidence of commitment to the ideals chosen. Moreover ideals ensure recognition and identity if you work for them for a long time and make this consistently visible in your behavior. After all, ideals are by definition issues that cannot be realized in a short time period. An ideal is something you commit to for the long term.

In chapter 10, integrity was described as patterns of behavior, focusing on the way reprehensible behavior indicates failing virtues. In the same way, behavioral patterns can indicate leading ideals, for instance through the cases SPs choose to tackle, the tasks they take on, the subjects they speak out about, the motions and amendments they submit, the memoranda they publish, and the additional jobs they hold show whether SPs are led by ideals, and if so, what those ideals are. What people do indicates what they stand for.

Integrity is the thread of the job, career, and even an SP's entire life. According to political philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre integrity is about living an integrated life. This is a matter of the unity of life. Life is a narrative. Integrity is narrative unity. People are co-authors of their own

lives. They are actors in a play in which they are also writing the script. Integrity “resides in the unity of a narrative which links birth to life to death as narrative beginning to middle to end.”¹³⁴ According to MacIntyre it is a question of how life looks once it is over.

The more visible and consistent the life thread, the stronger the person’s integrity. That is why a politician who changes party has a lot of explaining to do – in many cases this can only be justified by loyalty to one’s own ideals. The same applies to a public administrator who changes position frequently without completing the term in office (which can generally only be justified if it is in the interest of society, one has been asked to move to the next position, or the aims of the previous position were achieved ahead of time). An incoherent package of duties, positions, and additional jobs is also bad for an SP (and is often only justifiable by the claim that the variety allows them to know and serve society as broadly as possible). SPs who have made the world a better place, such as Gandhi, Lincoln, and Mandela, are admired not only because they had ideals, as mentioned in the previous chapter, but also because these ideals defined their lives. They devoted themselves so systematically and constantly that their ideals were visible as a pattern in their behavior, forming their identity. Their ideals became identity-forming commitments, ground projects, as philosopher Bernard Williams called them, giving their lives purpose.¹³⁵

SPs should therefore guard against inconsistency becoming their only consistency. When accepting new positions the extent to which they fit in with the integrity of a person’s life story is therefore continually relevant. That life story can consist of different parts, so people do not always have to do the same thing for the sake of consistency, nor do they always have to cling to ideals once they have chosen them. There can be good reasons for changing ideals, even if it means losing support. Vice president Chester Arthur followed US president James Garfield after he was shot dead by an applicant rejected for an official position. The murder led Arthur to realize that the “spoils system”, whereby the party who wins the elections hands out official jobs to its own supporters, a system he had long adhered to, was morally bankrupt. Arthur began to introduce the “merit system”, selecting based on suitability of officials rather than political color. This led to his becoming estranged from the people who had helped him become president, costing him his second term.¹³⁶

Viewing integrity from the perspective of a person's life story shows its relevance for everyone. Every living person has a life, so integrity is important to people simply for that reason. At the same time, integrity is different for everyone because everyone has an individual life. Since integrity is a life's work, it is never finished as long as a person lives.

28. Integrity must fit the person

The art of integrity is to unite position with personality. Taking office as an SP should not mean acting a part. Before taking up office, SPs must therefore establish whether the position suits them, or will suit them, since it is possible to grow into a position. One position fitting is no guarantee that others will fit.

On the one hand integrity is doing what is expected in office, on the other hand being oneself. But it goes further still. The art is to combine the two. Integrity is about the position fitting and feeling natural, about embodying the job.

Someone who takes office as an SP is not acting a part. Good actors can make the audience forget that they are acting, but working with integrity as an SP involves more than acting. People are true SPs when their positions fit their true nature, who they really are. This is existential integrity. The position corresponds, as philosopher Søren Kierkegaard expresses it, with the true self. As a princess once said, "...if it's not who you are, then you fail. As a princess too."¹³⁷ SPs can therefore work honestly but still lack integrity because holding office does not come naturally to them. A weekly magazine once called a prime minister "the man who played prime minister", because he came across as artificial and wooden in the role.¹³⁸

The fit between a person and a position can vary not only from person to person but also from job to job. A good fit between one person and one job is no guarantee of a good fit for that person in other jobs, even in the same area. One mayor was praised as exemplary, as if the job were "made for him" and he was "born for" that role, fully embodying his position, but when he went into national politics, becoming a party leader, he was much criticized because the work did not sit naturally with him. He could not get a grip on the job. He was more an administrator than a politician, more of a connector than someone who could

handle opposition, more of a manager than a leader. This made the position a struggle for him, as was painfully obvious to others. After two years he stepped down from his job and left national politics.¹³⁹

A position must correspond with one's own identity. There must be chemistry between the position and the person. So taking office is not only a matter of being capable and willing, but also of a good fit, and not only whether you think so yourself, but also whether others agree.

Ideally one should choose a job that fits. It is difficult when there is little or no choice, for instance in the case of an heir to the throne or someone asked to take office in the absence of more suitable candidates, where a position must be filled quickly. At the same time, as in the case of clothing, people can adjust to their work over time, improving the fit. You can grow into your role, as long as you are minded to do so.

29. Integrity is expressing well-thought-out viewpoints

Having your own views is an essential virtue for SPs because it shows you are autonomous and stand for something. A standpoint has integrity if it (1) is well-thought-out, (2) is unified with an SP's ideals and identity, and (3) is expressed. However, silence is often imposed on SPs for the sake of collective integrity. This makes it all the more important that SPs use the freedom their positions provide to express standpoints with integrity.

"A typical vice of American politics is the avoidance of saying anything real on real issues," said former president Theodore Roosevelt.¹⁴⁰ An SP without an opinion cannot easily be seen as having integrity. Having your own opinion shows autonomy and independent thought, an indication that you are not led by what others, the majority, or policy makers think. Having your own viewpoint shows that you stand for something. A minister was praised for his integrity in the media when he took a stand on the liberation of three war criminals, despite the fact that this met with fierce resistance in parliament and society. Similarly, a member of parliament was praised for her stand on strengthening women's rights in her country despite a great deal of opposition, and a senator was praised internationally when he firmly denounced government corruption.

It is not only a question of having a point of view, but of viewpoints showing integrity. Such viewpoints must be well-thought-out and consistent with your ideals and identity. An SP who has a viewpoint but wavers at the first sign of opposition fails to exhibit support for a well-thought-out position. Such SPs will be seen as impulsive, superficial, and immature, not as good examples of integrity.

At the same time it is not always easy to come to a well-thought-out viewpoint.¹⁴¹ New questions can suddenly come up requiring a direct response and sometimes there is no time

for careful consideration. The plethora of documents can also lead people to lean heavily on what others tell them. Some may even take advantage and abuse this fact. SPs with no views of their own are easily suggestible to others, leading to accusations that they are easily swayed or manipulated, or vulnerable to bad influence. Associates such as employees and colleagues may promote this effect by filling an SP's agenda, raising issues at the last minute, and overwhelming the SP with information. Even their free time may be filled to avoid giving them time to think for themselves.¹⁴²

Having views with integrity is therefore important, but it is just as important to stand up for them. Say what you think and think what you say. French philosopher Michel Foucault calls this *parrhesia*, speaking openly.¹⁴³ Only then can others see what a person stands for. If a person expresses no opinions, they stand for nothing, as in the case of a French mayor who strayed from the well-trodden path by spending five days on hunger strike in a tent in front of the government buildings because he felt his commune, with high unemployment and low incomes, should not have to help pay for the crisis. Only when the government promised constructive help did he stop his protest.¹⁴⁴

However this does not mean that SPs must have views on all issues. Integrity is a question of having views on matters relating to one's own ideals and identity, making SPs who they want to be. For this they need the freedom to express their consciences. In doing so, they show what they consider important and worth supporting, laying a connection between their position and their personal identity, and showing that they are prepared to stand up for this. Conformity is often the easiest option, the path of least resistance, whereas going against the grain shows not only that you stand for something but also that you are strong. For instance a member of parliament spoke about her experiences of the negative consequences of conformity: "I thought, I'll vote differently from the others [in my party] for once. The party chairwoman said, do what you please, but remember, you can only be the village idiot once. ... You're under pressure to express yourself exactly as everyone else does When I came in I was armed to the teeth. I now realize I'm well on my way to becoming precisely the person I don't want to be."¹⁴⁵ By conforming and silencing your own conscience, you lose yourself. That is why it is important that SPs have the freedom to express their consciences.

The difficult and sometimes tragic aspect of an SP's position is that it generally offers little freedom to air individual opinions on politics and administrative subjects publicly, so that individual integrity is less clear. Administrators and politicians are often expected not to express their opinions on subjects outside their own remit in public, and officials and employees are even expected not to express any public views on politics and administration. This may promote unity and integrity for the collectives they belong to, but it means that SPs may be seen as one-sided, limited. This makes it all the more important that SPs make the most of the space their positions offer to develop, adopt, and express well-thought-out views.¹⁴⁶

VI. Risks from environment and power

Part VI, consisting of eight chapters, is about the risks to SPs' integrity from their environment and from their own power.

30. Integrity is threatened by ambition: the greater the ambition the greater the threat

As their ambition increases, SPs run more integrity risks, such as (1) decline in the quality of their decisions, (2) less effective execution of those decisions, (3) less coherence between decisions, and (4) an increase in bad decisions. SPs must therefore have realistic ambitions.

It is good to have ideals, and all the better to stand up for them, but SPs should avoid overreaching themselves. Having too many ambitions, even with the best of intentions, brings various risks to integrity.

Firstly, having many ambitions risks lowering the quality of decision making because SPs have insufficient time to assimilate preparatory information, weigh up options, and think through the consequences. The multitude of ambitions and decisions to be made could lead SPs to miss things or make suboptimal or downright bad decisions. A large number of ambitions also makes an easy target for critics: an SP has invited mistakes by trying to do too much at once. Mistakes show that SPs have bitten off more than they could chew, forming the basis for a lack of integrity: they stand to be accused of setting out too hastily, not knowing their limits, and taking on too much.

A second risk is making good decisions but giving too little attention to carrying them out and checking them, instead leaving a trail of half-measures and incomplete actions, which will subsequently be seen as failures. This can quickly damage integrity, because culpability resides in a lack of persistence, commitment, and discipline. There is a gap between what you want and what you achieve, or an inconsistency between good decisions and bad execution.

A third risk of big ambitions is that the many decisions, proposals, and plans lack cohesion, either in appearance or in fact. Integrity, after all, means unity, coherence, and cohesion. The absence of cohesion or a clear line means easy pickings for the critics. You can expect accusations such as “lack of focus”, “scattergun policy”, “lack of vision”, “unclear course”, “like a headless chicken”, and “disjointed”.

Finally, because you want so much and are so busy, you risk becoming impatient and making inappropriate decisions. An assistant of John F. Kennedy once said, “Everybody believes in democracy until he gets to the White House and then you begin to believe in dictatorship, because it’s so hard to get things done.”¹⁴⁷ Dictatorship is a risk because you want to achieve targets and democratic processes slow things down, forming a hindrance, or even, in your own eyes, leading to bad decisions. You risk becoming insistent and domineering, because you think you have no time to lose. It was with good reason that top official John Dean gave his book about the Watergate scandal the title *Blind Ambition*.¹⁴⁸

In short, it is a case of taking care to ensure that in their enthusiasm to run, SPs do not run down a blind alley. It is important to have realistic, feasible ambitions. It is equally important to be able to decide to take fewer good decisions rather than more half-good decisions and to ensure that good decisions are carried through properly. At the same time SPs should realize that democratic decision-making processes simply take time and that one should respect that, because such processes embody a precious value and do justice to those involved. Creating support for decisions also takes time, and that time can only be spent once.

31. Integrity is threatened by multi-tasking: the more tasks the greater the threat

The more duties and positions an SP takes on, the greater the risk to integrity because (1) there is less time for each separate task, (2) the likelihood of conflict of interest rises, and (3) it becomes more difficult to maintain a common thread. It is therefore important for SPs to work out whether the tasks and jobs they take on are compatible.

One strategy for acquiring power is to take on as many tasks and jobs as possible. The trick is to maximize the size of your portfolio, participation on different committees, and the number of additional jobs you take on. This allows you to voice your opinion everywhere, stay up to date with everything, and develop a large network. From an integrity perspective, however, it is a risk, even if it is done with the best intentions of learning about society and serving as well as possible. There are at least three reasons why this is a risk to integrity.

Firstly the more jobs SPs take on, the less time for each task, so they risk having too little time and attention to do things well: attention becomes fragmented and it is impossible to concentrate fully on each task. Especially if the main job requires a great deal of time and attention, additional jobs will only create an impression of insufficient focus on the central role. For that reason there was concern among members of congress when they publicly questioned a governor's eligibility for reappointment in view of his fourteen additional jobs, which doubled his private income. Similarly there was considerable criticism for a party leader soon after his election when a magazine revealed his many additional paid jobs from which he earned as much as he did from his regular income as a congressman, while rarely showing his face in congress.

Secondly, taking on more jobs increases the chance of conflict of interest. After all, each job has its own interests. The more jobs, the more interests there are to be served. Accumulating

jobs increases the chance of conflict of interest and mixing of tasks, to the point that others no longer know in what capacity the SP is speaking. Even the appearance of conflict of interest can damage integrity.

Thirdly, it becomes more difficult to find the common thread in the multiplicity of tasks. The more tasks a person has, the harder it is to maintain cohesion and unity between them. It becomes more difficult to express individual identity, because when everything runs together, neither the SP nor outsiders can make head or tail of the situation.

For integrity it is therefore important to ensure that the combination of tasks and jobs is feasible. They should be compatible in terms of time management, as well as credibility, clarity, and independence. As a commissioner said, "Personally when it comes to additional jobs I always ask myself: is there any conflict with my main job and is it compatible with my main job in terms of time and effort?"¹⁴⁹

32. Integrity is revealed by relationships with others

SPs' relationships tell us a great deal about their integrity, because these can influence their own integrity and because SPs have an affinity with their associates. The extent to which the integrity of others rubs off on an SP depends on proximity. This interdependence of integrity can also have positive effects. For the sake of their integrity, SPs should be selective about entering into and breaking off relationships.

In addition to integrity playing a role in the compatibility of an SP's jobs, it also affects their relationships. Relationships tell us about a person's integrity. How?

Firstly, the people an SP spends time with can affect their integrity. The circles in which SPs move affect their thoughts, opinions, and actions. An SP who mixes in the underworld is more susceptible to illegal activities. For that reason a council member was discredited when it emerged that he had connections with an extremist organization. Similarly there were calls for Japanese minister of justice, Keishu Tanaka, to resign when it became known that he had played a ceremonial role at a gangster's wedding 30 years previously.¹⁵⁰

Secondly, one's choice of associates expresses one's own integrity. People are drawn to those with whom they have an affinity, like choosing like, so the choice of associates reflects a person's identity. A socialist alderman was criticized when it emerged that he had close relations with a wealthy businessman. This was seen as hypocritical by his supporters: how can a person who fights against capitalism embrace a capitalist at the same time? Similarly a prince was discredited when it became known that he regularly mixed with obscure businessmen. What would a prince be doing there, was the critical question from society. Even in the absence of personal contact, associations with people can be an indication of integrity. For instance a liberal congressman was criticized when it was suggested that he had sent fan mail to a leader of an extreme racist party at the age of 16.

The extent to which the integrity of others rubs off on SPs depends on their proximity: the closer they are, as with family, friends, and colleagues, the greater the effect. After all, we form a unit with these people, or so it is assumed. Northern Irish prime minister Peter Robinson stepped down temporarily when it emerged that his 60-year-old wife had had an affair with a 19-year-old man, and had arranged for £50,000 to go to project developers for this man to set up his own café.¹⁵¹ For this reason people also pay close attention to the life partners of members of royal families. New members will become part of the family and play a part in determining its integrity. For this reason there was outrage when Norwegian Crown Prince Haakon started a relationship with Mette-Marit Tsjessem Høiby. The criticism from the Norwegian public related to her rough lifestyle and the fact that she brought a child with her from a previous marriage to a drug baron. At a press conference a few days before their marriage she said, “I led a wild life and paid a high price for my life experience. Unfortunately I cannot turn back time and undo everything, but I have grown stronger for it and will do my utmost best in my future role as crown princess.”¹⁵²

This interdependence of different people’s integrity can also have positive effects: other people’s integrity can rub off on one’s own by the mechanism described above. SPs can use this when they want to improve their reputation for integrity, by connecting themselves with someone with a better reputation, for instance by placing someone who has made a big name for integrity on the candidate list or on a committee. This rubs off on others on the list or committee, although those others may in turn have a negative effect on the reputation of the person brought in for their integrity.

It is therefore important that SPs take care about who they associate with. This applies in private to friends and family, and in office to the composition of committees, parties, and management, as well as who you speak to, work with, and maintain relations with. Who should you take into your confidence, who do you involve in decisions, and who do you bounce ideas off? Who do you congratulate on happy events, who do you greet, and who do you eat lunch with? Who do you invite to events such as conferences, meetings, and receptions? Integrity can also be seen in the relationships people break off, who they dismiss, and who they end collaborations or private relationships with.

33. Integrity is threatened by the environment

SPs cannot be seen as having integrity if they are estranged from themselves. This estrangement can occur due to pressure from the environment, such as (1) pressure to perform, (2) pressure to compete, and (3) time pressure. However, pressure from the environment is never a valid excuse for a lack of personal integrity.

SPs cannot be seen as having integrity if they are estranged from themselves. They are then no longer themselves, do not know themselves, or have completely or partially lost themselves. The true self, the original identity, is suppressed, resulting in loss of unity. Speech, action, and even thought is inconsistent with their deepest convictions and beliefs.

This alienation can arise in public office. Politicians of one party, for example, described their leader as deformed, changing from smart to sly, from good-natured to villain, from cautious to paranoid, from disarming to tense, and from clay to stone.¹⁵³ Other SPs have been described as contorted, hardened, and crippled.¹⁵⁴ They started with ideals and ended up corrupt. They started with the conviction that they should not get involved in power politics, but ended up addicted to power. As a member of parliament wrote in his book on politics, "It seems that once they have had a sniff of power, even well-brought-up people of good character are capable of fighting to the death,"¹⁵⁵ as in the case of friends who sacrifice one another for the position of alderman, or who pinch a colleague's position as spokesperson on an important topic when he is off sick for the day.

The loss of integrity can be caused by the environment in which SPs work. As German statesman Otto van Bismarck said, "Politics ruins the character."¹⁵⁶ This is partly a function of the pressure the environment places on SPs. There are at least three aspects to this pressure.

Firstly there is pressure to perform. The pressure to perform on the job is often high. People place their trust in SPs and results are expected. SPs are not simply there to mind the shop. They must contribute, deal with issues, and bring change and improvement, so SPs' performance is critically observed. They must prove that public confidence is well-placed and that they are the right people for the job. Furthermore, they must keep the promises they made when they were appointed. If not, this will damage their integrity and they will be called to account.

Secondly there is competition. Power is scarce and highly sought-after. Political parties compete with one another for voters' favor and media attention to realize their agendas. There is even party-internal competition, because a list of candidates can only have one ranking, one job is more interesting in terms of content and profile than another, there is limited time to speak in meetings, and the number of subjects a party can address is limited. "Only the things that float to the top remain," a minister once said, adding that a politician may be better off with an opponent than an ally. Fellow party members and colleagues are the most dangerous: the internal battle can be fierce.¹⁵⁷ Even mayors compete over attracting business, good public facilities, and subsidies, as well as posts in the more attractive municipalities. Competition is fierce in situations where there is only one winner. As US president Richard Nixon put it, "Finishing second in the Olympics gets you silver. Finishing second in politics gets you oblivion."¹⁵⁸

Thirdly there is time pressure. The time available is scarce. Terms of office are limited, as are the number of hours in a day and a person's shelf life. Deadlines for commitments and promises can be stifling. Time is dictated by urgent requests, extinguishing fires, and dealing with breathless bystanders. Decisions must be made at short notice, SPs are required to make choices right away, or come out with a viewpoint immediately. This can make the job feel like a marathon run at sprinting pace, where you cannot relax and must be permanently on the ball, and if you do well you are rewarded with another marathon, another job or term of office.

The necessity of performing and competing under time pressure can have all kinds of consequences for physical condition, such as fatigue, stress, and heart problems. In order to escape the pressure, some people seek refuge in excessive use of stimulants, thrill-seeking,

or forbidden fruits such as extramarital affairs and illegal betting. Mayor Rob Ford gave “extreme stress” as the reason for his excessive behavior.¹⁵⁹ Pressure can also accentuate bad character traits and suppress good ones. The most serious problem occurs if the character itself degenerates, for instance because you are under so much pressure to perform that you become obsessed, distorting your character, or in such a rush to compete or meet deadlines that you do things you would never otherwise do, or become so involved in the job that you no longer have time for yourself and lose your grip on your identity, only thinking of yourself in terms of the job or only thinking of the job itself.

It is essential that SPs realize how these factors can affect their own integrity, and take action if they notice that they are in the grip of their environment and that it is damaging their integrity. Pressure from the environment is never a valid excuse for lack of integrity. As US president Harry Truman said, “If you can’t stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.”¹⁶⁰ If you cannot take the pressure, you have no business becoming an SP.

34. Integrity is nurtured by the environment

The environment can also have a positive influence on the integrity of SPs. Pressure from the environment offers opportunities to display and grow integrity. The environment is more than just a source of pressure. Rules, role models, and other people around the SP can also be sources of integrity. A transparent environment encourages integrity. Since SPs form part of the environment for others, they can also feed the integrity of others.

The effect of the environment on SPs' behavior and character is often seen as negative. As the previous chapter points out, it can put integrity under pressure, but if we only view it from this narrow perspective, this gives too much credit to personal integrity, undervaluing the environment. The environment can also have a positive influence on SPs' integrity.

Pressure from the environment can have positive effects. Philosopher Bert Musschenga states that integrity is like a metal that must be tempered to make steel.¹⁶¹ The heat in the kitchen (see Truman's remark in the previous chapter) can also purify and shape a person. The pressure makes people strong, allowing them to discover what they really stand for, and teaching them to set priorities. The greater the pressure on integrity, the more opportunities to show and grow this quality. US president John F. Kennedy began his book about eight brave senators with a quote from Ernest Hemmingway: "Virtue under pressure."¹⁶² The truly virtuous SP can withstand pressure.

However, the environment affects integrity in more ways than just pressure, and integrity is more than a counterweight to negative influences in the environment. There can be positive aspects to the environment that contribute to an SP's integrity. It is important to use these factors to protect and develop one's own integrity. In the initial chapters we therefore looked at the use of written and unwritten rules, those which teach SPs to do

right, where they would not otherwise know, want, or be able to do so. There are additional positive environmental factors. These mainly become visible when one imagines oneself standing alone, without the environment.

Imagine that we find ourselves on an uninhabited island. We would have no one else to learn integrity from. We would be left entirely to our own devices. The advantage of SP positions is that there are others: SPs always deal with other people. These people form an opportunity for SPs to learn what is desirable, what can be improved, and how to develop themselves. We can learn from observing how others deal with problems, make decisions, convert their ideals into standpoints, set boundaries, and view the interests and expectations of others. We can lean on such role models and gain ideas from them.

However, role modeling behavior by others is not the only source of support. We can also feed our integrity through people who are not models. By sharing integrity issues with colleagues, for example, we can learn their thoughts, experiences, and advice, improving our own viewpoints, inspiring new ideas, and making solutions more concrete. By looking for advice among other interested parties we can learn about their expectations and feelings, deepening our own ideals and views, so that we can better anticipate expectations and feelings. Other sources of personal integrity can be predecessors in the job, mentors, coaches, and prominent figures. They can point out stumbling blocks, weaknesses, and points for improvement, as well as what is going well and should be maintained.

There is an additional factor besides rules, role models, and other people around SPs, that can benefit integrity, and that is transparency. Imagine that we could make ourselves invisible. No one would see who we were and what we did. Whatever we did, we would do freely. All brakes would be released, leading to all kinds of inappropriate behavior. That, at least, is Plato's view: we would murder the king and take the throne.¹⁶³ For that reason transparency in a job promotes the integrity of the SP, inhibiting abuse and encouraging proper use of power.

The effect also works in the opposite direction. SPs form part of the environment of those around them, so we can also ask to what extent SPs feed the integrity of others, for instance acting as role models, advising others on advancing their integrity, and creating transparency by checking on others and calling them to account. Integrity in this respect

is not only about getting the best out of the environment, but also about creating a good environment for others. To put it another way, integrity is not only a matter of one's personal integrity but also promoting that of others.

35. Integrity demands insight into the effects of power on integrity

SPs' power is inherently corrupting. Power (1) is addictive, (2) gives rise to a feeling of supremacy, and (3) is stifling. SPs therefore need to realize the effect of power on personal integrity.

According to American senior official James O'Toole, "People with integrity 'know who they are'."¹⁶⁴ But in order to know your own integrity you also need to know the effect of the environment, in both a negative and a positive sense. In this respect it is also important to know the effect of power from the job on personal integrity. According to political scientist Patrick Doherty integrity corrodes under the acid of power.¹⁶⁵ As British historian Lord Acton stated, "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."¹⁶⁶ What inherent corrupting effects of power should SPs at least be aware of?

Firstly power is addictive and self-perpetuating. Power can lead people to do things they would not otherwise be capable of. Because power is scarce, it is in demand (and because it is in demand, it is scarce). There is an irresistible charm to power. "Power is the ultimate aphrodisiac," according to US minister Henry Kissinger.¹⁶⁷ People with power have attention, are listened to, count for something, and can have their say. Once people have had a taste of power, they often want more. The thirst for power cannot be stilled and grows continually.¹⁶⁸ The more power people have and the longer they have it, the more difficult it is to part with. As one minister wrote, "The longer you are in power, the more difficult it is to let go."¹⁶⁹ People become attached to the trappings of power because it gives a sense of purpose and meaning to life; power energizes, becoming part of one's identity. For this reason self-preservation is the instinct of power. This leads to power politics: politics is practiced out of fear of losing power or the desire to defend and increase power for its own sake.

Secondly, power leads to a sense of supremacy, the feeling of being above others, and therefore able to get away with more than them, leading SPs to think they know best, that they do not owe others an explanation, that people will listen to every demand they make. Power goes to people's heads, having an intoxicating effect, and as with alcohol, it reduces self-control. There is also the risk that people assume the reverse holds: if the powerful can get away with more than others, then doing so is a sign of power, and the more you can get away with, the more power you must have.

Thirdly, power is stifling. Power creates enemies, as well as followers and friends who want to benefit from, share in, or influence that power. The closer you are to the power of another person, the more power you have and believe you have. Being close to power makes you more important and visible. Power even has an eroticizing effect, a seductive, sensual force of attraction on those who lack it. Power therefore creates yes-men, people who flatter the powerful and follow them blindly. As one deputy prime minister said, "You are made important, there is always interest in you, people run around for you and curry favor with you. When you have risen so high, you have to stand very firm to stay normal."¹⁷⁰ As a result negative feedback from others does not penetrate as deep, SPs think themselves more successful and better than they really are, seeing themselves as untouchable, indomitable, and unbeatable. In other words, power is stifling: it overwhelms a person's grip on reality. Margaret Thatcher, for instance, became increasingly reckless because, it is claimed, she gained more and more support from backbenchers during her time as prime minister, causing her to lose her sense of reality.¹⁷¹

"If you want to discover just what there is in a man – give him power," said US president Abraham Lincoln.¹⁷² SPs must therefore realize the effect of power on their integrity. The problem is that their view is clouded by power: power distorts self-image and our view of the environment. Writer George Bernard Shaw therefore advises, "Better keep yourself clean and bright; you are the window through which you must see the world."¹⁷³ For that reason SPs should not be too hasty in claiming not to be in the grip of power.

36. Integrity sours with cynicism

SPs run the risk of becoming cynical, leading to a souring of their integrity: their ideals and principles fade, their motivation decreases, and they become negative about the value of being an SP and the integrity of others. SPs can avoid cynicism by (1) paying sufficient attention to the positive sides of their jobs, (2) being realistic, (3) handling criticism well, (4) allowing the facts to shine through, and (5) looking for sources of energy and hope.

SPs who start their jobs idealistic and in good spirits run the risk of becoming frustrated because they achieve less than they had hoped, morality disappoints them, they receive less appreciation than expected, and meet with more opposition than they could ever have imagined. Such frustrations can lead to cynicism. SPs become embittered and casual about complying with standards and rules. They can also become cynical about the significance of the job. This is reflected in the way Winston Churchill once defined politics as “the ability to foretell what is going to happen tomorrow, next week, next month, and next year. And to have the ability afterwards to explain why it didn’t happen.”¹⁷⁴ Similarly SPs can become cynical, even paranoid, about the integrity of others. This is said of US president Richard Nixon and British prime minister John Major. Major is said to have increasingly believed he was surrounded by scoundrels who were out to thwart him and get rid of him.¹⁷⁵

This kind of cynicism leads to a souring of integrity: ideals become blunted, principles watered down, and motivation to do good and perform well drains away. SPs then become lukewarm and indifferent where they started out warm and committed, dull and expressionless where before they were sparkling and colorful, and mechanical and robotic where originally they were involved and animated.

It is therefore important that cynicism is not allowed to gain the upper hand. This can be avoided by giving sufficient attention to the positive, pleasant sides of the position,¹⁷⁶ such

as the meaning the SP job has for people. Cynicism can also be prevented by realizing that fulfilling an SP job is a privilege. US president Dwight D. Eisenhower stated that politics is a noble profession.¹⁷⁷ Barack Obama even made the battle against cynicism the core of his first election campaign for the presidency: "In the end that is what this election is about. Do we participate in a politics of cynicism or do we participate in a politics of hope?"¹⁷⁸ The battle against cynicism is not only determined by how people see their jobs and their environment, but also how they see themselves. As Indian political leader Mahatma Gandhi said of himself, "Men say I am a saint losing himself in politics. The fact is that I am a politician trying my hardest to become a saint."¹⁷⁹ There is no better retort to cynicism. The job provides the place and the opportunity to gain integrity, as well as the pitfalls that cause SPs to lose it.

In addition to having an eye for the positive sides of the job, cynicism can be avoided by realism. Cynicism is in part caused by failing to realize that achieving ideals is difficult because reality is obstinate. It is important not to expect miracles in the job and to remember that an individual's power, even in the case of dictators, is always limited. Institutions are inert, procedures bring delay, and the dynamics of decision making often lead to unexpected and unwanted outcomes. Realism prevents overstrained expectations and enables us to handle disappointments better. As an SP described it, "Politics is effort, disappointment, getting up and carrying on every day."¹⁸⁰ To avoid cynicism George W. Bush put the situation and himself in perspective by starting out from the idea that you have to make do with the cards you are given.¹⁸¹ At the same time, it is these very limitations and impossibilities that the challenge lies. Former US secretary of state Hillary Clinton sees the challenge of politics as "the art of making what appears to be impossible, possible."¹⁸²

In order to avoid cynicism it is important to be able to deal with criticism. Decisions can lead to bitter, harsh, and even degrading reactions, beyond anything that could be imagined ahead of time. Gerald Ford, when accused of coming to secret agreements with Nixon on his resignation in exchange for a pardon, conceded, "I knew when I became President that hard decisions would produce some bitter reactions. Still, I wasn't prepared for the allegations that the Nixon pardon prompted."¹⁸³ There are also SPs who have been publicly called Nazis, narcissists and devils.¹⁸⁴ Such accusations can lead to cynicism if people come to believe they can never get it right, so it does not matter what they do and the job is a hopeless case.

Another possible retort to cynicism is to allow the facts to speak for themselves. Cynicism is easily fed by defeatists, pessimists, and prophets of doom, who take issues out of context, leading to some alarming views: for instance, things only get worse, degenerate, and deteriorate, SPs' integrity only declines, everything was better in the past, and the scale of breaches of integrity only rises. By first gathering the facts, we can avoid getting swept along in misplaced cynicism.

Finally, to avoid cynicism we can look to the points that have given us energy and hope. Cynicism has its opportunity when people are tired and burnt out, when they have had enough, and lost perspective. By recharging our batteries and grasping the things that are going well, we can avoid exhaustion, despair, and pessimism. For example, those who are energized by contact with citizens or by debating should seek out these moments. This prevents cynicism leading to the souring of integrity.

37. Integrity shows more in good times than in bad times

An SP's integrity becomes visible in adversity: pressure reveals what you stand for. But integrity shows even more in prosperity than in adversity: the less we depend on others the more we reveal how much we care about them. This also increases the chances of overestimating oneself and of recklessness. In good times, unlike in bad, SPs cannot hide behind circumstances, so more can be attributed to integrity in times of prosperity.

It is often said that you see what someone stands for when they are under pressure. Time pressure reveals one's priorities. Budgetary pressure shows what a person really cares about. When things are going badly, people's true nature rises to the surface.

This is certainly true. Adversity reveals integrity, and the greater the adversity, the more it shows the level of a person's integrity, but this is only one side of the coin. The other side is revealed when we do well, when success keeps on coming and everything goes our way. The absence of pressure also reveals integrity. Why?

As pressure decreases, power increases, providing more space, freedom, and opportunities, making people less dependent on others, and therefore less compelled to take their interests and expectations into account. It is then that it becomes clear how much people care about others. As German writer Johann Wolfgang von Goethe said, "You can easily judge the character of a man by how he treats those who can do nothing for him."¹⁸⁵ Along the same lines, Al Gore stated, "Our nation's greatness is measured by how we treat those who are the most vulnerable."¹⁸⁶ There is no integrity in dropping allies when their support is no longer needed. Plato puts this succinctly: "The measure of a man is what he does with power."¹⁸⁷ So the more power people have, the more the level of their integrity is revealed. What if SPs were omnipotent? To what extent would they serve the people then?

Good situations can lead to SPs becoming self-satisfied and self-centered, casting aside good advice and criticism, and ignoring warning signs. They believe their fortune proves their success and rightness. This can cause overconfidence, leading people to take excessive risks, invest insufficiently, or keep inadequate reserves for periods of adversity. There is a Dutch saying that only strong legs can carry wealth. Dictators and tyrants do not only stand up when they have nothing to say and just want the final word, but also when they have plenty to say and others no longer matter to them. For that reason SPs must have a high level of integrity to avoid misusing their power in times of good fortune.

Integrity is therefore visible both in times of fortune and in times of adversity, but it is more visible in good times than in bad. You can hide behind circumstances to some extent in bad times, but not when things are going well. Prosperity is never an excuse for abuse of power. For the same reason we should not be too hasty in praising integrity, but should wait until we have seen how an SP behaves in good times and bad.

VII. Faithfulness

Part VII, consisting of six chapters, is about the significance of integrity for faithfulness among SPs.

38. Integrity is being faithful to a cause

Faithfulness is an important aspect of integrity, because it shows that SPs are consistent. This can relate to (1) other people, (2) institutions, (3) promises, and (4) oneself. However, faithfulness does not mean never changing course. In order to be faithful, SPs must have courage.

Faithfulness is a central concept in the oaths or promises many SPs swear when appointed. For instance the president and prime minister of Italy promise “to be faithful to the Republic”, the US president to “faithfully execute” and the ministers in Poland “to be faithful to the provisions of the Constitution.”¹⁸⁸ Faithfulness is an important aspect of integrity. It shows consistency, persistence, conscientiousness, and loyalty in keeping promises.¹⁸⁹ Without being faithful it is impossible to be trustworthy,¹⁹⁰ so in important matters SPs must, as US president Thomas Jefferson put it, “stand like a rock.”¹⁹¹

Faithfulness varies according to its object.

To start with, we can be faithful to other people, such as colleagues, employees, supporters, leaders, and group members, not leaving them in the lurch, standing up for them, supporting them through thick and thin; such as an elected leader who promised to be faithful to voters, a chairperson who called for members to be faithful to one another, and two coalition parties who promised to be faithful to one another during their term in government.

SPs can also be faithful to institutions. You can be faithful to authority, to the institution you work for, or those who selected you, to the interests you are expected to serve, and the written and unwritten rules. In a public address Egyptian president Mohamed Morsi said, “Opposition or supporters, I urge you all to adhere to legitimacy together with me, to stand steadfast safeguarding this legitimacy. [...] If the price for safeguarding legitimacy is my

blood, then I am prepared to sacrifice my blood for the sake of stability and security of this homeland.”¹⁹² Morsi called on others to be faithful to legitimacy, promising to do the same himself.

Faithfulness can also be about fulfilling promises and commitments one has made, and acting according to the policy and program one has endorsed. Being faithful to such duties requires precision because people subscribe to them voluntarily and failure to comply is therefore inconsistent, showing a lack of integrity. When George W. Bush changed his mind, Al Gore, his opponent as US presidential candidate, accused him of being lower than a zebra, because “a zebra does not change its spots.”¹⁹³ Later Bush in turn accused Gore of failing to keep his word when, soon after the election results, Gore promised Bush over the telephone that he would acknowledge his defeat publicly a quarter of an hour later and subsequently failed to do so. Bush informed him that “in Texas, it meant something when a person gave you his word.”¹⁹⁴ This does not only hold in Texas: in life in general, giving your word and not keeping it is seen as a sign of lack of integrity.

Finally, we can be faithful to ourselves. According to Aristotle a virtuous and trustworthy person has a steadfast, unchanging character. Being faithful to yourself means being faithful to the ideals and values you stand for. In this spirit, George W. Bush closed his autobiography with the words “When I walked out of the White House this morning, I left with the same values I brought eight years ago. And when I look in the mirror at home tonight, I will have no regrets about what I see.”¹⁹⁵ He then expressed the hope of being remembered as a president who “kept my vow to keep the country safe; who pursued my convictions without wavering but changed course when necessary.”¹⁹⁶ The fact that this appears on the final page of his autobiography shows the importance the US president attached to it. Realizing the importance of being faithful is essential not only once things have finished, but also when starting out in office. As a prime minister was advised by his brother when appointed, “Back straight. Set your own course. You’re the one at the wheel.”¹⁹⁷

Being faithful does not mean never changing direction, as Bush also indicated.¹⁹⁸ People with integrity are unbending but not rigid. People who are unbending do not cave under pressure; they keep their backs straight. Those who are rigid refuse to adjust at all, even when circumstances demand it. In this respect, fanatics are in some sense faithful, persistent, but

in another respect they lack integrity,¹⁹⁹ since people with integrity realize that situations can change, that the quest for what people stand for is therefore continual, and that they must adjust to change without being inconsistent or losing credibility.²⁰⁰

In order to be faithful, SPs must have courage,²⁰¹ holding onto a cause even when they meet with opposition and setbacks. As Australian senator John Faulkner said, “to have integrity, politicians must have the courage to defend their political principles and the strength to uphold their moral convictions. Fail either of these two challenges and political integrity is an impossibility.”²⁰² SPs who are faithful show that they have courage, that they are really committed, and that they have the power to fulfill their commitments. For that reason the weak-willed cannot be seen as having integrity. Weak-willed SPs may well know what they want and what they have to do, but they lack the courage to act accordingly and give in to pressure or temptation that should have been resistible. According to Confucius, the most cowardly behavior occurs when people know the right thing to do but fail to do it.²⁰³ British minister Barbara Castle states that “In politics, guts is all.”²⁰⁴ In politics everything revolves around courage: that is what makes the difference.

Courage and bravery are qualities that are often valued in practice in SPs. SPs are appreciated for holding out, showing persistence, not being fobbed off or opting for the easiest route, but persevering despite opposition and setbacks until their aims are achieved. For that reason irresolution, weakness, and timorousness are seen as vices in SPs.²⁰⁵

So what lesson can an SP take from this? One official dealt with it concretely as follows: for every difficult decision he took, he asked himself whether he would do something different if he had five percent more courage. If the answer was affirmative, that meant he needed to show more courage. By doing this every time he became increasingly courageous and more faithful to the causes he stood for.

39. Integrity comes down to the answer “I can’t do that”

One measure of integrity is the question of what a person would never do. If everything is negotiable, ultimately you do not stand for anything. Saying no is more than doing nothing: saying no means saying yes to what you stand for. SPs should have arguments for what they will not do, and ultimately they themselves will be the argument.

SPs with integrity, as we saw in the previous chapter, must be faithful, meaning persevering for the causes they stand for. This perseverance lies in their persistence and strength of will to achieve what they want or have to achieve. This faithfulness means not only doing what they must, but also refraining from doing what they should not do. One measure of integrity is the question of what people refrain from doing, or better put, what they would never do. As Melham Waken put it, integrity comes down to the answer, “I can’t do that.”²⁰⁶

“I can’t do that” does not mean lacking the courage but rather having the courage to refuse. If everything is negotiable, in the end we stand for nothing; if every principle can be overruled, we are unprincipled. So integrity is a matter of standing for something that cannot be tampered with, renegotiated, or affected by others. Integrity consists in setting the bottom line and sticking to it.

An example of someone showing backbone was US president Harry Truman. Douglas MacArthur, general of the US army at the time, caused an obstruction by publicly calling for a new US politics of conflict management. Truman was advised not to dismiss MacArthur due to his popularity, but decided to do so. “The time had come to draw the line,” he stated in his memoirs.²⁰⁷ Insubordination undermines the president’s authority as commander-in-chief of the army and with it the principle that civilians have a say over the army in a democracy. Truman was not prepared to bargain on this, despite the dismissal negatively affecting his last year and a half in office.²⁰⁸

So integrity is revealed in the moments when we draw the line with the words, "this far and no further"; or as Margaret Thatcher expressed it, "You turn if you want to. The lady is not for turning."²⁰⁹ Such moments show what a person stands for. By saying "I can't do that," you reveal non-negotiable aspects of your own nature: "It goes against everything I stand for," "I can't get behind that," "I can't convince myself to do it," "If I do this I'll be morally bankrupt." In such situations we show independent character. US president Theodore Roosevelt stated that such character is of essential importance: "Character, in the long run, is the decisive factor in the life of an individual and of nations alike."²¹⁰ In this respect saying no is different from doing nothing. It is saying yes to what you stand for.

Ideally we should have arguments to support not being able or willing to act, but the more there is at stake the more it touches people personally, reaching the core of what they stand for, making it harder to explain. At a certain point we have to stop looking for reasons, because we are the reasons ourselves: "There are no words for it. It's just how I am."

Saying no, incidentally, should not be made more difficult than it has to be. Saying no is often difficult because people first say yes or do not speak out. The more often and the longer people say yes or remain silent, the harder it is to say no later. The more often and consistently people behave, the easier it is to remain consistent and the harder it is to be inconsistent, so saying no is easier if you consistently say no. As a minister of finance was advised by his predecessor, "Finance minister is the easiest job in the world. All you have to do is say no, and there is only one thing you have to say yes to. That's when they ask you, 'did you say no?'"²¹¹

40. Integrity comes down to the price you are willing to pay

The extent to which SPs are prepared to act with integrity shows the price they are prepared to pay. If integrity were free, its value would be unclear, so SPs can only show their integrity by showing the price they are prepared to pay for it. The higher the price, the higher the value they ascribe to it.

Integrity resides in setting principles above opportunistic motives, for instance being faithful to what you stand for and saying no to pressure and temptation to act contrary to your nature and beliefs. SPs sometimes point to the impossibility of behaving in a principled, faithful manner as a reason for opportunism and infidelity. Where people are playing games of divide and rule or dirty tricks, it is impossible to be faithful. In order to survive and be successful, it is necessary to behave unfaithfully, as Machiavelli argues.²¹² Regardless of the truth of the matter, in the end it is an individual decision whether or not to play along with this, and this choice makes clear the value an SP attaches to integrity.

People who give up on integrity raise not only the question of the reasons for giving up but also that of the reasons for not persevering. The first question relates to their circumstances and the second to their personal motivation. The extent to which we are prepared to act with integrity shows the price we are prepared to pay. This is not only about saying no, being faithful to what you stand for, but also about the lengths you are prepared to go to for it. The value of an issue is revealed by what you keep in reserve for it. As the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche states, "The value of a thing sometimes does not lie in that which one attains by it, but in what one pays for it — what it costs us."²¹³ If integrity costs nothing, it tells us nothing of its value. If you have never had to pay for integrity, you cannot determine its worth, so as an SP you can only show how you value integrity by paying a price for it.

If integrity has a price, this raises the question of what one is prepared to pay for it. How great are the sacrifices people will make to maintain integrity and at what price will they trade it? The higher the price, the higher the value they ascribe to integrity. When decisions in favor of integrity lead to decreases in popularity, status, and influence, this gives an indication of the value ascribed to them. Truman's integrity became visible, as discussed in the previous chapter, because his decision cost him a substantial slump in support (only 25% of the population supported him in his decision), making the rest of his term of office difficult.²¹⁴ Congressman Thanasis Apostolou was also prepared to pay a high price for his integrity when he was the only one in his party to vote against a new law: "I am prepared to accept all the consequences. (...) I don't think I will be high on the list of candidates next time."²¹⁵ So integrity can be so transcendent that people will give up their positions for it. As one politician said, "I would rather die standing than have to crawl the rest of my life," or as another commented on his refusal to agree to something against his principles, "Over my dead body." People even give up their lives, as in the case of a Russian mayor who accused several local officials and businessmen of corruption on a local television channel and was subsequently murdered.²¹⁶

So the question is not so much whether a person is able or willing to act with integrity, but rather what one is prepared to pay to become and remain that way. By revealing the price people are willing to pay, they show the value they set on it. For this purpose SPs can seek out situations which reveal the price of integrity, although such situations will probably arise unprompted in fulfilling their role as SP. Instead of avoiding such situations, we should see them as excellent opportunities to show what integrity is worth.

41. Integrity is impossible without power

Power and integrity are not incompatible. In fact power can provide integrity. Moreover integrity is impossible without power. The more power you have, the more freedom you have to act with integrity, towards others and towards yourself. Power can realize ideals and enable SPs to hold their ground so SPs should gain power for the sake of integrity.

Power and integrity are often seen as opposing, incompatible forces. People think of power as being at odds with integrity; they believe that people can only acquire power through dishonest means, that striving for power undermines integrity, and that holding onto power means selling out. Even if there is some truth to this, it is only one side of the coin. In chapter 75 we will see that integrity can also lead to power. In this chapter we will see that power can lead to integrity. In fact, integrity is impossible without power. In order to act with integrity you need power.

Power can be defined as freedom to act according to your own insights and to do as you wish. This means the more power you have, the more freedom you have to act with integrity, and the less power you have, the less freedom you have to act with integrity. With less power we are more dependent on others to achieve our ideals, and others can more easily force us to give up our principles. So if we want to act with integrity, it is a matter of having the power to realize ideals and adhere to principles and standards, to be the boss of the situation and not the other way around, to influence others rather than being in their power, and to be autonomous rather than under the control of power.

Power can reside in the individual person. People can be powerful because they are self-confident and self-controlled (more about this in chapter 43), or through the specific authorities that come with their positions: power to command, organize, and implement. Power may lie in the support of others and the interests SPs represent. One vice president was faithful to

his principles, despite pressure to support the president's view, because, as he put it, "I felt... very much supported by my colleagues in the cabinet and the rest of the party. I was only able to stick to my guns because I knew I was broadly supported."²¹⁷

So integrity is impossible without power, because power enables SPs to realize their ideals, faithfully do their jobs, and remain themselves. Power is also necessary in order to take a stand on an issue, or at least to do so credibly. Taking a stand without having the power to maintain it misses the goal and merely shows lack of backbone if you subsequently have to change standpoint, so it is important to ensure that you have the power to hold your ground. Whenever you commit to a cause you should ensure that you have the power to remain faithful to it, because integrity is impossible without power.

42. Integrity is undermined by vulnerability to blackmail

SPs should not put themselves in positions in which they can be blackmailed, because this limits their power to do their jobs properly. Susceptibility to blackmail arises when others know or could find out that an SP has acted improperly, because threats of revelation can push the SP into new improper behavior or passivity. For this reason SPs must remain alert to attempts to maneuver them or those around them into vulnerable positions.

When it became publicly known that a state secretary for defense had had an extramarital affair, a former minister took the view that the state secretary would do best to resign: “He has knowledge of state secrets and has therefore been vulnerable to foreign powers and has lost authority at home.”²¹⁸ So this SP was required to leave his post simply for having been in a vulnerable position. Why does this matter and why is it important for every SP to avoid getting into a vulnerable position?

People with integrity are people with the power to do what is expected of the job. This power means that they can do what they should. However, this power is limited if they fall under the power of others, if others can make them do things that go against their own will and the demands of their jobs. One way of achieving this is blackmail, compelling people to behave wrongly by improper means. People susceptible to blackmail are vulnerable: they are open to abuse of power. This vulnerability damages their authority and trustworthiness, as this vulnerability raises the risk that they will be forced to abuse their power. Even if no blackmail has taken place, simply the chance of it can lead to SPs losing their jobs.

A position vulnerable to blackmail arises when others find out that an SP has done something showing a lack of integrity and use this knowledge to make the SP behave inappropriately. The threat lies in the fact that the person blackmailed has an interest in the information being

kept secret, for instance to avoid the commotion it could cause. A candidate for chancellor in Germany was blackmailed by an unknown person two weeks before the elections, threatening to reveal that an illegal migrant had worked as a cleaner for his family fourteen years previously unless he withdrew from the elections immediately. The above-mentioned secretary of state was also vulnerable to people who knew of his affair as long as it remained a secret to the general public. By threatening to expose this knowledge these people could make him act inappropriately, for instance passing on state secrets. People do not necessarily become susceptible to blackmail if they have behaved inappropriately, but they may become susceptible if further revelation of their behavior has the potential to disadvantage them.²¹⁹ When the state secretary's relationship became known he was therefore no longer vulnerable to blackmail.

Vulnerability to blackmail can cause people to do things they should not and to fail to do things they should. For example, they may fail to correct the inappropriate behavior of others. President John F. Kennedy and his brother were slow to confront FBI director Edgar Hoover about his inappropriate behavior because they were afraid Hoover would leak information concerning the president's extramarital affair.²²⁰ This also happened to the French government when master criminal Alexandre Stavisky involved them in his fraudulent practices to such an extent that they did not dare to confront him, because Stavisky would reveal incriminating information about them.²²¹

The best way to avoid vulnerability to blackmail is, of course, to behave with integrity and in particular not to do anything that would damage your reputation if revealed. If you become vulnerable, then the task is to avoid people with an interest in and the wherewithal for blackmail from finding out. Even if you make others accessories to your actions, you must still be careful not to rely too much on their loyalty. At a certain point they might threaten to expose the inappropriate practices to distract attention from themselves, or in return for lenient treatment. They may also be blackmailed. In the unfortunate event that this occurs, from an integrity perspective it is inappropriate to blackmail the blackmailer back, since blackmail is misuse of the position and the knowledge that comes with it.

In order to avoid SPs becoming vulnerable to blackmail, they should be alert to those who might want to maneuver them into such a position. These people and agencies are most likely to be found among those who have a serious interest in SPs being discredited or stepping

down, or who stand to benefit from SPs behaving inappropriately, as they will think in much the same way as actor Larry Hagman: as he put it, "Once you get rid of integrity the rest is a piece of cake."²²² Once an SP is vulnerable to blackmail, the rest is easy.

A proven method is to entrap SPs, for instance by getting them to mix with men and women of loose morals in order to maneuver them into a position where they are vulnerable to blackmail, or by offering expensive gifts in the hope that they will take the bait.²²³ It is therefore important, despite the human inclination towards getting something for nothing, to be very reserved in accepting gifts and invitations. A gift often heralds something more expensive, in return for which compensation will be expected. As they say, there is no such thing as a free lunch.²²⁴ A gift creates a debt, an obligation, and is therefore a way of gaining power over the recipient. If a gift is really worth having, then it is also worth paying for. Integrity has a very low price if it is worth giving up for a gift.²²⁵

It is important not only that SPs avoid vulnerability to blackmail but also that the people around them do the same in order to avoid bringing the SP into disrepute. As Tony Blair wrote in his autobiography, "The problem, as I used to say to people who became close, is that knowing me is like catching a disease."²²⁶ Family and friends can become objects of interest for the media in their attempts to worm incriminating information out of them. When the media could not catch Blair doing anything inappropriate (after many of his cabinet colleagues had come under fire for extramarital affairs), the media plunged into his social relationships. It is important that those around SPs stand by them, and that they avoid becoming susceptible to blackmail. In Blair's case there was a commotion when the media discovered that his wife's personal advisor had had a relationship with a criminal.²²⁷

In short, when it comes to integrity SPs must be invulnerable, at least in the sense of avoiding weak points which others can misuse. At the same time SPs must not imagine themselves to be invulnerable, as then they run the risk of being insufficiently alert to attempts at blackmail.

43. Integrity requires self-control

Self-control is important for SPs, because they cannot properly exercise power over others if they do not have power over themselves. This power is also important because the job brings with it great temptations and pressures, and emotions can run high. Integrity does not entail SPs being true to themselves by giving their feelings and thoughts free rein: circumstances can compel SPs to behave differently. Self-control is needed for this.

In the previous chapter we look a cursory look at how people tend to want something for nothing. Self-control is needed to resist this tendency, and for various other reasons it is important for the integrity of SPs.

Self-control is what is known as a volitional virtue. This means being restrained and in charge of one's own behavior. Those who give their needs free rein lack integrity. Such shallow people are controlled by their needs, impulses, and emotions.²²⁸ In his book *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* moral philosopher and political economist Adam Smith argues that this self-control is necessary for every citizen in order to comply with the law, keep promises, and honor requests.²²⁹

This self-control is particularly important for SPs. As Italian poet Pietro Aretino put it, "I am, indeed, a king, because I know how to rule myself."²³⁰ This is also how SPs are seen. SPs cannot lead others if they cannot first lead themselves. People cannot exercise power over others if they are not capable of first exercising power over themselves. If we have no power over our own environment, then it is all the more important to have power over ourselves. As French author Michel de Montaigne put it, "Not being able to govern events, I govern myself."²³¹ There is a reason why making opponents lose their self-control is used as a tactic. If one party becomes angry, this reflects positively on the party that remains calm. Irritability and volatility are signs of impotence, whereas self-control is a sign of power.

Self-control is important because there can be many temptations and pressures in an SP's job. Fatigue and stress can damage self-control. Frustrations and irritations can lead to loss of self-control. One expression of lack of self-control is physical violence. For example, after an exchange of words US senator Charles Bishop hit his opponent Lowell Barron.²³² There was also recently hand to hand fighting in the parliaments of Morocco, Ukraine, South Korea, Venezuela, and Suriname. In Ukraine three members of parliament were even wounded.²³³ Lack of self-control is also indicated when people blurt out insults, as did Nicolas Sarkozy when he lost patience with a journalist questioning him and called the journalist a "couillon" ("dickhead").²³⁴ Similarly when a mayor got into a fight with a few Sinti people, a Romani group, he told the local newspaper, "Perhaps Hitler didn't get rid of enough of them."²³⁵

Self-control is all the more important for SPs because they should be devoted to their ideals and their jobs. Emotions can run high if others frustrate or thwart this. This affects SPs deeply, but emotions damage rationality, causing people to lose control. Emotions may well be good (showing that your heart is in the job), but it is important to maintain control so that you can determine for yourself when to show or hide emotion. In other words, emotion can be good, as long as you are not dominated by it.

Integrity does not entail being true to yourself by giving feelings and thoughts free rein. It is generally a good thing if SPs, as figures of authority and dignitaries, remain calm and dignified in the face of criticism, even if it is fierce, untrue, and ungracious, and even if they are irritated and indignant on the inside. It is also best for SPs not to panic in crisis situations, but to appear calm and assured even if they feel uncertain inside. Wearing a mask in such situations is not a sign of lack of integrity but rather the opposite: it shows self-control with an eye for the people one serves.

VIII. Willingness to serve

Part VIII, consisting of six chapters, is about the significance of integrity for SPs' willingness to serve.

44. Integrity requires humility

Although the importance of serving the people cannot be emphasized enough, there is a hidden risk here. SPs might think that it is not their jobs that are important but they themselves. However, SPs with integrity think small with regard to themselves, which requires humility. SPs can promote this by (1) avoiding seeing their power as a well-earned reward but rather as a consequence of the job, (2) attributing success to the environment and failure to themselves, and (3) the ability to laugh at themselves.

The importance of SPs' work cannot be emphasized enough. The decisions, ideas, and proposals SPs put forward have far-reaching consequences for people, institutions, and society as a whole. By being conscious of the importance of their jobs, SPs avoid frivolousness, laziness, carelessness, and recklessness. Integrity therefore demands that SPs remain aware of the importance of their jobs.

On the other hand, the more SPs are aware of the importance of their work, the more likely they are to consider themselves, rather than their jobs, important. As French Sun King Louis XIV said, "L'état c'est moi," ("I am the state") as if he were the only person that mattered. A party chair was guilty of a similar boast at a municipal council meeting: "We're all God, Mr Speaker."²³⁶ It shows a lack of integrity if instead of adapting to the job, SPs mould the job to suit them, placing themselves above their work instead of inside or beneath it, using their position to serve personal interests instead of those of the people. This is inconsistent, lacking integrity with the purpose for which SPs are appointed. Overestimating oneself also increases the chance of behavior lacking integrity because it causes people to ignore signals from their surroundings ("I know better"), misappropriate privileges ("I have a right to it"), and stay in office too long ("They can't manage without me"). People with integrity therefore think small with regard to themselves. As American essayist Ralph Waldo Emerson put it, "A great man is always willing to be little."²³⁷ This approach to self-perception avoids overestimation.

Humility can be promoted among other things by realizing that power is not something you have earned but something that follows from the job to be done. Without the job – and the consequent authorities, information, and networks – you would not have that power. SPs do not start out having power; they are given it.²³⁸ That power is not forever, but only for a specific, limited period. “We are all transitory,” as a politician put it.²³⁹ Or as Obama said, “We as leaders occupy these spaces temporarily.”²⁴⁰ As a reminder of this Bill Clinton had a glass box on the coffee table in the Oval Office with a piece of stone Neil Armstrong had brought back from the moon. When things became heated he said, “You see that rock? It’s 3.6 billion years old. We’re all just passing through.”²⁴¹

Humility can also be promoted by – and shown in – the way people handle success and failure. People who overestimate themselves attribute successes to themselves and failures to others and the environment, perpetuating their inflated self-image. In order to avoid overestimating yourself, it is better to do the opposite, or at least to begin with, attributing success to the environment, and failure to yourself. This keeps us critical and prevents us from erroneously believing that we deserve our success. Abraham Lincoln, for example, attributed the winnings generally ascribed to him to his environment: “I claim not to have controlled events, but confess plainly that events have controlled me.”²⁴²

Finally, humility can be promoted and demonstrated through the ability to laugh at ourselves. Self-mockery helps us keep both feet on the ground. George W. Bush made remarks with this effect at a graduation ceremony: “To those of you who received honors, awards and distinctions, I say well done,” he told Yale graduates before breaking into a grin. “To the C students, I say, you too can be president of the United States.”²⁴³ Even without good grades, it is possible to become president. Bush saw himself as living proof and was not ashamed of it.²⁴⁴

Humility is also protective. Keeping the job and your own contribution in perspective ensures that you do not feel the need to be there for everyone or stand up for everything. This helps prevent us from wanting too much but doing nothing. Humility enables us to stand back from what is happening and to avoid taking everything personally. When Margaret Thatcher was cast aside as prime minister and heard from her family on arriving home that her colleagues’ betrayal was a scandal, she replied dryly, “We’re in politics, dear.”²⁴⁵

45. Integrity is preserving the dignity of the job

In addition to the official's integrity, there is also integrity in the office itself. SPs should not damage the integrity of their positions, as this not only hinders their own work but also that of their successors. SPs should therefore uphold the dignity of their position and leave it in at least as good a condition as when they took up office.

In the previous chapter we saw that SPs should bear in mind that they hold office temporarily. An SP sits on a borrowed chair. SPs come and go, but positions remain longer than the term of a single SP. Seeing oneself as transient or as an observer, custodian, representative, or authorized agent, promotes humility. Seeing oneself in this way, as we will see in this chapter, promotes SPs' sense of responsibility and offers a guide for their behavior.

We cannot talk about an official's integrity in the absence of the integrity of the office. The integrity of the position means, among other things, that the position is untainted and stainless, and is respected and valued partly for this reason. The dignity of office plays an important part in enabling officials to work effectively: a position that is tainted is taken less seriously and inspires less confidence than one that remains clean. It is therefore important for SPs to avoid damaging their positions, as this would damage their own integrity as officials, and make it impossible to do the job well. That is just one side of the story.

The other side is that such behavior impedes not only the job itself but also successors in the position. When successors encounter a job that has been discredited and lacks dignity, this impedes their work. SPs should therefore see their job as borrowed from their successors. This means that they are responsible for ensuring that their successors enter a dignified position. That is why French King Louis XV's comment, "Après moi, le déluge" is so reprehensible.²⁴⁶ The responsibility for guaranteeing the dignity of the position is even greater if we consider both the future and the past. The dignity of a position is built up by the behavior

of predecessors in the job. If a successor brings the position into disrepute then their efforts are denied, undermined, and wasted. For that reason SPs should act as stewards for the dignity and trust of the office. In short, an SP is a guardian.

An important guide for the behavior of SPs is therefore to preserve the dignity of the function for successors in at least as good a state it was on appointment. As one minister said, "When it is time for an official to lay down his power, the office he held should have the same public dignity as when he was called to it. If this threatens to go wrong, he should resign his office."²⁴⁷ You should pass on what you received; and leave behind what you encountered. In that respect it is a sign of integrity if people consider it an honor to hold office (showing a sense of perspective on themselves) and a great responsibility to keep up this honor. As George W. Bush wrote at the end of his autobiography, "I hope they will conclude that I upheld the honor and dignity of the office I was so privileged to hold."²⁴⁸

46. Integrity means subordination of personal interests but not servility

A willingness to serve is essential to the servant concept and it is therefore a virtue for SPs. This means SPs subordinating their own interests to those of their position. This is both an attitude and a prescription for their behavior. This subordination, however, does not demand servility. SPs should stand up for what they do, and be prepared to oppose the views of others and to educate them.

An SP should be willing to serve, as this is inherent in being a servant. According to Plato, rulers should love their countries more than anything and should never be prepared to act against their interests.²⁴⁹ The power one has obtained should be used for those who have bestowed it and for the purposes for which it was bestowed.²⁵⁰ Willingness to serve also means subordinating one's own interests to the interests of the institution, office, people, or area in which one is appointed.

An important question for integrity is therefore also the extent to which SPs see themselves as servants and their activities as service, and of course as serving the right interests, namely those of the people.²⁵¹ This is not only a matter of attitude, but also a prescription, that every decision should serve the right interest. As George W. Bush said, looking back on his presidency, "I believe I got some of those decisions right, and I got some wrong. But on every one, I did what I believed was in the best interests of our country."²⁵² SPs with integrity can say this of themselves: every decision they make, to the best of their knowledge, is in the best interests of those whom they should serve. On receiving the Nobel Peace Prize, Kofi Annan said that throughout his term in office as secretary general of the United Nations he had tried to set people as the focal point of everything he did.²⁵³

When people have the impression that SPs are serving other interests than those of the people, such as their own careers, this arouses disgust. Lyndon Johnson was criticized for being too greedy and tactless to be president of the US when he took the oath for himself in the airplane in which John F. Kennedy's body was transported just after his murder and in the presence of his widow. For the same reason SPs accepting bribes often receive responses of disgust, not only because bribery may well lead to the wrong decisions being made but also because it indicates that they place their own interests above those of the people. This emerged from the demonstrations which took place in Slovenia, in which people pressed for the departure of prime minister Janez Janša because a government committee had concluded that large sums of money in his private bank account could not be accounted for, causing the fall of his cabinet.²⁵⁴ Similarly 33% of voters for the party of South African president Jacob Zuma stated that they were less likely to vote for his party due to allegations that Zuma used about US\$20 million of public money to upgrade his private residence.²⁵⁵

Subordination, however, does not mean SPs should be servile, or indiscriminately follow what others think. SPs with integrity do not follow the crowd. Populism is good if it is about understanding and interpreting the voice of the people (the "vox populi") and the battle against the arrogance of power and the elite, but it misses the mark if it assumes the people are always right and automatically adjusts its attitudes to public opinion, becoming an ideology without values other than an assumption that the people are always right.²⁵⁶ SPs are not representatives of the people in the sense of mouthpieces or conduits. As discussed above, integrity demands that people do what they think is good, what they believe in, and what they support, and that they are faithful to this.²⁵⁷ For instance when Obama talked about the long and difficult road necessary to solve social problems he said to his supporters, "You didn't elect me to tell you what you wanted to hear."²⁵⁸

SPs are more than reflections of their time; they can also get into situations in which they must shape that time, requiring the courage to go against the Zeitgeist. Tony Blair realized that he was swimming against the current when he decided to take the UK into the Iraq war.²⁵⁹ He felt that this decision served the interests of the UK and the world. In this connection George W. Bush remarked, "One of the lessons I took from Roosevelt and Reagan was to lead the public, not chase the opinion polls."²⁶⁰

Integrity does not chime in with chasing opinion polls and serving personal popularity. Sometimes decisions must be made for which you will be loved less, as when sacrifices are required of society, the interests of citizens are infringed, and serious interventions are made in communities. As US senator John Culver put it, "You can't worry too much about being loved; at some time, you have to decide, 'Let's go! Bang!'"²⁶¹

Willingness to serve does not prevent SPs from educating the people, in the sense, for example, of showing them other arguments, a different perspective, different (bigger or smaller) interests, and indicating that some things have to be different from the way people would like.²⁶² Blair saw it as his task to defend his decision to participate in the Iraq war before the people, more with the idea of presenting a different perspective than with the intention of convincing them. US president Ronald Reagan, too, took a different perspective in the abortion debate. Reagan stated, "Abortion is advocated only by persons who have themselves been born."²⁶³ He stood up for the people who could not stand up for themselves, those who were unborn. Similarly there are SPs who stand up for future generations, developing countries, the environment, and animals, or other groups and stakeholders who cannot make their voices heard.

47. Integrity does not require impartiality or independence

Although impartiality and independence are seen as important qualities, it can be desirable for SPs to show bias. They may be required to take sides and be appointed to promote particular interests. Partiality can be justified on the basis of impartial and independent grounds, although this does not mean that SPs can ignore the interests of others or give themselves over to others.

In addition to a willingness to serve, many public sector codes of integrity state that impartiality and independence are important qualities, but is this always desirable for SPs? The answer is no. In some respects impartiality and independence are undesirable.

Let us begin by examining the above proposition for politicians. Politics is about choosing a party and factionalism. Politicians bind themselves to parties and work for them. Politicians with integrity are therefore faithful to their own parties: they stand up for their parties' views, uphold their ideals, and follow their political programs. It would be inconsistent for politicians to renounce their parties, not to have anything to do with their programs, and to ignore party political agreements and pledges. Such politicians would hardly be paragons of fidelity or credibility. For politicians, taking sides and partiality are compatible with integrity.

For other SPs partiality can be just as important. SPs are appointed to stand for the interests of their position, institution, or area of service. This form of partiality is expected of them. Mayors should stand up for the interests of their own municipality in a regional context, governors for regional interests in a national context, and prime ministers for national interests in an international context. The idea is that if everyone stands up for the interests they are appointed to represent, this will then contribute to a good appraisal of those interests. This way, those

who chose or appointed the SP can trust that their interests are well represented. Partiality can therefore be justified on the basis of impartial grounds. For this reason partiality is not only a right but also a duty.

Partiality does not mean that SPs can or should ignore the interests of others whom they do not represent. After all, integrity demands that people have an eye for the legitimate interests of others, as we saw in chapter 6 and elsewhere. Having an eye for these interests means taking them into account, involving and respecting them without necessarily standing up for them or making efforts for them. Furthermore, partiality should not prevent SPs from acting in conflict with the interests they serve and depend on. There may, for example, be other interests that weigh more heavily and demand priority above those that SPs represent. It may be necessary to sell decisions to your own supporters (such as voters, citizens, and colleagues) by arguing that acting in the interests of a greater or different good will eventually serve your own supporters too. However, this removes the ethical dimension of such action, as the interests of the supporters are not sacrificed.

Partiality does not demand giving up all impartiality and independence, entirely handing oneself over to others. American entertainer Will Rogers is skeptical about the extent to which SPs are independent. In his view there is no more independence in politics than there is in jail²⁶⁴ (in other words, very little). If SPs feel locked in, they should seriously ask themselves whether they can continue to act with integrity, and if not, whether this is a price they are willing to pay.

48. Integrity requires intellectual as well as moral qualities

Intellectual qualities are important for SPs' integrity because in their absence (1) there is no coherence between the demands of the job and what the individual SP has to offer, (2) it increases the risk of the job being done badly, and (3) it increases the risk that SPs will act without integrity in order to fulfill their role. SPs should therefore only accept jobs they are intellectually capable of. They should also take care of their physical integrity.

Integrity demands that SPs have moral qualities. In the previous chapter different virtues were discussed, such as courage, self-control, and humility. Moral qualities can be distinguished from intellectual qualities, as Aristotle stated. These intellectual qualities, such as knowledge, wisdom, and intelligence, are also important for SPs' integrity. At least three reasons can be given for this.

Firstly integrity cannot exist in the absence of coherence between the demands of a job and what the individual has to offer. SPs without the necessary intellectual capacities are unsuited to their jobs and therefore cannot be said to have integrity.

Secondly, SPs with intellectual shortcomings run the risk of failing to do their jobs properly and therefore making suboptimal or bad decisions, wasting public resources, and letting people down. So SPs in difficult jobs should usually have the intellectual capacity to properly analyze situations, expectations, options, and consequences quickly so as to be able to come to well-thought-out, properly supported viewpoints and solutions. They also need the intellectual capacity to communicate viewpoints clearly, as well as a good memory: in addition to breaking promises, forgetful SPs also run the risk of acting inconsistently, because they have forgotten how they behaved in the same situations on previous occasions.

Thirdly, SPs who fall short intellectually heighten the risk to their integrity, because they are more likely to feel the need to engage in dishonest behavior than those who are intellectually equipped to make up for their shortcomings. If they cannot achieve goals on their own strength, they may start to abuse their power. If SPs lack the competence to persuade others of their views, they may put them under pressure or blackmail them, if they do not understand situations, they may shirk responsibility for decisions or postpone them too long, or if they cannot do a good job, they may cover up mistakes and gloss over bad performance.

An inability to cope with the job intellectually may lie in a lack of ability, or in wanting too much. People may want jobs that involve too much responsibility, to do things they are incapable of, or they may be asking too much of themselves. The same goes for those who raise excessively high expectations, promise too much, and are overly ambitious. This is not just a question of incapability: it also points to a lack of insight into limitations and boundaries, suggesting an inability to withstand the temptation to give the impression of being able to do more than one can. People either mislead others or delude themselves. From the perspective of integrity the task is therefore to remain realistic in what you resolve to do, knowing your own limitations, and only taking on what you can cope with.

Integrity therefore cannot be separated from intellectual qualities. This does not mean that SPs must always be very intelligent people. The desired intelligence depends on the level of responsibility of the job. That does not mean that having the intellectual capacity by definition gives SPs integrity. Intellectual capacities can also be used to serve the wrong goals and interests. Dictators may be analytically capable (for instance in understanding power relationships) and good at communicating (seducing with rhetoric and manipulating others). Integrity is about the combination of intellectual and moral virtues.

A relevant question here is the extent to which SPs need physical integrity. Should they also possess physical qualities? A physical handicap need not present an obstacle to doing the job well, as German minister Wolfgang Schäuble and US president Franklin Roosevelt, for example, have shown. But does not physical health matter too? On the one hand SPs, like everyone else, are people of flesh and bone and can fall sick like everyone else. SPs do not need to be physical superheroes. On the other hand, very demanding jobs in particular call for physical fitness in SPs. If doing the job well is an elite sport, this requires good physical

condition, not only in order to be able to work long and hard when required, but also because physical health promotes intellectual and moral virtues. Research shows that the less sleep people have, the less ethical decisions they make.²⁶⁵ Furthermore, in many SP positions being present and available is essential and people cannot get away with frequent absences due to ill health. A prime minister's work is hindered by weekly absences due to sickness. Since physical health is important, if its absence is the fault of the SP, this is a matter of integrity. An SP who neglects his or her health, for example through bad nutrition, and insufficient rest and exercise, denies the importance of this issue for doing a good job as an SP²⁶⁶

49. Integrity requires respect for the integrity of others

SPs should respect the integrity of others, because there is a core to everyone that should remain intact. This integrity breaks down into (1) psychological, (2) physical, and (3) emotional sides. Whether they have substantial power or very little, SPs run the risk of infringing the integrity of others. The best way to respect the integrity of others is to value it.

So far we have focused on the integrity of SPs themselves, but others also have integrity. Aristotle stated that a politician must recognize people's dignity and honor them as people.²⁶⁷ Integrity requires that SPs respect and value the integrity of others, because everyone has a core that should remain intact.²⁶⁸ This integrity breaks down into psychological, physical, and emotional sides.

A person's integrity includes psychological integrity, the autonomy and freedom to think. According to the philosopher Kant, it is this autonomy, this ability to reason, which makes people human.²⁶⁹ Infringing this autonomy is an essential infringement of a person's integrity. Integrity therefore demands that others refrain from infringing this autonomy, for example through manipulation, brainwashing, or blackmail. This is the problem with dictatorships, where the will of the people is subordinated to the will of those in power and freedom of thought is restricted. A dictatorship can arise not only in countries, but also in parties, teams, committees, and organizations.

Integrity also has a physical aspect. Many SPs have lost their positions for infringing the physical integrity of another, for instance by sexual harassment. Dominique Strauss-Kahn, director general of the International Monetary Fund, handed in his resignation when he was remanded in custody after accusations by a hotel employee that he assaulted her in his hotel room.²⁷⁰ Israeli president Moshe Katsav also stepped down due to rape, indecent acts, and sexual

harassment of several women, receiving a seven year prison sentence.²⁷¹ Similarly a councilor who made six women carry out sexual acts in exchange for subsidized accommodation was forced to step down. Infringing people's physical integrity is a serious transgression, because it damages their dignity and unity, affecting their right to self-determination over their own bodies. Strauss-Kahn later admitted to having committed a moral error.²⁷²

There is also an emotional side to integrity. Emotional or mental integrity is a person's psychological completeness and unity. People who are stressed out, confused, or disturbed, lack emotional integrity. Integrity therefore requires that people do not terrorize one another, string one another along, or injure one another. A prime minister made a hurtful remark, publicly calling one of the state secretaries in his party "an ill-suited little man." Another prime minister terrorized a political opponent in the cabinet, keeping him under surveillance. It is also hurtful to leave people hanging, strip them of their titles, only give them the unpleasant jobs, or send them on a wild goose chase. A councilor resigned when an investigation found that he had intimidated officials with his robust style, causing anxiety in others. Italian prime minister Silvio Berlusconi has a record of making denigrating remarks. He stated publicly that fascist dictator Benito Mussolini had never murdered anyone, a German member of the European parliament was cut out for the role of kapo²⁷³ in a new Italian film about a Nazi concentration camp, leftwing voters were "mentally handicapped" and should be put in psychiatric hospitals, Barack Obama was tanned, that the people of Abruzzo affected by an earthquake should see their temporary accommodation in tents as a weekend of camping, and that it is more honorable to be passionate about a beautiful young woman than an ugly homosexual.²⁷⁴ Such remarks lead to outrage because they touch people's integrity and disturb them emotionally. For that reason there was also a commotion when Japanese deputy prime minister Tarō Asō said that the healthcare system should be changed so that terminal patients who were receiving expensive treatments "can quickly pass away" adding, "I cannot sleep well when I think of myself receiving expensive treatments by using government money."²⁷⁵

The relationship between infringing the integrity of others and having power is twofold. On the one hand having more power offers more opportunities to infringe integrity. After all, power is the ability to influence others against their own will. The more power you have, the easier it is to influence others in undesirable ways, and the more you infringe someone's integrity the more you display your power. On the other hand, infringing the integrity of others indicates

that you have little power. In order to increase your own power you eliminate opponents, exploit weaknesses, and make personal attacks. By intimidating others you degrade them while also elevating yourself. "To speak ill of others is a dishonest way of praising ourselves," said historian Will Durant.²⁷⁶ Machiavelli even recommended rendering opponents innocuous in a single stroke: "If an injury has to be done to a man it should be so severe that his vengeance need not be feared."²⁷⁷ So regardless of the level of power, damaging the integrity of others is a risk.

The best way to respect people's integrity is to appreciate it. By paying attention to people's dignity and unity, be they colleagues, citizens, or opponents, we discover the value of these properties, how precious integrity is. People are autonomous, unique, and interesting. One mayor remarked that his contact with citizens had increasingly shown him how wonderful people were in their nature and their diversity.²⁷⁸ If you see the integrity of others in this light, it is easy to show respect for it.

IX. Responsibility and accountability

Part IX, consisting of four chapters, is about what integrity means for responsibility and accountability among SPs.

50. Integrity gains attention when you shape the collective conscience

Integrity rests not only in SPs themselves, but also in their contribution to the integrity of the groups they belong to. If you stand for something, you promote it in your own group. SPs can do this, for example, by raising the issue of inappropriate behavior, discussing moral considerations during consultations, and taking measures to promote integrity. However, co-opting the integrity of colleagues brings new risks to integrity.

Integrity is not only about the individual. It is also a question of what we contribute to the integrity of the groups we belong to. A politician, for instance, can contribute to the integrity of the section, party, or entire parliament. This can be achieved by confronting others about their behavior, showing willingness to discuss moral questions and dilemmas, denouncing inappropriate practices, and raising important moral considerations at meetings. This kind of contribution breaks through groupthink, keeping others on the right path and ensuring integrity in decision making. We can also make efforts for measures to advance the integrity of our group, such as making or carrying out proposals for new rules and programs to implement and enforce them.

This kind of contribution is not reserved for special SPs. In principle this is the role of every SP. If you stand for something, you will not tolerate others infringing it or decisions and developments that threaten to take things in the wrong direction. The issues you confront others about – and also those on which you can be confronted – show your own integrity, as do the subjects you speak out on. At the same time, the more relevant experience and education people have, the better they are able to speak out and confront others, as they know what they are talking about and can speak with greater credibility and authority. Over time in office there are increasing opportunities – and responsibilities – for using your knowledge of history,

as well as preserving and passing on tradition, for instance by educating others about relevant decisions taken in the past, and the related considerations. It is with good reason that senior members tend to have special duties and privileges.

SPs can choose to build up a public image of integrity and gain positions of trust in their groups, playing the gadfly or clown, shaping the collective conscience, and inspiring new measures and activities to promote integrity. A public image of this kind brings risks to integrity. As we saw previously, the more you criticize the integrity of others, the more critically your own integrity will be scrutinized and the more criticism you will attract if you deal with it inadequately. The more you become the guardian of group integrity, the more passive others may become, because they think that you are taking action. The more actively you stand up for issues, the more significant it is when you are silent on a particular subject, leading more easily to the assumption that you agree. Finally the more you build your reputation on integrity, the more likely you are to be seen as interfering, a know-it-all, or obstructive.

In short, an important benchmark for integrity is the extent to which you see yourself as your brother's keeper: when do you confront others, and on what issues? This reveals not only when you feel moved or offended yourself, but also the extent to which you feel responsible for protecting and promoting the integrity of others and the group.

51. Integrity means demanding responsibility

Taking responsibility for failure is a sign of power and integrity in SPs, especially when they are not really responsible. This shows that they stand for a cause and are prepared to take the repercussions. The more power SPs have, the more others will also expect this of them.

In the office of US president Harry Truman there was a sign which read, "The buck stops here." In other words, this is where responsibility ends. The sign was intended to make it clear that the final responsibility for governing the country went to the president and could not be shifted to anyone else. As President Obama also said, "as president you're held responsible for everything, but you don't always have control of everything."²⁷⁹

According to sociologist Max Weber, failure to take responsibility is one of two deadly sins in politics.²⁸⁰ By contrast taking responsibility is a sign of integrity, showing that you are accountable, stand for your cause, and do not shrink from it or run away. It is not difficult to take responsibility for successes, because that benefits your own success. The crux is dealing with failure, criticism, setbacks, and mistakes. Do you take responsibility then too, or do you pass the buck? These situations reveal what SPs stand for, what they really believe in, and the magnitude of their sense of responsibility.

Passing the buck is often seen as weak and cowardly (because it is easy to see through it), whereas taking responsibility is interpreted as strength (because it shows willingness to accept repercussions). Nevertheless, SPs can become blameworthy here, for instance by attempting to clean up their own records and shift the blame to subordinates, predecessors, and circumstances, in meetings and interviews. Sacrificing someone else in favor of oneself is even more objectionable. Cao Cao, the first minister of the Han dynasty, had the head of the food stores beheaded during a siege in order to blame him for the food shortage and stop an army mutiny, when really the food shortage had occurred due to a tactical misjudgment of his own.²⁸¹

Shirking responsibilities shows a lack of integrity. Imagine that this was not the case, and that passing the buck was acceptable. No one would take responsibility for mistakes and failures, creating an image of SPs as untouchable, uncontrollable, and irresponsible. On the other hand it is a sign of integrity when one takes responsibility for something one is not responsible for, or only to a limited degree; if there is no need to take full responsibility but you do so all the same; if you had no influence or opportunity for influence on particular outcomes, but still take responsibility. Such moments show integrity. A party leader showed integrity by stepping forward and taking responsibility for his party losing the election, despite the fact that this was due to external factors; an alderman took responsibility for the failure of a large-scale collaboration, despite the fact that many others were liable; and a president took responsibility for a policy failure, despite the fact that he could not have done any better.

Responsibility, however, is not easy for SPs to shirk or neglect. The more power you have, the more others expect you to take responsibility for matters for which you are not responsible, or only partially so. Taking responsibility shows power. Shirking responsibility shows a lack of power. Passing the buck therefore infringes power as well as integrity. Pier Luigi Bersani achieved a good combination of personal responsibility and confrontation of others when he became stuck in the process of negotiating the formation of a new government in Italy: "I want things to be clear: I am ready to assume a huge amount of responsibility, but I ask everyone else to all take on a little bit themselves."²⁸²

52. Integrity is the link between responsibility and accountability

Integrity is the connection between responsibility and accountability because it is the consistency between the two: accountability reveals responsibility and responsibility cannot exist without accountability. Accountability is also an important mechanism for promoting integrity and acknowledging others. SPs can therefore come under serious criticism for lack of accountability, and the more power, the more serious the criticism.

Walter Raleigh, a 16th century British writer, stated, “Wise men [should be] like coffer with double bottoms; which when others look into, being opened, they see not all that they hold.”²⁸³ This chimes in with a rule proposed by the poet Ovid, “One who lives well, lives unnoticed.”²⁸⁴ Machiavelli also followed the same line: a monarch or prince should appear outwardly virtuous and profess to be honest, but should not shrink from secretly developing immoral practices.²⁸⁵ In short, SPs should not be open or transparent. Does this also apply to SPs who strive for integrity?

The previous chapter was about taking and demanding responsibility. This is somewhat different from being accountable. Responsibility is about the state of affairs in a given situation, where a person’s task, duty, moral liability, or influence comes into play. Accountability is about informing others, a forum, potentially leading to a debate, judgment, decisions, and consequences, such as sanctions or discharge. Integrity is not only about taking and demanding responsibility, but also about being accountable. Integrity is the consistency, the connection between responsibility and accountability. In providing an account, a justification, you reveal the responsibility you take. There is no responsibility without accountability, because responsibility only gains substance when an account is provided. Equally there is no accountability without responsibility, because an account only has substance relating to the responsibility one takes. You cannot give an answer (an account) if you have nothing to answer

(no responsibility). SPs who attempt to avoid accountability by claiming they have responsibility for an issue lack integrity (as they are operating on the misconception that because the matter is their responsibility they do not owe anyone an explanation). The UK parliamentary Code of Conduct therefore rightly states, "Holders of public office are accountable for their decisions and actions to the public and must submit themselves to whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their office."²⁸⁶

Accountability is a core element of a democracy, or to put it in stronger terms, a minister stated, "Public accountability is the soul of democracy and the willingness to be accountable is the first requirement of an official."²⁸⁷ Public accountability is important for democratic supervision of use of public power and preservation of the people's sovereignty. Other forms of accountability for SPs, within their institutions or collaborative groups, aim to prevent irresponsibility and promote responsibility in their use of power. Accountability also contributes to the legitimacy of SPs and the institutions they represent.²⁸⁸ For that reason, in the view of political scientist Dennis Thompson, the vices of concealment, such as misleading people, hushing matters up, and manipulation, are the most dangerous,²⁸⁹ as they involve SPs evading and frustrating accountability and with it their own responsibility.

Lack of accountability can therefore be a serious charge. A mayor was required to step down for his lack of accountability. He had not committed a specific offense, nor was his passive accountability condemned: he always answered questions from council members and alderman. The point of criticism from the municipal council was that he was not proactively accountable in reporting contacts he maintained with agencies in the municipality and his commitments to them. He should have taken the initiative instead of waiting until he was asked to do so. He was accused of a lack of democratic integrity, with an appeal to the applicable code of conduct, which stated, "The actions of a political incumbent are transparent, ensuring optimal accountability and providing the supervisory bodies with full insight into actions and the motives behind them." In a sense, as a mayor remarked about himself, an SP is a public body.²⁹⁰

SPs who take insufficient responsibility are often insufficiently aware that their power is delegated power. The more power they have the less they feel the need for accountability. After all, that is power: being able to withhold justification. SPs feel they are above other interested parties, and the less accountability, the more power they think they project. In

actual fact the opposite is the case: the more power you have, the greater your responsibility and the more you must account for your actions. Politicians may well be independent, but this does not mean that they should have nothing to do with their own supporters and voters. That is why it is always important to return to the basis of power. Where do SPs derive their power from and what can others reasonably expect in terms of accountability?

SPs should understand that if they do not account for their actions, others may interpret this as a personal renouncement, a suggestion that SPs feel they have nothing to do with them. Moreover SPs who fail to be accountable may be seen as having something to hide, something they are ashamed of, or that they are afraid will come out. If you really stand for something, you will stand up for it and be accountable. Being accountable may make SPs vulnerable (giving others insight and ammunition for unfavorable judgments), but providing no justification damages SPs' integrity and probably also makes them vulnerable, possibly more so (because others may criticize their lack of accountability and attach consequences to it, such as taking back the responsibility bestowed).

SPs' integrity therefore lies in acceptance of the responsibility of the position and the willingness to be accountable, within their own organizations, towards supervisory bodies, and towards the people and institutions they work for. Whether people are naturally accountable becomes clear from the moments in which this accountability emerges, not in conformity with procedure or the requests or demands of others, but voluntarily and on the SPs' own initiative. It also emerges in the moments when there is nothing to be gained from taking responsibility. If supporters only see their representatives at election time, for example, when the power lies with the voters, then this does not give the impression of an intrinsic willingness to be accountable.

Accountability works prospectively. Awareness of a need to be accountable leads people to take this into account in advance in their behavior. For that reason the idea of having to be accountable is also good for decision making with integrity. "When I resolve to do something, will I be able to account for it properly later?" Accountability is an important mechanism for promoting integrity. If people still have doubts as to what to do, the motto of American poet Henry Wadsworth Longfellow may be the deciding factor: "It takes less time to do a thing right than it does to explain why you did it wrong."²⁹¹

53. Integrity demands truth, but not complete openness

Integrity requires the truth because, without truth, accountability and responsibility are empty, and there is no consistency between what you say and what you know. SPs should not only tell the truth in what they say, but also in what they do not say. This does not mean that they have to be completely open. There are many situations in which confidentiality and secrecy are ethical. However, lying always infringes SPs' integrity, because it undermines their honesty and can often be avoided.

Besides accounting for one's responsibilities, integrity is about doing this in a responsible, honest manner. This means communicating the truth. Without the truth, accountability, and with it responsibility, is empty.

Integrity requires telling the truth.²⁹² If we fail to do this, there is inconsistency between what we say and what we do. We pretend and are dishonest. As a result we mislead others and fail to respect them. That is why it is important to tell the truth. As an alderman aptly put it, "Those with power should tell the truth, and nothing other than the truth."²⁹³ Even if you really want something else and even if you do not mean it. As Harry Truman said, "Always be sincere, even if you don't mean it."²⁹⁴

According to Will Rogers dishonesty is inextricably bound up with politics: "If you ever injected truth into politics you have no politics."²⁹⁵ For that reason according to English actress Felicity Kendal dishonesty is common practice: "There is one sure way of telling when politicians aren't telling the truth - their lips move."²⁹⁶ In other words, politicians lie the entire time they are speaking. It may be an exaggeration to say that SPs never tell the truth, but according to a former US congressional chief of staff every US president has told lies on the job out of necessity.²⁹⁷ Two and a half millennia ago, the Greek philosopher Socrates said, "I was really too honest a man to be a politician and live," showing that lies and dishonesty in politics are common to all times and places.²⁹⁸

If dishonesty were a virtue, it would not lead to outrage. In practice it is clear that SPs have been discredited for lying. Danish minister of justice Morten Bødskov lost his position after admitting having lied to parliament about the reason why a visit by lawmakers to a notorious district had been postponed.²⁹⁹ Similarly the majority of a council supported a vote of no confidence against their mayor when it emerged that he had withheld information regarding the overrun of costs for building a theater, and British member of parliament Chris Huhne lost his position when it emerged that he had lied to the police, albeit 10 years previously, about a traffic offense, stating that his wife had been driving rather than himself, in order to avoid charges.³⁰⁰ The fact that honesty is seen as a desirable virtue in SPs is also clear from the way opponents, supervisory organizations, and journalists attempt to uncover untruths presented by SPs and to use this to show their lack of integrity and trustworthiness. If dishonesty were seen as a virtue, others would try to uncover the truths SPs told and use these to show lack of virtue and suitability.

Telling the truth, however, goes beyond honesty. It is possible to be honest and still skirt around the facts, remain silent on important matters without lying, or to leave statements open to different interpretations. For instance, in response to a question about support for a fellow party member, one president replied that people could rely on him, meaning that he would let them know; others interpreted this as meaning he supported his colleague. A member of parliament, asked whether he had assaulted an employee of the embassy in Syria, replied with a resounding no, giving the impression that he was denying the assault, when in fact he said no without further explanation because he had committed the assault in Jordan. When Bill Clinton was asked whether he had had sexual relations with Monica Lewinsky, he denied it under oath, because, as it emerged later, he interpreted sexual relations to entail sexual intercourse, whereas they had only committed sexual acts.³⁰¹ In all cases in which people conceal things, they mislead others: they try intentionally to create or maintain an image that is not in keeping with reality. For this reason if others find out they will hold it against the SP, be disappointed, and always consider the SP unworthy. After all, they want to be able to believe that SPs not only tell the truth in what they say, but also in what they do not or only half say, that they are clear, honest, and transparent, by not concealing relevant information.

Nevertheless, speaking the truth does not always mean complete openness. There are many situations in which confidentiality and secrecy are ethical. It may be reasonable and necessary to keep quiet if this is the only way of serving public interest. If SPs were forced to make all details immediately publicly available with respect to ideas, plans, and preparations, for example for investigations, wars, or transactions regarding land, this would undermine attempts to reach their goal. Those under investigation would gain the opportunity to escape, the country on which war was declared would have more opportunity to prepare, and speculators would be able to drive up the price of land. Similarly SPs must be silent about rescue operations in progress in case openness leads to panic, making rescue more difficult or pointless. SPs showing openness in such situations will be seen as imprudent.

At a party political level, too, telling the truth does not mean always being completely open. Here again, people do not have to be, and indeed cannot be completely open if this undermines the integrity of the action concerned. For example, political parties' election strategies and tactics are not typically made public, because if they became known this would play into the hands of other parties, rendering the strategies pointless. The same goes for negotiations. If we had to put all our cards on the table, this would undermine negotiations.³⁰² Similarly, we need not always make the content of internal discussions known. If everything said became public knowledge, this would lead to not everything being said in the first place, because it is often necessary to be able to talk freely about confidential subjects internally in order to make them public as a unit at the right moment. It is a violation of integrity if an SP spills the beans and makes information public prematurely. If complete openness were the norm, it would no longer be possible to leak information, because leaks require information to be confidential or secret, and this would not be the case. So the very existence of leaks is down to the confidentiality of certain issues and the common understanding that openness is limited.

SPs are not obliged to be fully open about themselves to anyone. If you were to state everything that you knew and thought, people's thinking and their nature would be undermined. For example SPs, who have doubts about continuing in their positions do not need to make this known if journalists ask. Expressing doubts would mean losing eligibility for a new term, as only SPs who are certain that they want and are capable of a position are likely to be appointed. Similarly, Jimmy Carter was not obliged to tell anyone in an interview during the US presidential election campaign that he had been unfaithful in his heart on multiple occasions

by looking at many women with desire.³⁰³ SPs do not need to be open books in this respect. This could lead to self-castigation or unnecessary problems, and it is simply unrealistic. Some questions do not require an answer.

Although there may be reasons for not being fully open, lying is always damaging to integrity. A lie is a statement that is deliberately in conflict with the truth. A lie therefore goes further than avoiding the truth. For that reason SPs accused of lying often try to remove the intentionality in order to preserve their integrity. As Richard Nixon said in the case of erroneous information he had spread about the Watergate scandal, "I was not lying. I said things that later on seemed to be untrue."³⁰⁴ There are at least two reasons why lying is by definition damaging to integrity.

The first reason is that even if there are good moral reasons for lying and even if a lie is praiseworthy, it is still an infringement of honesty. US president Franklin Roosevelt admitted that he would have lied and cheated if it could have enabled him to win the Second World War.³⁰⁵ In order to gain support for his decision John F. Kennedy had to lie about the reason why the US had withdrawn long-range missiles from Turkey and Italy as part of a deal with Russia to end the conflict over Cuba and prevent nuclear war. Similarly George W. Bush did not answer the question of whether he had used marihuana because if he said he had used it he thought it might be used as a justification by American youths for doing the same.³⁰⁶ Even with noble motives and important interests, lying shortchanges the truth and personal integrity with it. It leaves people incomplete. In this respect it is the same as secretly being unfaithful in marriage. It damages the people's integrity because they are unfaithful to their life partners, even if it is with the best of intentions (for instance because people love their partners more as a result of their affairs, or because they help those with whom they have affairs). Lying is unfaithfulness to the truth.

A second reason is that people can often avoid needing to lie. SPs lie by completely denying a suggestion. For instance one SP emphatically maintained that it was "utter nonsense" that he would become the new vice president of an important advisory council, and was appointed to it shortly afterwards. Similarly a mayor denied that there were ideas for renovating a shopping street, a president that money had been paid to free hostages, and a party's management denied having had discussions with another party about collaboration. Denial is unnecessary, because it is possible and better to explain why you cannot give an answer. For example,

you might say that openness on a particular issue is impossible because confidentiality must be respected, the question can never be answered (because answering would be self-destructive), you are not the right person to speak on the matter, or an answer is premature and more time is needed before you can respond properly. Since you cannot or do not want to say anything contentful, there is plenty to say about why this is the case and why there are limits to offering openness without having to lie.

SPs who nevertheless consider lying would do well to realize what it means if their lies emerge and they tell the truth the next time. As Aristotle said, "Liars when they speak the truth are not believed."³⁰⁷

X. Between standards and practice

Part X, consisting of five chapters, is about the meaning of the relationship between standards and practice for SPs' integrity.

54. Integrity does not exist

Complete, perfect integrity is an illusion, because SPs live in a broken world and human nature itself is broken. For that reason an SP cannot possess complete integrity. The positive sides of this are that (1) there is no need for panic if SPs are found to lack integrity, (2) SPs do not need to claim to fully possess integrity, and (3) the completely corrupt SP does not exist either.

Having passed the halfway mark in the book, the title of this chapter may seem disillusioning, denying the existence of integrity in a book on the subject. This title points to the fact that an SP cannot possess integrity. SPs with integrity do not exist. Complete, perfect integrity is an illusion, just like the idea that a person can be completely loving, helpful, or sympathetic. Why is that?

Firstly there is the issue of a broken world. The world itself lacks integrity. Society is full of tensions and conflicts. Corruption, criminality, injustice, and unfairness are all around. Instead of harmony or balance, there is fragmentation, dispersion, imbalance.³⁰⁸ It is no different within organizations. According to scientists Margaret Wheatley and Myron Kellner, organizations are characterized by multiple personality disorder.³⁰⁹ Organizations are incoherent, lacking a single voice, due to different interests and conflicts over scarce resources. This makes them imperfect, lacking integrity. In such a world and in such organizations it is difficult to act with integrity as an SP. However, that does not make it impossible.

What does make it impossible, the second element, is that human nature itself is broken. Human flesh is weak. Human nature is selfish, causing internal tension. There is evil in everyone. "Every man has a price," as Abraham Lincoln said.³¹⁰ That is why humans lack integrity.

Looking at integrity in this light helps eliminate an anxious knee-jerk response when someone is labeled as lacking integrity. There is nothing wrong with it: that is human nature. Behaving without integrity is a sign of humanity. Seeing someone as lacking integrity does not necessarily mean that this person is no good. People can be suited to a position or job despite not having integrity. The same goes for two people who may be meant for one another as life partners despite regularly having their differences.

The fact that integrity does not exist therefore means that SPs do not need to profess to have integrity, and it is important to watch out for those who do. Such people may be hypocritical or lack self-knowledge. They may be wolves in sheep's clothing. Appearing better than others is in any case dangerous, because this can create envy and feelings of inferiority, thereby inspiring unwanted opposition. Robert Greene advises the powerful never to create the impression of perfection.³¹¹ Spanish writer Baltasar Gracián even advised rulers to show at least one vice. Revealing an innocent vice can make others less envious, and what is seen as less morally praiseworthy can distract from more serious vices.³¹²

Another positive side of the non-existence of integrity is that the opposite, corruption, is equally non-existent, at least in the sense that no one can be completely corrupt and fragmented. Everyone has at least something good, some virtue. Without a certain level of integrity it would be impossible to function.³¹³ SPs would have no sense of standards, no self-control, and no self-awareness. So calling someone corrupt is a denial of the integrity they possess and with it an expression that in itself lacks integrity. For that reason it is better not to make such accusations.

55. Integrity does not reduce standards to practice

A serious danger for integrity is that the actual situation becomes elevated to the status of a standard. What should happen cannot be inferred from what is: if this were the case, behavior would be self-justifying. It is therefore important that SPs do not elevate practice to the status of a standard and use this as a justification for their behavior. Nevertheless practice implies certain standards for integrity. Knowledge of this helps SPs to handle integrity properly in practice.

Politics is often portrayed as amoral. There is no space for morality, ethics, or integrity in politics. As Russian leader Vladimir Lenin put it, "There are no morals in politics; there is only expedience."³¹⁴ German poet Friedrich von Schlegel made the same point: "Where there is politics or economics, there is no morality."³¹⁵ Politics and ethics are seen as a contradiction in terms, two incompatible quantities. As American writer and social critic Henry Louis Mencken stated, "A good politician is quite as unthinkable as an honest burglar."³¹⁶

SPs' beliefs are fed by their images of their field of work, the terrain in which they do their jobs. For example, if we look at politics there are at least two images that feed the irreconcilability of politics on the one hand and morality, ethics, and integrity on the other.

Politics is sometimes compared with prostitution. In this connection Harry Truman once said, "My choice early in life was either to be a piano-player in a whorehouse or a politician. And to tell the truth, there's hardly any difference."³¹⁷ In this regard Ronald Reagan said, "Politics is supposed to be the second oldest profession. I have come to realize that it bears a very close resemblance to the first."³¹⁸ Politicians apparently sell themselves, devote themselves to satisfying others, dancing to their tune, allowing themselves to be used. By baring all, they exhibit a willingness to serve par excellence.

Politics is also regularly portrayed as war. "Politics and war are remarkably similar situations," said Newt Gingrich, former chair of the US House of Representatives among other things.³¹⁹ The only difference between politics and war, according to Winston Churchill, is that "In war you can only be killed once, but in politics, many times."³²⁰ In particular by your own friends and party members: "I've always said that in politics, your enemies can't hurt you, but your friends will kill you," said US governor Ann Richards.³²¹ According to Belgian governor Steve Stevaert the greatest enemies of political leaders are their own parties.³²² Mao Zedong, too, states that politics and war have great similarities: "Politics is war without bloodshed while war is politics with bloodshed."³²³ Some go even further, as in the case of US presidential candidate Ross Perot: "War has rules, mud wrestling has rules - politics has no rules."³²⁴

This view of politics feeds the image of politicians as streetwalkers,³²⁵ thieves,³²⁶ jokes,³²⁷ snakes,³²⁸ magicians (who have to distract attention from what is really going on),³²⁹ murderous,³³⁰ depraved,³³¹ and experts in the less elevated skills of imperfect human beings.³³² President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono of Indonesia said that corruption took place in his government.³³³ Similarly a top European official described in detail how his years of experience led him to conclude that hypocrisy is the father of all success in European politics.³³⁴

If politicians describe their experiences this way, there must be a grain of truth to it. Here we are not talking about determining the extent to which these images are true, or whether other types of SPs also see their works as prostitution or war. Those are empirical questions. The question in this chapter is what this means for SPs. That is a normative question. The major danger, after all, is the misconception that the actual situation should be the standard. In response to the Watergate scandal Richard Nixon said, "When the President does it, that means that it's not illegal."³³⁵ However, behavior does not create the standard. If hypocrisy led to success, this would not make it moral. As philosopher David Hume stated, what ought to be cannot be inferred from what is: current behavior cannot be used as a basis for desirable behavior.³³⁶ If this were the case, behavior would be self-justifying and we would never be able to speak of good and evil. Behavior would then be good because it was behavior. Machiavelli, for example, may have stated, "A man who wishes to make a profession of goodness in everything must necessarily come to grief among so many who are not good,"³³⁷ but this does not make his next conclusion morally defensible: "Hence it is necessary for a prince... to know how to do wrong."³³⁸ Nor that of Napoleon Bonaparte: "Place your iron hand inside a velvet glove."³³⁹

In short, integrity does not reduce standards to practice. From the perspective of integrity it is therefore important not to elevate practice to the status of a standard or to use it as a justification for your own behavior or that of others. Arguments such as “That’s the way it is,” “Everyone does it,” “That’s normal around here,” and “That’s the only way to achieve success,” may well be true, but that does not make them ethical.

At the same time common practice harbors standards, in the sense of the norms people follow for integrity in themselves and others. These are known as descriptive norms.³⁴⁰ Practice shows what is actually understood by integrity, how it plays into the way SPs are seen and evaluated, and how integrity helps or hinders them in doing their jobs well. Knowledge and insight into how integrity is used in practice helps in handling it properly.

56. Integrity is not moralistic

Although desirable standards cannot be unified with practice, they should not be too distant from practice, otherwise they become moralistic. For that reason it is important that demands of SPs' integrity are realistic, and that SPs make realistic demands of their own and others' integrity.

In the previous chapter we saw that SPs must take care not to elevate practice to the status of a standard. This would cause a lapse in ethics, making reflecting on practice pointless because practice would then be the desired standard and would always be seen as morally acceptable. Avoiding unifying standards with practice is one side of the coin.

The flipside is that the standards set should not be counter to practice. Integrity is sometimes seen as moralistic, preaching, idealistic, superior, and overly fastidious. SPs will then set aside criticism of their integrity because they do not feel it applies to them. In their view the criticism fails to take their situation into account. It is therefore important to keep an eye on SPs' situations when setting demands of their integrity. Machiavelli indicated the risks involved. When studying what is desirable we should not ignore the circumstances: "There is such a gap between how one lives and how one should live that he who neglects what is being done for what should be done will learn his destruction rather than his preservation."³⁴¹

This means that realistic standards should be set for SPs, with attention for practice without automatically allowing standards to follow practice. SPs do not need too much integrity.³⁴² It is unethical to set excessively high expectations of integrity among SPs. If the demands of integrity are too high, this will only lead to continual fault finding, a recipe for defeat and withdrawal of SPs, as Stephen Carter notes.³⁴³ Integrity would lose its attraction and would only repel when the gap between standard and practice became too great. "Politics is the art of the possible," as Otto von Bismarck put it.³⁴⁴ The same goes for integrity: integrity must be

attainable; we cannot ask the impossible. This means that we should not make excessively many demands of SPs, nor excessively few.

When it comes to judging SPs' behavior, the unruly situation in which they operate should be taken into consideration. For SPs themselves this means maintaining standards that are neither too high nor too low in criticizing one another. Otherwise you come across as a know-it-all or moralist (if you set standards too high), or as immoral, cowardly, unresponsive, and inactive (if you set them too low). Realistic standards are also important for self-evaluation. Otherwise you risk wrongly talking yourself into an inferiority or guilt complex (if standards are too high) or conceitedness, overconfidence, and passivity (if standards are too low).

If you are confronted and criticized, it can be sufficient defense to dismiss criticism and the critics as moralistic. This transfers attention to the critics and their knowledge and understanding of the situation in question. It is also important to avoid creating the impression of lacking morals yourself when pointing out excessively high morals applied by others, as this exacerbates the problem.

57. Integrity is about what you aspire to, not how you are

For SPs integrity means navigating between standards and practice. Practice does not necessarily have to mirror the standard, but standards should not be too distant from practice. This is a question of SPs bringing practice closer to standards instead of lowering standards to practice. Integrity is about making a difference here.

We saw above that we have standards (ideals, values, and principles) on the one hand and practice, on the other, and that the two should not be equated. We have also seen that integrity does not exist, and we must take care not to expect perfection from SPs. At the same time this does not mean that we should throw integrity overboard, prioritizing practice over standards.

For SPs integrity means navigating between standards and practice. On the one hand practice does not necessarily have to mirror the standard, but on the other hand the standards should not be too distant from practice. We should avoid being too relativistic (continually adapting to what happens in practice), or too idealistic (ignoring reality). It is a question of bringing practice closer to standards, not lowering standards to practice. Ideally standards should function as a magnet: practice should be attracted towards the standard, not vice versa.

Integrity is not so much about SPs being perfect,³⁴⁵ as about aspiring to integrity. Striving for integrity in itself harbors integrity, even if we strive for something that can never fully be achieved. As Stephen Carter puts it, “The life lived with integrity is a life of striving toward the good and the true.”³⁴⁶ Even if we never achieve what is good and true, integrity lies in chasing after it. Integrity in that respect is not only a journey of discovery of what our own integrity contains and means (see chapter 11), but also like climbing a mountain, continually ascending without ever reaching the summit.

Machiavelli was right when he stated that people should learn not to be too virtuous in a none-too-virtuous world.³⁴⁷ We have to be realistic. However, we should not go too far or start out lacking virtue. Integrity is about continually trying to be a little more virtuous than before (growing personal integrity), than others (relative integrity), and than others think you should (surpassing expectations). The question for SPs is where they can make a difference, as personal integrity lies in making a difference.

58. Integrity is not like pregnancy

Integrity is sometimes compared with pregnancy: SPs either have it or they do not. The disadvantage of this metaphor is that the smallest infringement of integrity means it is seen as completely absent. As a consequence, people are both reticent and at the same time eager to criticize the integrity of SPs. However, integrity is not a dichotomy but a continuum. For this reason SPs should be restrained in talking of people's integrity in absolute terms.

A minister once compared integrity with pregnancy: people either have it or they lack it. You cannot be a person of partial integrity any more than you can be partially pregnant. By the same theory, in her view the government either does or does not possess integrity.³⁴⁸ The strength of this metaphor is that it focuses on the importance of integrity. Integrity is absolute. People who fall short are found completely lacking. No tolerance, margin, or compromise is possible with respect to integrity.

The serious disadvantage of this metaphor, however, is that it presents integrity as a dichotomy. It is one or the other, black or white, suggesting that the slightest infringement wipes it out altogether, equating a single scratch with a total loss. This makes questioning someone's integrity highly charged and threatening. After all, if evidence is found of a lack of integrity, there is no integrity any more. This view can easily lead to reserve and cautiousness in criticizing a person's integrity in practice and to fierce defense when people are criticized: after all, it casts doubt on everything about their integrity.

However, integrity is not a dichotomy but a continuum, running from extreme corruption through corruption and lack of integrity to integrity and extreme integrity. People may possess a great deal of integrity or very little, or they may be in between. Integrity is not absolute in the sense of being about SPs' entire lives or behavior. Integrity is relative, because it is attached

to the relevant situations, jobs, roles, and positions, although, as indicated in chapter 12, it can be transferable. An SP may have integrity as a colleague but less so as a chairperson, or may do well as a party leader but show insufficient integrity as a negotiator.

Since integrity is a continuum, and attached to the situation and office, we should be cautious in making negative generalizations about a person's integrity. Italian president Silvio Berlusconi called Giorgio Napolitano untrustworthy.³⁴⁹ Such accusations raise various questions: are you doing the person justice, what gives you the right to describe someone in this way, and are you trustworthy yourself? Above all, it raises the question of whether this is an absolute issue. Labeling someone untrustworthy means they are not trustworthy in any respect, not in different situations, nor in different jobs. Descriptions of a person's integrity can be softened by avoiding speaking of the person as a whole, and focusing instead on their capacity as an SP (speaking of someone as an official, rather than an individual person). Instead of speaking of the presence of bad, speak of the absence of good (not trustworthy, rather than untrustworthy), instead of virtue, speak of behavior (for instance not being faithful in keeping promises) and instead of behavior in a general sense, speaking of behavior in a specific situation (for instance, someone may not be faithful when pressure is high or during negotiations). It makes a substantial difference calling someone corrupt compared with stating that in their position as chairperson, under time pressure, they unduly push their own opinions.

The same cautiousness should be observed when it comes to labeling SPs as possessing integrity in absolute terms. For example, a prime minister was called "a person of integrity through and through" by a minister.³⁵⁰ Since integrity is an ideal and in a certain sense, as we saw previously, no one has complete integrity, it is risky to label someone this way. This is not only potentially naïve, but suggests that the person making the claim knows the other through and through. Since integrity has many sides, this is a bold assumption. After all, we do not know what knowledge we are missing. Such pronouncements are also risky because they imply that things that do not completely conform to integrity in a person have been judged as integrity. This runs the risk of others with a lower opinion (for instance because they know more) thinking that those who label such as person as having integrity must have less strict criteria. By labeling another person as having integrity, you run the risk of appearing to have less integrity yourself.

XI. Dealing with dilemmas

Part XI, consisting of twelve chapters, is about what integrity means for the way SPs deal with dilemmas.

59. Integrity is expressed in the battle over moral dilemmas

The battles SPs fight over moral dilemmas are signs of integrity, because they show that (1) SPs have aspirations for different values, (2) these values are equally important, (3) the choice between them is difficult, and (4) this affects the SP. For this reason SPs should not be too hasty in avoiding dilemmas. Dilemmas are also building blocks for personal integrity. Confrontation with dilemmas is not a sign of weakness as long as they have not been caused unnecessarily by the SP. SPs should prepare well for potential dilemmas.

SPs can be confronted with dilemmas, situations in which values are in conflict. There are dilemmas of many different kinds. A classic example is the mayor's wartime dilemma, whereby mayors are confronted with the question of whether to step down to avoid working with the enemy regime or to stay in order to inflict less pain than a hostile mayor would. Whatever you do, it goes against one of the values you stand for: doing reprehensible things yourself versus limiting the reprehensible things done. Similar dilemmas include the issue of whether or not to agree to the demands of hostages, terrorists, criminals, and reprehensible regimes. At the start of the 1990s, after the murders of two lawyers, the Italian government was presented with the choice of whether or not to agree to the mafia's offer to moderate their campaign in exchange for lower prison sentences and better treatment for convicted Mafiosos.³⁵¹ For the government it was a choice between security and maintaining law and order. US president Gerald Ford was also confronted by a dilemma as to the application of the law. He was faced with the decision of whether to punish Nixon for the Watergate scandal or to grant him a pardon, giving Ford freedom to govern (which was necessary for the sake of the country). Ford opted for the latter, on the basis that Nixon had been punished enough already, although Ford knew this would cost him his next term in office.³⁵² According to Barack Obama there are few other professions in which one has to make as many daily decisions

as in politics; decisions include those “between different sets of constituents, between the interests of your state and the interests of the nation, between party loyalty and your own sense of independence, between the value of service and obligations to your family.”³⁵³

Integrity dilemmas consist of a choice between two or more evils.³⁵⁴ Whatever you do, you cannot get it right: you have to act in conflict with one value, principle, or interest or another. Economist John Kenneth Galbraith expresses this strongly with respect to politics: “Politics is not the art of the possible. It consists in choosing between the disastrous and the unpalatable.”³⁵⁵

Dilemmas are unavoidable choices. A choice must be made, because doing nothing is a choice too. It is therefore farcical to think that we can escape dilemmas by passing on decisions to others, putting them off, or doing nothing at all. All of these involve choices, and the choice to do nothing, like any other, reveals what you stand for.

Moral dilemmas can arise from the diversity of values an SP holds. According to value monism all values can be placed in a hierarchy and there are no real ethical dilemmas, because one value always outweighs another and therefore becomes the deciding factor. According to value pluralism, values can come into conflict, because there is no absolute hierarchy.³⁵⁶ This does not change the fact that not all values are equally valuable, nor every choice equally good, contrary to value relativism and value subjectivity. A moral stand can be taken on a choice, and it can be discussed.

A dilemma is therefore a situation in which different values come into conflict. With respect to integrity the question is whether this conflict is experienced as such by the person. The conflict, after all, reveals aspirations for a variety of values, showing that these values are seen as important, and equally important, and that the choice between them is difficult and affects the person.³⁵⁷ As philosopher James Gutman puts it, “Such inner tension is one measure of integration and is commensurate with the richness and magnitude of the values which it seeks to organize.”³⁵⁸ The inner conflict is a sign of integration, of integrity.

It is therefore important not to avoid dilemmas but where possible to take the time for them and involve others. This shows how much effort the decision takes, that the SP has taken the

dilemma to heart and carefully studied the options. Moreover if you give up easily on a value this suggests that it has little value to you and that you have not thought it through.

The fact that SPs are confronted with moral dilemmas therefore does not indicate weakness. In fact it shows strength when you take on the fight and act accordingly. Dilemmas are also building blocks for strengthening personal integrity. They help in discovering and shaping integrity.³⁵⁹ In the struggle over dilemmas you discover what you consider important and what you stand for at the core. However, seeking out or deliberately causing dilemmas is not a sign of integrity. For example if dilemmas are the result of wrong or bad decisions made earlier or of personal incapacity, this does not show integrity. Such cases are not “pure” dilemmas. So in evaluating a person’s integrity in handling a dilemma, we should always ask if they did enough to avoid the situation.

Another important question is what people have done to prepare for dilemmas. Any SP can be confronted by dilemmas. Moreover, in most terms of office dilemmas will arise which determine the official’s reputation and personal success. Often these dilemmas are unexpected. A crisis or disaster may arise, officials may be confronted with allegations or disastrous environmental changes. Knowing this, SPs should not respond with surprise, and should avoid giving the impression of being insufficiently aware of the likely eventualities. Good preparation for dilemmas involves thinking about possible dilemmas, gaining a good view of the relevant values and the way they are interrelated, and using experience and education to develop the skills and competences to handle them properly.

60. Integrity does not exclude compromise, but compromise compromises integrity

Compromise does not have to damage personal integrity. After all, it can help achieve ideals and standpoints. At the same time, compromises are a threat to SPs' integrity because (1) they raise the risk that SPs will be unable to explain what they stand for, (2) they create the impression that SPs are prepared to offer up their values and standards at any price, and (3) SPs may find it increasingly easy to compromise, eventually doing so for the wrong reasons. For this reason SPs should take care not to (1) defend compromises as they do ideals and standpoints, (2) agree vocally when they cannot be sure they can fulfill their promises, (3) allow their own beliefs and commitments to be damaged, and (4) become satisfied with less and less progress.

It is often thought that integrity is at odds with compromise. It is true that compromise puts integrity under pressure and can threaten it, but integrity does not exclude the possibility of compromise.

Compromise is an indispensable part of government and politics.³⁶⁰ In fact, according to British politician Paddy Ashdown politics *is* compromise.³⁶¹ In a pluralistic society people have different values and norms. Since people with the same values and norms tend not to form a majority, in a democracy we must be willing to compromise with others. If we are not willing to do this, we cut ourselves off. Those who want everything end up with nothing. It is a matter of give and take.³⁶² In the view of a former parliamentary chairperson, the willingness to compromise is the test of a democracy.³⁶³ "If politics is the art of the possible, then compromise is the artistry of democracy," said American political scientists Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson in their book *The Spirit of Compromise*.³⁶⁴

Compromise does not have to damage personal integrity. According to political philosopher Martin Benjamin, integrity even demands compromise to some extent.³⁶⁵ Integrity may be holding onto certain values, norms, and ideals, but at the same time it does not mean fanaticism, or always holding onto all of them.³⁶⁶ Holding onto something means very little if you cannot let it go. Integrity sometimes means taking what you can get, without necessarily infringing what you stand for.³⁶⁷ In fact, you may compromise because you stand for something, because this allows you to achieve part of what you want to achieve, bringing you closer to your goal, which would not otherwise have been possible. In this respect compromise can underline integrity. A choice in favor of one value is not necessarily a choice against the value passed over or breached.

At the same time compromise does compromise integrity, in the sense that it threatens personal integrity. Firstly there is the risk that you will no longer be able to explain what you stand for, losing your way in shades of gray, or making it unclear what you stand for. This applies mainly to intangible, qualitative issues. If one party wants to save 3% and the other 1%, then 2% is a clear compromise. However, when it comes to non-material issues, such as security and integration, we are no longer talking about gradual differences but rather differences in principle, making compromises more difficult to explain and justify. As one deputy prime minister said, "If you keep on watering down the wine, eventually you'll have no wine left."³⁶⁸ Compromise means taking the middle way, and as US president John Adams stated, "In politics the middle way is none at all."³⁶⁹

A second risk of compromise is that it gives the impression that you are prepared to give up your values at any price. Compromises can be seen as deals instead of ideals, bartering rather than standing for a cause and making a point. You may even be accused of turning tail or hypocrisy if you trade in too many ideals and promises.³⁷⁰

For that reason it is important not to defend your compromises as if they were your own ideals and views, but rather as a means to an end, a step towards realizing your own ideals while also giving others the opportunity to realize some of theirs. At the same time vocal promises and agreements and use of terms such as preconditions and breaking points are only desirable if you know you can live up to them. As an SP said during an election campaign, "Our standpoints are negotiable, our principles are not."

A further risk is that compromise becomes easier over time, so that you compromise too easily (giving others the impression that you are bypassing points of principle) or on issues that damage integrity. For that reason SPs should be careful not to let excessive compromise damage their own commitment, leaving them satisfied with dwindling progress. This requires of SPs what Martin Benjamin calls “a creative blend of commitment to particular positions and tolerance of opposing positions.”³⁷¹

61. Integrity allows you to get your hands dirty, but only in special circumstances

SPs can get their hands dirty and still have a clear conscience provided they (1) do their best to avoid it, (2) come closer to achieving their ideals in doing so, (3) do not do so lightly or with pride, and (4) do not allow others to dirty their hands more than is strictly necessary.

In the previous chapter we saw that compromise is inextricably bound up with an SP's position. Getting your hands dirty, or violating values, standards, and principles, is an extension of this. However, this does not mean that integrity is damaged. Just as a surgeon has to make cuts and spill blood to make a patient better, SPs must be prepared to do undesirable things to achieve desirable outcomes. It is possible to have dirty hands and a clean conscience.³⁷² Integrity, however, does not allow us to get our hands dirty without a conscience. When getting our hands dirty we should ask ourselves if this is morally acceptable. What should SPs pay attention to here?

In order to be able to get your hands dirty with a clean conscience it is important first and foremost to be sure that you have done everything you can to avoid getting your hands dirty, and to minimize any dirt.³⁷³ That is why you should always ask yourself if it is really necessary to get your hands dirty, whether there is another way. The risk is that you find it increasingly easy to get your hands dirty and fail to realize that things could be different and better, thereby damaging your own integrity.

A second important test is whether, when getting your hands dirty, you are really striving for the ideals you stand for and bringing them closer. For that reason when making a compromise you should understand that what you are giving up is attached to what you receive in return, and that the compromise is not an end point but an intermediate stage. It is also important

when it comes to a compromise between several people or parties to make it clear what each party is giving and receiving. Integrity demands balance and reciprocity between what everyone gives and receives. As Angela Merkel puts it, “A good compromise is one where everybody makes a contribution.”³⁷⁴ It is also important that everybody receives a fair share of the benefits. The converse can also be acceptable: where you cannot make a situation good, you should minimize the bad. Sometimes you have to pick the least bad option to limit further departure from the goal or ideal.

Thirdly you should avoid taking dirty hands lightly or taking pride in them (as if you could easily step over corpses or even enjoy doing so). In chapter 59 we saw that conflict over dilemmas is an important characteristic of integrity. It is therefore important only to get your hands dirty with a troubled conscience or sense of shame.³⁷⁵ This feeling can be long-lasting. Ten years after 7,000 citizens were murdered in the fall of an enclave, a former minister of foreign affairs responsible for providing military protection commented, “One way or another the question continues to follow you: did I do enough, did I do what I could in my position? I still feel dissatisfied about it. I cannot make it stop. It remains the case.”³⁷⁶ A troubled conscience, incidentally, is not the same as regret. Regret means feeling that you should have done things differently. Despite a troubled conscience you can still openly account for the choice you have made.

The fourth thing that does not help keep your hands clean is allowing others to dirty them more than is strictly necessary. Franklin Roosevelt, for example, had a reputation for being honest and just, and was unwilling to associate with dirty hands. Instead he had his secretary, Louis Howe, pick up the dirty jobs.³⁷⁷ However, this indirectly dirties your hands, because you give the order or knowingly offer others the freedom to do so.

For this reason SPs taking up office should realize that they will have to get their hands dirty. It shows naivety if you leave as soon as things get messy. Serving the people, as Otto von Bismarck said of politics, is not the art of what is most feasible, but of the “next best,” of second choice.³⁷⁸

62. Integrity is the good you achieve, not just the wrong you avoid

Fear of doing the wrong thing should not lead SPs to passivity. Integrity is also contained in the extent to which SPs use their own talents and abilities, gaining value in the value they create. SPs should therefore focus on doing good and should frequently ask themselves to what extent they are achieving this.

In order to avoid getting your hands dirty too often and for the wrong reasons, you might choose to do nothing. Fear of making mistakes or wrong decisions and letting others down makes people passive. Of course, integrity is not about avoiding getting your hands dirty at any price: the end does not always justify the means. However, it is important to take care not to go too far in the opposite direction and do nothing.

Ask yourself, can you hold a position with integrity without achieving anything? The answer is no. Integrity resides in the extent to which you use your talents and skills. You become complete when you fulfill your potential and make it count. You are only virtuous when you use the virtues you have, given the opportunity. So if you fail to use your virtues when you have the opportunity, you lack integrity.

This perspective on integrity means that it is not only about avoiding doing wrong. If that were the case, it really would be a matter of doing as little as possible in order to minimize mistakes. Integrity also has a positive meaning. It is about what you actually do, and of course about what matters, the good things. Integrity gains value in the value people create. If you achieve little when you have the capacity and opportunity to do more, integrity is of little or no value. The following German saying expresses this well: one does enough evil when one does nothing good.

SPs should therefore frequently ask themselves what they are achieving and whether it is good. Is there a difference in what you do, what you contribute, and what you avoid doing in a positive sense? For example Bill Clinton judged his presidency mainly in terms of the influence he had on the lives of citizens, recording it in figures, such as the number of US citizens with a new job, house, school bursary, or health insurance.³⁷⁹ SPs should also ask themselves to what extent getting their hands dirty relates to the good they achieve. The more you achieve, the more this justifies getting your hands dirty. The less you achieve, the more you need to keep them clean.

These questions may seem evident, but SPs run the risk of being so caught up in hectic everyday internal worries that they ask this question too little, and when they are free they are too tired to think about such questions, never mind pondering or answering them.

63. Integrity can be sacrificed for good reasons

Before criticizing SPs, we should pay attention to (1) the investments they make, (2) the noble interest that they serve, and (3) the risk they take of having to sacrifice their integrity. It is desirable that SPs gain appreciation from society, so that SP positions are attractive to current and future SPs and they have the necessary authority.

SPs are sometimes spoken of with disdain and moral indignation,³⁸⁰ with the suggestion that they are after power, fame, and status. Self-interest dominates and morality is nowhere to be seen. SPs operate in a snake pit, a battlefield, an arena. Is this fair? Before criticizing SPs, we should understand that they deserve appreciation for a number of reasons.

Firstly, many citizens do not want to go into politics or public administration. Although there is a great deal of enthusiasm for SP positions, there are also many people with no interest in them. Many SP positions take up a good deal of free time. Salaries for paid SP positions are relatively low compared with those in business. There is also generally no job security: political and administrative changes can mean that SPs are forced to step down from one day to the next. In this respect, serving the people is a risky investment. For this reason alone there should be appreciation for SPs.

There is a second reason why SPs deserve appreciation. Even if it were true that SPs were after power, fame, and status, or other personal interests (such as creating a network and springboard to a better position), the position is still focused on serving the people. SPs are choosing a noble position above doing nothing or serving other interests. That is why people who work for the good of society should be appreciated.

Appreciation should extend further. If SPs really operate in a snake pit, on a battlefield, or in an arena, it is all the more praiseworthy that they risk becoming embroiled in it, having to get their

hands dirty, and even damaging or losing their integrity. Those who want to serve the people are praiseworthy in this respect. It is a sign of integrity when people consciously risk having to sacrifice this quality. Philosopher Bernard Williams states that people who place keeping a clear conscience above all else exhibit a form of moral selfishness, what he calls moral self-indulgence.³⁸¹ They prioritize avoiding damage to themselves (through moral dilemmas) above the damage they might cause by making the wrong decision. For this reason risking damage to your conscience can be desirable and praiseworthy.

There should be appreciation for SPs for these three reasons. As Theodore Roosevelt put it, "It is not the critic who counts: not the man who points out how the strong man stumbles or where the doer of deeds could have done better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood, who strives valiantly, who errs and comes up short again and again, because there is no effect without error or shortcoming, but who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions, who spends himself for a worthy cause; who, at the best, knows, in the end, the triumph of high achievement, and who, at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who knew neither victory nor defeat."³⁸² People who are unwilling to take any integrity risks do not belong in SP positions. As philosopher Lynne McFall puts it, those people would be better off taking up residence in their closets.³⁸³

Lack of appreciation is not something SPs should allow to happen to them. Where possible they should make it clear what they invest and risk. Appreciation is not only necessary for your own pleasure and fulfillment in your work, but also for the necessary authority to be able to fulfill your role and to maintain the attractiveness of such positions for future SPs.

64. Integrity resides in what you do not do, not just what you do

There is also integrity in what SPs refrain from doing. Doing nothing is a decision to continue with the current situation, and SPs can get their hands dirty by inaction. Since it is more difficult to judge SPs for inaction than for action, inaction is all the more important from the perspective of integrity. For SPs, therefore, it is not only a matter of what they do, but also what they could and should do better, and not only what they know, but also of situations in which they could and should know better.

Integrity, as we saw above, resides in what a person does and achieves. The behavior we see and the effects it has are therefore the object of a person's integrity. Still, this is just one side of the coin. The other side is that integrity is revealed by what people refrain from doing and the areas where they fail to perform.

Inaction is also a form of action, passivity is a form of activity. Doing nothing involves a decision to do nothing. What people do not do reveals integrity because it indicates that people agree not to act and that they do not consider certain matters important enough to be worth acting on. As Tony Blair said of the choice whether or not to attack Iraq, "Indecision is also decision. Inaction is also action."³⁸⁴ Doing nothing is a decision to continue with the current situation.

Doing nothing expresses itself in allowing matters to pass by, not standing up for them, and tolerating a situation. It expresses itself in putting things off, handing them on, or shirking, by not spending money, time, and attention on significant matters, and by not developing new policies or executing current policies to the full. As French politician Henri Queuille said, "Politics is the art of postponing decisions until they are no longer relevant."³⁸⁵ At the same time SPs are often criticized for indecisiveness, setting the wrong priorities, and shirking responsibilities. A former cabinet secretary to two European Commissioners described

non-intervention as the highest wisdom in the European Commission, because, as he put it, “power counts for everything and morality only applies after the game has ended.”³⁸⁶

It is also tempting to do nothing rather than take action, because it is more difficult to judge inaction. If nothing is done, then in some sense there is nothing to judge. Action provides material for judgment. Decisions are recorded in meeting minutes, but there are no minutes to describe the countless decisions that are not made. So by taking action we make ourselves more vulnerable to criticism, accusations, and repercussions than if we do nothing. That is why non-intervention can be the highest wisdom, because that way you do nothing wrong, make no enemies, and remain irreproachable, thereby surviving.

Just because it is harder to catch someone at inaction, does not make it any less relevant from the perspective of integrity. In fact it makes it even more relevant, firstly because it happens more often (if people do something, then at the same time there are many things they are not doing), and secondly because inaction is harder for others to correct and therefore more dependent on personal integrity. Inaction is important from the perspective of integrity when it becomes negligence. Negligence is a serious threat because, as Irish politician Edmund Burke states, “The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.”³⁸⁷ For that reason inaction can cause us to get our hands dirty.³⁸⁸ For that reason Tony Blair rightly stated, “It is better to try and fail than to fail to try.”³⁸⁹

A much-used tactic for not doing what one should is feigning ignorance. What people do not know will not hurt them. Ignorance is seen as “the best form of defense.”³⁹⁰ However, if ignorance is intended to evade responsibility, then it is very bad from the perspective of integrity, as it causes us to fail to know and do things we should. Integrity is not only about what you know, but also about what you could and should have known. A governor, for example, was criticized when he hid behind the fact that he did not know his officials were not applying his policy properly; the council considered this irrelevant, because the governor should have known.

In judging the integrity of SPs it is therefore not only a question of what they have done and achieved, but also what they have not done, particularly neglected issues that should have been tackled.

65. Integrity is only relevant if there are alternatives

SPs can only be held responsible for a choice if they have something to choose. SPs who shirk responsibility by claiming they have no other choice exhibit a lack of power and integrity if there are in fact several choices or if they have done too little to create options or keep them open.

One way of defending oneself against criticism and accusations is to point to a lack of choice. “I couldn’t do anything else”, “It was the only choice”, and “There was no other option” are typical comments people use in the hope of justifying their choices. There was really no choice at all.

Such a defense is a sign of integrity if personal integrity is the driving force behind the choice. What you stand for only allows you one choice: all other choices would be a betrayal and loss of self. As German theologian Martin Luther said when he was required to appear before the Diet of Worms, “Here I stand. I can do no other.”³⁹¹ This is taking full responsibility for a choice, embodying the choice.

However, claiming a lack of freedom of choice can also be a way of attempting to avoid responsibility. You can only be held responsible for a choice if there is something to choose. If there is no choice, you are not responsible. This kind of shirking of responsibility, however, quickly becomes transparent. With a few exceptions there is no such thing as a complete lack of choice. Often there is at least the choice between action and inaction.

Pointing to a lack of choice also indicates your own impotence, taking action without being able to change anything. This means being completely in the grip of the situation or of other people. SPs should therefore realize that shirking responsibilities in this way will not be seen by others as a sign of power. Moreover from the perspective of integrity it is not right to act as if you lack power when you have it.

At the same time this means that in judging a person's integrity we should take into account the room for maneuver. People can only be morally reprehensible if they could have made better choices.³⁹² Criticizing people for their behavior suggests not only that the person should have acted differently, but also that they could have done so.

Judgment of a person's integrity does not only depend on the room for maneuver over the decision. It is also important to determine the extent to which a person is responsible for the room for maneuver that they have. People are also responsible if they have not created or maintained sufficient freedom when this was possible, for instance by failing to look for alternatives, or limiting options by making commitments or closing doors prematurely, or placing themselves in positions vulnerable to blackmail.

The points above apply to valuing as well as criticizing a person's integrity. People with no other choice cannot be praised for their choices. That is why former German chancellor Gerhard Schröder once emphasized his responsibility as follows: "Here I stand, but I can do otherwise, if you would finally budge a bit."³⁹³

66. Integrity is the midway between two evils

Integrity demands that SPs strive for good and avoid evil, as the absence or opposite of good. However, it also demands that SPs do not go too far by doing too much of a good thing, as that is bad too. Focusing on avoiding going over the top can help SPs take decisions and judge themselves and others.

Integrity is about striving for ideals, values, and principles. Integrity demands that SPs make efforts to do good and avoid evil or wrongdoing, the absence or even opposite of good. Dishonesty, for example, is the opposite of honesty, and injustice the opposite of justice. However, there is another, less well-known, undesirable side to good.

According to Aristotle, a virtue is the midway between two vices or evils. These two vices are two undesirable extremes diametrically opposed to one another. One vice is the absence or opposite of the virtue, the other an excess of the virtue. Overconfidence, for example, is excessive bravery, and extravagance is excessive generosity.

Integrity means not only striving for good and avoiding bad as the opposite of good, but also ensuring that you do not go too far and strive for excessive good. Too much of a good thing is not good either. Integrity is looking for the midway between two evils, although this midway may not be the geometric midpoint.

SPs should realize that in striving for ideals, values, and principles with the best of intentions, they must not go too far, but should to hold the middle ground between vices. They should avoid following the example of one prime minister who, driven to excesses by a sense of vocation and great responsibility, went too far in dominance, contrariness, and pushiness, thereby frustrating many of his own ideals.³⁹⁴

Thinking in terms of excess is useful because it can ensure a valuable and surprising contribution to discussions, debates, and decision making. People often do not think about this, because they are more focused on determining and striving for what is good than on thinking about the risks involved in achieving good. For example, solidarity might become injustice if it goes too far, likewise setting rules might become paternalistic and enforcing rules might become callousness.

At the same time this is a tried and tested way of criticizing people. Instead of pointing to a lack of good qualities, people point to someone going too far and having too much of a good thing. By expanding the good characteristics and extending them they turn them into disadvantages. SPs with a good sense of humor may be depicted as laughing off everything and may fail to see the seriousness of situations. Similarly SPs who are good listeners may be depicted as indecisive, and those with strong opinions as authoritarian. It is therefore important that SPs do not take their virtues too far but find and practice the midway.

67. Integrity benefits from the “not-unless” principle

In order to avoid going too far, SPs can employ the “not-unless” principle. This principle states that you will not act unless there is a good reason to do so. This (1) avoids many dilemmas, (2) makes communication clear and simple, and (3) avoids a slippery slope. In order to employ the “not-unless” principle, it is important for SPs to view saying no as an important principle and only to be willing to deviate from it if it is better to do so.

In the previous chapter we saw that integrity is the midway between two evils. One way to avoid going too far is the “not-unless” principle.³⁹⁵ “Not unless” means saying no in principle, and only making an exception where there is good reason for doing so. This prevents people from taking a good thing too far.

The “not-unless” principle starts out at the baseline. For example in order to avoid any appearance of influence and conflict of interest, paid side-jobs that may relate to SPs’ political decisions are not permitted. SPs can deviate from this rule if, for example, the additional job is relevant to the official position and the income is passed on to the organization in which the office is held. Similarly, accepting gifts and invitations is not permitted in principle. An exception can be made for gifts made out of politeness. For example mayors are permitted to accept small tokens from citizens who have been personally helped by their efforts. In this case doing otherwise would mean taking strictness to the point of rigidity and conservative behavior to small-mindedness.

The advantage of this approach is that it avoids a great number of areas of doubt. It prevents people from always finding arguments for deviating from the rules when, on balance, it is not to the benefit of integrity. On the one hand the “not-unless” principle sets the moral bar high: we should refrain from doing many things, even when they seem attractive. On the other hand it also simplifies matters, avoiding many dilemmas and discussions by simply

not embarking on them. Another advantage of this approach is that it can be easily and cleanly communicated, as “no” is a simple response, leaving little room for gray areas and misunderstandings. This clarity avoids embarking on a slippery slope, because the point of departure for each consideration is the same baseline, the answer “no” (instead of taking the previous action or choice as a starting point), even if you have to take care that “unless” is not interpreted increasingly freely, making it too much “unless” and not enough “no”. In this respect it is important that the exception always confirms rather than becomes the rule.

It is also important that “not-unless” thinking is not driven by fear or to avoid evil. We should choose “no” because we consider it an important principle or value in itself, that you want to maintain because it is good, and from which you will only deviate when doing so is better. This positive foundation is essential to both the “no” and the “unless”. You choose to deviate because this is better, not because of a focus on looking for boundaries, opportunities to deviate or stretch “unless” as far as possible. The power of “not unless” is that it is not always an absolute “no”, but not always “unless” either (as this would make the exceptions the rule, eliminating the “no”).

68. Integrity benefits from moral intuition

SPs must be able to determine rationally what constitutes integrity, but they also need to possess moral intuition in order to spot and solve moral problems. After all, there may be no time to work through a decision rationally. It may even be impossible to think through a decision completely rationally. At the same time SPs must be critical of their moral intuition, because it can be a bad guide. Moral intuition is a gift that can also be developed and directed.

When SPs are confronted with dilemmas the question is always what the best, second best, or least bad solution is. According to US president Lyndon Johnson this is a president's most difficult task: "A President's hardest task is not to do what is right, but to know what is right," because, "The Presidency brings no special gift of prophecy or foresight."³⁹⁶

Determining what is right – the midway between two evils – can be achieved rationally, by systematically working out the facts of the conflicting values, interested parties, pros and cons, and what will be most useful or fair in the end. Such an approach avoids missing things and contributes to measured, insightful decision making.

Integrity demands that SPs possess more than just these intellectual qualities in order to take a structured approach, producing well-considered decisions. Another important quality is moral intuition. Moral intuition is about the instinct to pick out moral problems, having moral antennae for moral aspects of problems, spotting problems that others miss, feeling that something is wrong without having proof, and seeing through moral consequences before they emerge. Moral intuition can also be about the feeling and instinct people have for solving moral problems, for example through creative or appealing solutions that resolve conflicting standards at a higher level.

SPs' integrity benefits from moral intuition because they do not always have time to think through everything before making a choice. In a debate or discussion you can respond quickly and spontaneously to new questions and arguments. Documents received shortly before a meeting must be quickly evaluated for moral sensitivities and neglected moral issues. Urgent questions and requests must be immediately and spontaneously answered with opinions, suggestions, or solutions. Even if there is sufficient time, problems, options, and implications often cannot be fully mapped out, so moral intuition remains important. This was the case for an SP who voted against an investment decision because he felt that market conditions would change in the foreseeable future, which indeed turned out to be the case. It also applied to an official who moved his organization's share portfolio into a savings account because he felt that investments in shares might become a moral issue, as later happened to other organizations. Similarly, an SP voted for the appointment of a candidate he felt was suited to the job, despite evidence to the contrary, and was later confirmed in his choice.

At the same time we should be critical of intuition. Individual moral intuition is not automatically ethical. Intuition can also be a bad moral guide. For instance an alderman who loved music turned out to have faulty intuitions when he spontaneously accepted a concert invitation from the municipal port authority while port business was part of his portfolio. Similarly it was a failure of moral intuition on the part of a congressman when in searching for an angle on the debate over fatal traffic accidents he noted that people had to die somehow. A party leader also fell short in terms of moral intuition when he remarked on television that rape victims only became pregnant if they wanted to, as did a senator who said that much of the sexual violence in the army is caused by the natural hormonal balance of recruits.

On the one hand moral intuition is a gift, one, as President Johnson stated, that does not come with office, but which individuals possess.³⁹⁷ Some people have a greater talent for picking up on and fathoming integrity problems than others. On the other hand moral intuition can be developed, for example by gaining experience and maintaining contact with relevant people and groups. It is also possible to unlock one's own moral intuition, for example by throwing in a break during a meeting or sleeping on problems before making a decision, to make space for your subconscious to speak.³⁹⁸ Intuition is most important, however, when there is no time to think and you have to come up with an opinion, proposal, or solution quickly.

69. Integrity is impossible without self-reflection and role distancing

Without self-reflection SPs cannot be seen as possessing integrity because they are not aware of what they are doing or the reasons behind it. Reflection demands that SPs are honest with themselves and distance themselves from their roles. It is therefore important for SPs to create moments for self-reflection and moments when they can show that they are more than SPs.

In the previous chapters we saw that contemplation or reflection is important for integrity. In order to come to a good decision with respect to problems in which integrity plays a role, it is important to take the time to analyze the situation properly and investigate the best choice. The less time there is for reflection, the more important moral intuition becomes. Even if SPs have a well developed moral intuition, it remains important to reflect critically on the extent to which intuition is morally defensible. Reflection, however, goes beyond this.

In chapter 6 we saw that ethics involves reflecting on morality and that integrity requires ethics. People with integrity are also reflective in the sense of knowing what they are doing and why they are doing it. People with integrity consider whether they are doing the right thing and are prepared to adjust where necessary. People who hold on by hook or by crook, without stopping to think, cannot be seen to have integrity; they are simply conceited. Acting morally is not the same as acting with integrity, because people can act automatically, without being aware of what they are doing and why. Similarly following your own conscience is not behaving with integrity because people can follow their consciences indiscriminately, without reflection.³⁹⁹ In short, an SP without self-reflection cannot be seen as having integrity.

Reflection demands, among other things, that SPs are honest with themselves. This honesty, however, is difficult because people want to have integrity. People want to keep their image of their own integrity intact, so they rationalize away failures and are dishonest with themselves.⁴⁰⁰ If we behave in a way that lacks integrity, a discrepancy arises between who we want to be and what we do. In order to release this tension, we deceive ourselves, thinking up ways that our behavior shows integrity after all, fitting our self-image. This restores internal integrity at the cost of external integrity, the consistency between what people do and what is expected in office.

Reflection also demands role distancing. Role distancing means that SPs are capable of rising above the job, in the sense that they should be able to view it critically from a distance. Nevertheless, this is difficult to do. After all, SPs should fulfill their roles, in the sense that the position should suit them and not involve play acting, as discussed in chapter 28. This way we show that we are one with our positions and fully behind the expectations of office. Nevertheless, this has its limits. Those who throw themselves completely into their positions can lose their sense of self, or, as MacIntyre warns, people may compartmentalize or completely eliminate themselves, no longer functioning beyond the jobs they hold. The risk is that people come to see the values and norms of office as absolute.⁴⁰¹ Moral autonomy no longer exists, so SPs lack a place and a framework for viewing their own position and functioning critically from a distance. The trick is therefore to behave like a good actor, making the public believe what happens on stage is real, while remaining aware yourself and being able to step out of the role at any moment.

It is therefore good for SPs to realize that official positions are like costumes that can be put on and taken off. It is also good for SPs to be dedicated to the position, as long as they do not go too far (as we saw in chapter 66, we should avoid too much of a good thing). SPs who prioritize attending meetings above their own children's funerals fall short as parents and as SPs. There is also a danger that devotion to the job may lead to addiction and dependence, so that SPs are controlled by the job, rather than living autonomously. So the trick is to create moments of reflection, not only on the job, but also outside of it. For example, Tony Blair used his summer vacation to think about the desirability of invading Iraq. SPs should also seek out moments when they can show that they are more than officials. SPs who only show themselves in office, with no sign of personality, create the image of being nothing more than their jobs.

It is important to create time for reflection. Lack of time for reflection indicates that integrity is not a priority.⁴⁰² However, not everything requires time: people who spend a great deal of time considering whether to accept the absolutely unacceptable, such as bribery, are not exhibiting integrity but rather the lack thereof, even if they eventually decide to refuse.

70. Integrity benefits from moral luck

How SPs' integrity is judged can depend on how their decisions work out. Whether a decision turns out positively or negatively can depend on factors over which SPs have no control. SPs therefore need their decisions to turn out well. They also need moral good luck in the problems that confront them: some problems can increase integrity, while others only damage it. SPs can take this good or bad luck into account in their decisions and communication about them.

"There is no gambling like politics," according to British statesman Benjamin Disraeli.⁴⁰³ Politics means taking risks. In Disraeli's view, risks are very much the territory of politics. The same applies to integrity risks. In politics and government, with the best of intentions, SPs risk damaging and losing their integrity. On the one hand, as we saw previously, there is plenty we can do to avoid this loss of integrity, and even to take the lead. On the other hand, not everything is within our control. Integrity can also be damaged or lost due to bad luck. To put it another way, you have to be lucky to have integrity.

How a person is judged depends on how their decisions turn out. If a decision works out well, the judgment is positive. If it works out badly, this leads to a negative judgment. For this reason Bernard Williams speaks of moral luck.⁴⁰⁴ How a decision works out depends on many coincidental factors that we cannot influence or even foresee. Nevertheless, they have an impact on personal integrity.

Williams gives a fictitious example of painter Paul Gauguin.⁴⁰⁵ In order to concentrate fully on an artistic project abroad, he abandons his wife. Judgments of Gauguin's moral integrity depend on the success of the project. If the project works out, Gauguin is praised for sacrificing even his wife to complete the project. If it goes wrong, Gauguin is accused of dumping his wife for a failed project. The same goes for SPs. An SP who stands up for investment

in education to improve economic prosperity will be considered morally right and praised if greater investment results in improvements in prosperity, even if this depends on countless other factors, whereas if greater investment fails to increase prosperity, for instance because foreign economies collapse, the SP will not be readily praised and most likely will be accused of misspending money that could have been better spent on other causes that would have helped the economy. Similarly the decision to invade Iraq in 2003 was based on the assumption that Saddam Hussein possessed weapons of mass destruction. If these weapons had indeed been found, this would have justified the war and benefited the integrity of the SPs who had voted for it. However, since no weapons were found, doubt was cast on the integrity of the SPs involved and all kinds of impure intentions were attributed to them (such as economic interests, ambition, and power politics). So you need moral luck to have integrity.

Moral luck shows up not only in how issues pan out, but also in which issues arise. It is morally unlucky to be confronted with situations in which integrity can only be damaged or lost, for example, if predecessors have left skeletons in the closet but it is impossible to lay the blame on them. Equally, it is possible to be morally lucky and to be confronted with situations that showcase and strengthen personal integrity, as, for instance, in times of disaster or crisis, by giving a great deal of attention to victims, refusing to renounce certain principles, and throwing yourself heart and soul into recovery. SPs who stand as moral heroes have often been able to do so due to great emergencies happening around them (such as war and great social divides). If they had lived in different times or places, perhaps no one would have heard of them.⁴⁰⁶

The question is what we can do with moral luck. If it is pure coincidence, then by definition we have no influence and can do nothing with it. It would be an oversimplification to say that people can compel luck and bring misfortune on themselves. Moreover that would not be pure luck, as then people would have some influence, whereas the defining characteristic of luck is that you have no control over it. In any case, in decision making we can take into account the luck factor, estimating how much luck you need for your decision to have the desired effect and thinking through the consequences if things do not go your way, for example if it turns out that the information presented is untrue, important issues have been missed, or if it turns out tomorrow that all developments go in the opposite direction to predictions and everything goes wrong.

In addition to taking into account the influence of luck on events, you can also factor it into the way you communicate decisions, avoiding sounding too certain about the effects of decisions in the future, and communicating the chances of good and bad luck, along with the possible consequences. Such communication is not a sign of weakness but of realism.

There are two sides to thinking in terms of moral luck. On the one hand it promotes modesty among SPs, as they realize that when things go well they could just as easily have gone the other way. On the other hand this thinking prevents SPs from blaming themselves too harshly if things work out badly due to bad luck, when they might just as well have worked out better. After all, serving the people involves taking risks.

XII. The importance of integrity

Part XII, consisting of eleven chapters, is about the importance of integrity for SPs.

71. Integrity is more important than what becomes publicly known

The magnitude of violations of integrity by SPs is greater than is publicly known. Violations can also take place behind closed doors or even remain completely undiscovered. This makes integrity all the more important, because the former situation lacks external corrective forces, and the latter both external and internal corrective forces. SPs should not allow themselves to think that they can keep their violations quiet: that was what the SPs who were discredited for violations thought too.

The people, parties, and organizations who have fallen into disrepute provide an indication of the importance of integrity, and there are a good many of them. Even if we narrow it down to presidents of various countries discredited for violations of human rights, war crimes, withholding relevant information from congress, and inadmissible private behavior, we already find large numbers. Czech prime minister Petr Nečas, initially nicknamed “Mr Clean Hands”, stepped down when his chief of staff was arrested, under suspicion of having used the military security service to spy on Nečas’s estranged wife, thereby making inappropriate use of the service. She was also suspected of involvement in bribing members of parliament. There was media speculation about a romantic relationship between Nečas and his chief of staff, which might have been behind these acts. Nečas denied knowledge of the illegal spying and bribery but the scandal made his position untenable. He resigned as prime minister and party chairman. Shortly afterwards Nečas married his former chief of staff, supporting speculation over their secret love affair.⁴⁰⁷ This and other incidents show (1) that integrity standards apply, (2) what those standards are, (3) that there are SPs who violate these standards, (4) that it is possible to violate the standards, (5) that the transgressions became publicly known, (6) that others censure this behavior, and (7) that the transgressions have negative consequences.

The lesson here is clear. SPs who do not take integrity to heart run the risk of ending their terms of office and leaving under a cloud. There is more to be said about the volume of incidents, as more incidents take place than become publicly known.

Firstly not all transgressions become publicly known because they remain behind closed doors. Others may find out but do not make it known in public because, for example, they are in league with the offender, acting as partners in crime, because they are dependent on one another, or in one another's grasp, do not feel responsible for making the transgression known, or want to spare themselves the trouble and discredit. There can therefore only be more transgressions than become publicly known. This makes the problem and the importance of integrity all the greater, not only because transgressions happen more often than outsiders see, but also because there is no public view of them, no external accountability, and so no possible sanctions to follow.

Secondly, not all transgressions become publicly known because they do not even become known behind closed doors. Culprits can keep their transgressions secret, so more transgressions must take place than is known internally or externally. This makes the problem and importance of integrity all the greater, because transgressions take place more often than others see, and there is no enforcement or correction of these unnoticed transgressions.

In short, the problem of integrity is greater than the extent of violations known externally and internally. For SPs this can be a reassuring thought, if they think they can keep their transgressions entirely secret or behind closed doors. However, this can be misleading. The SPs discredited probably also thought they could keep their violations hidden (otherwise they would not have committed them), and that turned out to be wrong.

72. Integrity on a slippery slope is difficult to stop

The loss of integrity generally happens because of many small mistakes. The danger of this is that SPs do not notice and continue to see themselves as acting with integrity. For this reason it is good for SPs to be strict in situations involving a slippery slope. However, it is also possible to slip consciously and against your will, for example, when maneuvered into a position vulnerable to blackmail. SPs should therefore be alert to situations that could turn into traps.

American writer Robert Brault states, “You do not wake up one morning a bad person. It happens by a thousand tiny surrenders of self-respect to self-interest.”⁴⁰⁸ The loss of integrity is not an abrupt step, taking an SP from integrity to corruption overnight. It generally happens because of many small mistakes. What does this mean?

The danger of gradual decline is that the person involved does not notice. This is because every mistake is normalized, making the next mistake seem small, a negligible deviation. Because this process keeps repeating, the standards are stretched in small steps but the gulf between the original standard, the starting point, and practice becomes ever greater.⁴⁰⁹ It begins, for example, with a single white lie with the best of intentions and ends in frequent deception, from a single exaggerated mileage declaration to self-enrichment, or from accepting a gift that is a little too expensive to systematic demands for bribes.

Furthermore, lapses become habitual. The first time you do something that is not permitted it may be with remorse, guilt, and crises of conscience, but the more you make the same mistake the less problematic it will seem because it becomes a habit. This process of habituation is promoted by use of rationalizations. Common rationalizations include the idea that others do it too, the damage to others is negligible, you have a right to it, and others demand it. This makes transgressions steadily easier.

The problem with such normalization and rationalization is that culprits continue to see themselves as having integrity, when the opposite is the case. Since their self-image is wrong, self-correction does not occur and risks to integrity increase. The further a person slips the greater the mistakes and the chance of the culprit abruptly losing personal integrity in the eyes of others if they are found out.

The simplest advice is therefore to be strict in situations in which there is a slippery slope. As one SP said, "If you enter into discussion with temptation, it is already too late." If you realize you have made a mistake the task is to be extra alert in ensuring it stops there and that you return as quickly as possible to the original standard. This can be achieved by repeatedly acting according to the original standards and making them a habit.

However, SPs can also slip consciously and against their will, for example by correcting one mistake with another, rescuing themselves from one lie by telling another. This also occurs when SPs are maneuvered into positions in which they are vulnerable to blackmail, whereby one mistake under pressure leads to another, and in turn to additional blackmail, demanding ever greater conscious and unwilling mistakes. For instance an SP accepted a bribe from a company in exchange for preferential treatment and was subsequently frequently forced to provide preferential treatment, because both the bribery and the preferential treatment were a means of blackmail.

It is therefore important that SPs are alert to situations in which such traps can arise: situations in which people steadily trade in more freedom of action until behavior lacking integrity is the only option. In order to avoid this, it is always advisable to have the option of withdrawal: to be able to leave, cancel what you are doing, or say goodbye, as in the case of the SP who chose to keep living simply so that he would not be bound to his position by a mortgage. If you feel bound hand and foot (and often also heart and conscience), then with an eye to integrity you should seriously ask yourself where you are heading and what the consequences will be, whether you want this, and whether there are better ways.

73. Integrity becomes more difficult to improve over time in office

The longer SPs hold office the harder it becomes to make improvements in personal integrity, because the longer people do something the harder it is to change and the more readily others disapprove of the change. This does not mean that improvement is impossible. Nevertheless it is best for SPs to use their initial period of office to establish a desirable standard of integrity.

The previous chapter taught us that loss of integrity on a slippery slope is difficult to stop. The gradual loss can occur subconsciously, so that people do not feel the need to do anything to prevent it. Gradual loss may also happen consciously, if people are trapped and cannot find a way back, instead being forced to make greater and greater mistakes. Stopping the decline in integrity, never mind improving on it, also becomes harder the longer people remain in office. There are two reasons for this.

Firstly, the longer we do something the more difficult it becomes to change, as it becomes second nature. Changing how we do things feels unnatural, and in that respect lacking integrity. This is because the more often you do something, the more it becomes ingrained and rooted, demanding more effort to break the habit and make a new one. Behavioral change becomes more difficult in higher, more important positions, because people in such positions have functioned in a particular way for longer. Such jobs are often preceded by other periods in office, in which the behavior that needs changing has become ingrained and brought success, or at least has not proved a hindrance to an official's career.

Secondly, the longer someone holds office the harder it becomes to change because the longer people exhibit particular behavior the more it becomes part of the image others hold of the position, so that change is seen as inconsistent. SPs' behavior in office sets the standard

they will apply. The longer they behave a certain way, the more the standard is propagated and the more it confirms the views of others. The longer people have exhibited the old behavior, the more inconsistent any change or new standards will seem, and the more they will appear to lack integrity. This image holds SPs back from change, because others will respond critically, remind them of their old behavior, and be less cooperative. This is visible, for example, when SPs suddenly make noble decisions shortly before the end of their terms of office. Despite the fact that the decisions are praiseworthy, they come across as inconsistent with previous decisions, raising the question of why somebody is suddenly behaving in this way. Are they trying to make up for something (and if so what), or do they now feel less obligated to behave in a certain way (and if so, what obligations did they feel they had)?

Fortunately this does not mean that substantial improvements in integrity are impossible. People can repent and decide to do things very differently. In chapter 27 we saw how US president Chester Arthur completely revised his appointment system for officials after the murder of his predecessor. Other SPs decided to apply for different SP positions after particular incidents opened their eyes. Others felt called to make more effort for social problems after reading shocking figures, or to change the way they worked after whistle-blowers exposed them. People can opt for gradual improvement. This, however, demands a great deal of persistence and determination because it takes a long time to achieve improvement. It is therefore easier to look for a clear reason for change, such as a crisis or intervention from outside, to introduce fundamental changes all at once. If SPs communicate this way with others, they create the expectations and pressure to achieve change.

The implication of all this is that SPs should take the opportunity to establish the desired standard of integrity in their initial period of office. Personal integrity is established in the early phases in office, so this is an important time for setting your agenda in terms of ideals, ambitions, and core values, as well as principles and standards. SPs who turn up on their first day and put their shoes outside the door in the expectation that they will be cleaned set a different impression than those who call their staff together and ask them always to be open and honest.

In the early phases it is also a question of what SPs do with the “integrity legacy” of their predecessors. Do they wipe the floor with their predecessors or do they show respect (even if they do not agree with what their predecessors did)? When the skeletons come out of the

closet, do they pass on responsibility to their predecessors or take responsibility themselves (regardless of procedural rules)? It is important to find out about possible skeletons in the closet when taking up office, because these can pose a risk to personal integrity. The longer people hold a position, the less they are able to blame their predecessors for skeletons, because they become more closely associated with the jobs themselves, and because it shows that they have not done due diligence on possible skeletons when they were appointed, or have been complicit in the skeletons they found.

74. Integrity is all

Integrity is all SPs have. If you do not stand for anything then you are nothing. For that reason there are SPs who take abrupt and far-reaching decisions because they do not want to lose their integrity at any price, and some consider maintaining their integrity most important when looking back on their work.

US senator Alan Simpson stated, "If you have integrity, nothing else matters. If you don't have integrity, nothing else matters."⁴¹⁰ In other words, integrity is the only thing that counts.⁴¹¹ But why is this?

According to US general Melham Waken, integrity is an important element of self-respect.⁴¹² Philosopher Gabriele Taylor even claims that it is an essential, integral element of self-respect.⁴¹³ In fact, integrity is a necessary condition for self-respect: without integrity there is no self to respect. Integrity is what you stand for. If you do not stand for anything, then there is nothing to respect. If you are not faithful to yourself, then you have lost yourself.

So integrity is the core of who we are. Without that core the rest is useless and worthless. That is why an SP (cited in chapter 40) once said, "I would rather die standing than have to crawl the rest of my life." Or as Ralph Waldo Emerson put it, "A little integrity is better than any career."⁴¹⁴ Abraham Lincoln worded it aptly as follows: "I desire so to conduct the affairs of this administration that if at the end, when I come to lay down the reins of power, I have lost every other friend on earth, I shall at least have one friend left, and that friend shall be down inside me."⁴¹⁵ That friend is self-respect, personal integrity.

"Don't compromise yourself, it is all you have,"⁴¹⁶ said singer Janis Joplin. If integrity is the only thing, it should also be the last thing we give up. This is the reason why SPs sometimes make abrupt and far-reaching decisions; they want to maintain their integrity at any price. For

example, people take serious personal risks by voting against something on the grounds that voting for it would conflict with their personal integrity, or resign because it is the only way of maintaining their integrity. This is also the reason why there are MPs who see having remained themselves and having retained their integrity as important or even the most important thing when looking back on their time in office. As an ex-minister recalled in her memoirs of her days in politics: "I am in any case convinced that I remained myself and I derive great satisfaction from that."⁴¹⁷

In short, if integrity is all you have, you should give everything for it.

75. Integrity generates power

Integrity gives SPs power over themselves, providing the strength not to waste it but to make it real. Similarly integrity gives SPs power over their environment: it attracts and creates more integrity, repelling those who lack this quality. It is up to SPs to discover and use this power.

Thus far we have generally seen power as a threat to integrity. Striving for and holding onto power can spur people on to behavior that lacks or damages integrity. However, the influence of power on integrity is not exclusively negative. In chapter 41 we saw that power can also be a necessary condition for integrity. By having power, SPs can make things happen and remain themselves. However, besides power being a threat and an advantage for integrity, there is a third element in the relationship between power and integrity. Integrity gives power.

Firstly, integrity gives people power over themselves. As the author Mark Twain states, "Laws control the lesser man, right conduct controls the greater one."⁴¹⁸ Integrity ensures self-control. By behaving with integrity people gain control over themselves; they can handle temptations, impulses, desires, and pressure; they know what they want and are capable of consistency. Integrity in this respect gives power. By standing for causes, people find the power to proceed to action. Giving your word generates the strength to stick to it. In giving your word you give part of yourself, binding yourself to it. Integrity therefore protects itself against being squandered, generating energy to rely on and realize it.

Secondly, integrity gives power over the environment, the situation, and others. In chapter 42 we saw that SPs can damage their integrity if they become vulnerable to blackmail. Being vulnerable to blackmail means losing power over yourself and being at the mercy of the environment. Others can force you to act against your will. People get blown off course by the destructive force of their environment, which can become a power in itself. Having to act

in accordance with the destructive power of the environment leads to continuation or even exacerbation of that power, so that others also have to act in accordance with it. If politicians, for example, make empty promises during elections in the knowledge that other politicians do the same, this encourages others to toe the line, or if one SP leaks information because others do so, this gives others reason to leak information in turn. This causes behavior lacking in integrity to spread unchecked.

By contrast, integrity can form a positive impulse for those around, making it easier for you and for others to behave with integrity. Integrity can have an attractive power over others. As US president Andrew Jackson said, "One man with courage makes a majority,"⁴¹⁹ so we might say that one SP with integrity makes a majority. One person's integrity can cause others to follow suit. An SP's integrity can provide inspiration and motivation for others, as was said, for example, of Nelson Mandela.⁴²⁰

An SP's integrity can also give others confidence in them, so that they can build on that SP. By giving confidence, you increase mutual trust, giving you more influence over others and the environment. Personal integrity creates integrity in the environment. At the same time an SP's integrity repels those who are not focused on integrity. People who want to blackmail others will be more likely to pick on corrupt people than on those with integrity; people who are corrupt have already shown that they are willing and able to become involved in reprehensible practices. As an SP's integrity increases it ensures that people with less integrity remain at a greater distance.

In short, power and integrity are not diametrically opposed. Power provides integrity and integrity provides power. The trick is to discover and harness the power of integrity. As Margaret Thatcher said, "I am in politics because of the conflict between good and evil, and I believe that in the end good will triumph."⁴²¹ In Thatcher's view this was the power of integrity.⁴²²

76. Integrity reveals beauty

Integrity supplies not only power but also beauty. Integrity stands for harmony, purity, and authenticity. There is beauty in the way SPs understand fulfillment of their roles, elevating them to an art and inspiring affection. SPs should understand this art and allow others to enjoy it.

Integrity does not only give power, as we saw in the previous chapter, but also beauty. It has a splendor of its own.⁴²³ Are we going too far here? Does this make integrity overly idealistic?

Integrity stands for wholeness and flawlessness. A person with integrity is complete and flawless, without cracks, contamination, or distortion. However, a person's beauty does not lie only in their flawlessness. Just as a painting, piece of music, or sports contest is beautiful not only because of an absence of cracks, wrong notes, or unsportsmanlike incidents, but primarily because of their harmony, purity, and authenticity. The colors, notes, and players fit together, creating a balanced whole. This shows what can be achieved from the combination of colors, musical notes, or players and how this can be optimally used.

We can also look at serving the people in this way. The beauty is more than just the absence of foul play and dirty practices. Beauty lies in harmony, purity, and authenticity. It resides in the purity of decision making, the passion of debate, the flawlessness of policy documents, and the harmonious interplay of different powers. It is also about how SPs understand the essence of their own positions and display it, for example by giving an animated talk, convincing opponents with pure arguments, cleverly bringing different parties together, and working heart and soul for others, in other words understanding the art of their position and elevating their position to an art.

According to some philosophers personal integrity is not something you can fall in love with,⁴²⁴ but revealing the beauty of integrity can inspire exaltation, admiration, and affection in others. Integrity is more than a term of praise. Integrity inspires affection, because integrity refers to people's ideal image of an SP, an image people want to associate and identify with, because it fits with how they would like to be themselves both in their current positions and if they were to find themselves in the positions of SPs.

Just as people can enjoy the beauty of a painting, piece of music, or sports contest, they can enjoy the beauty of an SP position. SPs should understand this art so that the beauty becomes visible and they themselves, as well as others, can enjoy it.

77. Integrity is a deadly weapon

Integrity is deadly because insufficient integrity is a reason for SPs having to quit their positions. If they are unfit to serve, the basis on which they gained their positions expires. Integrity is a deadly weapon because it can be used to trap SPs and trip them up. For that reason SPs should not hand it over to others on a plate, but should use it as a weapon, at the same time ensuring that is not turned against them. Integrity can also be disarming.

In addition to its beauty, integrity also has a dangerous side. Integrity is a deadly weapon. Why?

Firstly, a lack of integrity can be deadly. When it emerges that SPs have insufficient integrity, that is a reason for dismissing them. Integrity is the basis of an SP's trustworthiness. Without this people cannot be trusted, so there is no reason to allow them to take office. For that reason, as stated in chapter 8, casting doubt on a person's integrity can be seen as a serious, even the most serious injury, as it means claiming that the person is unfit for office, and the basis on which they held office no longer holds. Many SPs have had to clear the way due to a lack of integrity or even just the suspicion of such a shortcoming. It is also deadly because the chance of taking a different SP position is reduced or disappears altogether. As a politician who resigned because of suspected fraud said, "I am a man without a future."⁴²⁵ According to his fellow party members he had become controversial and a risk to his party. Without integrity SPs' careers are effectively condemned to death.

Integrity is not only deadly, it is also a weapon, in the sense that it can be consciously used and timed to cause SPs to fall, be that with good intentions or bad. Exposing incriminating information about an SP, publicly condemning an SP as dishonest and untrustworthy, or taking legal action against an SP, for example, can be fatal. Simply spreading rumors can damage

SPs' reputations so as to make their positions untenable. SPs can also use integrity as a weapon themselves. This can even be done inappropriately, as in the case of a governor who used his executive power to remove a public official, claiming a conflict of interest, when the real reason was that this public official would vote against a controversial new pipeline (which was to run through state protected land, potentially harming residents nearby and threatening protected plants and wildlife), a project in the interest of a contributor to the governor's campaign (the company that might finance the pipeline).⁴²⁶

The deadly weapon of integrity can also be used to trip up SPs, either by opening them up to blackmail, or by testing their integrity. Three members of the European Parliament were dismissed because it emerged that they were willing to accept bribes from journalists who presented themselves as lobbyists. The journalists asked for changes to bills that would be advantageous to financial institutions. They also asked the three for a less critical attitude to the human rights situation in Russia. According to the journalists, the three members of parliament asked for sums around €100,000.⁴²⁷ Similarly, the treasurer of the British conservative party resigned after camera images emerged showing him telling the journalists acting as lobbyists that he could arrange a dinner with Prime Minister Cameron, where everything would be confidential and anything could be asked, in exchange for a donation to the party of £200,000 to £250,000.⁴²⁸ A member of parliament also had to resign when it emerged that he had responded very seriously to made-up examples on a radio program. "In this interview I allowed myself to be led into statements that not only damaged my credibility, but also that of parliament as a whole and my own party," the politician said on resigning.⁴²⁹ Prime minister of Serbia Ivica Dačić, however, withstood the test when a young TV interviewer wearing a short dress uncrossed her legs during an interview to reveal that she was not wearing any underwear. The president's eyes and facial expression were followed closely by the cameras, showing only a brief smile and twinkle in his eye; he did not lose his thread.⁴³⁰

It is not only journalists who can put SPs' integrity to the test: others around them are also able to do this. This can be done maliciously, for example by giving out confidential or false information in the hope that the SP will pass on the information and trip up, or with good intentions, by telling a fabricated secret to see if the SP can be trusted. A councilor was caught by the police when he accepted cash in exchange for helping a businessman to obtain a coveted liquor license, as the businessman was secretly cooperating with the police and videotaped the exchange.⁴³¹

Since integrity is a deadly weapon, SPs should ensure that they avoid handing it to others on a plate. The more integrity you have, the more difficult it is for others to use or abuse a lack of integrity. As we saw in chapter 15, you should avoid the appearance of a lack of integrity as far as possible. You should also think about how you can arm yourself against possible false accusations. As we saw earlier, this can be achieved by avoiding dealing with sensitive issues alone, keeping proper records, and avoiding the impression of seeking out integrity risks.

If you use integrity as a weapon against others, you should ensure that it cannot be turned against you. Because there is so much at stake, others will defend themselves or even strike back. Purity of motives is important, because confronting another person about their integrity for opportunistic reasons, such as popularity or revenge, will give you less credibility. If you criticize the integrity of others too much, you run the risk of creating the impression of being bloodthirsty, pushing others into the role of victim and arousing sympathy for them. It is also important to maintain a sense of proportion. In criticizing another person's integrity you run the risk of being accused of splitting hairs or being told to remove the beam from your own eye first.

Integrity, however, can also be disarming. For instance, if SPs are particularly considerate and sincere this can embarrass and even paralyze others.⁴³² If others think in terms of war, a peaceful approach can throw them off balance and allow integrity to triumph. For instance at the height of the American Civil War Lincoln spoke of the citizens of the southern states not as his opponents but as fellow human beings, creating an opening to end the war.

78. Integrity is a silent killer

Integrity is a silent killer because its absence can take effect late and at moments when SPs feel safe, or indeed at their most vulnerable. Integrity issues do not go out of date in this respect. SPs therefore should not think that undiscovered lapses will never be discovered or that once the slate is wiped clean of mistakes it will remain clean forever. Misdemeanors can escalate to be used as deadly weapons, or discovered by coincidence. For this reason, SPs always carry their past transgressions with them.

Integrity is a deadly weapon, as we saw in the previous chapter. SPs can use this weapon to lay others low, and others can also use it against them. For this reason it is necessary for SPs to have integrity and not to put weapons into the hands of others. This demands that SPs pay close attention to whether others use the integrity weapon against them, and if so to what extent. This is not only about the question of whether others are armed – or if not, the chance of their arming themselves – but also when and in what circumstances they use this weapon against SPs. Common practice teaches us that integrity is a silent killer that can lull SPs into a false sense of security, striking when they are at their most vulnerable.

Even if others have incriminating materials, they may not strike immediately but may bide their time, waiting for the moment when they can maximize their gains, for instance when they are best prepared to take over the position of the person they are looking to bring down, when the SP is in difficulties and publicizing a lack of integrity will be the coup de grâce, or when making incriminating information known in election battles or negotiations will get them ahead or drive the SP into a corner. They may wait until they publish their autobiographies or memoirs to stimulate sales or plead their way out of something. They may wait while gathering more evidence or support for the attack, increasing the chance of attaining their goal. They may wait until the other has less power so that they can no longer so easily strike back or defend themselves. This happened to Jacques Chirac after

he had stepped down from his position as French president and given up his presidential immunity, when he could be charged and convicted of fraud committed long before, in his capacity as mayor.⁴³³

Integrity does not go out of date in this respect. Something unknown soon gains news value, even if it happened years before. Mistakes from a distant past, after all, can easily be connected with relevant aspects of the present. For example, fraudulent claims regarding school diplomas decades ago can still be relevant if an SP is responsible for education or is required to be highly numerate in office. In fact, it is all the more relevant. Such fraud among ordinary citizens leads to less outrage than among SPs. Past mistakes on the part of SPs with successful careers will be taken more seriously because of their power and influence. As we saw in chapter 22, the more power SPs have, the harder they fall.

SPs should not be too quick to assume they are safe and that undiscovered mistakes will remain that way. It can take years before bribery, extramarital affairs, illegitimate children, or manipulated reports come to light. It took five years for a video of George W. Bush admitting to having once taken illegal drugs to be leaked,⁴³⁴ and presidential candidate Mitt Romney was even confronted with his own behavior as a teenager when a newspaper revealed that he had bullied a boy 47 years previously for aberrant behavior.⁴³⁵ In the battle against corruption the Greek parliament decided to compare the actual incomes and tax returns of the prime minister, ministers, state secretaries, and party chairs over the past 38 years.⁴³⁶

SPs should also be careful about thinking that once mistakes are behind them they will remain so. Many small mistakes can eventually lead to a big problem. The separate droplets are not a problem, but many droplets fill the bucket until it eventually overflows. For example a mayor who left a trail of nepotism and corruption in various municipalities was eventually unable to hide behind others, as in the case of a prime minister who repeatedly cited erroneous figures. The first few times he could dismiss it as a mistake, but the more it happened the more he came to be seen as careless and negligent, until confidence in him was damaged.

Integrity can also be used as a weapon to settle an account. In this case it is not an accumulation of small violations leading to integrity being pulled out as a weapon; instead when a situation escalates integrity is used to put the other party at a disadvantage. For example an investigation

into suspected unlawful declarations by a mayor were fed by frustration and ill will because the mayor had created a hostile atmosphere on the municipal council with his high-handed behavior and the council members had used the investigation to get even. Similarly, integrity can be used as a weapon to sign a proverbial death sentence. For instance, a minister was forced to resign for what in itself was a minor error. Opposing parties used this to instigate a vote of no confidence because there had been a great deal of criticism of him over a long period. Similarly conversations with Boyko Borisov, prime minister of Bulgaria, were secretly recorded and leaked by the media, revealing that he had instructed officials to obstruct justice. This did not lead to his resignation, although he was discredited for it.⁴³⁷

Slip-ups can also be discovered by coincidence. Lapses from even the distant past can crop up, for example, when former colleagues are discredited and their behavior is investigated, leading people to stumble across inappropriate behavior by others. In an investigation into expenses fraud by one SP, it came to light that others had submitted many false claims in the same period. Despite thinking they had long gotten away with it, they suddenly found themselves playing the lead roles in a scandal. SPs can therefore become the object of investigations without their initially having been doubts as to their integrity.

In short, SPs always carry their past mistakes with them, especially those that have remained secret. They can be discovered unexpectedly and lead to commotion. Incidentally, this does not mean that living with integrity is without risk. Integrity can arouse envy in others, or frustration because they cannot exert power over them. For example, SPs who are susceptible to blackmail and corruption can be more easily manipulated than those with integrity. In this respect it is advisable, as stated previously, for SPs not to set themselves up with too much of a reputation for integrity.

79. Integrity can be calculated formally or informally, but the accounts are not always settled

Besides a lack of integrity leading to the fall of an SP, there can be other consequences such as reprimand, fines, curtailment of office, prison sentences, and, in some countries, the death sentence. In addition to these formal sanctions, there are informal sanctions, such as social exclusion, loss of support, not being reappointed or gaining a new position, and demotion. A lack of integrity can also have substantial negative consequences for a person's private life. All the same, behavior lacking in integrity is not always sanctioned and behavior showing integrity is not always appreciated. For this reason, integrity is primarily of intrinsic importance.

We have seen that integrity leads to power, but can also be a weapon, tripping people up and depriving them of their positions, but there are other ways of settling the account on a lack of integrity.

On the one hand there are formal sanctions. People who act without integrity may stay in office, but their behavior can lead to a reprimand or penalty. A member of a municipal council was reprimanded by a mayor for civil disobedience after partially removing traffic measures as an act of protest, under the watchful eyes of the press.⁴³⁸ Another council member was fined €1,000 for acquiring 30 voting passes for council elections to distribute among his family members,⁴³⁹ and a third was fined €750 for citing confidential committee negotiations on a possible nightclub closure.⁴⁴⁰

Bad behavior can lead to SPs losing part of their portfolio, or being placed under supervision or legal restraint. The first appointed mayor of Toronto Rob Ford had to give up some of his powers due to his excessive behavior. SPs can also be punished with prison. A British politician received an 18-month prison sentence for submitting £18,350 in false expenses claims,

a mayor of Detroit received a 28-year prison sentence for corruption, a Greek mayor was sentenced to life imprisonment for embezzlement, the Liberian ex-president Charles Taylor received a prison 50-year sentence for complicity in war crimes, and ex-presidents Hosni Mubarak (Egypt) and Zine al-Abidine Ben Ali (Tunisia) were sentenced to life imprisonment because they were considered responsible for the deaths of demonstrators.⁴⁴¹ Finally, in many countries the punishment can even be death, as in the case of former Romanian head of state Nicolae Ceaușescu and Iraqi president Saddam Hussein for their repressive and degrading regimes.⁴⁴² The Chinese minister of railways, Liu Zhijun, was also condemned to death for bribery for around six million pounds over 25 years and abuse of power by helping an investment company achieve big profits.⁴⁴³

At the same time SPs can often call on immunity to prevent legal consequences. In a monarchy the monarch generally has immunity, meaning that the ministers have to account for the monarch's actions, even with respect to private behavior and criminal acts. Immunity does not place monarchs above the law; even a king or queen is bound by law. Heads of government and ministers of foreign affairs also enjoy immunity throughout the world, but this only holds while they remain in office. The immunity of an incumbent president can often be broken by means of impeachment in the case of serious crimes. Two presidents of the United States have been subject to impeachment: Andrew Johnson in 1868 and Bill Clinton in 1999.⁴⁴⁴ Carlos Menem, former president of Argentina, was sentenced to seven years' imprisonment for illegal weapons dealing, but he did not have to go to prison because he had become senator in the meantime and therefore enjoyed immunity from prosecution. The judge then requested that the Argentine senate suspend him so that his immunity would end.⁴⁴⁵ In the case of former Zambian president Rupiah Banda the vast majority of parliament voted for the motion to revoke his immunity so that he would be submitted to the due process of the law on the allegations leveled against him, including abuse of authority and corrupt acquisition of public property.⁴⁴⁶

On the other hand, there are many imaginable informal sanctions. People are ignored and passed over because their integrity is damaged. They are left out of the group, losing the support of some (even if others claim to stand by them),⁴⁴⁷ and come to be declared outlaws or target practice. As an SP said in this connection, "I was a pariah, I was a lame duck." Another SP saw his social network and even his circle of friends shrink substantially.⁴⁴⁸ Even if no direct

sanctions follow, if the opportunity arises the negative consequences of behavior lacking integrity may crop up at a later date, for instance at the end of the term of office, when it is time to decide whether a new term will follow. Then the lack of integrity revealed previously can be the decisive factor in an SP not having a new term. For this reason people may no longer be placed on election lists or may be demoted to invisible, harmless, and thankless positions.

In private life, too, a loss of integrity, or even doubt alone, can lead to problems. In order to escape reality SPs may seek sanctuary in addictions to alcohol, gambling, or drugs, or the problems may eat away at them until they vent their feelings in fits of anger or isolate themselves. In such situations divorce or suicide are not unthinkable. German President Wulff, who had to step down due to controversial private loans from businessmen, was hissed at by 250 demonstrators as he left. His leaving reception was boycotted by prominent figures, and afterwards he retreated to a monastery.⁴⁴⁹ Romanian ex-prime minister Adrian Năstase even tried to take his own life a few hours after being sentenced to two years in prison for illegally raising €1.6 million over a period of four years for his election campaign.⁴⁵⁰

These negative consequences are all reasons to behave with integrity. The problem is that the same reasons can be used to act without integrity. People act without integrity in order to be accepted by others, to gain standing and success. This can have positive effects in specific situations, while acting with integrity can have negative effects. So pleas for SPs to show integrity fall short if they only point to negative consequences of lacking integrity and positive consequences of having it. In the end integrity is primarily of intrinsic importance: it is good in itself, regardless of the consequences, or better put, when the consequences of integrity are negative, and those of a lack of integrity are positive, intrinsic integrity is essential.

Appreciation for integrity cannot be taken for granted. Sometimes it is withheld, or only comes much later, even posthumously. Similarly, as mentioned earlier, it cost Ford his second term when he pardoned Nixon. He was only vindicated decades later when he received a distinction from Bill Clinton with the words, "You were right, and the country thanks you for it."⁴⁵¹

80. Integrity becomes more important when transparency increases or decreases

Whether behavior lacking integrity leads to sanctions depends in part on transparency. The more transparency there is, the more important integrity becomes, because SPs cannot hide their behavior as much and cannot afford as many mistakes. At the same time, the less transparency there is, the more important integrity becomes, because it then comes down to SPs' intrinsic motivation to avoid mistakes. The best protection against increased transparency is for SPs to behave as if there were complete transparency.

Whether bad behavior is sanctioned depends in part on transparency. Transparency stands for the extent to which there is a view of who SPs are, what they do, and how they perform. The better the view, the better others can pass judgment on SPs' integrity. For this reason there are all kinds of mechanisms for achieving this transparency. The aim of monitoring, control, inspection, evaluation, giving account, meetings, debates, and appraisals is there to gain an overview, after all. The greater the transparency, the less people can hide behavior lacking integrity, so the greater the importance of integrity standing the test. SPs therefore cannot afford to abuse power as much if transparency increases.

However, this is only one side of the coin. On the other side, the less transparency, the more important integrity becomes. It is precisely because it is possible to hide more that more hangs on personal integrity, the SP's motivation to act with pure intentions. The greater the transparency, the more important integrity becomes from extrinsic motives: in order to avoid getting caught, or being called to account, criticized, or sanctioned. However, the less transparency there is, the more intrinsic motivation matters. If there is no transparency at all – the transgression or culprit would never be discovered, revealing true integrity.⁴⁵² The only thing that then determines behavior is personal integrity or its absence.

Due in part to increased public transparency in many countries over recent decades, worldwide attention for integrity has increased. In search of what is newsworthy, journalists follow the actions of SPs closely. What people say to those around them can be picked up by the microphone hanging in the air and broadcast to the world. Obama did not realize he was being recorded when he joked before a meeting that he was afraid of his wife (as a reason for stopping smoking), making headlines.⁴⁵³ Similarly Uruguayan president José Mujica failed to realize that a microphone was on before the start of a press conference and that it was audible to the media when he told an employee that the Argentine president Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner was an “old witch,” resulting in a diplomatic scandal between the two countries.⁴⁵⁴ A congressman failed to notice that a camera was still running after an interview, when he threatened to throw a journalist over the balcony and break him in half if he asked about his suspected illegal campaign funding again.⁴⁵⁵ In the battle for newsworthiness, journalists can take it to extremes, sorting through trash cans at SPs’ private houses, enquiring among their private contacts, and making hidden recordings. Journalists (like all citizens) have also gained more opportunities to find information, so SPs’ behavior cannot remain hidden as easily. As a result of increasing mediatization, behavior lacking integrity cannot as easily remain restricted to personal circles, but tends to become publicly known, so SPs cannot afford to make as many mistakes.

The rise of social media in recent years further increases transparency. SPs’ behavior is easier to follow and trace, and harder to wipe away. What people do can simply be recorded with a smartphone and put on the internet, used for blackmail, or sold on. Private matters become more and more public. A mayor was discredited when unknown people placed a four-year-old video online showing that she had had sexual intercourse with her boyfriend up a tower in public abroad.⁴⁵⁶ The British royal family was also embarrassed when photos were published of Prince Harry naked at a strip poker party, taken on a smartphone by one of the attendants.⁴⁵⁷ Mexican governor Andrés Granier sentenced himself when a radio station broadcast a conversation in which he boasted to his son about his possessions at home and abroad and revealed a great many details about his wardrobe of 400 pairs of shoes, 400 pairs of trousers, 300 suits, and 1,000 shirts. In the end Granier was sentenced to jail for fraud and money laundering to a value of more than 1.9 billion Mexican pesos.⁴⁵⁸

A good protection against increasing transparency is for SPs to act as if their behavior is known by definition, as if there are always cameras following them, microphones above their heads, and the eyes of the world watching. However, the best protection is to have the intrinsic motivation to behave with integrity, so that it does not matter whether your behavior becomes known or not. The greater the transparency, the more important the intrinsic motivation. People guided by extrinsic motivations must continually wonder about the chance of their actions being discovered. This is time-consuming and perilous. You only have to get it wrong once for behavior to become known and discredited.

However, there is reassurance for anyone who fears increasing transparency because they have something to hide. Greater transparency applies not only to your own behavior but also to others. The more we find out about behavior lacking in integrity by others, the more we can put our own in perspective.

81. Integrity must not cross over into integritism

Integritism is excessive and therefore inappropriate use of integrity. SPs must watch out for this, because if everything revolves around integrity then integrity means nothing. Integrity should therefore be reserved for cases concerning the real interests of those involved and the essence of SPs themselves. Raising questions about people's integrity therefore brings obligations with it.

Integrity is an important, multifaceted concept. There are many aspects to integrity and it forms an important standard and handle for SPs to operate by. Seen in this light, integrity is positive. We simply have to watch out for taking it too far, seeing integrity as the only thing that counts. This is integritism: excessive, inappropriate use of integrity.⁴⁵⁹ What do we need to watch out for?

Integrity can be extended to the point that everything revolves around it. All mistakes and problems become integrity problems. All values and norms become integrity criteria. All dilemmas are about integrity. If you see integrity in everything, then it amounts to nothing. An issue only gains content if there is more to it than just integrity. If everything revolves around integrity, the concept becomes watered down and loses force. It is therefore important to delimit integrity.

The most important point is to reserve integrity for real issues. Integrity is about fundamental interests. It is a matter of important values and principles, people's moral rights and duties, things that matter. For that reason it is wrong to immediately turn a minor error or practical problem into an integrity issue. Turning up late to a meeting is not necessarily a matter of integrity, nor is the distribution of tasks.

Integrity is also about the essence of individual people. Integrity touches the cores of individuals and their behavior. For this reason integrity is not a throw-away compliment or criticism. Integrity is about issues for which SPs can be valued or accused, praised or blamed. At the start of a council meeting to discuss a report on an investigation into a certain mayor's integrity, the mayor said, "But this is about genuine mistakes, misjudgments. They do not spring from indifference, arrogance, or ill will. Of course an administrator should be upright, but linking all mistakes and foolish errors with integrity denies its essence and importance, watering down the concept."⁴⁶⁰

Questioning or praising integrity therefore brings with it obligations. You need to have good arguments and grounds for it, because the consequences can be far-reaching. You cannot simply question a person's integrity on the basis of assumptions, half-formed impressions, and soft facts. Integrity in this respect is knowing what you are talking about, and because integrity is a great good, it is important to deal with it in a manner consistent with integrity.

XIII. Dealing with wrongdoing

Part XIII, consisting of six chapters, is about what integrity means for the way in which SPs deal with mistakes and the associated tell-tale signs and accusations.

82. Integrity becomes more problematic if wrongdoing is hushed up, denied, or hidden

It is problematic when SPs hush up mistakes because (1) SPs themselves are not in control if others expose their lapses, (2) hushing matters up is an infringement of integrity in itself, and (3) others will wonder what other mistakes the SP may be keeping quiet about. Denying or negating accusations is even more problematic, because this involves lying or a lack of values, constituting an additional infringement of integrity. Hiding wrongdoing is the most problematic, because this leads to further wrongdoing. For this reason, SPs should be aware of what they are doing if they hush up, deny, or hide their transgressions.

“Not disclosing the DUI on my terms may have been the single costliest political mistake I ever made,” according to George W. Bush, reflecting on his presidency.⁴⁶¹ Why is hushing up a mistake so damaging?

Firstly, by hushing up transgressions, you lose control if others reveal them. If that happens, it can often turn out worse (because those who publicize the transgression may have reason to maximize the impact and damage caused), the information is incomplete (because those making it known often know less than the culprit), and colored (because information is presented subjectively and selectively for a specific purpose). Moreover SPs are often taken by surprise by the announcement, with insufficient time to prepare a good response. If you take the time necessary for this, you give the impression that you are hiding, have forgotten about it, are wiping away the traces, or avoiding criticism. By failing to take control you soon become a plaything and this in itself makes it look like you lack integrity.

Secondly, hushing up wrongdoing is damaging because it may involve a double violation of integrity, since both the transgression and the hushing up are violations. The more relevant honesty is for the position, the more opportunities SPs have had to reveal their misdemeanors themselves, and the longer the period between the misdemeanor and its becoming known, the more seriously their silence will be taken.

Thirdly, keeping quiet about a transgression is damaging because others will ask what else has been hushed up. If you are evidently capable of keeping one transgression quiet, why would you not do the same with others? This damages trust in the maxim “No news is good news.” Such situations are good opportunities for people with grudges or pent-up frustrations to add fuel to the fire and push you over the edge. It is also an ideal breeding ground for rumors, lies, and half-truths, because when others doubt a person’s integrity, they are more open to rumors and gossip about them. These doubts can lead people to distance themselves, out of fear of being infected and sucked into the impending scandal. They may do this by not picking up the phone, keeping quiet about their own involvement in the transgression, judging it harshly, and even contributing new incriminating information.

A more risky tactic is to deny accusations. If there has really been a lapse, this is a more serious infringement of integrity, as it resides not only in (1) the transgression itself, and (2) hushing it up, but also in (3) denying it when the issue is raised.⁴⁶² Denying a transgression is risky. On the one hand, by acting this way you can come off well if the accusations blow over or cannot be proven. On the other hand, you will be judged twice as harshly if the accusations are corroborated, let alone if more misdemeanors come to light. Greek minister Akis Tsochatzopoulos responded to accusations of corruption from a newspaper by calling them insulting and defamatory, and threatening to sue. However, a subsequent parliamentary investigatory committee advised that he be prosecuted. Tsochatzopoulos denied all charges and said that the accusations were a plot against him. The court declared him guilty on all charges, including accusations such as accepting bribes in purchasing submarines and missiles, and condemned him to 20 years’ imprisonment. His wife, ex-wife, daughter, and 13 other accomplices were also convicted.⁴⁶³ A congressman reported to the media that accusations of possible insider trading on his part were lies from beginning to end. When it later emerged that the accusations were true, he resigned because he had not only abused his position but also lied about it. The more stubbornly the misdemeanor is denied, the more

seriously it will be taken if it is proven to be true. The situation is further exacerbated if denial occurs under oath, making it perjury. It almost cost Bill Clinton his presidency when he denied the sexual nature of his relationship with Monica Lewinsky, when the facts emerged shortly afterwards.

Another possible response to accusations is, instead of denying the facts, to label them insignificant, for instance saying the leaked information was never confidential in the first place, that a private payment was a loan rather than a gift, or that a lie was merely an inconsistent reflection of the facts. For example, in an emergency debate a minister said that he had stated in parliament that he had not authorized a newspaper interview, whereas a day later it emerged that he had issued a press release in which he declared that the interview had been authorized: "I wasn't fibbing, I didn't lie; I just made a mistake."⁴⁶⁴ By taking the moral issue out of it, the minister hoped to take the sting out of the debate. However, this is not without risk. This shifts the discussion to the standard, implicitly confirming that the behavior of which the SP is accused really took place. If it is subsequently judged that the SP should have known better, this becomes not only a violation of integrity but also a lack of standards.⁴⁶⁵

In addition to hushing up and denying wrongdoing, there is another approach that is even more risky: hiding the transgression and thereby making new ones. For example, one might get rid of witnesses by blackmailing those who want to go public, or destroying evidence. This exacerbates the integrity issue, increasing the damage if the cover-up becomes known. Criticism of German President Wolff increased when it became known that he had used threats in an attempt to prevent a newspaper from revealing new facts about an advantageous loan he received from a bank. Similarly, criticism of Berlusconi increased when it emerged that he had bribed three witnesses €127,000 in a case against him.⁴⁶⁶

In short, integrity becomes more problematic if transgressions are hushed up, denied, or hidden. For this reason SPs need to know what they are doing if they start down this track. Things will only go from bad to worse.

83. Integrity is investigating suspected wrongdoing

When SPs ignore indications of violations of integrity on the part of others, they become part of the problem, rather than part of the solution. By tolerating such violations, they send out the message that they consider this acceptable, raising questions as to why. If you consider integrity important, it is inconsistent to tolerate behavior in conflict with it. For this reason SPs should tackle indications of misdemeanors appropriately, for example by conducting thorough investigations.

SPs are playing with fire if they ignore indications of violations of integrity by others. When we pick up on such indications we become part of the solution, confronting, denouncing, or dealing with the issue. However, there is a flipside to this positive opportunity, as failure to deal with these indications appropriately makes us part of the problem. By failing to tackle such indications you implicitly give the impression that you consent to the behavior or do not see it as problematic. For this reason it is essential always to take action in response to indications of transgressions.

The problem with tolerating integrity violations is not only that it communicates unacceptable standards, but also that you end up embroiled in the violation if it flares up. In the case of many infamous transgressions, it has emerged that those closest to the situation had already received indications but had done little or nothing with them. In this way bystanders run the risk of becoming objects of criticism and investigation: should these bystanders not have intervened, announced the transgression, and taken measures to avoid repetition? They particularly run risks if people look into the causes of passivity: did they tolerate the situation because they themselves had done the same, are they in cahoots with the culprit, do they have any sense of responsibility at all, or are they incapable of addressing and tackling transgressions?

The principle that always applies here is that if you consider integrity important you must not only act accordingly but also confront and where possible correct those who do not. After all, integrity is not a matter of taste, where others have the right to feel and act differently. If we see integrity as important, we cannot tolerate others infringing it. Many integrity codes and regulations even state that SPs have a duty to confront offenders and if necessary to report the transgression to the competent authorities. The more serious the misdeed, the greater the chance of repetition, the closer the proximity of transgressor and transgression, the less witnesses there are, and the more the SP is professionally responsible for the transgressor or for tracing the transgression, the greater this duty, and with it the negative impact on personal integrity if you tolerate transgressions.

In deciding what to do with indications of wrongdoing, we should ask ourselves how reliable they are. Indications can be diffuse and contradictory. They can also come from the wrong intentions. A possible first step is therefore to investigate the reliability of the indications. After or instead of investigating, the suspected offenders can be confronted with the indications, asking whether there is more to the issue that could threaten integrity and confidence. For example, when a party chair heard that a fellow party member visited prostitutes he immediately wanted to know whether there was more to the case that might put further pressure on his political work.⁴⁶⁷

So when it comes to violations of integrity the question is whether it is necessary to investigate the facts further. Investigating shows that you take the indications seriously and take responsibility, that you consider integrity and the suspected infringements of it important, and that you are determined to take measures in the case of transgressions. By conducting or commissioning an investigation you take control (preventing others investigating with the wrong intentions) and allow the facts to speak for themselves (preventing incorrect impressions from damaging an image of integrity or indeed from preserving the illusion of it).

The more serious the indications, the more serious the suspected transgressions, and the greater the number of transgressors, the more important it is to formalize the investigation and to have it carried out by the competent authority.⁴⁶⁸ This is not only a question of the time needed, but also of independence (keeping one's own hands free and avoiding the impression of wanting to remain out of range), expertise (a good investigation requires specialized skills,

techniques, and knowledge), and proportionality (the greater the possible problem, the more serious the investigation).⁴⁶⁹ Such an investigation can be carried out by existing authorities within an organization, by setting up a committee, or by an external agency. A competent authority can be called in to carry out an investigation as quickly as possible (because operations are impeded until an investigation is complete and the air is cleared), or to buy time (to divert attention, get other things done first, and think through a good response).

Before ordering an investigation it is important to clearly delimit its scope to prevent it from expanding to unmanageable proportions (as there may have been a chain of transgressions). It is also important only to embark on an investigation if the culprit can be traced, a good reconstruction is possible, or clear lessons can be learned. For example, a certain party chair once said, "I would never order an investigation of the leak, because that would only make it more vague, and before you know it, people would start pointing fingers at the wrong person."⁴⁷⁰

An investigation can escalate if the suspects counteract it in order to divert attention, extend the problem, or frustrate the investigation. They can do this, for example, by revealing incriminating material about others, casting doubt on the integrity of the investigation (for example by questioning the quality and independence of the investigators or the investigation) or on the integrity of the person commissioning it (for example by questioning their motives). It is therefore important to involve the suspects as far as possible in the investigation, to carry out a high quality investigation, and to insist that those involved do not make announcements externally during the course of the investigation (although this will not prevent leaks).

The suspects may also fear escalation. For example, they may fear that others will raise more serious allegations, that the investigators will find incriminating materials they were unaware of, that the situation will become complex and unmanageable, leading to disastrous consequences. For example, an alderman had a nervous breakdown when he was discredited. The thought of others bringing new allegations and finding things that were not there drove him to delusions and hallucinations.⁴⁷¹

84. Integrity is like being a lady: if you have to tell people you have it, you do not

SPs should avoid claiming to possess integrity in order to ward off accusations. Since no one fully embodies integrity, this response reveals a lack of self-knowledge, and since self-knowledge is an aspect of integrity, it also reveals a lack of integrity. It is better to state that the accusations are incorrect or deny having committed the suspected transgressions. Integrity, however, demands that SPs do not (1) allow accusations to wash over them, (2) too readily accept punishment, or (3) parade a lack of integrity.

The previous chapter addressed the question of the extent to which violations of integrity by others affect one's own integrity and how this is best handled, but what should you do if people cast doubt on your integrity, if there are indications that you lack integrity yourself, or if you are confronted with hard evidence? This question is addressed in this chapter and the next.

SPs tend to counter accusations of abuse of power with claims of integrity. However, this is not a good defense. What Margaret Thatcher said of power applies to integrity too.⁴⁷² Having integrity is like being a lady: if you have to tell people you possess this quality, then you do not. Why is that?

SPs who claim to have integrity will be seen by others as conceited, self-satisfied, or arrogant, acting as if they are "without sin," irreproachable, without shortcomings or idiosyncrasies. Since no one is perfect (see chapter 54), people who set themselves up as having integrity show a lack of self-knowledge, and self-knowledge is an aspect of integrity. Saying that you have integrity therefore reveals a lack of integrity.

It is better to say that false accusations are incorrect, or, better still, that you have never committed the suspected transgressions. This avoids extending the accusation to apply to a whole person or the entirety of their behavior, limiting it to the specific behavior or trait

that the accusations relate to. By delimiting the issue and the denial, you avoid making too general or too stubborn a proclamation, thereby making it easier for others to counter. If SPs use claims of integrity as a defense, this is an invitation to others to bring new accusations to prove that they are lying (or at least have a selective memory).

If a positive claim regarding personal integrity is desirable, it is more credible and safer for someone else to make it, and the more independent and authoritative they are, the greater the value of the claim. There may be few people willing to do this, because when you make such claims you bind your own integrity with that of the accused. If a lack of integrity is subsequently demonstrated, you then become associated with it. Standing up for others also means running the risk of being accused of favoritism, nepotism, and arrogance in power. Avoiding presenting yourself as a person of integrity should not mean going too far in the opposite direction. A mayor once stated that when there were rumors about personal integrity one should act small in order to emerge the bigger person.⁴⁷³ He was right that people who are accused should not puff themselves up, presenting themselves as invulnerable, showing resistance, and frustrating the process. At the same time this does not mean that SPs should make themselves small. People with self-respect, which is an important element of integrity, will stand up for themselves, and will not passively allow accusations and investigations to wash over them. If you remain passive, this feeds the image that you are not interested in personal criticism and accusations, that integrity is unimportant to you, that you are ready to let people walk all over you, and that you lack autonomy, identity, and pride. The saying that you should sit still while you are being shaved creates the wrong image of integrity. An alderman responded powerfully when he was publicly accused by his officials: "I won't put up with being called a fraud. I cannot operate as an alderman when my integrity is in question."⁴⁷⁴

At the same time, SPs should avoid too readily accepting punishment, or even parading a lack of integrity. Such eagerness arouses the suggestion that you are making insufficient efforts to combat accusations and to operate with integrity in your position, as if you enjoy or profit from behaving without integrity, justifying your behavior as consistent because you lack integrity or are corrupt.

85. Integrity is not responding badly to accusations of wrongdoing

When faced with well-founded accusations, there are various tactics SPs use that fail to show integrity, such as (1) denying them completely, (2) distracting attention, (3) sacrificing others, (4) launching counterattacks, or (5) bringing investigations into disrepute. Stumbling blocks for responding with integrity are (1) loss of control over one's own emotions, (2) exacerbating the problem, (3) narrowing the problem down to a legal question, and (4) first confessing to the accusations but later withdrawing the confession.

There are various cunning techniques for dealing effectively with well-founded accusations. The first is denial. Napoleon Bonaparte stated, "In politics... never retreat, never retract... never admit a mistake."⁴⁷⁵ According to common advice, even if they have done wrong, it is best for SPs not to admit anything, firmly to deny it, and to act as if they were innocence itself. Admitting wrongdoing and mistakes, after all, means losing their job. SPs also have the right not to cooperate in their own condemnation and fall, or not to play into the hands of opponents. For example when Hungarian president Pál Schmitt was accused of plagiarism in his PhD thesis, he obstinately denied it, but later lost his job when an investigation upheld the accusation.⁴⁷⁶

Besides completely denying accusations, SPs can also distract attention, the so-called "wag-the-dog" technique, by setting something else in motion, for example spreading more serious accusations about others, bringing a different situation to crisis point, or revealing very positive news on another topic.

A third cunning tactic is to sacrifice someone else in order to remain out of the picture. The trick here is to select as innocent a scapegoat as possible.⁴⁷⁷ This makes it so unthinkable that it becomes plausible. Sacrificing others is particularly opportune if it is clear that there has been a misdemeanor but unclear who the culprit is.

A fourth cunning tactic is to launch a counterattack. For example, when a party leader threatened to expel a congressman from the party if his reprehensible behavior damaged the party too much, the congressman went on the offensive, expressing careful criticism of the lack of democratic leadership from the party leader in an interview. This meant the party leader could no longer expel him, because the media would conclude that he tyrannically eliminated opponents.⁴⁷⁸ Making things personal can also be effective if it causes opponents to lose self-control, letting themselves go, thereby creating an image of impotence. Integrity can also be used as a concept for launching a counterattack. For example it is possible to cast doubt on the integrity of accusers, for instance by pointing to their impure motives or more serious forms of inappropriate behavior. The weaker the integrity of the accuser, the less seriously the accusation is taken. Prime Minister Janša, for example, claimed that charges against him were politically motivated and that he would appeal.⁴⁷⁹ One can also damage the integrity of the accusation, for example by showing that there have been contradictory statements, conflicting reports or missing facts, and inconsistencies between findings, interpretations, and conclusions.

A fifth cunning tactic is to help with the investigation into the accusations but to withhold information. When the results of the investigation are revealed, you or others reveal the withheld information, discrediting the investigation and the investigators. After all, this creates the image that the investigation has been incomplete, the investigators are incompetent, and the results are therefore incorrect and unusable.

These tactics do not show integrity. Moreover, they add to the number of transgressions committed, risking greater reputational damage if discovered. Discovery is likely because the tactics are so transparent. Italian Prime Minister Berlusconi thought that he could deflect accusations of bribery by proposing that parliament sharpen the laws against corruption. "Those who commit crimes cannot stay in any political party," said Berlusconi. He labeled fraud by politicians as "simply the behavior of scoundrels."⁴⁸⁰ This attempt at distraction was transparent and added fuel to the fire for those accusing Berlusconi of corruption and fraud.

When it comes to integrity, the question is then how to react properly to well-founded accusations. The following chapter gives the answer to this. The following paragraphs give four examples of stumbling blocks for SPs that can cause them to respond badly.

The first stumbling block that prevents people from responding properly to well-founded accusations is losing control over one's own emotions. Self-control, after all, is an important constituent of integrity. Cursing and swearing, slamming doors, threats, outrageous gestures, and physical violence all reveal a lack of self-control. During a press conference Mayor Ford claimed to have seen a haze before his eyes because his integrity as a father and husband was questioned when he attempted to counter what turned out to be well-founded accusations. In coarse language he denied ever having offered an employee oral sex, saying he "got more than enough at home".⁴⁸¹

A second stumbling block is making the problem bigger in an attempt to allay the accusation. An alderman responded to the revelation that he visited prostitutes by saying that he had told a newspaper columnist in confidence and that she had misused the information. This magnified his problems, as others now saw him as naïve: SPs talking to columnists should assume that what they say will not remain between the two of them. A good SP is not naïve. Another example is a congressman called Harry who, when accused of sexual intercourse with employees at an embassy, admitted that he was sensitive to feminine beauty. This increased his problem because it raised the question of how often he had succumbed before, and he was subsequently nicknamed "Dirty Harry". Moshe Katsav's problems also grew when he claimed that a female employee was blackmailing him with false allegations of rape and sexual harassment; in response, the attorney general opened an official investigation, leading to Katsav being found not only to have had inappropriate relations with a female employee, but also to have been accused of sexual harassment by 10 other women.⁴⁸²

A third stumbling block is narrowing the problem to a legal issue. As stated in chapter 5, integrity is more than the letter of the law. Bystanders may think that by tackling the problem purely from a legal perspective the SP is evading and weakening the spirit of the law – let alone the prevailing morals and ethics. Moreover the judgment as to integrity is not only a legal or moral issue, but also an organizational or political problem. As a council member said of an investigation into fraud by a mayor, "Whatever a judge might decide, we as the council remain the ones to judge a mayor's administrative integrity."⁴⁸³

A fourth stumbling block is first admitting guilt but then withdrawing the confession. This inconsistency alone shows a lack of integrity. US senator Larry Craig was discredited when he made sexual advances towards a police officer at an airport by touching the agent's foot with his foot in the restrooms and repeatedly putting his hand under the partition between the cubicles. This was sufficient reason for the agent to arrest him. Initially Craig confessed, but he soon retracted this, claiming it was all a misunderstanding, that he had confessed to have the matter dealt with quicker, and that he had touched the agent's foot by mistake. This turned to greater public outrage because Craig was now also seen as a hypocrite.⁴⁸⁴

86. Integrity is responding well to accusations of wrongdoing

It is a misconception that SPs do not need to respond to accusations because the burden of proof lies with the accuser. If SPs really care about integrity, they will want to refute accusations actively, even if it is difficult to disprove inappropriate behavior. SPs can respond with integrity to concrete accusations by (1) broadening the problem, (2) requesting a vote of confidence, (3) being open, (4) investigating, (5) repairing or compensating for the damage, and (6) apologizing and showing regret.

There is more to be said about how to deal appropriately with accusations. One of the many common fallacies is based on the maxim that you are innocent until proven guilty. The danger here is that people think that the burden of proof rests on those who make accusations. This principle may apply to citizens – whoever points the finger should produce evidence – but that does not change the fact that an SP's reputation can be badly damaged by waiting for others to find proof. This puts you at the mercy of what others say and do, creating an image of passivity, indifference, or even of having something to hide. Even if you have the legal right not to incriminate yourself, openness, commitment, and proactivity are desirable for showing integrity. One party leader stated that members of parliament have a moral duty to clear their names.⁴⁸⁵ Those involved often expect this of SPs and criticize and condemn those who fail to do so, praising those who do. This expectation is generally fed by the assumption that even if the accusations were wrongful, the SP must have done something to arouse suspicion (no smoke without fire). So it is best to be cooperative in dismissing accusations, or better still to work actively to ensure that they are refuted. If SPs take their integrity and the integrity of their positions to heart, they will not tolerate their damage and defilement, and will want to actively refute accusations. Turkish prime minister Tayyip Erdoğan failed to follow this principle in his response to big protests by the people against his dictatorship, as he stated, "If they call someone who has served the people a dictator, I have nothing more to say."⁴⁸⁶

At the same time proving behavior lacking in integrity is awkward. After all, it is often a question of (1) a complex range of facts, observations, and images, (2) evidence that is difficult or impossible to obtain, (3) standards that are context-dependent and ambiguous, and (4) serious interests at stake that mean the situation is colored, distorted, and manipulated. It is even more difficult to prove that inappropriate behavior has not taken place. In chapter 64 we saw that it is more difficult to illustrate the absence of a quality than its presence.⁴⁸⁷ For example, it is more difficult to show that people have not committed transgressions than to show that they have. Moreover the absence of a transgression in general is more difficult to demonstrate than the absence of a transgression in a specific situation. For example you can show that you did not break a specific rule at a specific time by witnesses proving that you were doing something else at the time, rendering the violation impossible, but showing that you have never broken a particular rule is difficult if not impossible, because it involves excluding many behaviors that cannot be easily reconstructed.

Just because it is impossible to prove your innocence, does not mean that nothing can be done to prevent an image of dishonesty, fraud, or corruption. You could argue that the opposite of the accusation can never be proven and that it is unfair to ask the impossible. You can also request that the accuser give concrete examples, providing the possibility of refutation (and the hope that no concrete examples will be found). An alternative reaction is a direct, firm denial that anything of the accusation is true, or an assertion that you have always complied with the associated rule or standard. You can also respond by indicating a willingness to be completely open and to cooperate towards concrete information (setting the ball in the court of the accuser in a responsible way).

If the accusations relate to a concrete incident, there are various ways of responding appropriately and with integrity. An initial response is not to deny the accusation, but to broaden the problem, making it less problematic. A member of parliament took this approach when his ex-girlfriend gave a newspaper details of their sex life. He responded calmly that if the newspapers dealt with everyone in this way then everyone should fear them. This effectively gagged other members of parliament because every member now had an interest in extinguishing the fire as quickly as possible. Moreover anyone who had anything to say on the matter would indirectly be claiming to be squeaky-clean, which

would be hypocritical. A member of a municipal council responded in a similar way when accused of manipulation of the facts: “Let him who is without sin cast the first stone.” In saying this she did not deny her own inappropriate behavior, but placed an obstacle in the way of others confronting her.

A second possible response is to request a vote of confidence. In doing so you acknowledge that confidence is necessary and a matter for others to determine. This is an all-or-nothing move. When an alderman was accused of unacceptable behavior he announced that he would suspend his activities until the municipal council expressed confidence in him. Similarly a state secretary raised the question of confidence when he was accused of insufficiently informing parliament, among other charges. In his view there could not be a “millimeter of doubt” as to his credibility.⁴⁸⁸

A third option is to provide openness by making available and disseminating whatever relevant information you possess, showing that you are willing to cooperate proactively. This increases the chances of confidence, because you allow others to understand what is going on. An alderman accused of making private journeys in service cars and taxis immediately published a list detailing all his journeys in service vehicles over recent years. “Politicians can be controversial for their political opinions, but not when it comes to integrity,” the alderman claimed in an open letter. “I have nothing to hide and have never acted out of concern for my own interest.”⁴⁸⁹ Similarly, in the aftermath of the scandal around Minister Jérôme Cahuzac, who was found to have a secret bank account in Switzerland, something he had repeatedly denied, and who was sacked by President Hollande, the French government published a list of possessions of all 36 government ministers, ranging from cars and jewels to houses and furniture.⁴⁹⁰

A fourth response is to conduct or commission an investigation yourself. This shows that you take the accusations seriously. Conducting your own investigation, however, arouses suspicion as to the independence and objectivity of the findings, as well as running the risk of making mistakes, with the best of intentions, because investigative work is complex. When the press reported that a party member had said in congress that the party chair was homosexual, the party chair decided to have all members state in writing that they were not the source of the report. He hoped that this method would lead him to the source. However,

this aroused great mistrust within the party because everyone was treated as a potential source. The investigation can also be carried out by others. A mayor gained respect when he asked for an external investigation into the accusations as to his suspected conflict of interest in purchasing a vacation home.⁴⁹¹

A fifth possible response is to repair or compensate any damage as quickly as possible. For example, when it became known that many members of parliament in the British House of Commons had declared too much in expenses, some SPs voluntarily paid money back. British prime minister Gordon Brown paid back £12,415, not because he had broken the rules, but because the rules were tightened after an investigation and he applied them to himself retrospectively.⁴⁹² When it became known that another prime minister had made use of an advantageous tax arrangement, he claimed to be shocked and spoke of “a serious error of form on my side,” requesting that the tax authority cancel the arrangement directly.⁴⁹³ A state secretary also paid back a sum in private when there was outrage over her claim for the expenses of using a private jet from her vacation address to congress for an emergency meeting. Such responses show that you are doing what you can, although SPs should realize that repairs and compensation can be taken as admissions of guilt. A minister dismissed a mayor who paid back a thousand euros because he felt that repayments constituted an admission of guilt.⁴⁹⁴

A sixth possible response is apologizing and showing regret. For example, Spanish King Juan Carlos apologized when it emerged that he had hunted elephants while acting as honorary chair of the Spanish branch of the World Wide Fund for Nature.⁴⁹⁵ Likewise, a mayor who resigned due to inappropriate behavior apologized to residents for the damage he had caused to the city’s image.⁴⁹⁶ An alderman who was discredited also expressed his regret saying, “I have made mistakes. I thought I was invulnerable. I have done things that have caused others and myself damage and I have been naïve and careless. I am sorry for that.”⁴⁹⁷ Similarly an Indian member of parliament apologized for making denigrating remarks about women who demonstrated against the gang rape of a student on a bus, calling them “dented and painted,” a term car mechanics use when they hide damage with a lick of paint. “I withdraw those words which have hurt the sentiments of others. My intention was not to hurt.”⁴⁹⁸ Viewed opportunistically, however, apologizing is risky. It increases attention for the transgression and can lead to doubts as to the SP’s competence and integrity.⁴⁹⁹ From the perspective of

integrity, it is necessary to put up with these possible consequences. Apologies are desirable for integrity because they involve acknowledging wrongdoing, taking responsibility for it, and showing regret. Apologizing also has the advantage of isolating the behavior associated with accusations from other behavior, avoiding accusations blowing over to other activities.

If you apologize, then from the perspective of integrity it is important to do so sincerely and not hypocritically. Announcements such as the following from US vice president Spiro Agnew to reporters should be avoided: "I apologize for lying to you. I promise I won't deceive you except in matters of this sort."⁵⁰⁰ Apologies should not be a cheap way of avoiding further consequences either, as this would lead to a situation in which SPs apologize purely for self-preservation. If you really regret something, you apologize not in order to avoid further negative consequences, but to accept them.

87. Integrity is revealed by the magnitude of punishment for wrongdoing

The sanctions SPs apply to wrongdoing reveal the value they attach to integrity. The harsher the punishment, the greater the weight attributed to the value that has been violated or the standard transgressed. However, SPs can fail to sanction wrongdoing because (1) the transgressor has immunity, (2) the SPs who should apply punishment are also guilty of inappropriate behavior, (3) the consequences of sanctioning are greater than those of the transgression or would not be sufficient, and (4) there is too much reverence for the transgressor. SPs should avoid allowing their integrity to be damaged by a failure to sanction wrongdoing.

However energetically indications of transgressions are confronted and investigated, SPs stand or fall by the consequences attached to them. Beyond simply acting in agreement with the findings and conclusions of an investigation, integrity entails sanctioning any violations discovered. After all, the punishment reveals the value you attach to integrity. The harsher the punishment, the greater the weight attributed to the value or standard transgressed. Tolerating violations indicates that integrity is not a priority.

However, adequately sanctioning wrongdoing is easier said than done. There are at least four important factors that inhibit proper sanctions and may damage the integrity of those who should deliver punishment.

Firstly, as indicated in chapter 79, there are SP positions that confer immunity. In democratic countries politicians generally cannot be dismissed, so the only way to get them out of their position is for party administration not to put them on the election list, not to place them in an electable position, and not to vote for them, as party members or voters, in new elections. Democratic principles are placed above constitutional principles. Democratic representatives may well come

under pressure from their parties to resign after inappropriate behavior, but in many countries they have the formal right to remain in their jobs. Political administrators can be forced to give up their positions due to violations of integrity in the interim. However, this is not so much due to a lack of integrity in itself, but rather to damaged confidence. For this a majority of the supervisory body must support a motion of no confidence or censure, but even then a political administrator can ignore this and remain in office due to a lack of formal obligation to step down.

Secondly, adequate punishment can be hampered if those who should be applying sanctions are guilty of inappropriate behavior. Applying double standards in itself implies a lack of integrity. Those who should be sanctioned can exploit this, pointing to double standards, or even using it as a means of blackmail. Double standards are also an issue if the same behavior has been tolerated in the past or elsewhere, as there is a risk of accusations of randomness and class justice. If those applying sanctions run the risk of being confronted about their own integrity, this can be a reason for failing to apply sanctions properly.

Thirdly, people can be conservative in punishment because the possible consequences are greater than those of the transgression itself. Bringing a motion of no confidence against a minister can lead to the entire government having to resign. Ford chose not to punish Nixon in part because putting an ex-president in prison would damage confidence in the presidency itself. Punishment may also be withheld for opportunistic reasons. A parliament may allow ministers to stay in power so that they commit further errors, further damaging their own reputations and those of their parties (allowing them to hang themselves).

Fourthly, punishment may be withheld out of reverence. Sanctions can have fundamental, even traumatic consequences for those receiving them. In order to spare them this, it can be decided to give them a second chance. A member of parliament lost his position as spokesman because he had kept quiet about the fact that he had a past criminal conviction, but was not required to stand down because the party leaders decided to give him a second chance to recover party confidence. It is possible to come back from a scandal, as Mitterrand and Clinton have proven.⁵⁰¹ It may also be felt that the culprits have been sufficiently punished by damage to their reputation, although this is risky, as it means public opinion takes over the role of those who should formally apply punishment, and public opinion may turn on those responsible for punishment because of an expectation of formal sanctions.

In short, SPs who are responsible for punishing others but fail to do so should realize that this may affect their integrity. If they wish to preserve integrity, this means they should as far as possible create conditions in which they can apply sanctions, remaining free of transgressions themselves, keeping their hands free (avoiding conflicts of interest with those to be punished), and that there is a good policy on sanctions. When formal sanctions are restricted or impossible, it is worth considering informal sanctions. If no sanctions are possible, from the perspective of integrity it is desirable at least to explain this as well as possible. This may limit the damage to their integrity.

XIV. Before and after service

Part XIV, consisting of three chapters, is about what integrity means for the periods before an SP is in office and after stepping down.

88. Integrity provides good reasons for resigning

SPs accused of inappropriate behavior can resign in order to maintain their honor. This requires precision because others may see it as running away from responsibilities and showing a lack of accountability. SPs may also have good reasons for resigning due to an environment lacking integrity. This also requires precision because others may see it as (1) naïve, (2) cowardly, (3) false, (4) hypocritical, or (5) betrayal. Threatening resignation can be a way of improving the integrity of the environment, although SPs should not do this too often, as it then loses credibility.

A lack of personal integrity can lead to SPs having to step down, as stated in previous chapters. Nevertheless, this does not mean you always have to show a lack of integrity before resigning. SPs may take the honorable way out and accept the consequences by stepping down. Resignation does not have to be limited to situations in which SPs consider themselves guilty. They can also resign to allow a proper investigation into their behavior. One minister resigned when an investigation into his expenses started, because he felt that a minister should be able to operate with uncontested authority and that continuation of his position was incompatible with the freedom to respond to the findings of the investigation. Another mayor charged with fraud over a real estate project stepped down despite claiming to be innocent, because he wanted the time to defend himself properly. Furthermore, a minister accused of incorrectly informing parliament explained that he was resigning because responding to accusations required too much of his energy, so that he could not operate properly in his job.

Integrity requires precision when resigning in such situations. If you resign without admitting guilt, it can create the impression that you have taken to your heels and are evading your responsibilities and accountability. When a mayor decided to resign during an integrity investigation this led to criticism because it deprived the municipal council of the most important weapon for punishing her if she was found guilty. Another mayor remained in

a similar situation for this reason and stated publicly that he wanted to take responsibility by handing in his resignation directly after the report had been discussed by the municipal council. Another mayor announced his departure at the end of the council meeting in which his integrity was discussed, but was then criticized for arranging a severance payment in the meeting recess: the noble aspect of handing in his resignation was difficult to reconcile with arrangement of financial interests.⁵⁰²

Besides a suspected or proven lack of personal integrity, there are other integrity-related reasons for resigning, when SPs find that their own integrity is irreconcilable with that of the environment in which they work. They may feel, for example, that the environment damages their integrity or puts it under pressure, they may not wish to be associated with an environment in which integrity is absent, or may see no further opportunities to improve the integrity of the environment. SPs may also resign because they can no longer support the policy of the organization they belong to. There is no longer any connection, any integrity, between the SP and the policy.

In such situations, again, integrity demands precision. Onlookers will pay close attention to whether SPs resigning have been naïve (could they have already known this before they started?), whether they made sufficient attempts to turn the tide (what have they done themselves to change what they disapprove of; have they been cowardly?), whether they are acting on purely good intentions (is the resignation a matter of self-interest?), and whether it is hypocritical (are they resigning over something they have been guilty of themselves?). Elected SPs may also encounter accusations of betraying voters: the voters are let down when an SP fails to serve a full term. The same accusation of betrayal threatens other SPs who are nominated or appointed in the expectation that they will serve out their term of office or complete the job.

Resigning due to a lack of integrity in the environment can improve the environment if it is given publicity. At the same time resigning is not the only means of calling for attention. Simply threatening to resign can be a powerful gesture. A prominent example is US General George Marshall. During the Second World War, President Franklin Roosevelt attempted to keep back a critical article from a military newspaper. When Marshall received this request from an informant close to Roosevelt, he let Roosevelt know that if he were to receive the request

in writing he would immediately resign. Marshall drew a clear boundary, and it worked, as no written request was ever forthcoming.⁵⁰³ At the same time it is worth being careful not to threaten resignation too readily. It is a serious resource that only works for fundamental issues. Threatening resignation too often is a risk to credibility.

89. Integrity does not stop when you stop

Integrity applies in office and continues to apply after leaving office. This requires that SPs (1) depart with integrity, (2) are consistent in the ideals and values they aspire to in and after office, (3) do not abuse their position in and after office, (4) form an integrated narrative of what they have done and will go on to do, (5) deal respectfully with their successor, and (6) comply with those rules which apply after holding office.

How people leave office is often an indication of their integrity. For example it is hardly a sign of integrity when someone throws mud at the last minute, gives a final kick, or leaves things in a mess. The farewell speech can speak volumes in this respect. Do you praise yourself highly and settle old scores, or do you show gratitude to everyone who you have had the pleasure of working with, speak of the privilege of having been permitted to hold office, and leave listeners with a message full of ideals and values? When stepping down as mayor of New York, Mike Bloomberg said, "Every day over the past 12 years, I've awakened thinking about how to make our city stronger and safer, healthier and greener, freer and fairer, more just and compassionate, more innovative and forward-looking, with more opportunity for all. On Wednesday morning, I will wake up and smile, knowing that we did everything we could to achieve those goals. Thank you for the opportunity to serve you – and to make a difference in the future of this great city we all love so much."⁵⁰⁴ Or as Eisenhower said to the people in his farewell speech as US president, "So – in this my last good night to you as your President – I thank you for the many opportunities you have given me for public service in war and peace. I trust that in that service you find some things worthy; as for the rest of it, I know you will find ways to improve performance in the future."⁵⁰⁵

At the same time the farewell speech should show integrity with who you were and what you have done in office. It is hypocritical for SPs to suddenly present themselves very differently than before. Even with the best of intentions, it is too late to set issues straight, make up for wrongdoing, and realize unfulfilled promises in a farewell speech. If you really found an issue important, you would not leave it until the last minute. It is easy, and therefore less credible, to say positive things in a farewell speech, because you can no longer be held to what you have said. A similar lack of integrity can exist among those to whom the departing official speaks. For example, one minister spoke of receiving a kiss of Judas on her departure, when the very person who had let her fall and forced her to leave said publicly that she was “one of us” and called her departure “terrible.”⁵⁰⁶ At the same time, a departing SP should be prepared for this, as it shows their lack of integrity if they hang out their dirty laundry in response.

However, integrity does not end with departure from office. What you do next indicates the extent to which the ideals and values you aspired to in office were part of you as a person. If someone stands up for public health in office but becomes governor of a tobacco manufacturer afterwards, this comes across as inconsistent. The ideals and views expressed in office go with you as an assessment framework for others in a new position. A former prime minister was criticized when he became a governor of various companies and approved high bonuses for the directors, having referred to payments at the top of business life as exhibitionist personal enrichment during his time in office.⁵⁰⁷ The high standards set for SPs can even apply after stepping down. There was outrage over Tony Blair’s tax evasion years after he had resigned as the prime minister of the UK, when he no longer held public office. Critics felt that as a former prime minister he still had an exemplary role.⁵⁰⁸ A former Greek minister of transport was also expelled by his party after he was convicted of failing to halt at a stop sign, and driving uninsured with bogus number plates.⁵⁰⁹

Integrity is revealed both by what you stand for in your past and present positions and in improper use or abuse of past positions to benefit present ones. There were questions about a former minister’s decision to transfer to an aviation company that he had made decisions about as minister of transport. Critics were of the opinion that as a minister he had gained knowledge of confidential affairs which he could now apply. Cabinet ministers also wondered whether the minister had acted with pure intentions in his decisions with respect to the

aviation company or had already been positioning himself for his new job. Furthermore, there were doubts as to Dick Cheney's integrity when he was US secretary of defense and a large commission was granted to a company where he subsequently went to work as CEO, winning a billion dollar tender from the ministry of defense. When four years later he was elected US vice president the company won a two billion dollar tender.⁵¹⁰

However, the most important point for integrity is whether the new positions and activities form an integral whole with previous positions. In chapter 27 we saw that integrity should be a theme in life. In this respect we should also look to the future. For some SPs this might mean continuing to work towards the same aims as in the previous position, serving the same interests and resolving the same issues, and for others doing something completely different (for example, having made a contribution to one interest or issue, proceeding to use the skills and experience for completely different ones). It is worth asking whether former SPs are acting with integrity if, after long careers as SPs, they then take on various honorary positions. Honorary positions tend to have little in common with service, casting doubt on or undermining any previous image of willingness to serve.

In addition to what you do after your departure, integrity is also revealed by how you deal with your successor. This starts while in office. It is hardly a sign of integrity if you quietly hand on lots of problems to your successor. Integrity is also revealed in the freedom you offer to potential successors. You should guard against offering potential successors too little freedom to develop and promote themselves, or seeking to restrict or eliminate them. Integrity is therefore put to the test as the end of the term of office approaches. To what extent do you voluntarily distance yourself from power, let go of matters, and create space for new people and new ideas?

Integrity is also revealed in the way you deal with your successor. If you are a bad loser, for instance by failing to congratulate the person to whom you have lost the election, bury the hatchet, and wish them luck, this is not a sign of integrity. A positive example is President Ford, who when he lost the elections to Carter said, "I believe that we must now put the divisions of the campaign behind us and unite the country once again in the common pursuit of peace and prosperity. Although there will continue to be disagreements over the best means to use in pursuing our goals, I want to assure you that you will have my complete and wholehearted

support as you take the oath of office this January. I also pledge to you that I, and all members of my Administration, will do all that we can to insure that you begin your term as smoothly and as effectively as possible.”⁵¹¹ Another positive example is the politician who after losing elections said to the winner, “See you at the next elections!”

Cooperating on a smooth handover of power is what Ford promised Carter. He also promised unanimity. This unanimity is lacking if people continue to exert influence after leaving office, publicly oppose their successors, and put spanners in the works. British prime minister John Major was repeatedly publicly criticized by his predecessor Margaret Thatcher, and found this unbearable. According to an advisor, even after eight months as prime minister he said of her, “I want her isolated, I want her destroyed.”⁵¹² It may be understandable but it is not a sign of integrity to speak this way of a predecessor.

Respect for the successor and any new generation, however, can be easier said than done. “It hurts to relinquish power,” said one ex-minister,⁵¹³ and “the black hole can be large” according to another. A member of parliament comments, “For politicians the retreat is the most difficult in all battles.”⁵¹⁴ If your life is serving society, then stopping is death. If you feel you have failed to complete your mission, it is all the more difficult to let go. This is further aggravated if successors give short shrift to the legacy of their predecessors and publicly slate them,⁵¹⁵ as in the case of an intended successor who said of his predecessor that playtime was over, presenting the new party program under the title “A Watershed”. Successors often feel compelled to put their own stamp on their work, not to be regarded as a copy of their predecessor, to create space for their own new agendas and quickly show action. This makes it difficult for predecessors “to look on in disappointment, mouth gagged, as life goes on without you”. “It feels like salt rubbed in the wounds,” said one former SP. Excessive opposition to a predecessor who you have worked for or with for a long time also does not give a strong image of integrity. This is hypocritical and a sign of impotence, showing that you are incapable of making the intended change and renewal.

An alderman who accepted a full retainer contrary to the rules after his aldermanship discovered that integrity did not stop on departure from his position. For several years he kept quiet to the municipality and the executors of the retainer about the income he received from chairing a professional organization. This income should have limited the retainer he

received from the municipality at that time. The alderman attempted to lay the blame on others, starting with his wife, because she conducted their home administration, and then the municipal secretary and salary administrator, who he claimed had failed in their duties. This did not remove his own responsibility. He was required to pay back the retainer he had wrongly received and relinquish his new position.⁵¹⁶ Even if the term of office has ended, SPs should comply with the rules that still apply.

90. Integrity is put to the test during selection processes and elections

Integrity reveals its power during SP selection processes and elections. This shows in (1) attempts by opposition to discredit the integrity of candidates, (2) the way in which integrity is included in the job description, (3) the way in which candidates are questioned and tested on their integrity, and (4) how candidates advocate integrity. Risks SPs run with respect to their integrity are (1) discrediting themselves when attempting to discredit others, (2) making commitments that lack integrity in themselves, and (3) making commitments they cannot keep.

Just as integrity does not stop after leaving office, it does not begin with being appointed as an SP. Integrity already plays a role in selection processes and elections. After all, if integrity is important for practicing as an SP, then it is also important to make sure that candidates for SP positions have the level of integrity required. Here, too, integrity reveals its power.

The fact that integrity is important is clear from all attempts opponents and competitors make to discredit the integrity of fellow candidates. Labeling other candidates as turncoats, liars, slippery, unreliable, and underhand, for example, are attempts to damage them because these are seen as negative qualities by those selecting.

The fact that candidates are questioned as to their integrity also shows the importance of integrity. This questioning does not only occur during selection interviews but also during talks, campaigns, media interviews, and may be carried out by intelligence services. Candidate SPs can be asked directly about their ideals, vision, and principles, and may be presented with dilemmas and thorny issues to determine whether they respond with integrity, extracting statements that conflict (lack integrity) with their own previous statements or prevailing policy. Sometimes traps are even set, such as misleading questions or hidden cameras, to

determine whether candidates hold firm and how authentic they are. No wonder SPs feel they have been grilled, set on the rack, and turned inside out in the run-up to taking office.

The idea that integrity is important is also indicated by the way in which candidate SPs present themselves. Bill Clinton explained his choice of Al Gore as running mate saying that he was “a leader of great...integrity.”⁵¹⁷ In his campaign George H.W. Bush called on people to vote for the candidate with “the integrity...to get the job done.”⁵¹⁸

Selection processes and elections are also a test of integrity in the sense of revealing how candidates deal with pressure and temptation. Elections can be exhausting, putting people under great pressure. In many elections it is all or nothing, now or never, a battle in which you win or lose. An illustrative example of this is the name of the headquarters of Bill Clinton’s presidential election campaign, which was the “War Room.” In election times people are closely followed, and cannot afford to make mistakes. Joe Biden had to withdraw his candidacy for the presidency after it emerged that he had given a speech full of personal anecdotes that originated from the speech of a British politician, and that he had failed a course in his law degree due to plagiarism.⁵¹⁹ Similarly an alderman was forced to resign when it emerged that he had used municipal address files for his new election campaign.

Vote rigging may be the greatest sin a politician can commit during elections, as it undermines the existence of free elections. Paraguay has a long tradition of vote rigging; to give a recent example, last year local media showed a video recording of a senator attempting to buy votes for his party at €20 a vote.⁵²⁰ An Italian municipal council member was also recently arrested when it emerged that he had bought 4,000 votes to be sure of winning the local elections.⁵²¹ There are other integrity risks besides vote rigging lying in wait during selection processes and elections.

One of the integrity risks is that candidates attempt to discredit others but end up discrediting themselves. Blackening the reputations of others, making things personal, making false accusations, and injuring opponents do not show integrity. For example, German candidate Oskar Lafontaine compared his opponent Gerhard Schröder with Chancellor Heinrich Brüning (who prepared the way for Adolf Hitler). Schröder dismissed this criticism saying that Lafontaine had never fully recovered from an attempt on his life.⁵²²

Another risk to integrity is promising others favors that lack integrity in return for support, for instance offering jobs, favorable treatment, or assignments if the SP achieves the desired position. Such promises damage the purity of decisions if SPs fulfill them once in office. Funding from private individuals or companies for election campaigns is a threat to integrity in this respect. It at least creates the appearance that favorable treatment will be given in return, with the possibility, as Obama noted, of becoming a prisoner of those financing the campaign.⁵²³

In attempting to gain support SPs also run the risk of making promises they cannot fulfill. During selection processes and elections there can be a great deal of pressure and temptation to present things as attractively as possible, promising the earth and outdoing the commitments of opponents. After all, SPs must impress, sell themselves, and enthuse others, which makes lying tempting. As US senator Chris Dodd said during a campaign, “Eight more days and I can start telling the truth again.”⁵²⁴ However, integrity means fulfilling your promises, including what you commit yourself to during elections and interviews. For this reason it shows a lack of integrity, as American writer Carl Sandberg puts it, that SPs should always have a hat to pull rabbits out of if elected.⁵²⁵

Quintus Cicero, a military leader under Julius Caesar, writes in his guide to elections, “Of course, you are who you are, and that is your trump card, but it can’t do any harm to act from time to time, especially if it is only for a couple of months.”⁵²⁶ For SPs considering this advice the question is how they can guarantee that it stops at a couple of months. How will you be in a position after a couple of months to act as you really are? In this respect the advice of Roman senator Publius Cornelius Tacitus on integrity may be more convincing: never has anyone who gained power through misdeeds executed it with virtue.⁵²⁷ Gaining a position through inappropriate behavior means holding office without integrity, so if you enter elections or selection processes in this manner, you know the road you are starting down and where it will end.

XV. Other levels

Part XV, consisting of four chapters, is about what integrity means for policy, decision making, organizations, and society.

91. Integrity is an important policy touchstone

SPs' policies are generally judged and evaluated against various aspects of integrity. SPs should therefore ensure that their policies show (1) consistency over time, (2) consistency at a given moment, (3) color, and (4) justice for those involved, as well as (5) being properly carried out. The less SPs do this, the more harshly others will hold them to account.

Integrity offers criteria for judging what SPs do and who they are, as well as for evaluating their policies, plans, contracts, programs, strategies, and memoranda. This often happens implicitly, as different aspects of integrity are applied. Let us examine some examples.

If a policy is typified as erratic or wavering, this implies a negative judgment. In such cases people use consistency as a standard, with the expectation that policy should form an integral whole. Stating that employment is the top priority one day and that cuts are most important the next, without a change in circumstances, shows inconsistency. Viewed in this way, integrity of policy reveals an inherent integrity risk to democracy. Changing coalitions lead to changing policy. Every new coalition will set new priorities, points of departure, and policy features (otherwise the former coalition might as well have continued). This inconsistency makes elected organizations unpredictable and therefore unreliable.

Policy can be inconsistent, showing a lack of integrity over time, and it can also be irreconcilable in a given moment. For example, if the environment becomes a policy spearhead, but at the same time motor vehicle taxes are reduced and public transport costs are raised, that is inconsistent. Such policies are not integrated, and fail to form a logical whole. Stakeholders will look at the policy, taking integrity, whether explicitly and consciously or otherwise, as a basis for judging its merits.

Another way a policy can be criticized is for lack of color. Policies can be portrayed as bland, pragmatic, and technocratic. This indicates a lack of integrity because people expect policies to be recognizable, with clear points, based on ideals. Compromise can beat policies flat. In order to avoid this, instead of seeking to compromise on each point, coalitions could give one side or another their way on individual issues, so that each party gets its way in a number of points and is recognizable for it. The risk here is that the entirety is incoherent, lacking integrity and recognizability. Good policy should therefore be driven by a shared mission and vision, with a story behind it. The mission and vision can even be morally charged. Thatcher and Reagan, for example, presented their political programs as crusades against evil, Martin Luther King stated, "I have a dream", Helmut Kohl spoke of "blooming landscapes", and George H.W. Bush of "a thousand points of light".

Policy can also be judged from the perspective of integrity by looking at whether the content does justice to everyone involved. Are particular groups or interests unjustly neglected or is there an even distribution of the advantages and disadvantages? The importance of integrity in this respect is also visible in the mottos, slogans, and titles used in policy programs and agreements. Slogans such as "mending what is broken", "finishing the job", and "tackle the problem, don't pass the buck" reflect the underlying importance of integrity.⁵²⁸

Integrity is also used as a framework for assessing the execution of policy. Policy must be carried out to have integrity. If not, then there is an inconsistency between words and deeds, between paperwork and practice, between what people say they will do and what they actually do. If an administration says it will implement reforms but fails to do so, this is grounds for calling the administration to account. Policy is a promise that others should be able to rely on and hold policymakers to. If the policy is not carried out, it shows it has not had the right priority, that the policy makers lack the dedication and energy to carry it through or that those who stand to benefit from it are not taken seriously. The importance of this shows not only in the supervisory bodies that check on such issues, but also in the fact that when it comes to elections and appointments people and parties are judged mainly on the promises they have fulfilled over the past term of office.

From the perspective of integrity it is therefore important for SPs to check that the policies they make are consistent in time, that the various aspects are reconcilable and coherent, that there is sufficient color, that they are fair to those involved, and feasible. The less SPs pay attention to this, the more harshly others will hold them to account.

92. Integrity of decision making is at the heart of integrity

The importance of integrity and the criteria for integrity are based on the core activity of SPs and the organizations they work for, which is decision making. If decisions are not taken with integrity, then the decision-making process, the SP, and the organization are defective. SPs should therefore avoid any infringement of integrity of decision making, such as corruption, fraud, leaks of confidential information, and inappropriate intervention.

The question of why integrity is important and what integrity criteria are based on can be answered by thinking of the core activity of an organization. The core activity of an organization, institution, party, administration, or council is decision making. Such organizations are in essence mechanisms for making decisions on distribution of power, what is good and right, and how best to use resources.

If decision making is the core activity of an organization, then integrity of decision making is at the heart of the integrity of the organization. If decisions are made without integrity, then decision making is not sound, optimal, or functional; instead it becomes improper, imbalanced, unacceptable, and irresponsible. In such cases the power to make decisions is not applied well.

A great deal of activity that is seen as lacking integrity can be explained by the way in which it infringes the integrity of decision making. For example, corruption lacks integrity because less good decisions are taken in exchange for bribes. Intimidation and blackmail lack integrity, because people are put under pressure to make decisions they otherwise would not make. Conflicts of interests lack integrity because decisions are influenced by the different interests, or at least appear so. Consciously ignoring relevant information shows a lack of integrity, because this means the best decision will not be taken. Fraud lacks integrity because a false

impression is given, leading to damage to the quality of decision making by others, or in the case of vote rigging to corruption. This is why integrity of elections is so important and why, according to Hillary Clinton, SPs have a moral obligation to ensure integrity of elections.⁵²⁹

Leaking information can also be seen as an indication of a lack of integrity. When information is leaked decision making procedures are undermined. One minister commented, "There are also 'leaks' regarding cabinet consultations. The deliberations of cabinet are confidential for good reasons. This protects internal consultation. Internal consultation needs to be frank and free, without being exposed to publicity; open and candid, but not public. Democracy is about direct and public consultation between ministers and parliament. Untimely publication of unpolished and incomplete policy resolutions frustrates consultation with parliament. [...] Leaking confidential information is destructive to the quality of government and democratic rules." Even leaking inaccurate information can indicate a lack of integrity, for instance if the aim is to damage someone.

Another form of inappropriate behavior that harms integrity in decision making is inappropriate intervention. A party chair once asked two party members on a parliamentary investigative committee to gain advance insight into a report by the committee in order to put pressure on a minister in his party to soften a judgment. One of the committee members responded resolutely, "If you are part of a investigation committee, you keep quiet to your wife, your dog, and the party chair."⁵³⁰ A governor was even voted the most corrupt governor of the year in the US for inappropriate interference in decision making with respect to the state collective bargaining board.⁵³¹ SPs in high positions can find it particularly difficult to avoid getting mixed up in the decision making of others in areas where they have no authority. For example, it appears that Tony Blair received many letters from Prince Charles on politically sensitive issues, much to his displeasure. Charles also became emphatically involved in public debates on topics such as fox hunting and genetically modified food. Blair felt that the crown prince was overstepping constitutional boundaries in doing so. According to Blair's press secretary at the time, Blair was so irritated by this that he even accused the prince of "screwing us."⁵³²

In short, in determining integrity, we can take an organization's decision making as a starting point and from this we can infer when its integrity is in doubt, damaged, or undermined.

93. Integrity is revealed in the design of an organization

The integrity of an organization SPs belong to is important for assessing their integrity. In order for SPs to avoid being held responsible for insufficient integrity within their organizations, they should (1) create an environment that encourages good behavior in those they manage and discourages behavior lacking integrity, (2) supervise the integrity of behavior, and (3) effectively intervene when there are indications of inappropriate behavior.

SPs might think that as long as they act with integrity themselves they do not need to worry any further. However, this is an erroneous assumption. SPs' own behavior and personality are not the only things that affect their integrity. The integrity of an organization that SPs belong to is also important for assessing their integrity. SPs have had to resign, not because they themselves have acted without integrity, but because the organizations they belong to have fallen short. A mayor had to resign when it emerged that an official had committed fraud, a minister resigned when it emerged that his officials had breached many procedures (detainees were tortured, humiliated, and raped), the chairman of the board of a party resigned when it emerged that one of the board members had received bribes, and a prime minister dissolved parliament when it became known that officials had eavesdropped on politicians and citizens for decades.⁵³³ A lack of integrity on the part of others can negatively affect an individual's integrity and may have far-reaching consequences. What is the basis of this?

There are SPs who want to see their officials and employees as having integrity. "I assume that officials act with integrity and loyalty," said one minister.⁵³⁴ This is a good assumption, as seeing others as opportunists, egoists, or even criminals is no basis for trust, collaboration, and delegation of work. However, this trust should not be allowed to stretch to naivety or passivity. Even if others have integrity, their behavior is in part determined by the environment in which they operate. The environment can put great pressure on them to abandon their integrity, or it can reveal great temptations, causing them to succumb.

This is the starting point for holding SPs responsible for the behavior of others. When they take insufficient action to create an environment in which others are encouraged to act with integrity and protected from inappropriate behavior. The term “insufficient” indicates that there is potential for improvement in encouragement and protection. This particularly applies to SPs who manage or have ultimate responsibility for an organization lacking in integrity. They have the power to prevent the problem, but fail to use it, or to apply it sufficiently, or if they lack this power, that is just as bad, because this is a sign of weakness and unsuitability when it comes to integrity. SPs should therefore ask themselves what inappropriate behavior on the part of others can affect them as SPs and what can reasonably be done to prevent it.

In addition to this preventive responsibility, there is also a responsibility for detection. Even if SPs do their utmost to avoid inappropriate behavior, it can still occur. If SPs close their eyes to this, they will be seen as naïve or negligent. For this reason SPs should ensure that they oversee the behavior of others that might affect their own integrity. This means, for example, making inquiries, checks, and inspections, as well as taking sufficient action when inappropriate behavior is found, as discussed earlier in this book. This is an SP’s responsibility for prevention. For example, a mayor was sentenced to lifelong imprisonment because his officials had set up an “embezzlement machine” swindling \$23.5 million while the mayor, according to the court, had been “aware of the whole plan but had stayed on the sidelines, feigning ignorance.”⁵³⁵

We have seen that SPs’ integrity is revealed in the way they create an environment in which others are encouraged to behave well and protected from behavior lacking integrity, and in which bad behavior is observed and tackled. This is something that SPs create through more than just rules and measures. The culture they create is also important. Is there space to discuss integrity dilemmas, for example? Can people confront one another about inappropriate behavior? Is good behavior valued?

In short, the more power SPs have over others, the more responsibility they have for the integrity of others. This is not limited to the negative aspect of damage to their integrity from the bad behavior of others. The positive side is that when others behave with integrity it increases the SP’s integrity, at least in those cases in which the behavior of others is related to the creation of a positive environment by that SP.

94. Integrity is about the design of society

Integrity is essential for the proper functioning of society, because citizens have (1) a right to their own integrity, and (2) a duty to respect the integrity of others. A society should also have (3) goals that show integrity, (4) a design with integrity, and (5) sovereignty. The implications of this are that SPs (1) truly serve society, (2) promote harmony in society, and (3) engage in dialogue with society.

Integrity is not only about people, policy, decision making, and organizations. It also relates to society.

“Integrity is the lifeblood of democracy,” according to US senator Edward Kennedy.⁵³⁶ If integrity is of such essential importance for the proper functioning of a democracy or even society in general, what is it based on?

Politics and government is based on the idea that there are opposing interests in society and that there are different opinions on how these interests should be handled. There is nothing wrong with the existence of opposing interests and different opinions. In fact, in principle it is good that people have individual interests and opinions. This indicates that they are autonomous and authentic. Citizens standing up for who they are and what they want is one side of integrity.

At the same time society is about minimizing the way in which these opposing interests and opinions infringe on the integrity of others. Participating in society means people taking one another into account, respecting one another, and honoring one another’s integrity. This is a second aspect of integrity. People have the right to their own integrity and a duty to respect that of others.

In addition to the way people live together, integrity can also be seen at the societal level. This is a third side of integrity, the question of what constitutes a society with integrity. This is first and foremost a question of the aims of society. When does society come into its own, when is a society good, what should a society strive to achieve? Aristotle, for example, speaks of a just society, while others speak of a sustainable, committed, or peaceful society, one of hope and prosperity.⁵³⁷

The question of what constitutes integrity in society can also be considered from the perspective of its design. How can integrity be achieved, what would constitute such a society, and what would the design involve? The philosopher Charles de Montesquieu, for example, speaks of the *trias politica*, involving a split between the legislature, executive, and judiciary. This separation of powers comes from the idea of purity (preventing mixing of interests and absolute power) and harmony (if every power acts as it should, this leads to balance in government and society).⁵³⁸

Finally, the question of what constitutes integrity in society can be considered from the perspective of the independence of society. The Russian foreign minister Sergei Lavrov, for example, expressed concern as to the integrity of Syria: "We are concerned with keeping Syria in one piece, territorially integral, sovereign, independent and secular, where the rights of all groups, ethnic and others, are fully respected."⁵³⁹ President Alija Izetbegović also pointed to the integrity of society when he said, "We Bosniaks would for sure fight for integrity of Bosnia."⁵⁴⁰ Before taking office the president and ministers of Egypt swear that they will "safeguard the territorial integrity of the motherland."⁵⁴¹ The integrity of an area is clearly something of value, to be defended by the sword. This notion of integrity was a fundamental idea for a polis among the early Greeks. Every polis or community strives for independence and sovereignty. This side of integrity was also the main aim of the advice of Machiavelli to the monarch of the time: the restoration of the unity of Italy.⁵⁴²

What are the implications of these aspects of integrity for SPs?

A first implication is that a society in which SPs are separate from everyone else cannot be seen to have integrity. This situation arises, for example, when SPs are turned in on themselves and society shows great mistrust of them. It is important for SPs to realize that their positions are all about people in the end. SPs are there for people. "Politics is a people business. I like people," as Laura Bush said as first lady.⁵⁴³ People are not the means but the end, as Immanuel Kant argued.⁵⁴⁴ For this reason SPs are servants of the people, not the other way around, nor servants of themselves or one another. As minister Chanakya of the Mauryan empire wrote of the king, "He shall not consider as good only that which pleases him but treat as beneficial to him whatever pleases his subjects."⁵⁴⁵ This is why dishonest SPs are so disastrous to the authority of SPs: these so-called "sleazeballs" make a pretense of serving the people, but in reality they serve their own interests. However, the slightest doubt that SPs honestly serve the people can be disastrous to them personally.

A second implication is that a society in which there is a question of a split or schism due to oppositions cannot be seen as having integrity, as it lacks harmony. SPs should therefore be oriented towards harmony and reconciliation,⁵⁴⁶ by realizing firstly that their jobs are about giving and taking, winning and losing,⁵⁴⁷ and secondly that citizens must be encouraged towards harmony. Society is about sharing, so SPs striving for integrity should not sow hate, demonize political dissidents, or encourage fundamentalism or ethnic cleansing (even if this is intended to give integrity to society),⁵⁴⁸ but should strive for unity,⁵⁴⁹ not in the form of uniformity, but in the sense of integration, a situation in which citizens can have or find and enrich their authenticity and autonomy on the one hand, and on the other hand share common values and norms. Integrity and integration can arise in diversity. President Bill Clinton, for example, worked for "a more perfect union" of society.⁵⁵⁰

A third implication is that dialogue is important for creating integrity in society. In a real dialogue, Jewish philosopher Martin Buber states, people do not only search for opportunities to convince the other party, but also admit the possibility of being convinced by them.⁵⁵¹ This does not mean that people must always agree. On the contrary, because you immerse yourself in the other, you more often disagree, but you are in agreement about what you disagree over.⁵⁵² Even if you think differently about what is important to society, you are thinking from the perspective of the interest of society. SPs with integrity therefore engage in dialogue with one another and society. Such dialogue is characterized by the fact that it tackles essential

issues. Debating and discussing petty matters is unworthy of SPs. In practice, however, things are different, as stated by Barack Obama before he became president: “What’s troubling is the gap between the magnitude of our challenges and the smallness of our politics – the ease with which we are distracted by the petty and trivial matters, our chronic avoidance of tough decisions.”⁵⁵³

XVI. Finally

The final part and chapter is about what integrity means to begin with.

95. Integrity only exists now

The importance of integrity continues until an SP's last breath. Integrity can be revealed even on the deathbed, and can live on after death, so it is important for SPs to consider how they wish to be remembered. This is not a question for later but for now, as the way people see you later is influenced by what you do now. The present situation is the only thing you can do something about now. SPs would therefore be well advised not to put off or shirk integrity, as the only people responsible for SPs' integrity are the SPs themselves.

Integrity remains important, as stated, even after an SP's term of office has ended. The importance of integrity continues until an SP's last breath. Integrity can be revealed even on the deathbed. The last words of Dwight Eisenhower were as follows: "I've always loved my wife, my children, and my grandchildren, and I've always loved my country. I want to go. I'm ready to go. God, take me." Another example is US president Grover Cleveland, whose last words as he died were: "I have tried so hard to do right."⁵⁵⁴ It is in those situations where more could be said that what is said reveals the most about where a person's heart lies.

However, a person's integrity can live on after death. It is expressed in the texts in sympathy cards and obituaries, on gravestones, and in media reporting and eulogies. When Franklin Roosevelt died just before the end of the Second World War, it was said that, "He died fighting for democracy."⁵⁵⁵ Joseph Stalin praised Roosevelt as being "a great politician of world significance."⁵⁵⁶ Integrity can also live on in the memories of others. For example, people may retain memories of ideals, courage, and honesty in SPs that can serve as an example to others. At the same time it is possible to go down in history as bad or corrupt, even the worst or most corrupt SP. Out of 690 mayors of large US cities, experts chose William H. Thompson as the worst mayor ever because he received campaign funds from gangsters such as Al

Capone, among other misdeeds, and after his death a \$1.5 million bribe turned up in his safe deposit box.⁵⁵⁷ As stated in chapter 17, Indonesian president Mohamed Suharto headed a list of most corrupt political leaders.⁵⁵⁸

From the perspective of integrity the question to ask is how you would like to be remembered. This is not a question for later but for now, as the way people see you later is influenced in part by who you are and what you do now. The present situation is the only thing you can do something about now. What happens now will never return and cannot be redone. In that respect integrity is about the here and now. The only thing that counts is what you do in the moment. As Bill Clinton wrote, "All we have is the moment."⁵⁵⁹

By relating integrity to now, you avoid putting off good intentions for the future and opting for less edifying issues in the short term. Postponing integrity is a rejection of integrity in the present. There is also the question of whether there will even be a later, and if so, whether you will be able to prioritize integrity at that point. SPs may think that they have to survive their first term in office before having the freedom in the next term to realize their ideals and principles. However, the second term often proves disappointing, as US presidents have found.⁵⁶⁰ They have less power because it is difficult to change course (because that shows a lack of integrity), receive more criticism (because others lose patience over unfulfilled promises), and less cooperation (because others begin to anticipate their successor). It is therefore better to begin the first term with the expectation that there will be no second term. This prevents postponement from turning into denial of duty if there is no second term, requiring the SP to leave empty-handed.

In the end you are integrity. The only person responsible for your integrity is you. The only person who can develop your integrity is you. In short, integrity is about the way you are now.

About the author

Muel Kaptein (1969) has worked as an advisor and researcher on integrity since 1991. In his role as a partner at KPMG he works with colleagues to support organizations in the public and private sectors in auditing and improving their integrity.

In his role as professor of business ethics and integrity at the Erasmus University Rotterdam he studies the management of integrity, the integrity of management, and the measurement of integrity. He is author of the books *Ethics Management* (1998), *The Balanced Company* (2002), *The Six Principles for Managing with Integrity* (2005), *The Living Code* (2008), and *Workplace Morality* (2013).

Further information is available at www.muelkaptein.com.

Notes

(Endnotes)

- 1 B. Obama (2008), *The Audacity of Hope*. Edinburgh: Canongate, page 103. Speaking of his colleagues in the Senate, he added on page 104, "Even when talking to those colleagues with whom I most deeply disagreed, I was usually struck by their basic sincerity."
- 2 B. Clinton (2004), *My Life*, London: Cornerstone, page 956.
- 3 Lindsay was mayor of New York. See: <http://news.yahoo.com/political-confessions--a-mistake-to-admit-mistakes-.html>.
- 4 Cited in: J. Monasch (2002), *De Strijd om de Macht: Politieke campagnes, idealen en intriges*, (The Battle for Power: Political campaigns, ideals and intrigues), Amsterdam: Prometheus, page 343. See also A. Rawnsley's (2000) book with a similar title, *Servants of the People: The inside story of New Labour*, London: Penguin Books.
- 5 See: <http://www.constitution.ru/en/10003000-05.htm>.
- 6 Servants of the people are those who, whether paid or unpaid, hold office in politics, (semi-)government, or the public sector.
- 7 Applying a common definition of power, as presented for instance in A. Heywood (2007), *Politics*, Hampshire: Palgrave.
- 8 Aristotle (2000), *Politics*, translated by B. Jowett, New York: Dover.
- 9 The title of this book, *The Servant of the People*, is at odds with *The Prince*, the title of the much-read book on politics and government written by the Italian Niccolò Machiavelli between 1513 and 1515. Where Machiavelli advises monarchs to sacrifice integrity to acquire power, this book recommends the opposite, that SPs act with integrity in order to obtain power, and that greater power requires greater integrity. Advice to the monarch in Machiavelli's time, 500 years ago, cannot be seen as directly applicable today. Societies in general have become more democratic, bringing more participation by citizens and taking power from government; social and moral values have changed, leading to higher expectations of SPs; and societies have become more transparent (partly due to the role of the media), making SPs' behavior more visible, so that they cannot afford as many mistakes. Machiavelli wrote his book in a time when war and schism were issues of the day, a unique situation, meaning that his advice cannot be applied to situations of peace and unity. Furthermore, Machiavelli does not state that a monarch should be self-serving. It is therefore erroneous to think that it is Machiavellian to abuse power for the sake of self-interest. See N. Machiavelli (1992), *The Prince*. New York: Dover Publications Inc..
- 10 Integrity is a rich, multifaceted concept. This multifaceted nature should therefore be left intact as far as possible in this book. This may not always make the presentation of this book as clear or convenient as it would otherwise be, but this is preferable to oversimplification, which would fail to convey integrity properly. Integrity is a legal, social, moral, philosophical and psychological concept, so this book examines the approaches corresponding to these disciplines. Furthermore, integrity is presented as both a positive and a normative concept (see part X in particular). This book focuses on the integrity of the SP as an official. For this reason integrity is primarily placed at the level of the individual. In this book, however, and particularly in part XV, other levels are also discussed, including those of the organization and society.
- 11 See <http://www.todayonline.com/singapore/good-politics-about-integrity-prime-ministers-office>.
- 12 D.M. Cox and M.P. Levine, (2003). *Integrity and the Fragile Self*, Hants: Ashgate, page 103.
- 13 See for instance <http://www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/theroleofthemayor>.
- 14 See, for example, Martin Hollis who claims, "This difference between private and public persons could be expressed by saying that private individuals acquire new moral duties with office, but it is clearer to say that office holders have moral duties which private persons do not." This quote is taken from S. Mendus (2009), *Politics and Morality*, Cambridge: Polity Press, page 43.
- 15 That is why professional integrity is somewhat different from personal integrity. Note, though, that the difference does not necessarily mean that they are in conflict.
- 16 These questions are also important for determining why someone aspires to or takes on a particular job. Ted Kennedy's aspirations to become president of America took a fatal turn when a journalist asked him why he wanted to become president and he could not come up with a convincing answer. Mike Bloomberg had a similar problem when he stood as a candidate for mayor of New York. See J. Purnick (2009), *Mike Bloomberg: Money, power, politics*, New York: Public Affairs, page 107.
- 17 Although integrity is specific to each position, this book focuses where possible on common characteristics of SPs. Nevertheless there is much more to be said about integrity in specific SP positions and situations.

- 18 See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/the_law_always_limits_every_power_it_gives/260606.html.
- 19 See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/integrity_has_no_need_of_rules/12614.html.
- 20 The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance has also drawn up a code of conduct for running campaigns for all democratic political parties. See http://www.idea.int/publications/coc_campaigning/loader.cfm?csmodule=security/getfile&pageid=2401.
- 21 See B. Obama (2008), *The Audacity of Hope*, Edinburgh: Canongate, page 100.
- 22 This is the same as drivers who always drive at the speed limit. They run the risk of accidentally driving too fast some of the time (unless they use a speed limiter), and of ignoring the circumstances that would make it safer to drive slower.
- 23 Looking purely at the letter of the law is like someone claiming to be in love but then making no effort to see their lover more often than is strictly necessary. The claim cannot be reconciled with their behavior. Love is about doing more than the minimum. In that respect it makes sense to talk about love for the rules. The fact that this is considered crazy simply points to contempt for rules.
- 24 See http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/President_Barack_Obamas_Inaugural_Address. See also in his book: B. Obama (2008), *The Audacity of Hope*, Edinburgh: Canongate.
- 25 A Canadian senator earned a prison sentence because he repeatedly paid \$50 for an aide's travel between Montreal and Ottawa while filing formal expenses claims for the full amount, generating a profit of \$175 per trip. See <http://www.torontosun.com/2013/06/14/retired-senator-raymond-lavigne-begins-jail-sentence-for-fraud>.
- 26 See <http://www.argentinaindependent.com/currentaffairs/newsfromargentina/menem-sentenced-to-seven-years-in-prison-for-illegal-arms-trading/>.
- 27 The quote is from Julius Caesar Watts. See http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/j/j_c_watts.html.
- 28 The quote comes from Thomas Babington Macaulay. See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/the_measure_of_a_man-s_real_character_is_what_he/14884.html.
- 29 See <http://www.therecord.com/opinion-story/4235146-integrity-in-politics-has-been-lost-if-it-ever-was/>.
- 30 See http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/11/nyregion/de-blasio-skewered-for-eating-pizza-with-utensils.html?_r=0. Incidentally, the mayor was not the first politician to appear in the media using cutlery to eat pizza. Former US vice presidential candidate Sarah Palin was criticized two years before when she showed ignorance of local customs.
- 31 See http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/14/us/politics/14vacation.html?_r=0.
- 32 See <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/7983043.stm>.
- 33 According to research in Australia, fake followers of federal politicians are a common way of increasing popularity. See <http://www.smh.com.au/data-point/fake-followers-boost-politicians-twitter-popularity-20130427-2ilm.html>.
- 34 See B. Obama (2008), *The Audacity of Hope*, Edinburgh: Canongate, page 98.
- 35 Incidentally, without that acceptance necessarily being achieved.
- 36 Martin Benjamin describes six types of people who lack integrity to some degree. The moral chameleon is one of these types. See M. Benjamin (1990), *Splitting the difference: Compromise and integrity in ethics and politics*, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, chapter 3.
- 37 Lubbers made this statement during the meeting 'De Ethiek van de Politiek' ('The Ethics of Politics'), organized by Tilburg University on November 1, 2011.
- 38 Stephen Carter states that moral reflection is essential for integrity. See S.L. Carter (1996), *Integrity*, New York: HarperPerennial.
- 39 Cited in T.J. Whalen (2007), *A Higher Purpose: Profiles in presidential courage*, Ivan R. Dee: Chicago, page xiv.
- 40 See: <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/j/junius.html>.
- 41 See: http://thinkexist.com/quotation/attitude_is_a_little_thing_that_makes_a_big/219106.html.
- 42 See: <http://www.medicalobserver.com.au/news/sloppy-expense-claiming-no-big-deal-says-wa-health-minister>.
- 43 L. McFall (1986), 'Integrity', *Ethics*, 98, pages 5-20.
- 44 Many books have been written about Berlusconi, such as B. Severgnini's (2010), *La pancia degli italiani. Berlusconi spiegato ai posteri (The belly of the Italians. Berlusconi explained to posterity)*, Milano: Rizzoli.
- 45 See for example chapter 18 of N. Machiavelli (1992), *The Prince*. New York: Dover Publications Inc. pages 145-148.
- 46 Integrity is not the same as moral purity, according to D.M. Cox and M.P. Levine, (2003). *Integrity and the Fragile Self*, Hants: Ashgate, page 152.
- 47 D.F. Thompson (1987), *Political Ethics and Public Office*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, page 124.
- 48 See: http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/14/us/politics/14vacation.html?_r=1&adxnml=1&adxnlx=1389596658-x6BiUuW7i0ZaIlNqy/rCMw.

- 49 See: http://thinkexist.com/quotation/i_love_a_dog-he_does_nothing_for_political/149983.html.
- 50 R. Oudkerk (2005), *Geen Weg Terug (No Way Back)*, Amsterdam: Prometheus, page 419.
- 51 Rice disputed the assessment of Cheney: "I kept the president fully and completely informed about every in and out of the negotiations with the North Koreans," she said. "You can talk about policy differences without suggesting that your colleague somehow misled the president." See: <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/condoleezza-rice-blasts-cheney-attack-on-my-integrity/>.
- 52 See: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-187450/Blair-BBC-story-attacks-integrity.html>.
- 53 See: <http://www.giron.co.cu/en/noticia/internacional/cuban-president-stresses-mandela-integrity-perseverance>. For example see the media praise for Mandela's integrity: <http://www.macaudailytimes.com.mo/macau/49204-south-africans-in-macau%3A-%E2%80%9Cmandela-represents-integrity-and-forgiveness%E2%80%9D.html>, and <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/in-depth/nelson-mandela/journalist-david-mcnicoll-reveals-nelson-mandela-as-man-of-integrity/story-fn7qgt20-1226780095679#>.
- 54 See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LvAoD4Suak0>. As Mandela himself said: "Great peacemakers are all people of integrity." See: <http://www.goodreads.com/quotes/75630-as-i-have-said-the-first-thing-is-to-be>.
- 55 See for example S. Birch and N. Allen (2010), 'How Honest Do Politicians Need to Be?', *The Political Quarterly*, vol. 81, nr. 1, pages 49-56; and A. Malik, P. Rao, and L. Inkster (2012), *The Best of New Britain: An UpRising survey on leadership in the UK*, UpRising & The Young Foundation.
- 56 *The New York Times* made this statement a week before Richard Nixon was re-elected president of the US. See: C. Ryan (2009), *The Chickenhawk Syndrome: War, sacrifice, and personal responsibility*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, page 140.
- 57 See B. Williams (1981), *Moral Luck: Philosophical papers 1973-1980*, Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press; B. Williams (1985), *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; and B. Williams (1995), 'Replies', in J. E. J. Altham and R. Harrison (eds.), *World, Mind, and Ethics: Essays on the ethical philosophy of Bernard Williams*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 58 See http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/nelson-mandela-a-colossus-of-unimpeachable-moral-character/2013/12/06/0a2cd28a-5ec9-11e3-be07-006c776266ed_story.html.
- 59 See for example M. Benjamin (1990), *Splitting the Difference: Compromising and integrity in ethics and politics*, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, page 46.
- 60 See <http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/about/values>.
- 61 Cox and colleagues call integrity a "thick term". See D. Cox, M. la Caze, and M.P. Levine (2003), *Integrity and the Fragile Self*, Hants: Ashgate, page 41.
- 62 S. L. Carter (1996), *Integrity*. New York: HarperPerennial, page 7.
- 63 I. Kant (1838), *Immanuel Kant's Werke*, volumes 5-6. Harvard University: Modes und Baumann.
- 64 See for example Chesire Calhoun, who states that integrity protects the self against disintegration: C. Calhoun (1995), 'Standing for something', *Journal of Philosophy*, 92, pages 235-260, and H. Frankfurt (1971), 'Freedom of the will and the concept of a person', *Journal of Philosophy*, 98, pages 5-20.
- 65 D. Putnam (1996), 'Integrity and moral development', *The Journal of Value Inquiry*, vol. 30, page 237.
- 66 E. Jones (1979), 'The rocky road from acts to dispositions', *American Psychologist*, vol. 34, nr. 2, page 107-117.
- 67 H.H. Kelley (1967), 'Attribution theory in social psychology', in: D. Levine (ed.) (1967), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- 68 If people always behave the same way in a particular situation, this does not provide any insight into whether they or their environment are the deciding factor, so consistent behavior by one person only tells us something about their integrity in comparison with other situations in which they behave differently.
- 69 For a description see H. van den Berg (1997), *De Ritselaars: Beknopte Nederlandse schandaalwijzer (The Fixers: A concise guide to Dutch scandal)*, Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, pages 94-97.
- 70 See <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/nov/05/toronto-mayor-rob-ford-crack-cocaine>.
- 71 See <http://www.medicalobserver.com.au/news/sloppy-expense-claiming-no-big-deal-says-wa-health-minister>.
- 72 See <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-16696347>.
- 73 Aristotle. *Ethica Nicomachea*. Edition by R. McKeon (1941). New York: Random House: page 952.
- 74 In other words, integrity is a process as well as a product, a progression as well as a situation.
- 75 See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/the_greater_the_power_the_more_dangerous_the/146214.html.
- 76 This is not to deny the existence of the mechanism of moral self-fulfillment whereby people who have done something good then think they have built up the right to do something wrong. Research shows, for instance, that people who have bought sustainable products are more likely to lie or steal. See N. Mazar and C. Zhong (2010), 'Do green products make us better people?', *Psychological Science*, vol. 21, no. 4, page 494-498.

- 77 See M. Kaptein (2013), *Workplace Morality: Behavioral ethics in organizations*. Bingley: Emerald. See also E. Aronson, T.D. Wilson, and R.M. Akert (2010), *Social Psychology*, seventh edition, Boston: Pearson.
- 78 Fritz Heider developed the idea that people interpret things as naïve psychologists or lay people and can therefore make mistakes. The idea has been further developed by others. See F. Heider (1958), *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*, New York: John Wiley.
- 79 E.E. Jones and K.E. Davis (1965), 'From acts to dispositions: The attribution process in person perception', in: L. Berkowitz (ed.) (1965), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, New York: Academic Press, vol. 2, pages 219-266.
- 80 N. Machiavelli (1992), *The Prince*. New York: Dover Publications Inc..
- 81 Belgian minister Steven Vanackere wrote a book arguing for "politics which concerns itself less with appearances and more with reality." See S. Vanackere (2013), *De Eerste Steen: Zeven hoofdzonden in politiek en samenleving* (The first stone: Seven deadly sins in politics and society), Antwerp: Vrijdag.
- 82 Page 19.
- 83 This was the Dutch Queen Beatrix. See J. Hoedeman and F. van Zijl (1996), 'Beatrix drukt regelmatig stempel op beleid kabinet' ('Beatrix regularly makes her mark on cabinet policy'), *De Volkskrant*, September 10; and R. Pasterkamp (2001), 'Weg van Valkenburg' ('Away from Valkenburg'), *Reformatorisch Dagblad*, January 27.
- 84 See <http://www.europeanvoice.com/article/2012/october/john-dalli-resigns/75389.aspx>.
- 85 Similarly the discredited Flemish Minister for Public Works Hilde Crevits would have been better off if she had not posed in the newspaper as a model for a fashion report, displaying various items of clothing with the labels and prices. This opened her up to criticism for "putting her efforts towards purely commercial initiatives." See <http://www.deondernemer.nl/buitenland/340635/Vlaamse-minister-in-opspraak.html>.
- 86 See http://www.rhema.co.nz/index.php?option=com_k2&view=item&id=6104:john-key-had-heard-of-kim-dotcom-after-all&Itemid=16.
- 87 The lie took on a life of its own when many Egyptians visited the member of parliament in hospital to offer their support. The newspapers displayed photos of his bandaged head and the government was much criticized for doing too little about the increasing crime rates. The doctor treating him in hospital then had to expose him. When his party suspended his membership he decided to step down. See http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/03/06/egyptian-lawmaker-resigns-nose-job-anwar-al-balkimy_n_1323819.html.
- 88 See http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/b/baltasar_gracian.html.
- 89 See http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/t/thomas_paine.html.
- 90 See among other sources <http://www.toptenstip.com/top-10-most-corrupt-leaders-in-recent-history/>. Other political leaders on this list include president of Haiti Jean-Claude Duvalier (between \$300 million and \$600 million), president of Peru Alberto Fujimori (\$600 million), prime minister of Ukraine Pavlo Lazarenko (\$200 million), president of Nicaragua Arnoldo Alemán (\$100 million), and president of the Philippines Joseph Estrada (between \$78 million and \$80 million).
- 91 See <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uToMvq3yw2A>.
- 92 In her defense the minister supplied the colorful detail that her husband had watched the film because he liked porn. See <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstoppers/mps-expenses/8339577/Jacqui-Smith-I-knew-my-husband-liked-porn-even-two-films-a-week.html>. It also emerged that she had claimed other minor private expenses.
- 93 The claims can, of course, go through the organization's credit card, so that it does not require the administration or time of the SP.
- 94 See <http://www.businessinsider.com/9-people-who-were-publicly-shamed-for-lying-on-their-resumes-2012-5#a-top-norwegian-bureaucrat-lied-about-being-a-registered-nurse-and-having-two-degrees-she-was-sentenced-to-14-months-in-prison-6>.
- 95 See http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/11/09/david-petraeus-affair_n_2104855.html. A similar list appears at http://www.ranker.com/list/the-sexcapades-of-the-world_s-most-corrupt-leaders/michael-gibson.
- 96 See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chappaquiddick_incident.
- 97 See http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/06/18/brett-mcgurk-iraq-envoy-nominee-obama_n_1606686.html.
- 98 See <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/mar/01/german-defence-minister-resigns-plagiarism>
- 99 See <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-21395102>.
- 100 See <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/front/archives/2013/08/07/2003569099>.
- 101 See <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-17586128>.
- 102 See <http://www.businessinsider.com/9-people-who-were-publicly-shamed-for-lying-on-their-resumes-2012-5#a-top-norwegian-bureaucrat-lied-about-being-a-registered-nurse-and-having-two-degrees-she-was-sentenced-to-14-months-in-prison-6>.
- 103 See <http://www.elmundo.es/elmundo/2013/01/18/espana/1358536985.html>.

- 104 As noted in R. Koole (2009), *Mensenwerk: Herinneringen van een partijvoorzitter, 2001-2007 (People work: Memoires of a party chairman, 2001-2007)*, Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, page 352.
- 105 L. McFall (1987), 'Integrity', *Ethics*, 98, pages 5-20.
- 106 This was B. Brouwer in *De Telegraaf* of January 23, 2004, cited in J. Leensen (2004), *De Affaire Oudkerk (The Oudkerk Scandal)*, Publistat Media Research.
- 107 "Hypocrite" was the response of Drew Johnson, chair of the Tennessee Center for Policy Research, who calculated that Gore had used 220,000 kilowatt hours over a year at his house in Nashville. See <http://westernstandard.blogs.com/shotgun/2008/07/mini-question-p.html>.
- 108 See <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/france/10563324/Profile-Francois-Hollandes-alleged-mistress-Julie-Gayet.html>.
- 109 Vincent Gounod wrote a biography of Mitterrand with the title 'Et alors?' (Aspekt, 2008). For an extensive description of the sexual exploits of French SPs, see C. Deloire and C. Dubois (2006), *Sexus Politicus: De sexuele escapades van Franse politici (Sexus Politicus: The sexual escapades of French politicians)*, Baarn: Tirion.
- 110 As American historian Arthur Schlesinger states, "Righteousness is easy in retrospect." See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/righteousness_is_easy_in_retrospect/221009.html.
- 111 See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Daniel_Cohn-Bendit. The case cropped up again later and Cohn-Bendit's party was investigated. Weekly news magazine *Der Spiegel* found an advertisement in a 1983 edition of gay porn magazine *Torso* by a working group of Cohn-Bendit's Green Party, calling for legalization of sex with children. See <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/green-party-leader-trittin-admits-to-approving-document-on-pedophilia-a-922442.htm>.
- 112 See <http://www.labour.ie/johnkelly/news/129711852461788.html>.
- 113 See <http://www.mathaba.net/news/?x=563098>.
- 114 Cited in S. Mendus (2009), *Politics and Morality*, Cambridge: Polity Press, page 3.
- 115 See <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/world/spain-princess-cristina-judge-money-laundering-charges-article-1.1605835>.
- 116 See <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2102524/German-President-Christian-Wulff-forced-resign.html>.
- 117 See for example S. Mendus (2009), *Politics and Morality*, Cambridge: Polity Press, page 1.
- 118 This happened to Dutch Prince Bernhard in the Lockheed bribery scandals. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lockheed_bribery_scandals.
- 119 See W. Bickerich (1996), *Franz Josef Strauß: Die Biographie*, Düsseldorf: Econ Verlag.
- 120 See H. van den Berg (1997), *De Ritselaars: Beknopte Nederlandse schandaalwijzer (The Fixers: A concise guide to Dutch scandal)*, Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, page 107.
- 121 See <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-25735900>.
- 122 See <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/feb/25/airport-tantrum-arrogance-entitlement-china>.
- 123 See <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-18366351>.
- 124 SPs can be forced out of their positions for private behavior even when it is not morally unacceptable per se, as in the case of the 40-year-old state legislator when it transpired that he had started a romantic relationship with a 16-year-old girl on Facebook, which was legal under the law of the country where he lived, but where he also flaunted immodest details of his life, sending hundreds of Facebook messages to her before they had their first meeting. See http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/18/world/europe/18germany.html?_r=2&.
- 125 Dennis Thompson states that the more intimate the information, the weightier the reason for infringing privacy should be. See D.F. Thompson (1987), *Political Ethics and Public Office*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, page 132.
- 126 Republican congressman Bob Livingston had to leave his position when his extramarital affair became known. Other Republican SPs subsequently discredited for extramarital affairs include Newt Gingrich, Helen Chenoweth-Hage, Bob Barr, and Dan Burton. See *Newsweek* (2009), 'Sex scandals through the years: both parties even', June 25. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lewinsky_scandal#cite_ref-43.
- 127 See <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/dec/01/tony-abbott-broke-a-promise>.
- 128 J. Dohmen (2000), 'De prins kan niet worden weggestopt: De "ijskastnotulen" van de Lockheed-affaire' ('The prince cannot be hidden away: The unofficial minutes of the Lockheed scandal'), *NRC Handelsblad*, January 15. The original pronouncement mentioned the Sermon on the Mount, rather than the Bible, but this was replaced due to greater familiarity.
- 129 The Dutch Young Socialists (2010), *Manifesto*, page 3.
- 130 Cited in G. van Westerloo (2003), *Niet Spreken met de Bestuurder (Don't talk to the governor)*, Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, page 157.
- 131 See *ABC News* (2008), 'Sarah Palin Makes History as First Female Vice Presidential Nominee of Republican Party', September 3.
- 132 See http://thinkexist.com/quotes/paul_wellstone.

- 133 M. Li Vos (2011), *Politiek voor de Leek: Een insidersverslag van een outsider (Politics for the layman: An insider's report by an outsider)*, Amsterdam: Prometheus, page 127.
- 134 A. MacIntyre (1981), *After Virtue: A study in moral theory*, London: Duckworth, page 191.
- 135 B. Williams (1981), *Moral Luck: Philosophical papers 1973-1980*, Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- 136 See for example <http://www.whitehouse.gov/about/presidents/chesterarthur>.
- 137 Maxima, then Princess of the Netherlands, said this. *Nu.nl* (2012), 'Maxima wil Machiavelliprijs delen' ('Maxima wants to share Machiavelli Prize'), February 10.
- 138 This was Dutch prime minister Jan-Peter Balkenende. See *Vrij Nederland*, January 18, 2003.
- 139 This was Dutch politician Job Cohen. See M. Chavannes (2012), 'Cohen: Linkse partijen omvormen tot één progressieve volkspartij' ('Cohen: reform leftwing parties to make one progressive people's party'), *NRC Handelsblad*, July 14. As the leader of an opposition party argued, "I see Cohen's struggle. It is a big switch to make." (*De Telegraaf*, May 25, 2010).
- 140 See http://thinkexist.com/quotes/theodore_roosevelt/3.html.
- 141 According to Barack Obama, "There is a constant danger... that a politician loses his moral bearings and finds himself entirely steered by the winds of public opinion." See: B. Obama (2008), *The Audacity of Hope*, Edinburgh: Canongate, page 67.
- 142 See for example former senior official Derk-Jan Eppink who said, "A Commissioner with nothing to do might have time to start thinking for himself. That's the last thing we want. If there are gaps in his agenda, then it's up to us to fill them." See D. Eppink (2007), *Life of a European Mandarin: Inside the Commission*, Tiel: Lannoo, page 114.
- 143 M. Foucault (1999), *Discourse and Truth. The Problematization of Parrhesia*. Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois (transcripts of lectures given at Berkeley).
- 144 See http://www.france24.com/en/20121111-france-mayor-gatignon-hunger-strike-over-impoverished-paris-suburb-sevran/#./?&_suid=140516571301109521998565117223.
- 145 This relates to member of parliament Hillie Molenaar. Cited in G. van Westerloo (2003), *Niet Spreken met de Bestuurder (Don't talk to the governor)*, Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, page 165.
- 146 This does not change the fact that it is sometimes better to keep quiet, or to put it more strongly, in the words of French politician Charles de Gaulle, "Silence is the ultimate weapon of power." See <http://quotationsbook.com/quote/36228/>.
- 147 See T.E. Cronin (1970), 'Everybody believes in democracy until he gets to the White House: an examination of White House departmental relations', *Law and Contemporary Problems*, Summer, pages 573-625.
- 148 J.W. Dean (2009), *Blind Ambition*, Palm Springs: Polimedia.
- 149 H. Alders (2007), 'De Overheid is geen bedrijf' ('The government is not a business'), in: H. Bruning and P. Strijp, *Dilemma's aan de Top: Topmensen in de publieke en semi-publieke sector over integriteit (Dilemmas at the Top: Top figures in the public and semi-public sector on integrity)*, The Hague: Sdu, page 22.
- 150 See <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/oct/23/japan-justice-minister-quits-yakuza>.
- 151 See <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1241545/MP-Iris-Robinson-60-affair-19-year-old-toyboy.html>.
- 152 See <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/1504492.stm>.
- 153 See R. Oudkerk (2005), *Geen Weg Terug (No Way Back)*, Amsterdam: Prometheus, page 388.
- 154 See for example R. Oudkerk (2005), *Geen Weg Terug (No Way Back)*, Amsterdam: Prometheus, page 389.
- 155 J. Monasch (2002), *De Strijd om de Macht: Politieke campagnes, idealen en intriges, (The Battle for Power: Political campaigns, ideals and intrigues)*, Amsterdam: Prometheus, page 108.
- 156 See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/politics_ruins_the_character/150971.html.
- 157 E. van Thijn (2008), *Kroonprinsenleed: Machtswisselingen in de politiek (The Crown Prince's Affliction: Power struggles in politics)*, Amsterdam: Augustus, page 209.
- 158 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/r/richardmn159251.html>.
- 159 See http://www.thestar.com/news/city_hall/2013/11/14/rob_ford_admits_drinking_and_driving_says_hell_sue_former_staffers.html.
- 160 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/h/harrystru162028.html>.
- 161 B. Musschenga (2004). *Integriteit: Over de eenheid en heilheid van de persoon (Integrity: On the unity and wholeness of the person)*, Utrecht: Lemma, page 180.
- 162 J.F. Kennedy (1956), *Profiles in Courage*, New York: Harper & Brothers.
- 163 Allen, R.E. (2006). *Plato: The Republic*. New Haven: Yale University Press: chapter 2.
- 164 J. O'Toole (1995), *The Executive's Compass: Business and the good society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, page 48.
- 165 J.P. Dobel (1999), *Public Integrity*, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, page 0.

- 166 J. Dalberg-Acton (1907), *Historical Essays and Studies*, edited by J. N. Figgis and R. V. Laurence, London: Macmillan.
- 167 See http://thinkexist.com/quotes/Henry_Kissinger/.
- 168 SPs can even become mentally ill as a result of power, as argued in D. Owen (2008), *In Sickness and in Power: Illness in the heads of government during the last 100 years*, London: Methuen.
- 169 E. van Thijn (2008), Kroonprinsenleed: Machtswisselingen in de politiek (The Crown Prince's Affliction: Power struggles in politics), Amsterdam: Augustus, page 14.
- 170 This statement was by Dutchman Wouter Bos. See C. Verbraak (2012), *Kijken in de Ziel: Politici (Looking into the Soul: Politicians)*, Amsterdam: Thomas Rap, page 146.
- 171 See E. van Thijn (2008), Kroonprinsenleed: Machtswisselingen in de politiek (The Crown Prince's Affliction: Power struggles in politics), Amsterdam: Augustus, page 128.
- 172 See http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Abraham_Lincoln.
- 173 <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/g/georgebern101126.html>.
- 174 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/w/winstonchu135267.html>.
- 175 See P. 't Hart and M. ten Hooven (2004), *Op Zoek naar Leiderschap: Regeren na de revolte (In Search of Leadership: Governing after the revolt)*, Amsterdam: De Balie, page 182.
- 176 One of the SPs who has talked about the beauty of politics is Bill Clinton: "My life in politics was a joy" (B. Clinton (2004), *My Life*, New York: Knopf, page 3).
- 177 In a letter to Leonard V. Finder on January 22, 1948, he wrote "Politics is a profession; a serious, complicated and, in its true sense, a noble one." See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/d/dwightdei135292.html>.
- 178 Address on July 27, 2004 during the 2004 Democratic National Convention.
- 179 See <http://www.great-quotes.com/quote/2274>.
- 180 M. Li Vos (2011), *Politiek voor de Leek: Een insidersverslag van een outsider (Politics for the layman: An insider's report by an outsider)*, Amsterdam: Prometheus, page 8.
- 181 G.W. Bush (2010), *Decision Points*, London: Virgin Books, page 446.
- 182 See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/the_challenge_is_to_practice_politics_as_the_art/209228.html.
- 183 G.R. Ford (1979), *A Time to Heal: The autobiography of Gerald R. Ford*. New York: Harper & Row, page 179.
- 184 George W. Bush was portrayed as a devil and a Nazi. See G.W. Bush (2010), *Decision Points*, London: Virgin Books, page 121.
- 185 See <http://quoteinvestigator.com/2011/10/28/judge-character>.
- 186 A. Gore (2007), *The Assault on Reason*, London: Bloomsbury, page 149.
- 187 See <http://www.goodreads.com/quotes/165580-the-measure-of-a-man-is-what-he-does-with>.
- 188 For more oaths and promises see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oath_of_office.
- 189 As Musschenga put it, "A person with integrity is conscientious and loyal in all his commitments." See B. Musschenga (2004), *Integriteit: Over de eenheid en heelheid van de persoon (Integrity: On the unity and wholeness of the person)*, Utrecht: Lemma, page 93.
- 190 See also Dobel, who states that people lose credibility when they do not stick to the principles and values they claim are important: J.P. Dobel (1999), *Public Integrity*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- 191 The complete sentence is as follows: "In matters of principle, stand like a rock; in matters of taste, swim with the current." See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/t/thomasjeff121032.html>.
- 192 See <http://rt.com/news/cairo-clashes-killed-report-575/>.
- 193 *The Toronto Sun*, October 19, 1995. See also H. Shittu and C. Query (2006), *Absurdities, Scandals & Stupidities in Politics*, Boston: Genix Press, page 34.
- 194 G.W. Bush (2010), *Decision Points*, London: Virgin Books, page 78.
- 195 G.W. Bush (2010), *Decision Points*, London: Virgin Books, page 475.
- 196 G.W. Bush (2010), *Decision Points*, London: Virgin Books, page 476.
- 197 E. Vrijzen (2002), 'De 100 van Balkenende' ('Balkenende's 100'), *Elsevier*, July 6.
- 198 For instance US senator Rob Portman changed his view on gay marriage completely when his own son announced that he was gay: "Knowing that my son is gay prompted me to consider the issue from another perspective, that of a dad who wants all three of his kids to lead happy, meaningful lives with the people they love, a blessing Jane and I have shared for 26 years." See <http://nos.nl/artikel/484815-zoon-gaysenator-voor-homorechten.html>.

- 199 Martin Benjamin states that fanatics are people with integrity in this respect because they show persistence and consistency. See M. Benjamin (1990), *Splitting the Difference: Compromise and integrity in ethics and politics*, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, chapter 3. Or as politician William Cobbett states: "Men of integrity are generally pretty obstinate, in adhering to an opinion once adopted." See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/w/williamcob400685.html>.
- 200 As Cox and colleagues state, "Integrity involves a frequent, if not constant, reordering or reprioritizing of commitments" (page 4). This is why certainty and consistency alone cannot be considered integrity. In their view the core of integrity is that it helps deal with the "fractured and fragile nature of existence" (page 153). See D.M. Cox, M. la Caze and M.P. Levine, (2003), *Integrity and the Fragile Self*, Hants: Ashgate.
- 201 Courage is also one of the four cardinal virtues of classical antiquity.
- 202 See <http://www.senatorjohnfaulkner.com.au/file.php?file=/news/QCRMVHXKFO/index.html>.
- 203 "To know what is right and not do it is the worst cowardice." See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/to_know_what_is_right_and_not_do_it_is_the_worst/189386.html.
- 204 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/b/barbaracas172859.html>. According to Robert F. Kennedy, however, few people are prepared "to brave the disapproval of their fellows, the censure of their colleagues, the wrath of their society. Moral courage is a rarer commodity than bravery in battle or great intelligence." Cited in T.J. Whalen (2007), *A Higher Purpose: Profiles in presidential courage*, Ivan R. Dee: Chicago, page xv.
- 205 R. Greene (1998). *The 48 Laws of Power*, London: Profile Books.
- 206 M. Waken (1996), *Integrity First: Reflections of a military philosopher*, Lanham: Lexington Books.
- 207 Cited in T.J. Whalen (2007), *A Higher Purpose: Profiles in presidential courage*, Ivan R. Dee: Chicago, page 153.
- 208 As described by T.J. Whalen (2007), *A Higher Purpose: Profiles in presidential courage*, Ivan R. Dee: Chicago, pages 153-177.
- 209 See <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rQ-M0KEFm9I>.
- 210 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/t/theodorero163799.html>.
- 211 G. Zalm (2009), *De Romantische Boekhouder (The Romantic Accountant)*, Amsterdam: Balans, page 99.
- 212 N. Machiavelli (1992), *The Prince*. New York: Dover Publications Inc.
- 213 See http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Friedrich_Nietzsche.
- 214 T.J. Whalen (2007), *A Higher Purpose: Profiles in presidential courage*, Ivan R. Dee: Chicago, page 170.
- 215 G. van Westerloo (2007), *Niet Spreken met de Bestuurder (Don't talk to the governor)*, Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, page 163.
- 216 See <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/08/22/us-russia-mayor-killing-idUSTRE77L4OV20110822>.
- 217 This was Dutch vice premier Wouter Bos in the TV program *Kijken in de Ziel van Politici (Looking into the souls of politicians)*, July 26, 2011, Nederland 2.
- 218 See <http://www.nrw.nl/nederlands/article/vakbonden-zeggen-vertrouwen-jack-de-vries-op>.
- 219 The extent of vulnerability to blackmail depends on the possible damage from revelation (which in turn depends on the magnitude and duration of the transgression) as well as the likelihood that others know, stand to gain by it, and are prepared to abuse their position by making the SP behave improperly.
- 220 D.F. Thompson (1987), *Political Ethics and Public Office*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, page 137.
- 221 The scandal took place in the 1920s, as described in R. Greene (1998). *The 48 Laws of Power*, London: Profile Books, page 260.
- 222 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/l/larryhagma329805.html>.
- 223 See for example D. Eppink (2007), *Life of a European Mandarin: Inside the Commission*, Tiel: Lannoo, page 130.
- 224 See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/There_ain't_no_such_thing_as_a_free_lunch.
- 225 Although many people have a deep longing to gain something for nothing.
- 226 T. Blair (2010), *A Journey*, London: Hutchinson, page 104.
- 227 Blair himself later stated in his autobiography that in retrospect it would have been better to be open when the story emerged in the media in 1994, as being secretive just added to media fascination. See T. Blair (2010), *A Journey*, London: Hutchinson, page 104.
- 228 See for example C. Calhoun (1995), 'Standing for something', *Journal of Philosophy*, 92, pages 235-260 and H. Frankfurt (1971), 'Freedom of the will and the concept of a person', *Journal of Philosophy*, 98, pages 5-20.
- 229 Adam Smith uses the terms "self-mastery" and "self-command" for this. See A. Smith (2008), *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations: A selected edition*, (K. Sutherland, editor), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 230 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/p/pietroaret106119.html>.
- 231 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/m/micheldemo106120.html>.
- 232 See <http://www.foxnews.com/story/2007/06/08/republican-punches-democrat-in-alabama-senate-chamber/>.

- 233 For an overview see for example http://www.cracked.com/article_17058_when-politicians-attack-17-most-violent-political-brawls.html.
- 234 See http://www.lemonde.fr/election-presidentielle-2012/breve/2012/03/15/video-sarkozy-repond-vivement-a-un-journaliste_1670290_1471069.html.
- 235 See <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/regions/europe/france/130723/gilles-bourdouleix-mayor-hitler-didnt-kill-enough-roma>.
- 236 Cited in G. van Westerloo (2007), *Niet Spreken met de Bestuurder* (Don't talk to the governor), Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, page 0. Max Weber speaks of the feeling of "holding in one's hands a nerve fiber of historically important events." See M. Weber (2004), *The Vocation Lectures* (translated by Rodney Livingstone, edited by David Own and Tracy B. Strong), Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.
- 237 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/r/ralphwaldo130654.html>.
- 238 See also R. Oudkerk (2005), *Geen Weg Terug* (No Way Back), Amsterdam: Prometheus, page 399.
- 239 R.A. Koole (2009), *Mensenwerk: Herinneringen van een partijvoorzitter, 2001-2007*, (People work: Memoires of a party chairman 2001-2007), Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, page 173.
- 240 See http://www.thestar.com/news/world/2013/06/29/barack_obama_tells_leaders_to_follow_nelson_mandelas_example.html.
- 241 B. Clinton (2004), *My Life*, New York: Knopf, page 952.
- 242 See <http://www.abrahamlincolnonline.org/lincoln/speeches/hodges.htm>.
- 243 President George W. Bush to the graduates of Yale University on May 21, 2001.
- 244 Although this might also be understood as a dig at universities, suggesting the education they offer is of limited value. See <http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,127630,00.html>.
- 245 Cited in E. van Thijn (2008), *Kroonprinsenleed: Machtswisselingen in de politiek* (The Crown Prince's Affliction: Power struggles in politics), Amsterdam: Augustus, page 132. Self-perception does not mean not being vain or confident, nor does it necessitate being hesitant or under-confident, modest or ordinary. An SP has more power than ordinary citizens, so acting like a difference in power does not exist is seen as unnatural, hypocritical, or a sign of weakness.
- 246 See http://www.proz.com/kudoz/french_to_english/other/148768-apres_moi_le_deluge.html.
- 247 In J.Th.J. van den Berg, E. Verhulp and R.K. Visser (ed.). (2010), *Zoals een Goed Ambtenaar Betaamt* (As befits a good official), Den Haag: Ien Dales Leerstoel, page 110.
- 248 G.W. Bush (2010), *Decision Points*, London: Virgin Books, page 477.
- 249 Allen, R.E. (2006). *Plato: The Republic*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 412 d-e.
- 250 Willingness to serve not only brings integrity, but can also be a way to power. Robert Greene advises people never to overshadow superiors but to conciliate them, to flatter them, and to act completely subserviently. If servants avoid forming a threat to another person, others will not take measures to oppose them and will trust them. This also prevents people from becoming envious of those who have great power. Greene cites Francis Bacon in this connection, suggesting that it is sensible for people with power to arouse pity in others, as if their responsibilities were a burden and a sacrifice. See R. Greene (1998). *The 48 Laws of Power*, London: Profile Books, page 407.
- 251 As George W. Bush stated, "The highest honor of my life was to serve as their commander in chief." See G.W. Bush (2010), *Decision Points*, London: Virgin Books, page 481.
- 252 G.W. Bush (2010), *Decision Points*, London: Virgin Books, page 476.
- 253 See P. Janssen (2007), *K. Annan: Zijn leven, zijn werk* (K. Annan: His life, his work), Amsterdam: Trademark. In his book Barack Obama connects representation of citizens by government with really wanting to serve. B. Obama (2008), *The Audacity of Hope*, Edinburgh: Canongate, 25.
- 254 See https://www.kpk-rs.si/upload/datoteke/Ugotovitve_nadzora_nad_PS_predsednikov_parlamentarnih_strank.pdf
- 255 See <http://www.scmp.com/news/world/article/1381451/south-african-president-jacob-zuma-loses-support-over-alleged-corruption>.
- 256 See for example P.Taggart (2000), *Populism*, Buckingham: Open University Press, proposing that populism is an ideology without core values.
- 257 Fidelity to good is a fifth effect of fidelity, to add to the four elements described in chapter 38. Steven Carter defines integrity as straightforward obedience to good (paraphrasing Bonhoefer). See S.L. Carter (1996), *Integrity*, New York: HarperPerennial, page ix.
- 258 See <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/OTUS/transcript-president-obamas-democratic-convention-speech/story?id=17175575&page=2>.
- 259 T. Blair (2010), *A Journey*, London: Hutchinson, page 374.
- 260 G.W. Bush (2010), *Decisions Points*, Virgin Books, page 272.

- 261 Cited in M. Benjamin (1990), *Splitting the Difference: Compromise and integrity in ethics and politics*, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, page 143.
- 262 On this dual responsibility, see M. Benjamin (1990), *Splitting the Difference: Compromise and integrity in ethics and politics*, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, page 144.
- 263 See <http://www.quotationspage.com/quote/204.html>.
- 264 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/w/willrogers135665.html>.
- 265 See W.D.S. Killgore, D.B. Killgore, L.M. Day, C. Li, G.H. Kamimori, and T.J. Balkin (2007), 'The effects of 53 hours of sleep deprivation on moral judgment', *Sleep*, vol. 30, no. 3, page 345-352.
- 266 David Owen proposes that government leaders should undergo obligatory independent medical tests on taking office and during their term of office. See D. Owen (2008), *In Sickness and in Power: Illness in the heads of government during the last 100 years*, London: Methuen.
- 267 Aristotle, *Politics*, translated by B. Jowett (1999), Kitchener: Batoche Books.
- 268 See also B. Musschenga (2004), *Integriteit: Over de eenheid en heilheid van de persoon (Integrity: On the unity and wholeness of the person)*, Utrecht: Lemma.
- 269 I. Kant (1838), *Immanuel Kant's Werke*, volumes 5-6. Harvard University: Modes und Baumann.
- 270 See <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/may/19/dominique-strauss-kahn-resigns-imf>.
- 271 See <http://www.yynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L4045757,00.html>.
- 272 F. Renout (2011), 'Zorgvuldig geregisseerde rehabilitatie' ('Carefully directed rehabilitation'), *De Standaard*, September 19, 2011.
- 273 A kapo was a prisoner selected by the Germans to collaborate on supervision of fellow inmates.
- 274 See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Silvio_Berlusconi.
- 275 See <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2013/01/22/national/cut-state-funding-to-terminal-patients-so-they-can-die-quickly-also/>.
- 276 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/w/willdurant117092.html>.
- 277 See http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/n/niccolo_machiavelli.html.
- 278 See B. Blase (2011), *Burgemeester van Beroep: Waargebeurde verhalen in Nederland anno nu (Mayor by Profession: True stories from the Netherlands of today)*, Het boekenschap.
- 279 See http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/keywords/president_2.html.
- 280 The other deadly sin, in Weber's view, is lack of professionalism. See M. Weber (2004), *The Vocation Lectures* (translated by Rodney Livingstone, edited by David Own and Tracy B. Strong), Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.
- 281 R. Greene (1998). *The 48 Laws of Power*, London: Profile Books, page 201.
- 282 See <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/italy/9957609/Pier-Luigi-Bersani-Only-a-mentally-ill-person-would-want-to-govern-Italy.html>.
- 283 See <http://hardworkpaysbills.com/2012/01/03/sir-walter-raleigh/>.
- 284 In Latin this is "Bene vixit qui bene latuit." See http://www.latin-dictionary.org/JM-Latin-English-Dictionary/F/7/Bene_qui_latuit_bene_vixit.
- 285 See N. Machiavelli (2006), *The Prince*: New York: Dover Publications Inc..
- 286 See <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmcode/735/735.pdf>.
- 287 This statement came from Dutch minister Klaas de Vries. In J.Th.J. van den Berg, E. Verhulp, and R.K. Visser (2010), *Zoals een Goed Ambtenaar Betaamt (As befits a good official)*, The Hague: Ien Dales Leerstoel, page 112.
- 288 M. Bovens and T. Schillemans (2009), *Handboek Publieke Verantwoording (A Guide to Political Accountability)*. The Hague: Lemma.
- 289 D.E. Thompson (1987), *Political Ethics and Public Office*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, page 38.
- 290 This statement came from Dutch politician Bram Peper. See J. Tromp (1994), 'Ik ben een geheel openbaar lichaam' ('I am an entirely public body'), *De Volkskrant*, December 3.
- 291 See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/it_takes_less_time_to_do_a_thing_right_than_it/147874.html.
- 292 Various researchers state that telling the truth is an important element of integrity. See, for example, L. McFall (1986), 'Integrity', *Ethics*, 98, pages 5-20. However, McFall also notes that honesty towards oneself can demand dishonesty towards others.
- 293 R. Oudkerk (2005), *Geen Weg Terug (No Way Back)*, Amsterdam: Prometheus, page 419.
- 294 See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/always_be_sincere-even_if_you_dont_mean_it/209469.html.

- 295 See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/if_you_ever_injected_truth_into_politics_you_have/226911.html.
- 296 See http://www.searchquotes.com/quotation/There_is_one_sure_way_of_telling_when_politicians_aren't_telling_the_truth_-_their_lips_move./237012.
- 297 See <http://edition.cnn.com/2013/11/24/politics/presidents-lie/>.
- 298 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/s/socrates122700.html>.
- 299 See http://www.nzherald.co.nz/world/news/article.cfm?c_id=2&objectid=11170581.
- 300 See <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-21322136>.
- 301 Clinton was also creative in answering the question of whether he had used marijuana, replying that he had not. In fact he had had marijuana, he later admitted, but he had not inhaled, so he had never lied. See 'Clinton tried marijuana as a student, he says', *The New York Times*, March 30, 1992. See also H. Shittu and C. Query (2006), *Absurdities, Scandals & Stupidities in Politics*, Boston: Genix Press, page 39.
- 302 On this subject see S.L. Carter (1996), *Integrity*, New York: HarperPerennial.
- 303 According to an interview in *Playboy* in 1976. During his presidential campaign Carter also said, "I will never tell a lie to the American people." See <http://edition.cnn.com/2013/11/24/politics/presidents-lie/>.
- 304 See <http://www.quotationspage.com/quote/23034.html>.
- 305 J.P. Dobel (1999), *Public Integrity*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, page 0.
- 306 *BBC News* (2005), 'Bush hinted at use of marijuana', February 21. See also H. Shittu and C. Query (2006), *Absurdities, Scandals & Stupidities in Politics*, Boston: Genix Press, page 34.
- 307 See <http://www.quotationspage.com/quote/24222.html>.
- 308 On compartmentalization see for example A. MacIntyre (1984), *After Virtue: A study in moral theory*. London: Duckworth.
- 309 M.J. Wheatley and M. Kellner-Rogers (1996), *A Simpler Way*, San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- 310 Cited in R.C. Solomon (1997), *It's Good Business: Ethics and free enterprise for the new millennium*, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- 311 R. Greene (1998). *The 48 Laws of Power*, London: Profile Books, page 400.
- 312 R. Greene (1998). *The 48 Laws of Power*, London: Profile Books, page 408.
- 313 See Michael Jensen (2009), 'Integrity: Without it nothing works', Rotman School of Management: *Rotman Magazine*, fall, pages 16-20.
- 314 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/v/vladimirle135580.html>.
- 315 See <http://www.litera.co.uk/t/MTA4MTEx/>.
- 316 See <http://quotationsbook.com/quote/31041/>.
- 317 See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/my_choice_early_in_life_was_either_to_be_a_piano/208939.html.
- 318 See <http://www.quotedb.com/quotes/3235>.
- 319 See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/politics_and_war_are_remarkably_similar/217226.html.
- 320 See <http://www.quotedb.com/quotes/2454>.
- 321 See http://thinkexist.com/quotes/ann_richards.
- 322 Mentioned in R.A. Koole (2009), *Mensenwerk: Herinneringen van een partijvoorzitter, 2001-2007*, (People work: Memoires of a party chairman 2001-2007), Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, page 294.
- 323 See <http://www.quotationspage.com/quote/24985.html>.
- 324 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/r/rossperot383374.html>.
- 325 According to Henry Louis Mencken, see http://thinkexist.com/quotation/a_professional_politician_is_a_professionally/261380.html.
- 326 According to Aesop, see <http://www.quotationspage.com/quote/725.html>.
- 327 "The problem with political jokes is that they get elected," said Henry Cate VII. See <http://www.quotationspage.com/quote/767.html>.
- 328 As Immanuel Kant stated, "Politics says: 'be ye therefore clever as serpents'; but morals adds as a limiting condition: 'and innocent as doves'." According to Kant the snake and the dove can coexist (although others say the dove gets little peace). Cited in D.F. Thompson (1987), *Political Ethics and Public Office*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, page 1.
- 329 As Ben Okri puts it, "The magician and the politician have much in common: they both have to draw our attention away from what they are really doing." See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/b/benokri390190.html>.
- 330 As Henry Miller puts it, "One has to be a lowbrow, a bit of a murderer, to be a politician, ready and willing to see people sacrificed, slaughtered, for the sake of an idea, whether a good one or a bad one." See <http://www quoteworld.org/quotes/9021>.

- 331 Bert Wagendorp wrote of Ella Vogelaar as a minister: "She was intelligent enough and had the knowledge, ambition and vision. But she lacked the depraved soul and survival instinct of the born politician." See B. Wagendorp (2008), 'Ella', *de Volkskrant*, November 15.
- 332 D. Eppink (2007), *Life of a European Mandarin: Inside the Commission*, Tiel: Lannoo, page 11.
- 333 See <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/08/16/us-indonesia-president-idUSBRE87F05J20120816>.
- 334 D. Eppink (2007), *Life of a European Mandarin: Inside the Commission*, Tiel: Lannoo, page 11.
- 335 See H. Shittu and C. Query (2006), *Absurdities, Scandals & Stupidities in Politics*, Boston: Genix Press, page 15.
- 336 D. Hume (1739), *A Treatise of Human Nature*, London: John Noon.
- 337 N. Machiavelli (1992), *The Prince*. New York: Dover Publications Inc., page 135.
- 338 N N. Machiavelli (1992), *The Prince*. New York: Dover Publications Inc., page 135. Incidentally, Machiavelli does not argue that doing wrong is therefore morally good. He says that doing wrong is necessary in order to be able to hold one's own.
- 339 See <http://www.kratosguide.com/the-48-laws-of-power/>.
- 340 This is in contrast to injunctive norms, which indicate how things should be. See R.B. Cialdini, R.R. Reno, and C.A. Kallgren (1990), 'A focus theory of normative conduct: Recycling the concept of norms to reduce littering in public places', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 58, no. 6, pages 1015-1026.
- 341 N. Machiavelli (1992), *The Prince*. New York: Dover Publications Inc., page 135.
- 342 For a detailed discussion of the possibility of having too much integrity, see D. Cox, M. la Caze, and M.P. Levine (2003), *Integrity and the Fragile Self*, Hants: Ashgate, pages 144-148.
- 343 S.L. Carter (1996), *Integrity*, New York: HarperPerennial, page 45.
- 344 "Die Politik ist die Lehre vom Möglichen," as stated in an interview on August 11, 1867 with F. Meyer von Waldeck of the St. Petersburgische Zeitung and reprinted in O. Bismarck (1900), *Fürst Bismarck: Neue Tischgespräche und Interviews (Prince Bismarck: New table discussions and interviews)*, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, vol. 1, page 248. See also http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Otto_von_Bismarck.
- 345 Steven Carter, for example, states that integrity does not mean being completely innocent but striving to become so. See S.L. Carter (1996), *Integrity*, New York: HarperPerennial, page 19.
- 346 See S.L. Carter (1996), *Integrity*, New York: HarperPerennial, page 20.
- 347 N. Machiavelli (1992), *The Prince*. New York: Dover Publications Inc..
- 348 Dutch minister of home affairs, Ien Dales, said this in June 1992 at a conference of the Association of Netherlands Municipalities.
- 349 See <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/10/01/us-italy-politics-attack-idUSBRE9900YY20131001>.
- 350 This was Dutch minister Ed van Thijn on prime minister Wim Kok. E. van Thijn (2008), *Kroonprinsenleed: Machtswisselingen in de politiek (The Crown Prince's Affliction: Power struggles in politics)*, Amsterdam: Augustus, page 148.
- 351 See <http://www.ilfattoquotidiano.it/2013/11/25/trattativa-stato-mafia-napolitano-ai-giudici-non-ho-niente-da-riferire/789535/>.
- 352 T.J. Whalen (2007), *A Higher Purpose: Profiles in presidential courage*, Ivan R. Dee: Chicago, page 255.
- 353 See B. Obama (2008), *The Audacity of Hope*, Edinburgh: Canongate Books Ltd, page 65.
- 354 Dilemmas can also arise from the choice between two good things. See J. Badaracco (1997), *Defining Moments: When managers must choose between right and right*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- 355 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/j/johnkennet113354.html>.
- 356 According to value pluralism values can clash due to their incommensurability (they are mutually exclusive on practical rather than logical grounds), incompatibility, and incomparability. On this subject see, among others, B. Musschenga (2004), *Integriteit: Over de eenheid en heelheid van de persoon (Integrity: On the unity and wholeness of the person)*, Utrecht: Lemma, pages 164-166.
- 357 Chesire Calhoun states that integrity permits ambivalence and that not all inconsistencies have to be resolved. See C. Calhoun (1995), 'Standing for something', *Journal of Philosophy*, 92: pages 235-260.
- 358 As cited in D. Cox, M. la Caze, and M.P. Levine (2003), *Integrity and the Fragile Self*, Hants: Ashgate, page xiii.
- 359 Among other sources, see J.L. Badaracco (1997), *Defining Moments: When managers must choose between right and right*, Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- 360 As Martin Benjamin writes, "Compromise is part and parcel of democratic politics," in M. Benjamin (1990), *Splitting the Difference: Compromise and integrity in ethics and politics*, Kansas: University Press of Kansas: page 139.
- 361 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/p/paddyashdo323274.html>.
- 362 Such trade-offs apply in any case to life in general.

- 363 G. Verbeet (2012), *Vertrouwen is Goed maar Begrijpen is Beter: Over de vitaliteit van onze parlementaire democratie (Trust is good but understanding is better: on the vitality of our parliamentary democracy)*, Amsterdam: Nijgh & Van Ditmar, page 14.
- 364 See <http://press.princeton.edu/titles/9657.html>.
- 365 M. Benjamin (1990), *Splitting the Difference: Compromise and integrity in ethics and politics*, Kansas: University Press of Kansas.
- 366 See also S.L. Carter (1996), *Integrity*, New York: HarperPerennial.
- 367 As Cox and colleagues state, "A political promise can be made and broken without the breaking of it undermining the integrity of the promise-maker. But the conditions under which this occurs are rather limited." See D. Cox, M. la Caze, and M.P. Levine (2003), *Integrity and the Fragile Self*, Hants: Ashgate, page 111.
- 368 These were the words of Dutch SP Wouter Bos.
- 369 See <http://quotationsbook.com/quote/30830>.
- 370 Another risk is that compromise is seen as a sign of powerlessness to negotiate properly.
- 371 See M. Benjamin (1990), *Splitting the Difference: Compromise and integrity in ethics and politics*, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, page 149.
- 372 Cox and colleagues explain why integrity is not identical to having clean hands. D. Cox, M. la Caze, and M.P. Levine (2003), *Integrity and the Fragile Self*, Hants: Ashgate. See also M. Kaptein and J. Wempe (2002), *The Balanced Company: A theory of corporate integrity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 373 See also D.F. Thompson (1987), *Political Ethics and Public Office*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, page 39.
- 374 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/a/angelamerk325766.html>.
- 375 According to Michael Walzer a crucial aspect of moral life is guilt over breaking rules, even for a greater good. See M. Walzer (1973), 'Political action: the problem of dirty hands', *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, vol. 2, no. 2, pages 160-180.
- 376 This was Hans van Mierlo as Dutch minister of Foreign Affairs. See B. Vuijsje (2006), *Adventures in Government*, Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, pages 29-38.
- 377 See R. Greene (1998), *The 48 Laws of Power*, London: Profile Books, page 204.
- 378 See <http://quotationsbook.com/quote/30861>.
- 379 B. Clinton 2004, *My Life*, London: Cornerstone, page 1068. Some other issues for which he maintained his performance scores were air quality and the hope for peace, freedom, and prosperity.
- 380 Australian senator John Faulkner notes that there is a cynicism about politicians and their motives and that "politics and parliament are seen by too many as inimical to integrity." See <http://www.senatorjohnfaulkner.com.au/file.php?file=/news/RIYYQRMIVR/index.html>.
- 381 See B. Williams (1981), *Moral Luck: Philosophical papers 1973-1980*, Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- 382 Cited in T.J. Whalen (2007), *A Higher Purpose: Profiles in presidential courage*, Ivan R. Dee: Chicago, page xii.
- 383 See McFall, L. (1987), 'Integrity', *Ethics*, vol. 98, page 19.
- 384 T. Blair (2010), *A Journey*, London: Hutchinson, page 238.
- 385 See http://thinkexist.com/quotes/henri_queuille/.
- 386 D. Eppink (2007), *Life of a European Mandarin: Inside the Commission*, Tielt: Lannoo, page 110.
- 387 See http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/e/edmund_burke.html#CtRERDu4eX3IOROH.
- 388 When people leave positions because they cannot identify with the job, they do not avoid responsibility. As Hollis says, "Once a dilemma has been posed for a person in office, integrity does not demand that he keeps his hands clean by stepping aside. It is too late for clean hands, whatever he does." Cited in S. Mendus (2009), *Politics and Morality*, Cambridge: Polity Press, page 111.
- 389 Blair also stated, "Of course it's good to think before you act, but the thinking has to be of finite duration and the action must follow." See T. Blair (2010), *A Journey*, London: Hutchinson, page 394.
- 390 D. Eppink (2007), *Life of a European Mandarin: Inside the Commission*, Tielt: Lannoo, page 124.
- 391 Address in Worms on April 18, 1521.
- 392 See also McFall, L. (1986), 'Integrity', *Ethics*, vol. 98, pages 5-20.
- 393 According to the Berliner Zeitung of Friday March 1, 2002. See http://www.atlantic-times.com/archive_detail.php?recordID=366.
- 394 This was Dutch prime minister Abraham Kuyper. See J. Koch (2007), *Abraham Kuyper: Een biografie (Abraham Kuyper: A Biography)*, Amsterdam: Boom, pages 578-580.
- 395 "Not-unless" thinking was proposed by the founder of the Dutch Socialist Party Jan Marijnissen. See http://www.sp.nl/opinies/3/Corruptie_in_Nederland.html.

- 396 Annual message to the US Congress on January 4, 1965.
- 397 Stephen Carter sees integrity as a gift that enables people to distinguish good from evil. See S.L. Carter (1996), *Integrity*, New York: HarperPerennial, page 19.
- 398 For more practical suggestions see Ph. Wallage, M. Kaptein, and E. Roos (2011), *Steered by Sensitivity: A plea for more intuition*. Amstelveen: KPMG.
- 399 See, for example, Jeffrey Blustein, who makes this claim: J. Blustein (1991), *Care and Commitment: Taking the personal point of view*, New York: Oxford University Press, page 129. Susan Mendus shows that from the perspective of integrity following one's own conscience is not always necessary for another reason. See S. Mendus (2009), *Politics and Morality*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 400 J.P. Dobel (1999), *Public Integrity*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- 401 A. MacIntyre (1981), *After Virtue: A study in moral theory*, London: Duckworth.
- 402 S.L. Carter (1996), *Integrity*, New York: HarperPerennial, page 29.
- 403 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/b/benjamindi134354.html>.
- 404 B. Williams (1981), *Moral Luck: Philosophical papers 1973-1980*, Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- 405 B. Williams (1981), *Moral Luck: Philosophical papers 1973-1980*, Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, page 22.
- 406 Although moral leaders may define and create their own situations in such a way as to be able to demonstrate moral leadership.
- 407 Among other sources, see <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/czech-pm-petr-necas-to-resign-mr-clean-hands-to-quit-in-effort-to-end-political-turmoil-over-aide-spying-and-corruption-scandal-8661418.html>.
- 408 See <http://www.robertbraut.com/2009/09/thoughts-some-heavy-some-light.html>.
- 409 This is known as "ethical fading" in the literature. See A.E. Tenbrunsel and D.M. Messick (2004), 'Ethical fading: The role of self-deception in unethical behavior', *Social Justice Research*, vol. 17, no. 2, pages 223-236.
- 410 See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/if_you_have_integrity-nothing_else_matters-if_you/343397.html.
- 411 A variant on this is the idea that integrity is priceless whether you have it or not.
- 412 M. Waken (1996), *Integrity First: Reflections of a Military Philosopher*, Colorado: United States Air Force Academy.
- 413 G. Taylor (1985), *Pride, Shame and Guilt: Emotions of self-assessment*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 414 See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/a_little_integrity_is_better_than_any/177041.html.
- 415 See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/i_desire_so_to_conduct_the_affairs_of_this/178051.html.
- 416 See <http://en.allexperts.com/q/Joplin-Janis-494/Don-t-compromise-yourself.htm>.
- 417 E. Vogelaar and O. Bosma (2009), *Twintig Maanden Knettergek: Dagboek van een ministerschap (Twenty months of madness: Diary of a ministry)*. Amsterdam: Balans, page 341.
- 418 See http://thinkexist.com/quotation/laws_control_the_lesser_man-right_conduct/215710.html.
- 419 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/a/andrewjack122499.html>.
- 420 See for instance <http://peacequest.ca/mourning-nelson-mandela-as-hero-and-role-model/>.
- 421 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/m/margareth153841.html>.
- 422 Or as US politician Harriett Woods put it, "You can stand tall without standing on someone. You can be a victor without having victims." Cited in C. Warner (1992), *The Last Word: A treasury of women's quotes*, New York: Prentice Hall, page 147.
- 423 American personal coach Thomas Leonard states that integrity reveals beauty. See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/t/thomasleon193706.html>.
- 424 See for example B. Musschenga (2004), *Integriteit: Over de eenheid en heelheid van de persoon (Integrity: On the unity and wholeness of the person)*, Utrecht: Lemma.
- 425 T. Wallaart and M. van Weezel (1999), 'Ik ben een man zonder toekomst' ('I am a man without a future'), *Vrij Nederland*, November 13, pages 10-12.
- 426 See <http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/21302-why-governor-chris-christie-and-his-aides-belong-in-handcuffs>.
- 427 See among others *Elsevier* (2011), 'Corrupte Roemeense europarlementariër uit fractie gezet' ('Corrupt Romanian member of the European Parliament thrown out of party') March 22.
- 428 See <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2120010/Peter-Cruddas-Tory-treasurer-resigns-selling-secret-meetings-David-Cameron-250k.html>.
- 429 This was John Leerdam, member of the House of Representatives in The Netherlands. See <http://www.pvda.nl/personen/John+Leerdam>.

- 430 See <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2271482/Serbia-PM-Ivica-Dacic-orders-inquiry-Basic-Instinct-fake-TV-interview.html>.
- 431 See http://www.boston.com/news/local/breaking_news/2010/10/post_109.html.
- 432 R. Greene (1998). *The 48 Laws of Power*, London: Profile Books, page 89.
- 433 Chirac had placed campaign employees on the Paris payroll.
- 434 See <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4282799.stm>.
- 435 See http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/mitt-romneys-prep-school-classmates-recall-pranks-but-also-troubling-incidents/2012/05/10/glQA3WOKFU_story.html?tid=sm_twitter_washingtonpost.
- 436 See <http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/corruption-continues-virtually-unchecked-in-greece-a-861327.html>.
- 437 See <http://www.economist.com/blogs/easternapproaches/2013/04/bulgarias-wiretapping-scandal>.
- 438 *Reformatorsch Dagblad*, 'Aalborgs raadslid krijgt berisping burgemeester' ('Aalborg council member reprimanded by mayor'), October 1, 1999.
- 439 *Trouw*, 'Raadslid krijgt boete voor ronselen van stemmen' ('Council member fined for election fraud'), February 7, 2007.
- 440 *NRC Handelsblad*, 'Smolders krijgt boete na lekken' ('Smolders fined for leaks'), September 5, 2007.
- 441 For the British politician who received an 18-month prison sentence, see <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newsttopics/mps-expenses/8246187/MPs-expenses-David-Chaytor-sentenced-to-18-months-in-prison-for-false-accounting.html>. For the mayor of Detroit, see <http://rt.com/usa/detroit-mayor-sentenced-kilpatrick-997/>. For the Greek mayor, see http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/28/world/europe/greek-ex-mayor-gets-life-in-prison-for-embezzlement.html?_r=0. Incidentally, it is noteworthy that four of the last seven governors of the US state of Illinois were convicted and imprisoned: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/30/illinois-governors-in-pri_n_2581182.html.
- 442 For an overview of countries where the death sentence is possible, see <http://www.amnesty.org/en/death-penalty/abolitionist-and-retentionist-countries>.
- 443 See <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/jul/08/liu-zhijun-sentenced-death-corruption>.
- 444 Richard Nixon was threatened with impeachment but he resigned. Warren Harding was also threatened with impeachment, but he died before the case could begin.
- 445 See <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2013/06/13/former-argentine-president-prison/2421435/>. Incidentally, the opposite can also happen, in the sense that a former SP can gain amnesty, as in the case of a Nigerian governor who was convicted of stealing millions of dollars from the public while in office but was pardoned by President Goodluck Jonathan. See <http://www.ibtimes.com/nigeria-corruption-wins-again-former-thieving-governor-pardoned-1124445>.
- 446 See <http://www.mwebantu.com/2013/03/15/rupiah-banda-loses-immunity-from-prosecution/>.
- 447 In politics "standing by someone" can be an expression for letting someone fall. Standing by them, after all, is not the same as really supporting them, but at most means cushioning and sympathizing with them.
- 448 See J. Wanders (2008), 'Eindelijk hangt Bram Peper in Rotterdam' ('Finally Bram Peper hangs in Rotterdam'), *de Volkskrant*, November 25.
- 449 Among other sources, see <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/time-out-former-president-wulff-seeks-respite-in-monastery-a-820813.html>.
- 450 See <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-25630091>. After serving his sentence he was sentenced again to four years in prison for illegally importing goods to decorate his house. The items were worth more than €600,000. He also had a house outside the capital Bucharest redecored, which was against the rules.
- 451 Cited in T.J. Whalen (2007), *A Higher Purpose: Profiles in presidential courage*, Ivan R. Dee: Chicago, page 229.
- 452 As explained, for instance, in chapter 34, with reference to Plato.
- 453 See http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/09/23/barack-obama-smoke_n_3977599.html.
- 454 See <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2304369/What-Uruguays-Jose-Mujica-called-Argentinas-president-Cristina-Kirchner-thought-listening.html>.
- 455 See <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MeJhXaC5WPg>.
- 456 See <http://www.nu.nl/buitenland/2609109/burgemeester-weigert-excuus-torensks.html>.
- 457 See <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-19364261>.
- 458 See http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/24/world/americas/official-corruption-in-mexico-once-rarely-exposed-is-starting-to-come-to-light.html?pagewanted=1&_r=0.
- 459 The term integritism was coined by Professor Leo Huberts of the Free University of Amsterdam. He described the term in his oration of February 23, 2005.
- 460 See http://vorige.nrc.nl/multimedia/archive/00267/Verklaring_Gerd_Lee_267586a.pdf.
- 461 G.W. Bush (2010), *Decision Points*, London: Virgin Books, page 76.

- 462 This is also known as a second- or third-degree transgression.
- 463 Among other sources, see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Akis_Tsochatzopoulos#cite_note-9.
- 464 This related to Dutch minister of defense Van Middelkoop. See E. Vrijzen (2010), *Wilt u niet aan mijn jasje trekken! Populisme en politieke pers, valkuilen en verkiezingstrucs, scoringsdrift en seksuele intimidatie, de grappen van Balkenende en de gezelligheid van Wilders (Don't buttonhole me please! Populism and political press, stumbling blocks and election tricks, point scoring and sexual harassment, the jokes of Balkenende, and the friendliness of Wilders)*, Amsterdam: Balans, page 164.
- 465 An Australian minister used the same defense when he was accused of expenses fraud, stating, "Now, I'm not going to worry about those, because frankly I don't think, well, I don't care about them and I'm sure the public didn't care." See <http://www.medicalobserver.com.au/news/sloppy-expense-claiming-no-big-deal-says-wa-health-minister>.
- 466 See <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/apr/12/silvio-berlusconi-paid-witnesses-ruby-trial>.
- 467 Koole, R.A. (2009), *Mensenwerk: Herinneringen van een partijvoorzitter, 2001-2007*, (People work: Memoires of a party chairman 2001-2007), Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, page 312.
- 468 Even if you take no further action, it is a good idea to document the situation to avoid the impression later of having done nothing at all.
- 469 For example, a big investigation into a minor transgression can be seen as a waste of resources, blind panic, exaggeration, misplaced, inappropriate, or even motivated by the wish to harm someone).
- 470 This was Tineke Lodders. Cited in B. Vuijsje (2006), *Avonturen in Besturen (Adventures in Management)*, Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, page 188.
- 471 R. Oudkerk (2005), *Geen Weg Terug (No Way Back)*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam: Prometheus, pages 15-16.
- 472 Margaret Thatcher said, "Being powerful is like being a lady. If you have to tell people you are, you aren't." See http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/m/margaret_thatcher.html#CkAWB5dbc58tkPRC.99.
- 473 This was Ivo Opstelten. H. van Osch (2010), *Bram Peper: Man van contrasten (Bram Peper: Man of contrasts)*, Amsterdam: Boom, page 331.
- 474 This was Adri Duivesteijn. See M. van Lieshout (2008), 'Wethouder Duivesteijn eist vertrouwen raad' (Alderman Duivesteijn demands confidence of the council'), *De Volkskrant*, February 1.
- 475 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/n/napoleonbo383851.html>.
- 476 See <http://www.politics.hu/20130516/former-president-schmitt-formally-surrenders-title-of-doctor-tainted-by-plagiarism/>.
- 477 See R. Greene (1998), *The 48 Laws of Power*, London: Profile Books.
- 478 E. Vrijzen (2010), *Wilt u niet aan mijn jasje trekken! Populisme en politieke pers, valkuilen en verkiezingstrucs, scoringsdrift en seksuele intimidatie, de grappen van Balkenende en de gezelligheid van Wilders (Don't buttonhole me please! Populism and political press, stumbling blocks and election tricks, point scoring and sexual harassment, the jokes of Balkenende, and the friendliness of Wilders)*, Amsterdam: Balans, page 95.
- 479 See <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-22781752>.
- 480 *De Telegraaf* (2010), 'Berlusconi: strenger optreden tegen corruptie' ('Berlusconi: stricter action against corruption'), February 19.
- 481 See http://www.thestar.com/news/city_hall/2013/11/14/rob_ford_admits_drinking_and_driving_says_hell_sue_former_staffers.html.
- 482 See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moshe_Katsav#cite_note-44.
- 483 H. van Osch (2010), *Bram Peper: Man van contrasten (Bram Peper: Man of contrasts)*, Amsterdam: Boom, page 357.
- 484 For examples of the public outrage and accusations of hypocrisy, see <http://voices.yahoo.com/the-larry-craig-scandal-deepens-691570.html>. Similarly he was accused of hypocrisy because he had supported attempts to prohibit homosexual marriage in the constitution. He also opposed adding sexual orientation to laws on hate crime and voted against protective measures for homosexual employees.
- 485 This was Dutch party leader Jolande Sap in the TV program *Knevel en Van den Brink* on August 24, 2011.
- 486 See <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L4387309,00.html>.
- 487 In other words, excluding the opposite is more difficult than demonstrating it.
- 488 This was Robin Linschoten. For a description see H. van den Berg (1997), *De Ritselaars: Beknopte Nederlandse schandaalwijzer (The Fixers: A concise guide to Dutch scandal)*, Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, pages 161-165.
- 489 See http://bis.almere.nl/regelgeving/1142010/000000634065817343089878_08062.1047443223.DOC.HTML.
- 490 See <http://www.declarations-patrimoine.gouvernement.fr/>.
- 491 This was the mayor of Maastricht, Gerd Leers. B. Oostra, T. Sniekers, and H. Goossen (2009), 'Dossier: Villa-affaire Gerd Leers' ('File: Gerd Leers' villa scandal'), *De Limburger*.

- 492 See <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstopics/mps-expenses/6311388/MPs-expenses-12500-payback-time-for-Gordon-Brown.html>.
- 493 Cited in H. van den Berg (1997), *De Ritselaars: Beknopte Nederlandse schandaalwijzer* (The Fixers: A concise guide to Dutch scandal), Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, page 34.
- 494 This was Dutch minister of internal affairs Ien Dales. See <http://nrcboeken.vorige.nrc.nl/recensie/hoogmoed-komt-na-de-val>.
- 495 See <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2131587/Spanish-King-Juan-Carlos-apologizes-Botswana-elephant-hunting-safari.html>.
- 496 See http://vorige.nrc.nl/multimedia/archive/00267/Verklaring_Gerd_Lee_267586a.pdf.
- 497 R. Oudkerk (2005), *Geen Weg Terug* (No Way Back), Amsterdam: Prometheus, page 419.
- 498 The member of parliament claimed that the women had lost touch with reality. See <http://www.itnsource.com/shotlist/RTV/2012/12/27/RTV271212028/RTV271212028-119?v=1>.
- 499 R. Greene (1998). *The 48 Laws of Power*, London: Profile Books, page 202.
- 500 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/s/spirotag389900.html>.
- 501 See P. 't Hart and M. ten Hooven (2004), *Op Zoek naar Leiderschap: Regeren na de revolutie* (In Search of Leadership: Governing after the revolt), Amsterdam: De Balie, page 181.
- 502 See *Binnenlands bestuur* (2010), 'Leers bedong wachtgeld tijdens schorsing debat' ('Leers demanded a retainer during suspension debate'), January 28.
- 503 J.P. Dobel (1999), *Public Integrity*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, page 126.
- 504 See <http://www.mikebloomberg.com/index.cfm?objectid=3F0C5F2F-5056-9A3E-D0E9E41D78DDD869>.
- 505 See <http://mcadams.posc.mu.edu/ike.htm>.
- 506 See E. Vogelaar and O. Bosma (2009), *Twintig Maanden Knettergek: Dagboek van een ministerschap* (Twenty Months of Madness: Diary of a ministry). Amsterdam: Balans, page 337.
- 507 This was Dutch prime minister Wim Kok. See http://www.rtl.nl/components/financien/rtlz/2004/04_april/27-ingbank_wim_kok_top_geen_zelfverrijking.xml.
- 508 See <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2083827/The-12m-tax-mystery-Tony-Blairs-earnings-soar-42-pays-315-000-HMRC.html>.
- 509 See <http://www.economist.com/blogs/charlemagne/2013/12/greek-politics>.
- 510 See <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/jun/08/dick-cheney-halliburton-supreme-court>. See also <http://www.corpwatch.org/article.php?id=6028>.
- 511 See <http://www.fordlibrarymuseum.gov/library/speeches/761015.asp>.
- 512 See http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/451396.stm.
- 513 E. van Thijn (2008), *Kroonprinsenleed: Machtswisselingen in de politiek* (The Crown Prince's Affliction: Power struggles in politics), Amsterdam: Augustus, page 15.
- 514 R. Oudkerk (2005), *Geen Weg Terug* (No Way Back), Amsterdam: Prometheus, page 32.
- 515 See for example P. 't Hart and M. ten Hooven (2004), *Op Zoek naar Leiderschap: Regeren na de revolutie* (In Search of Leadership: Governing after the revolt), Amsterdam: De Balie, page 177.
- 516 Bureau Integriteit (2010), *Gemeente Maasdriel*, Amersfoort: BING (publication by the Office of Integrity of Dutch Municipalities on the municipality of Maasdriel).
- 517 Cited in C. Ryan (2009), *The Chickenhawk Syndrome: War, sacrifice, and personal responsibility*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, page 140.
- 518 Cited in C. Ryan (2009), *The Chickenhawk Syndrome: War, sacrifice, and personal responsibility*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, page 140.
- 519 See <http://www.nytimes.com/1987/09/24/us/biden-withdraws-bid-for-president-in-wake-of-furor.html>.
- 520 See <http://www.newsdaily.com/article/fde0351647558a4aeea363eb4e0a8bca/vote-buying-video-causes-stir-ahead-of-paraguay-poll>.
- 521 See <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/italy/9599222/Italian-city-council-dismissed-over-mafia-infiltration.html>.
- 522 See <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/steuerpolitik-lafontaine-vergleicht-schroeder-mit-bruening-a-223229.html>.
- 523 B. Obama (2008), *The Audacity of Hope*, Edinburgh: Canongate, page 119. Many SPs have also been discredited due to conflicts of interest and abuses of power in the interests of donors to election campaigns. See for instance http://crew.3cdn.net/eddb9bb31133ce4051_s8m6bcke.pdf. Incidentally, receiving campaign funds can also be a source of abuse for SPs. A former state senator agreed to plead guilty of spending campaign money on gambling at a casino. See http://journalstar.com/news/state-and-regional/nebraska/former-state-senator-to-plead-guilty-to-wire-fraud/article_076ed124-16f4-5876-9c06-1d31168749f2.html.

- 524 Cited in H. Shittu and C. Query (2006), *Absurdities, Scandals & Stupidities in Politics*, Boston: Genix Press, page 72. Otto von Bismarck also pointed to the prevalence of lies during elections, when he said, "People never lie so much as after a hunt, during a war or before an election." See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/keywords/election.html#eDgtdHDGPM6g8vjU.99>.
- 525 "A politician should have three hats. One for throwing into the ring, one for talking through, and one for pulling rabbits out of if elected." See <http://www.quotesdaddy.com/quote/150637/carl-sandberg/a-politician-should-have-three-hats-one-for-throwing>.
- 526 Quintus Tullius Cicero: *How to Win an Election: An ancient guide for modern politicians* Translated and with an introduction by Philip Freeman (2012), Princeton: Princeton University Press, page 33.
- 527 R. Lenaers (2005), *Tacitus: Het drama van een imperium (Tacitus: The drama of an empire)*, Antwerp: De Boeck, page 57.
- 528 For a list of political slogans see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_political_slogans.
- 529 See <http://usliberals.about.com/od/liberalpersonalprofiles/p/HillaryClinton.htm>.
- 530 T. Lagas (2003), 'Bij zulke ruzies is de VVD in de buurt' ('When fights like these happen the VVD is nearby'), *Trouw*, September 26.
- 531 See <http://blog.workingamerica.org/2013/07/17/susana-martinez-makes-list-of-nations-most-corrupt-governors/>.
- 532 N. Watt (2011), 'Alastair Campbell: Blair was angry at Prince's interference', *The Guardian*, July 2.
- 533 See for instance <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-19669537>.
- 534 G. Zalm (2009), *De Romantische Boekhouder (The Romantic Accountant)*, Amsterdam: Balans, page 113.
- 535 See http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/28/world/europe/greek-ex-mayor-gets-life-in-prison-for-embezzlement.html?_r=0.
- 536 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/e/edwardkenn177291.html>.
- 537 Aristotle (2000), *Politics*, translated by B. Jowett, New York: Dover.
- 538 C. de Montesquieu (1748), *Spirit of the Laws*. A. M. Cohler, B. C. Miller and H. S. Stone (Eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- 539 See <http://en.ria.ru/politics/20130926/183734072.html>.
- 540 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/a/alijazetb180954.html>
- 541 See http://www.egypt.gov.eg/english/laws/constitution/chp_five/part_three.aspx.
- 542 The independence of a state is also a central tenet of many SPs' oaths.
- 543 See <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/l/laurabush335914.html>.
- 544 See also M. Kaptein and J. Wempe (2002), *The Balanced Company: A theory of corporate integrity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 545 See <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arthashastra>.
- 546 According to political scientist Bernard Crick, politics is about reconciling differing and opposing interests. He defines politics as "the activity by which differing interests within a given unit of rule are conciliated by giving them a share in power in proportion to their importance to the welfare and the survival of the whole community." See B. Crick (2000), *In Defense of Politics*, fifth edition (first edition published in 1962), New York: Continuum, page 21.
- 547 Harold Lasswell describes politics as the battle over the question of who gets what and why. One British prime minister defined politics as the possession and distribution of power. See http://thinkexist.com/quotes/benjamin_disraeli.
- 548 The political elite can turn against anyone who raises questions about their position, as Socrates found 2,500 years ago. As a philosopher he was unable to keep quiet, preferring the poison cup.
- 549 Creating discord in society because of suspected inappropriate behavior can also be a reason for resigning, as in the case of Hungarian president Pál Schmitt, who resigned when it became known that he had committed plagiarism in his PhD dissertation, saying, "my personal issue divides my beloved nation rather than unites it. It is my duty to end my service and resign my mandate as president." He said this because he saw it as the task of a president to bring unity (in other words integrity) to Hungary. See http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/03/world/europe/hungarian-president-pal-schmitt-resigns-amid-plagiarism-scandal.html?_r=0.
- 550 B. Clinton (2004), *My life*, London: Conerstone, page 854.
- 551 As discussed in S.L. Carter (1996), *Integrity*, New York: HarperPerennial, page 222. As Carter himself put it, "discernment makes integrity possible" (page 59).
- 552 Agreeing to disagree.
- 553 B. Obama (2008), *The Audacity of Hope*, Edinburgh: Canongate, page 22. In his book *The Assault on Reason* (London: Bloomsbury) US vice president Al Gore (2007) also criticized a lack of critical thinking in national politics.
- 554 For more last words of US presidents see <http://www.diplom.org/manus/Presidents/faq/last.html>.
- 555 T.J. Whalen (2007), *A Higher Purpose: Profiles in presidential courage*, Ivan R. Dee: Chicago, page 150.

- 556 T.J. Whalen (2007), *A Higher Purpose: Profiles in presidential courage*, Ivan R. Dee: Chicago, page 150.
- 557 See <http://www.nytimes.com/books/first/h/holli-mayor.html>.
- 558 See among other sources <http://www.toptenstip.com/top-10-most-corrupt-leaders-in-recent-history/>. See also the Global Corruption Reports by Transparency International. Other political leaders on this list include president of Haiti Jean-Claude Duvalier (between \$300 million and \$600 million), president of Peru Alberto Fujimori (\$600 million), prime minister of Ukraine Pavlo Lazarenko (\$200 million), president of Nicaragua Arnoldo Alemán (\$100 million), and president of the Philippines Joseph Estrada (between \$78 million and \$80 million).
- 559 B. Clinton 2004, *My Life*, London: Conerstone, page 952.
- 560 L.B. Lindsey and M. Sumerlin (2008), *What a President Should Know: An insider's view on how to succeed in the oval office*, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.



This free edition was downloaded from
www.obooko.com

Although you do not have to pay for this e-book, the author's intellectual property rights remain fully protected by international Copyright law. You are licensed to use this digital copy strictly for your personal enjoyment only: it must not be redistributed commercially or offered for sale in any form. If you paid for this free edition, or to gain access to it, we suggest you demand an immediate refund and report the transaction to the author.

