

## The Country Alliance

What sort of pressure group are they?	It's an outside group, sectional and causal. It believes it represents all of the countryside however it probably doesn't. Sometimes considered an insider group as well, this depends on who is in Parliament at the time. If it was a Conservative government they would be much more in favour than if it was a Labour government.
What are the key characteristics of the group?  <i>policy community - environment - animal rights</i>	<p>The Countryside Alliance was created in 1997 as a response to the newly elected Labour Government's pledge to ban hunting with dogs. An amalgamation of three organisations: The Countryside Business Group, the British Field Sports Society and the Countryside Movement, the Countryside Alliance.</p> <p>Their vision is that it works for everyone who loves the countryside and the rural way of life. Our aim is to protect and promote life in the countryside and to help it thrive.</p> <p>It has a budget of 5million as there are a lot of wealthy 'countryside' members who donate their money towards the group.</p> <p>It doesn't have any celebrity backing but surprisingly it has a Labour MP as the chairman of the alliance who is the MP for the inner city constituency of Vauxhall and another as the president since 1998.</p> <p>They are against the ban on hunting of foxes, shooting, fishing and other countryside sports. They also claim to be helping local communities.</p>
How does it carry out its function?	<p>The Countryside Alliance's events listing is constantly updated and aims to keep you in touch with rural events of interest across the UK. The Countryside Alliance will have a presence at several of the key rural shows and events this summer and we hope to see you soon. 407,791 supporters participated in its Liberty &amp; Livelihood March in London on 22 September 2002.</p> <p>It claims to represent the whole of the countryside but there are probably a few who disagree with their views.</p>
What persuasion methods does it use?	They campaign for shooting, hunting, fishing and other countryside sports. They also help keep a strong local communities working together. They try and gain public support on issues like hunting by handing out leaflets, holding meetings and protests.
Does it enhance democracy?	It is good for democracy as it is voicing the views of the people against the bans on hunting and trying to promote other countryside sports that are in danger of being banned. However it doesn't represent everyone in the countryside and they do claim that they do this.

## Fathers 4 Justice

Type of pressure group	<p>Outsider <i>political + cultural</i> <i>children better with mothers</i></p> <p>Sectional because it represents the group fathers but you don't have to be a father to join and it claims to represent the interests of all fathers not just those in the group.</p> <p>Their aim is to champion the cause of equal parenting, family law reform and equal contact for divorced parents with children.</p> <p>For Parents and grandparents to have a right to see their children.</p> <p>Entirely rely on donations as all their funding and do not accept any money of government or other organisations that might compromise the integrity of their campaign making them an outsider group.</p>
Characteristics	<p>Outsider group (Therefore less formal and have limited if any contact with the government and MP's.)</p> <p>Promotional/sectional group and seeking to raise awareness of the single fathers.</p> <p>Also seeking to gain legislation for single father custody however with the methods they use makes it increasingly harder to gain this legislation (Outsider methods) e.g. Lobbying Buckingham Palace or Spiderman at tower of London .</p> <p>They do not accept any donation from government or solicitors as they claim it "compromises their integrity" and therefore are choosing to remain an outsider group.</p> <p>Founded by Matt O'Connor in 2002 after the separation of his family in 2000.</p>
How it carries out it's functions	It promotes discussion and debate by public stunts.
Methods	<p>Direct action. Controversial methods of gaining attention- two members dressed as batman and robin scaled the royal court of justice. Nine days later another member climbed a 120 feet crane dressed as Spiderman. Two members threw purple flour bombs into the house of commons. A member scaled the walls of Buckingham palace dressed as batman- this was reported in the news around the world. More recently their protests have become more serious and have stopped wearing superhero costumes- A member was arrested for refusing to pay money owed to the child support agency. Marched outside David Cameron's home after comments he made on father's day "Feckless fathers" and "heroic mothers". Staged a peaceful protest outside of Buckingham palace but then handcuffed themselves to the railings.</p>
Policy community	Not associated with any other pressure groups or people in policy making positions.
Effect on democracy	<p>It depends on the viewpoint-</p> <p>Promoting an issue that no political party is openly talking about</p> <p>Mobilising public opinion through media coverage</p> <p>However, Are not accountable for their actions (many of them being illegal)</p> <p>E.g. Alleged kidnapping plans for Tony Blair's youngest son (in 2006).</p> <p>Also many of their methods are branded as too extreme such as sending fake parcel bombs and hate mail to individuals.</p>
Impact	Their political aims are yet to be achieved but they have had the unintended impact of high lightly the low levels of security in the house of commons and Buckingham palace.

*most prominent  
guerrilla pressure  
group in the UK  
→ Times,  
2004*

## Greenpeace-

What sort of pressure group are they?	Sectional outsider <sup>mostly</sup>
What are the key characteristics of the group?	<p>Key aims and objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nuclear disarming of countries</li> <li>• Stopping Global Warming</li> <li>• Preventing deforestation</li> </ul> <p>Notable Campaigns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Save the artic</li> <li>• Go beyond oil</li> <li>• stop climate change</li> <li>• Protect forests</li> <li>• Defend oceans</li> <li>• Eliminate toxins</li> <li>• work for peace</li> </ul>
How does it carry out its functions?	<p>Greenpeace promotes its campaigns through social networking sites, leaflets and its own personal website.</p> <p>Its website and leaflets provide information and figures on the different campaigns Greenpeace undertake in order to educate the public and gain support through the use of statics and bias facts. Greenpeace campaign issues that governments often won't because they often include activities that the government makes money off, example oil, and the government taxes fossil fuels whereas Greenpeace campaign openly to ban the use of them.</p>
<p>What persuasion methods does it use?</p> <p><i>Environmental policy community:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- successful; high prominence</li> <li>- businesses don't really like them</li> </ul>	<p>Greenpeace do not protest within the political system because many of the pressure group's methods are extreme and considered illegal or pushing the legal boundaries of many of the countries it is active within.</p> <p>Greenpeace supplies information to all channels of media and the government if requested. <i>insider</i></p> <p>Greenpeace Utilise the media to gain support and to advertise their many campaigns, the media does not show some the actions of Greenpeace in a positive manner however because their actions are seen as extreme by non-members.</p> <p>They organise:</p> <p>Protests</p> <p>Boycotts of big businesses if they disagree with their business principles.</p> <p>Rallies</p> <p>Petitions</p> <p>They use direct action to gain success in their campaigns.</p> <p>Greenpeace has some long term campaigns mainly global warming related issues.</p>
Does it enhance democracy?	<p>Greenpeace allows for the education of the masses on subjects often avoided within party politics due to fears of alienating sections of voters, Greenpeace enhances democracy to the extent of furthering campaigns on issues that may not be addressed in main stream politics. <i>Difficult to determine.</i></p>

### CAMRA – Campaign for Real Ale

<u>What sort of group are they?</u>	<u>What are the key characteristics of the group?</u>	<u>How does it carry out its function?</u>	<u>What persuasion does it use?</u>	<u>Does it work within a policy community?</u>	<u>Does it enhance democracy?</u>
CAMRA are an outsider cause group. However some may also consider them a sectional group at the same time as they target the people who like real ale and want them to join and celebrate this fact.	<p><b><u>Aim:</u></b> CAMRA's 'core aims to promote real ale and pubs, as well as acting as the consumer's champion in relation to the UK and European beer and drinks industry.'</p> <p><b><u>Compatibility:</u></b> CAMRA are an outsider group so have little compatibility with government however they are trying to gain influence by having an e-petition for those who support their campaigns and lobbying ministers telling them why pubs matter personally. Also lager and other non-real ale beers are more likely to make more money so the Gov won't go against those.</p> <p><b><u>Members and participation:</u></b> Many silent members but also thousands of volunteers who give up their own time in many different ways to help campaign e.g. taking part in local pub surveys, distributing membership leaflets to pubs, writing to your local MP, managing local CAMRA website or pouring a few pints at local beer festival.</p> <p><b><u>Wealth:</u></b> 132,967 members at time of writing each paying £20 a month at least, presumably have a large amount of money.</p>	<p>They respond to Government consultations on issues concerning pub goers, such as licensing hours and regulations, and produce a "hard hitting" monthly newspaper which informs readers about new beers and regulations and puts across campaign views. They also give evidence to Select Committees."</p> <p><b><u>Education:</u></b> Students can create CAMRA societies at universities which spreads the name and knowledge of the group through the younger generation. Society members get cheaper membership for the first year and receive all the normal CAMRA members' benefits.</p> <p><b><u>Non-governmental issue:</u></b> On the issue of Real ale vs. Lager government unlikely to side either way as they don't want to lose one set of supporters, and also lose the money gained from the alcohol industry.</p>	<p><b><u>Campaigns:</u></b> CAMRA run national and local campaigns, currently they have 8 national campaigns and enable members and regional groups of CAMRA to run their own campaign to save their own pub. People can sign there e-petition if they agree with them, also trying to lobby to ministers writing what there pub means to them.</p> <p><b><u>Media:</u></b> "CAMRA is mentioned quite frequently in national and local newspapers around the country. For example, CAMRA was mentioned 9 times in December 2011 alone, according to <a href="http://www.camra.org.uk/">http://www.camra.org.uk/</a></p>	<p>Not really as the preservation of pubs and ale is such a small issue that ministers would rather concentrate on the bigger issues. Also, they might not be willing to side with CAMRA as bigger companies are likely to produce more revenue compared small ale producers.</p> <p>At present, more focus is put on regulating alcohol and safe drinking, rather than on what people should drink in their spare time.</p>	<p>In some ways yes, CAMRA enables the drinkers of real ale to support its fight to remain while also supporting Pubs, they are allowed to be as active or as silent a campaigner as they wish.</p> <p><del>beneign</del> Relatively harmless organisation engages members however don't affect government so no reason to exclude them.</p> <p>However in the grand scheme of things CAMRA themselves have little influence and have had few successes, most of those successes aren't linked to government but to their own members.</p> <p>Another point is that many could argue if the group satisfies the views of its members it enhances democracy in that area. More of a social organisation as well.</p>

## Cardiomyopathy Association

What sort of pressure group is it?	<p>Insider</p> <p>Cause</p> <p>This group promotes awareness of different types of heart disease and wants to make the public more aware of the consequential effects on the individual and their family. It relies on the public to make donations so they can send professionals to help those who suffer with the condition. It also gets part funding from the government making it an insider group.</p>
What are the key characteristics of the group?	<p>The main aims are:</p> <p>The CMA helps to provide support and easy to understand information the different types of cardiomyopathy there services are beneficial to CMA suffers because of the nurses and support groups available.</p> <p>They get part government funding but otherwise rely on fundraising and donations.</p> <p>Achievements:</p> <p>They founded the partnership with the British heart foundation and printed off booklets and leaflets to achieve awareness of heart disease.</p>
How does it carry out its functions?	<p>They hold conferences between doctors that allow people to become more aware of CMA. Furthermore, they inform people through events, such as those held in Trafalgar Square that makes people more aware of CMA and the consequences on both the family and the sufferer.</p>
What persuasion methods does it use?	<p>Mobilising public opinions and direct action. They have funding from government with new legislation since 2000, they can now claim back tax on all donations made by taxpayers and encourage all members to contact their local MP's to raise awareness of the issue for the need for improved specialist services to provide effective treatment for cardiomyopathy. In an attempt to get people to join the organ donor programme the BBC got in contact and funded 5 half an hour shows that illustrated the issues concerned with the disease.</p>
Does it work within a policy community?	<p>As a small pressure group the CMA only plays a minimal role in the medical communities work in pressuring the government to change laws. Because it only focuses on the one single issue cause, their opinion isn't heard so much.</p> <p><i>British Heart Found. R. Soc. Nurses; Cancer Res. Cent; NHS; GMC; drugs manufacturers</i></p>
Does it enhance democracy?	<p>Most insider groups do enhance democracy as they are working alongside politicians and express the views of individuals who may not otherwise have had their views heard. CMA stands for the beliefs of many individuals across the UK and without this group their suffering would continue without government to increase medical care and support.</p>

# Animal Liberation Front (ALF)

very outsider → bordering on terrorism

What sort of pressure group are they?	Outsider, sectional/cause
What are the key characteristics of this group?	Their aims are for testing upon animals to be ended and also all other forms of animal cruelty, which for the ALF includes hunting and slaughtering. Also promote vegan/vegetarian lifestyle
How does it carry out its functions?	Protests, intimidation, property damage, breaking and entering, arson, bombing, contamination, freeing animals. The ALF has liberated tens of thousands of animals, and delivered several million pounds of property damage in the UK alone The ALF are responsible for there being no more captured dolphins in the UK .
What persuasion methods does it use?	Extremist methods: intimidating scientists, websites, leafleting, and photography. The group often videos and photographs the "missions" they go on, and circulate images of the treatment of animals in order to garner sympathy ALF often target businesses who use animal research labs in order to cut funding to the animal testing labs e.g. claiming to have injected Mars bars with rat poison, causing millions of dollars to Mars in pulling bars
Does it work within a policy community?	Yes. Within the policy community the ALF represents a small but renowned organisation. Most animal rights groups prefer peaceful methods, such as petitions and protests. The ALF believe most animal rights groups are too moderate, seeking only more humane treatment of animals, not an end to the practices altogether, and argue that they don't want "bigger cages" but "empty cages".
Does it enhance democracy?	Very unaccountable as there is no recognised leadership, no official membership means no representation of members, ALF <sup>SG</sup> does have membership ALF try and protect accountability by only allowing actions to be claimed as theirs if all reasonable precaution is taken to ensure no life is harmed ALF would argue that animals have no representation and that animal rights organisations do not protect animals in labs ALF have no interest in working within the parliamentary system or using democratic methods, so they cannot be said to enhance democracy, however they do give representation to an extreme segment of the population .

parliamentary

support group

# League Against Cruel Sports.

Type of pressure group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Causal, outsider (but more insider than ALF) due to some ministerial support</li> </ul>
Key characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Save bulls from death</li> <li>Save dogs from illegal fighting</li> <li>Save endangered animals from trophy hunters</li> <li>We help people whose lives are being detrimentally affected by cruel sports.</li> <li>The League has a large number of celebrity supporters such as Paul McCartney, John Bishop and Ricky Gervais</li> <li>Scottish actress Annette Crosbie OBE has been President since 2003</li> <li>Sells land and property to fund campaigns</li> <li>Virtually directly opposes the Countryside Alliance, and is more of an insider group than the ALF due to restrained and respected models of protest and promotion of their campaign</li> </ul>
How does it carry out its function <i>international organisation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourages petition signing to get issues such as snares discussed in Parliament (currently has 20,000 signatures) and bull fighting to be resolved in the EU</li> <li>Provides those who care about animal cruelty a chance to voice their opinions in a civil manner</li> <li>Has yet to mobilise enough support to reach a 'critical mass'</li> <li>Holds roughly 20,000 acres of land, as well as numerous properties, which they sell off to fund campaigns. This implies that they are not especially well funded, as they rely on the generosity of donors, both from celebrities and the general public.</li> </ul>
What persuasion methods does it use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lobbying throughout the UK AND EU</li> <li>Many protest campaigns</li> <li>Various campaigning and fund raising to stop the acts</li> <li>Have sued past law breakers however none of these ended up with a prosecution</li> <li>Partnership for Action Against Wildlife Crime (PAWS) and are also members of the Scottish Parliament's Cross Party Group on Animal Welfare.</li> </ul>
Does it work within a policy community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>However it doesn't use violence or any absurd ways of promoting its course</li> <li>Generally the group is less extreme than the ALF and is more of an insider</li> <li>It tends to work independently</li> </ul>
Does it enhance democracy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LOBBYING is not really democratic. Furthermore it's not very transparent with its funding and IS charity and thus receives charitable status on many issues that could affect the true nature of the company. Furthermore it has over £10million worth of assets which it doesn't use and relies on donations instead for its cause. Which is fair but as it's not transparent it could be.</li> <li>Suitable and seeming effective opposition to the Countryside Alliance</li> </ul>

UMBRELLA GROUPS      SECTIONAL      ADVOCACY

these two groups are too big and representative to be ignored by any governing party.

Trades Union Congress  
Labour  
govt.  
bus  
unions

709007—

corruption  
govt. bus unions

Govt. bus unions

The Trades Union Congress (TUC) is a national trade union centre, a federation of trade unions in the United Kingdom, representing the majority of trade unions. There are fifty-eight affiliated unions with a total of about 6.5 million members, around half of whom are represented by Unite or UNISON.

The TUC's decision-making body is the Annual Congress, which takes place in September. Between congresses decisions are made by the General Council, which meets every two months. An Executive Committee is elected by the Council from its members. The senior paid official of the TUC is the General Secretary, currently Brendan Barber.

## Structure

TUC policy is made at its annual Congress, which meets for four days each year during September. Affiliated unions can send delegates to Congress, with the number of delegates they can send proportionate to their size. Each year Congress elects a President of the Trades Union Congress, who carries out the office for the remainder of the year and then presides over the following year's conference

## History

The TUC was founded in the 1860s. The United Kingdom Alliance of Organised Trades, founded in Sheffield, Yorkshire, in 1866, was the immediate forerunner of the TUC, although efforts to expand local unions into regional or national organisations date back at least forty years earlier; in 1822, John Gast formed a "Committee of the Useful Classes", sometimes described as an early national trades council.

## 20th century

During the First World War, the Trades Union Congress generally supported the aims of the British Empire. However, in 1915, national conference voted against the introduction of military conscription.

The position of General Secretary of the Trades Union Congress was created in 1921, when the Parliamentary Committee of the TUC became the General Council. The General Secretary is the chief permanent officer of the TUC, and a major figure in the UK trade union movement.

## Members

The TUC has fifty-eight affiliated unions with a total of about 6.5 million members, around half of whom are represented by Unite or UNISON. The number of unions affiliated to the TUC has declined dramatically over the twentieth century, as smaller unions repeatedly merged into larger ones.

Bigger groups can more effectively make a difference.

**Questions:**

What is the part of umbrella groups?

**Why might these two groups be considered as changing their insider/outsider position over time? Extension question: what is the connection between these two groups and 'corporatism'?**

**Extension question: what is the connection between these two groups and 'corporatism'?**

Depending on which party is in power.

## Confederation of British Industry

The Confederation of British Industry is a British not for profit organisation incorporated by Royal charter which promotes the interests of its members, some 200,000 British businesses, a figure which includes some 80% of FTSE 100 companies and around 50% of FTSE 350 companies.

The CBI works to promote these interests by lobbying and advising governments, networking with other businesses and creating intelligence through analysis of government policies and compilation of statistics, both in the United Kingdom and internationally through their offices in Beijing, Brussels, New Delhi and Washington DC. It is the foremost lobbying organisation for UK business on national and international issues. It works with the UK government, international legislators and policymakers to help UK businesses compete effectively.

## Structure

The present Director-General is John Cridland, former Deputy Director General, who assumed the role in January 2011. He replaced Richard Lambert, who was formerly the editor of the *Financial Times* and member of the Bank of England Monetary Policy Committee.

**CBI policy is decided by its members – senior professionals from all sectors and sizes of business are directly involved in the policy-making process.**

It has offices in every region of the UK. The headquarters are next to Tottenham Court Road tube station, not far from the headquarters of the TUC.

## History

The organisation was formed in 1965 out of a merger of the Federation of British Industries, the British Employers' Confederation and the National Association of British Manufacturers.

## Research

The CBI conducts numerous surveys and reports which are of particular use to its members. Research conducted is available to the relevant sections of its membership.

University funding

In September 2009, it concluded that UK universities should be more scrupulous over who is funded for university courses, with concern over some universities seeking quantity of students rather than quality of learning. Industry wanted students with work-friendly skills and knowledge. Students were expected to contribute more to their courses.



# Lobbyists: stretching the limits of pluralist democracy?

role of production (capitalism) → owners of means of production (factory) → bourgeoisie → Marxists

pluralist or elitist? — distribution of power  
plutocracy oligarchy patriarchal feminists  
meritocracy — power to those with money

Many decisions made in the Houses of Parliament are made as a direct result of lobbying - the influencing of members' votes either by parliamentary colleagues, constituents or outside pressure groups. Lobbying takes its name from the lobbies or hallways of Parliament where MPs and peers gather before and after debates in the Commons and Lords chambers.

Traditionally, people wishing to influence the opinions of MPs or peers have frequented the lobbies seeking to persuade members of the validity of a particular viewpoint. Nowadays, the term lobbying often refers more specifically to the work of private companies known as lobbyists which are employed by organisations to represent their views to Parliament in a variety of ways - by arranging meetings, organising protests or providing briefing material. MPs are also lobbied directly by their constituents, local businesses and campaign groups on many issues.

— free advice?

The professional lobbying industry has been rapidly growing since the mid-1990s and in 2007 was estimated to be worth £1.9 billion, employing 14,000 people. The report also suggested that some MPs are approached over 100 times a week by lobbyists.

The UK lobbying sector is self-regulated by the Association of Professional Political Consultants (APPC) and the Public Relations Consultants Association (PRCA) and the Chartered Institute of Public Relations (CIPR) which registers individual lobbyists. There is presently no formal registration process for lobbyists and consequently there are many self-employed or freelance workers who consider themselves to be lobbyists of some sort.

The House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee argued that while there are shortcomings in the regulation of the lobbying industry in the United Kingdom, "The practice of lobbying in order to influence political decisions is a legitimate and necessary part of the democratic process. Individuals and organizations reasonably want to influence decisions that may affect them, those around them, and their environment. Government in turn needs access to the knowledge and views that lobbying can bring."

— MPs registers of interests

Many recent MPs and in particular Ministers are recruited by lobby firms and lobbyists have been recruited by ministers as 'special advisors' using what is termed the Revolving door of influence. In 2009 the House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee recommended that a statutory register of lobbying activity and lobbyists would improve transparency to the dealings between Whitehall decision makers and outside interests.

Parliament controversially responded to this recommendation by saying that self-regulation was more practical.<sup>[13]</sup> The Conservative leader, David Cameron, predicted that it was "the next big scandal waiting to happen" and was one that had "tainted our politics for too long, an issue that exposes the far-too-cosy relationship between politics, government, business and money".<sup>[14]</sup>

MPs demand stronger controls to make lobbying industry accountable

*The Independent* 7<sup>th</sup> Dec 2011

Labour MPs backed demands for the establishment of a register of parliamentary lobbyists detailing their contracts and spending. Leading the calls, John Cryer told the Commons: "Britain has a £2bn lobbying industry and there is a very strong mood among the public to make lobbying more transparent and accountable."

[He said: "Bell Pottinger, a firm that has been close to the heart of the Conservative Party since its founding 30 years ago, did not even hesitate signing a contract that would include lobbying on behalf of the Uzbek government that we are told boiled two opponents alive in water."]

The Leyton and Wanstead MP ridiculed No 10's denial that such companies could influence Government policies. He said: "The idea is pretty difficult to stomach that large corporations, multinational companies and big banks hire big lobbying firms in order to exercise influence at the heart of Government and yet it has absolutely no consequence whatsoever. The reality is this Government is very, very close to vested interests in the City, big corporate interests and big business." He said lobbying was taking place on a bigger scale than ever in Britain, notably on behalf of major health companies - often based in North America - angling for contracts.

Jesse Norman, a Tory MP, described lobbying as "a serious problem" and a "canker on the body politic". He described *The Independent's* disclosures as "rather depressing".

The Prime Minister's official spokesman promised that plans for a statutory register, originally promised for last month, would be announced "shortly" but stopped short of saying it would happen before Christmas. He insisted: "It simply isn't true to say Bell Pottinger or any other lobbying company has influenced Government policy. Clearly it is in their interests to tell their clients that they can provide them with a service and that is what they appear to be doing."

One member of Britain's lobbying industry has lodged a formal complaint with the trade body that represents Bell Pottinger. Mark Adams, head of public affairs at Lanson Communications, told *The Independent*: "These allegations are extremely serious." He said he had informed the chief executive of the Public Relations Consultants Association, Francis Ingham, that he believed Bell Pottinger had broken the industry's self-regulatory code. He called for an immediate investigation, adding: "It is important that the issue is investigated. Effective self-regulation is in the best interests of the lobbying profession."

— Public Relations Consultants Association

[Bell Pottinger belongs to the PRCA, but is not a member of the Association of Professional Political Consultants, which requires its members to reveal who their clients are.]

The pragmatic wing of the industry is dominated by Sir Martin Sorrell, the CEO of WPP, which owns 15 per cent of Bell Pottinger. Speaking from New York, he said the claims made by Bell Pottinger undermined the importance of "not exaggerating your possible influence". He said lobbying, by definition, meant presenting a case effectively and avoiding the use of influence unduly.

*exaggerating what they can do*  
The effect of Sir Martin criticising a company he holds influence over will be noted by the entire UK industry. His strongest words were for Bell Pottinger's executives on what they said they could deliver: "I doubt whether the claims by the firm's CEO are accurate."

Graham McMillan, CEO of the communications consultancy Open Road, said: "This sort of incident simply should not be happening. It is very disappointing, but it is not typical of the industry at all."

Iain Anderson, director of the Cicero Group, said The Independent's story showed "the clear need to provide transparency". Edelman, whose clients include News International, also said it was committed to transparency.

#### **Demands for action: The lobby industry**

"This sort of incident should not be happening. The industry's contributions usually benefit public policy as politicians need external expertise and influence."

*Graham McMillan, Open Road*

"These allegations are extremely serious. It is important that the issue is investigated. Effective self-regulation is in the best interests of the lobbying profession."

*Mark Adams, Lansons Communications*

"It underlines the importance of not exaggerating your possible influence. I doubt whether the claims made by the firm's CEO are accurate."

*Sir Martin Sorrell, WPP*

## **The Liam Fox affair shows we need tighter controls on lobbying**

*The Guardian 11<sup>th</sup> Dec 2011*

There are many questions thrown up by Liam Fox's relationship with Adam Werritty, but perhaps the most significant is this: if the MOD isn't paying Werritty, who is? It's the question most in need of an answer, but the one we're least likely to get. Which of Werritty's "defence-related business interests" have had access to the defence secretary?

We now know about the "chance meeting" in Dubai between Liam Fox and the private equity firm Porton Capital. We may never know who funded the rest of Werritty's trips abroad. But we might have known had the government delivered on its pledge to "shine the light of transparency on lobbying". Ahead of the general election, Cameron promised that he'd "force our politics to come clean about who is buying power and influence," because, he said, he believes "secret corporate lobbying ... is why people are so fed up with politics".

In May last year, in a concession to the Lib Dems, we saw a commitment from the coalition to deliver on this pledge, with the introduction of a compulsory register of lobbyists. The policy is straightforward enough: a decent lobbyists' register would reveal who is lobbying whom, about what, and how much money is being spent to influence our politicians. It requires a quarterly filing from lobbyists (above a minimum financial threshold) on a public register, some monitoring, sanctions and enforcement powers, and that's it. The US has one, Canada too, Australia and Germany to an extent.

The public administration select committee, which called for a statutory register in January 2009, described a compulsory register as "proportionate and effective". The committee's then chair, the parliamentary reformer Tony Wright, echoed Cameron's words: "There is a public interest in knowing who is lobbying whom about what", he said.

And yet, since May's agreement, the government has effectively sat on its hands. Eighteen months on, we are still no nearer to having public scrutiny of the UK's £2bn lobbying industry. We're told that a consultation on the register, which has been due since last autumn, is imminent. As things stand, Werritty's actions look like those of a lobbyist. What's more, it's apparent that he's trading on his friendship with Fox, first running a health consultancy when Fox was shadow health secretary, then a defence consultancy.

Had the prime minister heeded his own words when he described lobbying "as the next big scandal waiting to happen", this latest crisis may have been averted. Werritty, and the hundreds like him, would be signed-up lobbyists. We would know who Werritty's paymasters are, and his dealings would be subject to public and parliamentary scrutiny.

Fox is rightly in the dock. But it's high time those that trade on their friends in high places were made accountable too.

#### **QUESTIONS:**

**C grade question:** Outline the case for greater controls over lobbying in the UK

**A grade question:** What does the above tell us about the difficulty of describing the UK as a pluralist democracy?

**A\* grade question:** Make out a case for the idea that the insider/outsider and sectional/cause taxonomies do not help us to understand the role of lobby firms in the UK