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**IC:** Thank you everybody. We are now going to hold a plenary discussion with representatives of anti-corruption bodies, public service and, no pressure Anneliese, the Houses of Parliament. So, I’m very pleased to introduce Professor Graham Brooks of the University of West London who rejoices in the wonderful title of “Professor in Criminology and Anti-Corruption”.

**GB:** Thank you Ian. Before we start, I would like to do the thankyous. First and foremost, I’d like to thank James and Sarah. In any of these events it’s mainly the people you don’t see that are sitting at the desk and do the organisation which makes these events work. So, I would like to thank James and Sarah for everything they’ve done. And with James sending me emails reminding to send him the information that he needs to make this work. I would also like to thank Angus [Hawkins] for a wonderful meal last night at Keble - it was wonderful, and we had a great time. Also, I would like to thank Ian and Tom [Crook] for running this event and for everybody who has given a presentation and a paper. Obviously if you don’t do that, and you don’t turn up, this doesn’t happen. So, thankyou everybody for all your contributions. Now I am not going to introduce the panel. I will let them do that themselves. I have told them that I did go online and search their profiles. But, as they are so extensive, I could spend the rest of the session talking about them and you would not hear from them. Do you want to start the procession please Robert?

**RB:** Sure, thank you.

**GB:** Thank you.

**RB:** Well I have been asked to say some introductory things to draw out some themes from the last couple of days which are relevant to public policy today. And the reason I have been asked to do that, I think, is because I work for an organisation called Transparency International which is an anti-corruption charity. We are based in Berlin and have chapters, as we call them, in 100 countries around the world. I run the UK chapter, which has about 50 people, and we are based just on the fringes of the city of London which gives us very fertile territory. We look at all types of corruption in the UK and globally, and we look at it within the definition that Angus used in his very opening remarks--“the abuse of entrusted power for the use of private gain.” We also try to measure it, create typologies of it, and then turn that into public policy recommendations which we then take to people like Anneliese to try and convince them to legislate, or regulate, or change the prevailing mood about what is and isn’t acceptable.

The first thing that struck me about the conversations over the last couple of days is that although we’re notionally speaking about the same subject, “corruption”, there is a vast difference in objectives between the academic community and the community of people I work in - the practitioners. In which we are actively setting out to try and change the world using an evidence base – some of which we generate, some of which others generate. And you are by your nature analysing the world and, as historians, analysing the world as it was rather than as it is. But I found the last couple of days incredibly valuable because putting our work, I think, in some kind of historical context is really important in terms of us understanding what change looks like over the long-term. What might seem to me as an advocate, as a win today in the sweep of history, might be relatively unimportant in terms of changing what we are trying to change. So that’s been extremely useful, and I’ve got three of four things which I think are common to the kinds of stuff which we’ve been discussing the last couple of days, which has been 18th and 19th century corruption, and what I see in our work today.

The first one is the incredibly important role of scandals. If I take my own work – I have worked for Transparency International for the last 10 years and before that I worked in the City – there have been a couple of really emblematic scandals which have helped shape public policy. The first one, very well known, is the BAE systems case over alleged, of course I have to say alleged because these were never proven in court, rather scandalously, bribes around the big defence deal in Saudi Arabia. I’m sure, by the way, that Andrew will be much less indiscreet because he doesn’t mind being sued. The BAE systems case around large alleged bribes to Saudi Arabia. This was a huge contributor to the UK Bribery Act of 2010 which has really been important. And secondly, more recently, the Salisbury poisonings. Our interactions with government, select committees and with parliamentarians like Anneliese have really, I think, changed the debate: from one in which yes, we know that there are rich foreigners, possible Russian oligarchs who have money in London, in houses in Kensington, own football clubs and so on, and we kind of don’t mind all that much about it probably because it is good for our economy; to “my God, these people are really enemies of the UK and we’ve got to do something about it”. Neither of those events could we have planned but both of those scandals were critical in turning the public discourse and changing the parliamentary mind-set on these things.

So, my second point, after the role of public scandals, is the incredibly important need for strong institutions if you are going to be a state that is robust in its defences against corruption. Now we heard a lot in the conversations and presentations about how we achieve strong institutions, and the role in which previous scandals played in achieving those. The one’s that, to me, have stood out as particularly important are the judiciary, the civil service, the electoral procedures and parliamentary ethics. All of those incredibly important today. That’s why I find it so disturbing when you have a newspaper headline, not criticized by the government’s front bench, calling our supreme court the enemies of the people. This is really serious stuff if we are going to be maintaining societal defences against corruption. We’ve got to have faith and trust in these institutions and the civil service, the electoral procedures, parliamentary ethics are equally important with the judiciary, I think.

The third thing which I draw out is of incredible resonance today. This discussion in several sessions yesterday, and initiated a bit by Angus, of the change in which intermingling between public and private interest is separated out and one sees the difference between what is private gain, and what is in the public interest or public good. And, I suppose, where I reflect on that in today’s society is that I sense that those interests have become rather intermingled again, particularly with the contracting out of government services to private identities, and different laws applying to the private and public sectors. An example in my area is something that is incredibly important to us in terms of holding government to account is the freedom of information laws. These don’t apply to the private sector even when they are delivering public services. So, if a local authority has a contract which it has procured itself, I can find information about that. If, on the other hand, it sub-contracted that service to a private sector entity I can no longer find out the same information. So, actually holding government to account is very hard if you don’t have that level of transparency. Another area in which I think we’ve got this re-intermingling of the public interest and the private gain is what we call the ‘revolving door’. So, people moving from bits of government into the private sector, and vice versa. Partly what worries me about that is the lack of transparency. But I think that at least if everyone knows when that is happening, who has been paid what and so on, you are in a better position for society to react against it. But partly in TI’s view there are things that you should fundamentally never do. I’m not sure it is ever sensible that a former defence minister should be allowed to become a director, or on the board of directors, or an advisor to a defence company. That seems to be an enduring conflict of interest that even after 10 years you’ve got something that we can untangle. So that is a bit of an alarm bell for me. In the nineteenth century this was a sign of a corrupt society – this intermingling of public and private interest. And I have a concern that we’re re-intermingling of those things and we might need to untangle them.

What might untangle them? Well my fourth point after the role of scandals, the need for strong institutions and this intermingling of public and private interest, is the ‘big bang moments’ as Bo Rothstein was describing them yesterday. Now it is worthwhile saying that in the anti-corruption discourse at the moment amongst political and social scientists, it is by no means taken for granted that this ‘big bang moment’ theory is right in terms of what makes society move from being relatively corrupt to relatively less corrupt. But, if you do take that view, some of the things that have come out in the last few days about what did that in the nineteenth century, whether it was Sweden, Britain or other parts of the world have some resonance. So, this sense of a huge inequality in society and the popular reaction against that just waiting to manifest itself in some way. Particularly the perceptions of not just the inequality but the self-serving elite that is different from the population and really is looking after its own interests and not the wider interest. And what might by a big bang moment in the UK? Well there have been a couple recently I think already: the financial crisis; MPs expenses; and possibly now Brexit. And one of the points that was made yesterday was that a big bang moment isn’t necessarily one year in history it can be an aggregation of events over a relatively short period of time which just changed the national psyche. So, I guess what’s interesting to me is whether we’re on the verge of a big bang moment and what that means for us. Does that mean we’ll be stepping back and concluding that our society is more corrupt than we thought and there needs to be some quite significant corrective actions taken. Or are we going to potter on with a few fudges and fixes here and there and hope for the best? And I think that’s yet to be determined. So those are my four big conclusions from the conference. Thank you.

**GB**: Thank you. Oonagh would you like to go next?

**OG**: Okay. Hello my name is Oonagh Gay. I retired a couple of years ago from Parliament where I was providing briefings for members and their staff on all sorts of ethical issues: electoral ethics; parliamentary ethics; and governmental ethics. I thought it might be quite useful if I sketched through some of the highlights of my career because I spent 20 years on this subject. When I first started in parliament it was very much an idea of the ‘good chaps’ theory of government as set out by Peter Hennessey. ‘Good chaps’ knew what the rules were, and you did not need to write them down still less regulate them because ‘good chaps’ knew what to do. That came under terrific strain in the 1990s with a series of scandals: cash for questions scandals where a couple of MPs were caught physically accepting money for putting down parliamentary questions. Then you had the Neil Hamilton scandal in the defence industry. Defence ministers have a very difficult time ethically is I can say. And under immense public and press pressure, Parliament had to bring in a code of conduct and appoint a semi-independent parliamentary standards commissioner. But to return to the electoral front, we heard Catherine this morning talking about the preponderance of electoral petitions which went up to the early twentieth century. But by the mid twentieth century there was hardly any. There was a couple in 1955 involving nationalist candidates in Northern Ireland, always a separate country. There was a successful Tony Benn petition to be returned even though he was a peer. It was not until 1997 that we have seen a serious electoral petition, and that was to do with the electoral administration. But then we had the Fiona Jones case in 1999 where she was found, initially, guilty of corrupt electoral practices under the criminal law. I distinctly remember sitting in my office and receiving a number of phone calls from rather worried MPs who wanted to just check that they – you had to investigate within a year, that’s what the law said, and after a year you were off the hook. I think somebody this morning referred to their experiences as an election agent where there was a fairly widespread practice of major political parties not telling on each other. A conspiracy really to avoid election petitions. They unlikely to be successful and were very expensive. If one Party accused another Party then, inevitably, their Party’s dirty washing would be brought out. That began to change with the Political Parties Elections and Referendums Act 2000 (PPERA). This was an initiative by Tony Blair to clean-up politics. I think the amount of expenditure that the Conservative Party had put into winning elections in the 90s meant that bi-partisan truce fell apart. But now we have a very difficult situation with election expenditure. PPERA was enacted at the dawn of the digital age and it does not in any way regulate effectively digital campaigning. But it is very difficult, as Kathryn showed this morning, to get bi-partisan support for changes in electoral regulation. So, for me, that is one of the most challenging pressing issues in elections today.

The next highlight, returning to my career, was the 2009 members expenses crisis. That was an object lesson in how freedom of information and a determined press can extract a lot of information which is unwelcome. But it also taught me a lot about culture. I knew what the law was, but I also discovered that parliamentary culture is something that is very difficult to shift no matter what the rules were on expenses. Such rules were clearly set out in various editions of what was called the “Green Book”. In actual fact, helped by the whips of all the major parties, members were, or large proportions of members, were colluding in escaping the rules. Therefore, unless you attack the culture of an organisation and somehow change it –and it is often through such a big bang moment—you will not get effective change.

I thought that I would just end on the latest scandal to hit Parliament which is, of course, sexual harassment. We had the fantastic Laura Cox report which came out over the summer. Yet again, we see how the rules change. Behaviour that had been acceptable 10-20 years ago and let us not forget that a lot of MPs have been in Parliament for a long time, is suddenly unacceptable. It seems possible to go back at least a decade to find examples of unacceptable behaviour. With the arrest of Alex Salmond yesterday this is an extremely topical matter. However, I don’t seem to have seen a single paper in the last couple of days which has looked at sexual manipulation. Undoubtedly it must have gone on. So, it’s a new fertile territory to regulate. I’ll stop there.

**RC**: Good afternoon. My name is Rosemary Carter and I’m currently, for the next two days, in charge of Compliance at OFQUAL. However, please don’t judge me on that because I have worked in the civil service for 25 years. I am an investigator and a compliance professional. It is my great privilege to have worked on many scandals to do with fraud across government. I am on the cabinet office advisory panel. So, I started at the front line of investigation and my new job is returning to compliance. I am not an academic, but I’d like to thank the quality of speakers that we’ve had over the last couple of days. What I find worrying is that there is nothing new historically that I don’t see today. I will be the only person in this room, slightly scandalous in what I say, who will make a judgement on evidence and fact, yet everyone talks of perception which is what I hear about now that I’m in a senior role. But, interestingly, there is this wrestling that I’ve seen today, which comes out in the reality of the jobs that I do, is this idea that “we’re doing it for the public interest”. This is the rationalisation of some sort of behaviour. It is my job to uphold those rules, and to hold you to them. We go out of those rules, we take risks. Whether or not that’s the right thing to do is not my judgement to make. I have worked with some very high-quality officials who do abide by the Nolan Principles. I have never come across a corrupt MP. I have never come across a corrupt minister. I have come across a slightly deluded Prime Minister. But, in general, I think this perception that the civil service does not want to do the right thing is totally incorrect. I’ve been at the front line of all of that. I‘ve never seen that. I think that ministers in war-room situations make the right decisions. Whether or not that’s the case going forward with Brexit, which possibly is why my time in the civil service ended, is interesting. So, my view is that you have a lot of short-term people coming into government who do not have the journey or invested interest that I’ve had. My view is that if I tell a minister the truth, that is better than a special advisor telling them the truth. I am concerned about the short-term hits, and this view is shared by my colleagues in counter fraud. So, everyone is on a short term hit with Brexit. What is the longevity of that in financial systems, on systems of due diligence inter-working with government departments? In effect I think the chaos means that some of the security will be lost. I expect to be back in civil service in five years’ time to rebuild this insurance framework.

Interestingly, what I would call ‘chummyism’, which is professional networks, is still alive and kicking. Maybe that would influence appointments where those who would be best qualified are being overlooked. The challenge for me as a senior leader is whether you recruit in your likeness, or you recruit the challenge? I think challenge is good. I think that there has been a loss of that recently. So, in my experience the truth is you are going to get organizations lying. You’ve got five per cent of people who are ripping you off. Some of those 5% will be criminals. Some of them might be doing a bad thing and maybe getting away with it. You are always going to have five per cent that are not doing the right thing. At the other end you are going to have someone like me who is going to be complying with the rules. Culturally, and I’ve discussed this with the other delegates, I’m interested in that grey middle. What drives people toward it is that, culturally, it becomes acceptable. My experience in investigating big internal frauds is that has happened, and everyone has seen it. Tolerance leads to corruption and perception gets bigger as more people become aware of these acts. I would thank everybody because the insights here will be of great help in my new job. I think the quality of the last two days has been excellent. I think practitioners will be interested. Thank you.

**AF:** Thank you very much for the invitation. Not only am I not an academic, I’m not even British. In these two schools I feel very grateful. I really must apologize that I have not been able to spend more time here – I would have very much like to. After this I must run back to London for another event this evening, and then I’m out of the country from tomorrow so I apologize for that too.

I run a very small organisation based in London called Corruption Watch UK. I’m the author of a book call *The Shadow World: Inside the Global Arms Trade* which, I suppose, speaks to Robert’s point about enjoying getting sued. Delightfully, I’ve been doing this work for over 17 years and have never been sued. Although that does not stop various people involved in the arms trade industry from trying every two or three months. This is why the book has over 3000 footnotes. There is very little written about this trade. In fact, the previous book on the arms trade to this one was written by Anthony Samson, first published in 1979. I’ll discuss very briefly why that is the case. It is incredibly difficult to get a hold of information about corruption and other forms of maleficence in the arms business. I came to understand this business first hand. I was a South African Member of Parliament. I served under Nelson Mandela in the ANC government in our first government, and then in Thabo Mbeki’s government, our second democratic government. And for my trouble I was forced out of parliament. After 1994 I was responsible for chairing the committee that drafted most of the country’s public sector financial sector management legislation. Then I became the ranking ANC member on the public accounts committee. A report of an arms deal came to our committee in which South Africa spent $10 billion on weapons that we had absolutely no need of, and the deal was done exclusively for the $3-400 million of bribes that were paid. These were to 3 of the 6 ministers who made the decisions: the head of the procurement in the defence force; the head of the South African National Defence Force; various executives of the state; arms companies; various intermediaries; and are then Deputy Prime Minister, Jacob Zuma, who faced 783 counts, 16 charges of fraud, corruption and racketeering in relation to the deal. These charges were dropped 3 weeks before he was elected president by a prosecutor who 3 weeks after the election was made a high court judge. On that particular deal BAE systems—and because I have the financial flows in the book I am going to say this without the use of the word ‘allegedly’—and this is something that the metropolitan police first set me on the trail of. BAE systems paid £115 million on bribes to win one contract in South Africa for which they did not even make the shortlist. The only reason they won the contract was because of the scale of the bribe they were prepared to pay. It resulted in South Africa receiving 24 trainer jets, 12 of which have never left the ground because South Africa does not have the fuel to fly them, money to train the pilots, or any no need for them whatsoever. And for anybody, and I ‘m sure no one in this room thinks this, but for anybody in broader society who might think that corruption is a victimless crime, it is just worth mentioning that the decision to spend $10 billion was taken at the time that our President, Thabo Mbeki, was telling the 6 million South Africans living with HIV or Aids that we had no financial resources to provide anti-retroviral medication through the public health system. As a consequence of which, according to the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, 365,000 South Africans died avoidable deaths, and 35,000 babies a year for 5 years were born HIV positive because we could not afford mother to child transmission treatment. This, of course, wsa at the same time BAE was concluding several other similar deals with a similar scale of corruption in other countries around the world. And, as Robert has mentioned, this came a few years after the investigation into the Al Yamamah deal had been closed down. This was a deal in which it is estimated that £6 billion of commissions were paid. But most of us understand this as bribes. We should also mention that in 2017 the BBC based a programme on an investigation we had conducted about Rolls Royce called “Bribing Our Way Around the World”. Just in case we thought this was in our deep and dark history. I must say that the arms trade is unique. It does not reflect every sector of the economy by any means, and those unique features are primary reasons why it is so bedevilled by corruption and maleficence. But, I think, because of the unique features, which I will mention in a moment, the one thing it does is that it perhaps explicates with more clarity than any other sector of our economy. The intermingling of business and politics, the confusion around what Robert described as “private and public interest”. I think this is something that has become more common in the world since probably the late 1970s and early 1980s. I also think it is at the expense of the effective functioning of the market economy, and the effective and clean functioning of our political and government’s processes.

So, what are these unique features that results in the arms trade, by one account, being responsible for around 40% of all corruption in all world trade? The man often described as the first modern arms dealer, sometimes known as the “Godfather of BAE systems”, Basil Zaharoff, was the first man who would visit ministers and leave brown envelopes stuffed with cash on their desks. What are the characteristics that led him to be able to do that with complete impunity? First, on the big items, so not small or light weapons which have a very different trajectory and life. On the main what we would call heavy weaponry so everything from vehicles upwards to aircraft carriers and jet fighters. There are very few deals done every year. Each of those deals is usually worth 10s of billions of pounds. Very few people make the decisions about what to buy and who to buy it from. As I mentioned in the case of the South African deal, 6 cabinet ministers made all of the decisions. Then I think, crucially, is that everything that takes place on arms deals takes place behind a curtain of national security-imposed secrecy. This is why it is such a difficult industry to investigate. In addition, the players in this trade tend to have incredibly close relationships: senior politicians; members of government; members of the military; executives of the big arms companies, who in this country are almost an arm of government as they are in many countries around the world; intelligence agents; and, crucially, intermediaries – agents, brokers or dealers – have incredibly close, in what I would describe as, symbiotic relationships. Or as Robert described, “the revolving door”, the movement of people between these different spheres. What we often see in the trade is that while politicians in the United States may actually get bribed while still in office, in a system I describe in my book as legalised bribery. In a system like the British system what we find far more often is that politicians get rewarded for decisions that they make while in office, once they leave office. Some of those rewards run into the 10s of millions of pounds. Crucially though, all of the operators in this trade operate with virtual legal impunity. This is something of a parallel legal universe. To give you just one example, when we published the first edition of the book at the end of 2011, we calculated with the research team at the University of British Columbia that there had been 502 violations of UN arms embargos. Each of which involved profound corruption. Two of those resulted in any legal accountability whatsoever. One of them in a conviction for an arms dealer who I interviewed for the book whose fine, according to him, was a pittance of the profits he had made of the deal. He still contested his conviction claiming it was an immoral conviction. I should just say one more point very quickly about intermediaries. Sometimes we think of these intermediaries as, what are sometimes called, the ‘bottom feeders’ of the arms trade. The Victor Bouts of this world. These arms dealers who do fairly grubby little deals into conflicts in Africa, South East Asia and South Asia etc. The vast majority of the intermediaries, particularly in the British industries, are pillars of the establishment. One only has to look at the name of the business school at Oxford University down the road to fully understand that. In the United Kingdom, institutionally, oversight is incredibly poor. We have just given evidence to the Committees on Arms Exports Controls where we describe them as unfit for purpose. As a result of taking a case to a tribunal against the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, and the Information Commissioner, we have in the last few days realised that in a case we investigated a few years ago of a hugely corrupt deal which was done with gunboats from Norway through the United Kingdom where additional bribes were paid to a Nigerian warlord who in the public domain was threatening to restart the civil war in the Niger delta at the time that Britain had granted the export licence for this transaction. Officials in Norway had already been imprisoned for their corruption on the deal. We discovered late last week through this tribunal that the arms export control authorities in this country had all of that information at their disposal and still decided to grant the licence. We do not know what it will take for a licence not to be granted for the export of arms from the United Kingdom. In addition to which, Kike and the Government have again for about the seventh or eighth time in the last 7-8 years refused to consider the adoption of a discrete and explicit corruption criteria in our arms exports controls. We have also recently dealt, finally, with a case involving a company I’m sure you’ve all heard of called Augusta Westland now known as Leonardo Helicopters in which a form defence secretary of this country caused a former veterans affairs minister in South Korea to break Korean Law in order to get this company a contract it should never have won. There are investigations in Korea, two people including the former minster are already in jail. In the United Kingdom, enforcement authorities have taken absolutely no action despite all of the available evidence being put before them. Finally, let me say that my very real fear, if we land up in a post-Brexit Britain, is that we will simply be exporting more weapons to more human rights abusing regimes. All of whom are deeply and systemically corrupt. Thank you.

**AD:** Thank you. I’d thought that I would reflect on my experiences as quite a new Member of Parliament since the last general election, and then before that as a Member of the European Parliament with a quite lot of experience of a country which is often viewed as being relatively corrupt – Montenegro where I was the chair of the European Parliament’s Committee for Montenegro. But I should say a lot of it comes from my previous experience as an academic. So, I feel in my comfort zone here because I used to work on comparative public policy so it is nice to be amongst some people who have really influenced what I thought about that in the past. I thought that I would talk about, particularly, Britain’s role in facilitating corruption in relation to hiding dodgy money. I have done quite a lot of work on that as a Shadow Treasury Minister and before as a member of the European Parliament. Then I wanted to reflect on what we were talking about related to, I suppose, a politician’s involvement today in what would have been viewed as classic corruption. So, a kind of lobbyist bribing politicians who in turn may have been bribing voters. What’s my experience of that, and is there any evidence of that? Then I was just going to reflect a little bit on the fact that when we try and parse public gain from private interest, as was suggested, some of the practical challenges that come up when politicians actually try and do that, and some of the complicating factors from my experience.

So, first of all, I would argue that there is a lot of evidence, and it is quite interesting hearing about the arms trade, uncovered by Transparency International and others that although, on the surface, we appear to have a very clean financial system – it is why so many people want to do work in London because they think there will be legal certainty – we do have a very leaky system. This is particularly so when it comes to company registration, due diligence around different company forms. In addition, there is very little evidence for politicians, who should be in charge of this area, to judge these current systems. The UK has recently been assessed by FATF. It gave the UK an almost completely clean bill of health and noted that we should have more resources devoted to suspicious activity reporting. But any of the recent scandals that I’m sure people in this room will have been aware of, such as the laundromats scandals in particular, we can say that UK companies were used very extensively to hide money by some very well-off people. I won’t go into the mechanics of it, there are people here who know a lot more about than I do. However, I was just thinking about why is there a blind spot around this still? Is it to do with a lack of understanding? I think to an extent, because this is a complicated area for those who are not company lawyers which is a point that I will come back to later. I think it is partly because it is viewed as nobody’s problem because it cuts across different governmental departments. Therefore, it is not picked up properly. But I think also, to do with quite a banal reason in relation to what was mentioned before, we had quite a few scandals recently. As was mentioned, it is very evident that the UK has, unfortunately, been used as a location for money laundering. However, the attention of the media has shifted away. Why has that happened? I was just reflecting on the way here about my experiences and just yesterday I was talking to a journalist about Scottish limited partnerships. In theory there is currently a crackdown upon these, but it hasn’t resulted in any fines or any action being taken at all. This journalist was saying to me, “the problem is I’ve just got to have a way of making this look sexy”. “I could go to Ukraine” she said. I replied, “well yes go to the Ukraine and stand in front of whatever has been stolen, and the profits from that hidden in different company structures in the UK. But I think that genuinely has been part of the problem and I have been working on this for quite a long time. I found it very difficult, a lot of the time, to get sufficient focus on it, politically. This has been a real challenge. I think one emerging concern that I have in the area is about our international links. This is because the ability of those who wish act corruptly, to work with people in other countries is massively increased with the advent of modern technology. I am concerned that we have had insufficient focus on ensuring international cooperation particularly when we might be withdrawing from some of those information sharing mechanisms. In one case last year, the Lycamobile case where French investigators were looking into money-laundering that had occurred within that company, but they were not allowed by the UK authorities to search their UK headquarters. A request was made but it was not granted. Of course, as a politician you can’t receive any information about why this was the case. You can ask for it but you won’t be given an explanation because that’s an operational decision for the UK authorities.

The thing about traditional corruption of the type that so many of you talked about so interestingly during this conference by looking at the abstract. I think the days when there are envelopes being handed around are thankfully gone in the UK. However, I think the problematic area has already been mentioned which is about the “revolving door” but also about second jobs which have proliferated to an extent. Where I think there is a difficult question is about those who become involved in politics who still have links to industry. They might not be still remunerated but they have an understanding of the sector because they have worked in it and they have many informal contacts within that sector. I find that very frequently when working on financial services regulation that, very often, the only other person in the committee who knows anything about what you’re talking about is somebody who has friends through that particular financial instrument or whatever. It is very difficult to push back against that particularly in a context where we don’t have, at least in the UK, a body such as Finance Watch that operates at EU level which can help with some of those processes. So, I suppose, experience can be a double-edged sword in some of these instances.

When it comes to whether politicians are bribing voters, and that kind of electoral fraud, my view of this is that when there has been electoral fraud in the UK, at least over the last 20 or 30 years, action has been taken. There were big court cases against what happened in Slough where people were happy to testify and those responsible were prosecuted. There is not widespread evidence of the everyday activity of politics being corrupt. In fact, I am very concerned about things shifting into the opposite direction with people having to jump through numerous hoops in order to get onto the register, etc. I think that, for me, is more of a system problem. Where I do think we have a major emerging issue, however, is around electoral financing. Of course, all of the work the electoral commission and others, such as the information commissioner, has been doing on the issue of referendum financing has been very important, and we need to look at if we have the right tools to deal with this issue.

And just to finish off, this can be quite a difficult area for politicians to work their way through. First of all, because politics is always about relationships as well as ideas, whether we like it or not. One aspect that has already been touched on is around recruitment. Traditionally, politicians will have recruited people like them. I have always advertised positions and unfortunately lots of my colleagues have not. But I always expect people to have some campaigning experience and the reason why I thought I wanted that is because I want people who will work really hard and won’t get upset if somebody rings them up and harangues them about dog dirt or parking. I don’t want them to think that they are going in to this highfalutin world of high policy making. But that probably does mean that I am recruiting from a small group of people. So, I think that is a challenge. Secondly, one thing I’ve found very interesting as an MP is that lots of my constituents do think that as a politician, I can override the rules for them. So, very often I will have people saying, for example, “we’re very overcrowded”, or “I need to find social housing”. All I can do, and all I should do, is to make sure that they have gone through the process correctly, and that nothing has been forgotten about. Very often people think that I can sort that out for them. It’s a very strongly held view in the UK. And conversely, very interestingly, in a place like Oxford you come up against lots of people who have experience of systems where the opposite has been the case. So, I have currently got three live cases of people who believe that they own property in other countries that has been removed from them by family members, and that local politicians are complicit in what has happened. It is quite interesting that people in Oxford have experience of different kinds of arenas. Are the elites always allowed to break the rules? Just thinking about what was said about a “big bang” leading to change - sometimes I think you can get change without having a “big bang”. When I was a member of the European Parliament the default used to be that politicians would always be booked onto first class flights or transport. That was the default. I realize that is not corruption, but I do think that it is a waste of public money. I got it changed and I didn’t need ‘big bang’ or a big scandal. In fact, “big bangs” can push in negative directions as well. If you look at what has happened in the US you have not seen a buttressing of rules or procedures by the current administration. Instead, you see a strong-man approach which suggests that some people are above the rules.

Now just finally, as another complicating factor, I think we need to bear in mind that where you stand, for a lot of people unfortunately, is where you sit. In a UK context that can be interpreted as always representing your constituents, and always reflecting their view. But, when you have a distributed issue, one could ask how wide is the public interest? Some ministers have struggled with that around policies that would benefit their constituents, and maybe not the country necessarily as a whole. I think this is much more a challenge in a country like the UK because in many other European nations there is not this strong traditional of constituency-based representation, and undertaking case work for individuals, for example. So, I think it can be harder for some UK politicians to deal with those questions maybe than would be the case in other countries.

**GB:** Thank you very much. I would like to thank all the panel members. Now we actually open it up to the floor. Are there any questions?

**Q&A Session**

**Question:** I do think something you said about the 19th century idea that elections themselves are a protection against corruption, particularly in the case of Parliamentary elections. But I think that the problem in Britain is partly in the single-member electoral system. I had the pleasure to stand against the gentleman called David Tredinnick in 2005, and it was clear to me that there were many Conservatives in that election who would have preferred to vote for another Conservative candidate. But if they wanted to support the Conservative Party against Tony Blair, they had to essentially voter for this man. I do wonder if there is a case for looking at whether a multi-member system would work better. I know that there is an obsession with single-member constituencies, but it is only a recent innovation. It only came about, of course, in 1884 with redistribution.

In addition, a slightly similar question on the future of democracy is political campaigning. Certainly, in the last election there were evidence that Labour were very effective at campaigning. I was at a briefing meeting in a Labour conference whilst this was going on – the Wakefield Ball and Facebook advertising. I have to be careful what I say here but certainly some of that presentation was concerned with how we spend very large amounts of money on this type of campaigning but still do it within the lines of the law. We have an electoral law which, essentially, goes back to 1883. That’s the foundation of modern electoral law, and there has been some changes. Do you think it is time for some sort of commission to look at the way democracy works in the digital age? If so, what things would you like to see changed to protect the quality of democracy in the digital age?

**OG:** Shall I kick off? Yeah, I think there is a real problem with updating electoral law. The Representation of the People Act 1983 consolidates all the way back to 1883. It is very old fashioned. The Royal Commission was updating it and I believe they brought forward a draft bill. But that has founded in the Brexit mess of the last couple of years really. It is overdue. That only regulates local campaigning and local limits. PPERA, which was introduced in 2001, looks at national. But the difference between national and local limits has always been unclear. As Anneliese has said, Members themselves don’t want too much regulation because they’re reliant on volunteers, and who wants to be a volunteer treasurer of a constituency party? You are going to slapped with fines for not having understood all the rules. But, as you indicate, with the advent of digital campaigning it is not at all clear what is national and local. We have recently had the trial at Thanet which has exposed quite a lot of overspending in order to keep out the UKIP Party, and not part of the traditional establishment. I think it is time to look again at election spending. Now, of course, the focus is on referendum spending. Limits on referendums have always been problematic because you have “Yes” and “No” campaigns that come into being for an extremely temporary and transiently period, and afterwards it is very difficult to prosecute as we are now finding. But we do have to remember that elections depend on Party volunteers so there must be a sufficiently flexible form of regulation in order to catch serial offenders, but not to enmesh constituency associations in too much regulation. It is very difficult! It took 50 years as we heard this morning with Kathryn Rix’s presentation to sort out election petitions and practices. I don’t think we are going to solve this any time soon.

**GB:** Thank you. Any other comments on that matter or any questions please?

**AF:** Sorry just a quick comment on that, if I may. Having served in a system that was exactly the opposite. In South Africa we have a pure Proportional Representation system where you are elected on a Party list and, extraordinary, constitutionally the Party can remove someone from that list, in other words from Parliament, on a specific date every parliamentary year and just insert the next people into their place. So, you are entirely dependent on your Party leadership which, having tried to investigate corruption in my own Party, didn’t serve me too well. So, I came here as a fervent advocate of the single-member constituency system that you have here, believing that a Member of Parliament can form a relationship with that constituency, and on the basis of the strength of that, they can take an independent position on something that the leadership might not be too comfortable with. But I obviously see that there are certain failings of this system as well. I’ve suddenly found myself, over the years, to have become a great proponent of mixed systems.

**GB:** Thank you.

**Question:** I have a question about Brexit referendums. One of the things that it seems to have thrown up is not that people overspend, we know that anyway, one of the crucial issues is the source of the money. Where did it come from? How clean or dirty is it? The fact that the electoral commission is investigating banks two years down the track. How much money was put up? What percentage might have contributed to the Leavers? I just wonder if anybody has any views.

**AD:** Thank you. I think that you’re right. It is very concerning about the source of the money. To me what I was more shocked by was the total misuse of customer data from his insurance company. The fact that you could simply use a database of people who wanted to buy insurance from you and send them, what is in practice, electoral information and not just do it once. I find it quite astonishing, as a Member of Parliament, we are very careful about people’s details. We must be because of all the information legislations. So, we never do that I would hope. That really shocked me. Really briefly, as it relates to the previous questions. For me concerning electronic campaigning, I think it is important for people to see who paid for it. If they are going to have targeted video, they need to see whose paid for it. To be totally honest with you with some of the localized use of it I think it obvious who paid for that. But when it comes to a national level question, I think we are in different territory. Lastly, there are people currently within the Labour Party who think that the mechanisms should be changed for sitting MPs, and that it should be easier to potentially remove them. There are others who are very strongly opposed to that for other reasons. Therefore, it is not just about whether its multi-member or single-member, but I think it is also about the conditions for that single-member.

**GB:** Thank you. Are there any other comments?

**RB:** Yes. I think there is lots of stuff around the referendum that is deeply concerning. One of the difficulties is that it’s such a toxic political subject. If you try and point out the flaws in the running of the referendum you seem to be taking a side in what the outcome of the referendum was. So, one of our difficulties was around that. But it seems clear to me that there are several things that are very disturbing. One of them is the dark money. We don’t know the origin of some of the money that was used in the biggest national debate that we’ve had for years. That is very concerning. We should all be really worried about that. Another is the fact that we were lied to. Unambiguously, I think, some politicians lied to us. I think its extraordinary that they can continue to be Members of Parliament. So that brings me on to the parliamentary ethics question. We’ve heard reference to the chumocracy, and the way in which the parliamentary system works. The good ‘chapism’ going out in the 90s. However, I think it is still there and that really disturbs me. That people, Ian Paisley Jr is a perfect example, who have broken laws but not enough to be banged up. I think our politicians need to stand up and be counted on these critical issues. I appreciate it is very hard because it has become a very toxic, polarized debate. You seem to be very partisan around the political issue as opposed to the ethical issue. I think it is critical that we re-establish this ethical basis for our parliamentary democracy.

**AF:** One very quick addition. The other aspect of what you refer that is worth looking at if you are not aware of it. This is the very interesting investigation into Mr Bank’s use of mining interests in Swaziland and South Africa to launder his money that he uses for various purposes including, quite possibly, for some of his political objectives. I suppose that over the years I have come to, because of the defence sector, second only to the financial sector, tends to be a huge contributor to political parties globally. I have come to what one might describe as a fundamentalist view. That any penny of money that has contributed to a political party or to a campaign in a referendum should be public knowledge. If people don’t want their contributions to be public, they simply shouldn’t make them.

**Question:** Just to follow up, I suppose, on some of the comments made in the last response. We have talked about the tensions defining the proper relationship between private interest, public good, and public interest. And the need to have that clear. We have also talked about what’s been happening in the last two years, three years, particularly the profoundly toxic issue of Brexit. There are many effects of this with one being, what I characterize, the erosion of civility in our public discourse. One of the effects of that is that it blocks, or at least it seriously inhibits, discussion about private interests, etc. Now if I say that as a voter, as a member of the electorate, I find it deeply depressing and worrying. I would just like to know if any members of the panel can offer me some encouragement or hope. Because where we are is not good. How do we enable a situation in which we can maintain a discussion and a dialogue about fundamentally important things such as private interest when we have such a toxic political situation?

**OG:** Just a not very serious observation. I remember in the 2010 Parliament the government was very concerned about voter turnout. People did not seem to be interested in politics. The Houses of Parliament set up a series of outreach programmes to try to get people interested politics when along comes an issue where people are interested in politics. You need to be careful what you wish for. Because the level of toxicity which has come with the referendum is, I think, unprecedented in modern times. I wish I had an answer for it, and I don’t think codes of ethics are going to wash it. Certain members seem to be beyond shame in terms of lies that they have told and refused to correct. I don’t know. The monarchy, which was a subject this morning? Maybe we should go back to Stuart times. There aren’t any answers I hope the rest of the panel have some.

**RB:** A few observations. The first is that I think you as historians are better placed because one thing, we learn from history is that every time you reach a low point, there is only one way to go and that’s up. Frankly we are at a low point. I think we should acknowledge that. This is a horrendous situation. So somehow it will get up. It seems to me that one of the ways in which this has happened in the past is that from somewhere you get leadership emerging. It seems to me that in all political parties there is a vacuum of leadership. We really need that as a society right now and we are not getting it. Who will emerge, I don’t know? Let us hope that it is not a Trump. I guess that’s our concern, that there are the wrong types of leadership and the right types of leadership. But the final thing I’ll say is that a lot of this is about our sources of information, impartiality, and the bases of which we, as a society, are making judgements. I think it is great that Russia Today, or RT as it is known, being investigated by Ofcom and it may have its licence withdrawn. It is an organ of the Russian state and we all know that. There’s no way, even with the Salisbury stuff, that its coverage was impartial. So it should not be allowed to broadcast. I think it is a real shame that the government has not proceeded with part two of the Leveson inquiry into the press which likewise is meant to be looking into impartiality. So I think there’s stuff we can do let alone from the social media side of things which brings us back to the question which has been prevalent in lots of our discussions, that we all know the digital age has outstripped our regulation and legislation and we don’t know quite what to do about it. So, maybe we should be asking Parliament to give much more immediate scrutiny to that issue and see where it can find a way forward.

**AD:** On the one hand we could say quite a lot of what is happening is positive because we can say in Parliament there is still the same rules being obeyed. There is contestation over the role of the Speaker now to a greater extent than I’ve seen for a long time. At least in theory there is an independent arbiter who is meant to be representing the institution. People are civil to each other inside Parliament. I have had some constituents saying to me that they have been involved in some of the stuff going on outside the House of Commons. They felt that kind of, someone described it to me as a village green, of banter going on between the groups could not have happened anywhere else in their view. That’s all fine however, I think we need to very aware that some of those who are now trying to insert themselves into the mainstream have a very anti-democratic impulse behind what they are arguing for. In those situations, those of us who want to defend institutions should not assume that they can be let in to those institutions like anybody else. Just one example of this would be around, this is even before the referendum, the whole process for the European elections. It always brings out people on the extreme right, unfortunately, more than other elections in the UK. I had tried to warn two organisations and I said, “you do know some of the far-right people are going to come so how will you deal with that if they spout homophobic or racist views”. They replied saying “well we’ve got this guidance from the electoral commission so we will give people the same amount of time each”. In those cases, there was intimidatory behaviour. I could have predicted that was going to happen. I guess what I am trying to say is that when you have some actors who want to directly undermine institutions then it’s not enough to respond saying, “everyone has the right to free speech” and, “everyone has the right to express themselves”. The idea that “we can all just get involved and talk about it” will not work. We need to be tougher on some of this, and people who say that, as I have said it, will get flak saying, “you’re against free speech”. But when some want to make others feel very nervous and frightened and keep them away from the public realm, I think that brings us to another place. I think it is a wider debate for another time.

**RC:** So, I’m optimistic and with the greatest respect to the honourable member I think once decisions are made the civil service is up for it. The trouble is that now everybody is doing theories, ideas, scenarios, etc. It is all a bit pointless really. So, it is what problem are we trying to solve. I think that its no secret that in the civil service the vast majority of people thought it sensible to remain. My experience of going to Westminster twice a week is that, mentally, they are not in that space right now. We are up for the challenge but what are you asking us to solve? There is a lot of work going in which is of the highest quality. Where do we go next? The big point is that once the leadership is there the civil service will swing into action. I truly believe that. I know excellent people who are on these things and solutions will come out. However, now we don’t know what the problem is that we need to solve. In all of the mechanics in this to with trade, licensing, business, which is where my contacts are, pensions, and all of that, but what are we doing? Once decisions are made from Parliament then the solutions will come. So, I am positive. I might be the only person in the country but, given the challenge, every crisis I have ever been involved with, working alongside both ministers and senior civil servants, is that the civil service is fantastic. It is interesting that if we do have emergency triggers, I think it might be better if emergency triggers are pulled because I think people will then make decisions.

**Question:** This is to take us away from Brexit. It is more of a reflection than a question, and it relates to some of the things we have heard in the conference. What I am interested in is the relationship between the two words “acceptable” and “tolerated”. I think this is fascinating and part of this is sparked by Rosemary’s previous remarks. I think we often believe that they are synonymous and, of course, they are not. I think a lot of what we’ve been struggling with in this conference is about ideas about corruption, and the idea that it is about private and public. The question being when did that perception, sorry to use that word, of where that boundary changes. I wonder if that’s the wrong question. The right question being what’s the boundary between acceptable and tolerated? What is tolerated is not always acceptable as Rosemary very rightly said. That boundary is about perception, but it is also about power and agency, and what you can do about it. So those sort of distinctions and ideas have always been there. It is just about, the question is, whether anybody has ever had the agency to do anything about them.

**OG:** Certainly, from my experience of parliamentary culture I think there were significant shifts. In the 80s it really was like Alan Bastard. I often think they should rerun Alan Bastard at the moment. Then there was a big shock. We had David Tredinnick, the cash for questions, and a lot of MPs realized that actually what they were doing might have been just about tolerated through Parliamentary rules, but it certainly was not acceptable to the wider public. We did have a significant change over of personnel in 1997 which helped a lot. We also had a lot more professionalisation of politics. MPs became much more full-time than they had been in the 80s when they were often lawyers or accountants or whatever. But then, just to reinforce the point, with the expenses scandal, again norms that were tolerated within a closed community of Parliament, and not accessible to the outside world until freedom of information, suddenly exposed as unacceptable and the rules were considerably tightened. Now who in Parliament is in a position of leadership? This is a fascinating question, and that is where it is so different from a government department where you have ministers who are clearly in charge, a permanent secretary, and so on. There is no one in charge in Parliament. There is the Speaker who has significant role in administrations as well as procedure. There is also the increasingly powerful select committees, the liaison committee, and there are the Party whips. Therefore, there is no one locus of power and so it is quite difficult to get shifts of behaviour. Parliament is one of the most challenging arenas in the public sector in terms of ethics.

**AD:** Just on that. I think things do change when you have new people coming in, and I think there was change. There is a question related to the distinction that could be made, you can look at what the rules say and whether they are breaking the rules. However, there are so many areas where the rules are not clear or there are no rules. Then the question is OK it may be acceptable to some people but not to others. So, the way I always think about it is whether my neighbour would be okay with what I’m doing. So, she probably wouldn’t mind me doing a working dinner where I get fed at the same time as I was speaking, and it concerns a policy related to my constituency. Would she think that it was acceptable for me to be wined and dined by a lobbyist, and to come out of it without any relevance to my constituency? Absolutely not as she should not. But for some other people who don’t have that frame of reference about who decides what is acceptable, they are not necessarily thinking in that way. It maybe people from that background who think that’s acceptable because its more normal. Thinking about somebody who has financial issues, which will be challenging as it is for many of my constituents in Rose Hill. Thinking about them as you are making these decisions, it is probably going to be a little different. So, I think that maybe part of it as well. A kind of accountability I suppose.

**AF:** What really alarms me is that, and I say this as a former politician, and with absolutely no disrespect intended to present company, but historically it’s not unheard of for politicians to lie. But I think what has changed, alarmingly, is that there now seems to be no consequences to the most senior politicians lying. And even when, thanks to social media and other technological innovations, they are shown to be lying virtually in real time there are absolutely no consequences. And, I suppose…

**RB:** …the fact that they get put in the cabinet.

**AF:** Exactly. I suppose what that means is that the ethics and values of ourselves as a society, or as societies, have changed or are changing. Which leads us into a much broader debate which is how does one engender certain basic ethics and values in a society? I wish I had the answers, but I do not. I find these very alarming questions having gone into Parliament. In one of our first caucus meetings our President, Nelson Mandela, said to us: we walked in and some people didn’t quite understand the idea of a rhetorical question and he said, “so who here thinks they’re important?”. And about 35% of people in the caucus meeting stood up. And he said, and he could be incredibly stern, and he was a very good actor, and he said “well you’re absolutely no use to us but, more importantly, you’re of no use to the people who elected you. Never forget that you have been elected to serve the people of this country who, by the way, pay your salary. And as soon as you forget that you of no use to them”. Unfortunately, as soon as he left public life, so did that ethos as quickly. Of course, leadership has a crucial role to play. But now the leaders are the problem. And I’m not sure how one engenders a certain set of ethics and values.

**RC:** So, I am going to slightly challenge him on that. I think there will only be me who ever knows the rules, and everybody only wants to know the rules when something has gone wrong. I get called in after the event and so it is not a compliance before the event. I think the effect of rules, which is where my interest is now, is do with ethics, behaviours and cultures in organisations. I don’t expect everybody to know the rules, but this is the essence by which my organisation wants to function. I want to see this replicated through my contracts, relationships and engagements. I really believe that you create a compliance culture and people start moving because what is the benefit of breaking the rule, it is anti-cultural. You are going to get 5% who will break the rules.

**AF:** There are two levels where I profoundly disagree with that…

**RC:** OK…

**AF:** I would argue that a set of unwritten rules that have at least – I mean you have people in the audience, and people in society more broadly, talking about the nadir we have reached at the moment. I think we have certain of the basic rules. They may not be the formal rules; they may be less formal…

**RC:** Well how do you break the rules? That is your belief rather than a rule.

**AF:** No, I think that everybody in this room would suggest that it’s an unwritten rule that our countries leaders should not be lying to us. However, we know they are on a daily basis. That’s not a written rule, but I would find it astonishing if a society thought that it was a good thing that political leaders lied to them on a regular basis. But at an organisational and institutional level, we have so many whistle blowers within large multi-national defence companies who come to us and say “here is our agreed compliance policy”, “here is the practical enunciation of those policies”, “our new managing director or CEO or Executive Chairman introduced these and told us that if anybody thought the organisation wasn’t living these they should come and talk to me about it because this is the most important thing about our organisation ethics and values. In the last couple of years, I have had 10 to a dozen people come to me and say, “so I went to see the CEO and I pointed out where these rules and practices were being violated”. And gee, big surprise, that person found themselves being marginalised in the organisation because he called out that, in fact, these rules were being violated. So, I think it is far more of a challenge than you make out.

**GB:** Ian.

**IC:** I started the conference with a quote from the *Routledge Handbook of Political Corruption* and I’d like to know – we can end up with breaking down a debate that supposed to be about ethics, public trust and public misbehaviour, into details about the expression of that. Eric Uslaner, in his chapter in the *Routledge Handbook of Political* Corruption, says that corruption is a symptom, and I’d make an argument that Brexit is a symptom. His thesis is that a society in which corruption is tolerated is one where trust in the political classes and the elites has broken down. Therefore, people believe that everyone is corrupt within whatever societies and, it would be interesting to hear from both Robert experiences, and a comparison with Andrew’s in South Africa. That everyone is corrupt, and therefore it does not matter if I am corrupt in my daily life. According to Uslaner, inequality is at the root of this breakdown in trust. That inequality produces the willingness, the lack of trust in the government system, which means that people are more willing to form their own private contracts to get on for their families, or to try and maximise their personal wealth. That, in a sense, is the social contract between the individual and the leadership which has broken down. Of course, there is an emotional argument that says this reasoning is at the root of Brexit. However, I am not going to get the Brexit bogey out of the box again.

**GB:** Would somebody like to….

**RB:** Thank you. The quote from Uslaner you used at the beginning of the conference, that it is an exception not to be corrupt. I profoundly disagree with that by the way. I think its an utterly pessimistic view of humanity. So, in my experience of this, which is not just the UK but many countries around the world, there are two or three observations. The first is, I think, in any society you get some people who are very inclined to be corrupt. In contrast, you will get some people, hopefully a balancing number, who are totally, morally pure, so far as it is possible to be. You will get a massive number of people in the middle who can be swayed either way by circumstance or the prevailing mood. One of the other terms that I heard used was “corrupt countries”, or a “corrupt country”, in the course of some of the discourse. From Transparency International we absolutely loath that phrase because it implies that an entire country is innately corrupt. We talk about countries in which there is a prevalence, or level, of corruption. Again, in my experience, if you go and talk to people in countries where there is a lot of corruption, like a Zimbabwe, or India, or a Russia, ordinary people absolutely hate it. They loath it. It blights their lives and they are the victims of corruption day in, day out. They may be, on the other hand, the people who pay bribes everyday of their lives because that’s the only way to get the doctor to write a prescription, or whatever it might be. So, I think, I don’t agree with that basic premise that corruption is everywhere at all times, and to be otherwise is just an exception. I think the steady state is open to negotiation. It could go either way and it depends a little bit on which way your society is going.

So, this is where I think I agree with you. That, I suppose, what worries me more having been here the last couple of days is that I am getting the sense that we have this convergence of things that should be alarm bells for our political class. Despite the fact this is probably a society where there is first, more corruption than we had imagined, and secondly, there is a burgeoning resentment about it that could have unforeseeable consequences. I think the inequality, and the lack of trust are part of it. So those, I think, should be big red flags for us as a society.

**AD:** Just very quickly, and I’m sorry I am going to have to run off to get to my surgery. I think inequality is part of it. This is because in societies where there are very limited opportunities for formal employment which is a decent rate of pay for example. You do get pressure being put on people by their families. So, it is quite interesting that some of the people I got to be good friends with from Montenegro where they’ve had a very strong anti-corruption series of measures, but not as much action from senior people at all as we would have liked to have seen. In fact, some of them have said, once in particular, he has been completely clean on absolutely everything. However, his family are saying, “why can’t you get a job for your cousin, that’s what everyone else does, why can’t you do it?” So, I think it is a very complicated thing and its quite difficult for those who stand apart from it. That is made worse by a very unequal society. Also, it is very much made worse by a lack of accountability going back to what we were talking about before. So, very unfortunately, the person who had been the Member of the European Parliament for my Party in the South-East, has served a jail sentence for fiddling his expenses. Now if he had been as accountable to his constituents about what he was doing all the time, if there had been media interest into what he was doing, I think the chances for him behaving like that would have been lesser. So, related to what we said about whether there might always be a tendency for some people towards corruption. When the opportunities for detecting that are lesser, I think that’s also going to be a problem to the kind of cultural practice that we are talking about. Which means that sometimes talking about our “political class” can be a bit problematic because this is quite a differentiated group of people. Hopefully it will get more differentiated in the future, I hope, and become more diverse.

**GB:** Can we all thank members of the panel please. Thank you.