

## The Study of Pressure Groups in the United Kingdom; A Research Note

Roderick. B Dugliss

In spite of the many references made to such ancients as Plato and Aristotle by students of politics, it must be said that political science as a discipline is a very recent addition to the overall field of scholarship. Within the discipline itself, explorations into certain areas of government and politics are only now emerging, and among them is that of the phenomenon of pressure groups.

For the student of comparative government and politics, especially, the patterns of politics which exist outside of the formal structures of law and constitution have become more and more important to the making of meaningful comparisons and contrasts between the political processes of nation-states, and one of the more important of these is the organized group with an "interest" which is, or can be affected by government policy.

Having mentioned, briefly, the importance of pressure groups to the contemporary study of government and politics, it must be said, at once, that the amount of useful research which has been conducted in this area is both limited and uneven. The pressure groups of some countries have received a good deal of attention, while for others there has been only a brief survey, and for many, the question has not been raised at all. In the United States, where the discipline of political science has been developed most broadly, pressure groups have been studied quite extensively.<sup>(1)</sup> For those wi-

---

(注 1.) Pressure group study in the United States is often traced back to one of the classics of group study generally, Arthur F. Bentley's *The Process of Government* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press), which was published in 1908.

shing to compare with other political systems, however, the materials are not so plentiful. It is the purpose of this essentially bibliographic essay to discuss the observations concerning pressure groups which have been made [by students of a political system which is essentially different from that of the United States both to note what conclusions they have reached, and to illuminate the present state of a potentially useful field of study in a country that is among the "standard" nations included in the general undergraduate course on comparative government.

## I

In spite of the great interest in, and study of the government of Great Britain, the study of pressure groups is only a recent concern. In 1958, the editors of the British journal *Political Quarterly* dedicated an entire issue to the topic of British pressure groups, and took their introductory comments as an opportunity to admonish their readers with the observation that,

... the place of Pressure groups in British public life has been almost entirely ignored except for a few scattered articles which have appeared during the past two or three years. Yet this is a subject of the first importance: and if we wish to understand the forces which exert influence on Parliament, the voter, ministers, civil servants, political parties, and the press, it is necessary to consider the enormous number of organized groups which exist wholly or in part for the purpose of pressing their claims or their policies on public authorities, politicians, and the public...<sup>(2)</sup>

The rather comprehensive nature of the articles included in that particular issue of *Political Quarterly*, as well as the wealth of data included in those books and articles which have been written on this subject (and to which this article will have occasion to refer

(注 2.) "Notes and Comments; Pressure Groups in Britain," *The Political Quarterly*, vol. 29, No. 1, 1958, p. 1.

later)<sup>(3)</sup>, indicate a rich variety in the number and types of groups

(注 3.) For the convenience of the reader, a fairly complete listing of the materials available is included here, and will be footnoted only by a short title hereinafter. In addition to the work of *The Political Quarterly*, there has been a section of Henry W. Ehrman's *Interest Groups on Four Continents*, University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, 1958; S. E. Finer's *Anonymous Empire: A Study of the Lobby in Great Britain*, Pall Mall Press Ltd., London, 1958; James D. Stewart's *British Pressure Groups: Their Role in Relation to the House of Commons*, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1958; and Allen Potter's *Organised Groups in British National Politics*, Faber and Faber, London, 1961. Three book-length studies of individual groups have been published to date -- Harry Eckstein's *Pressure Group Politics: The Case of the British Medical Association*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1960; H. H. Wilson's *Pressure Group; The Campaign for Commercial Television*, Secker and Harburg, London, 1961; and Graham Wooton's *The Politics of Influence; British Ex-Servicemen, Cabinet Decisions and Cultural Change*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1963.

Periodical articles including the "few scattered" ones mentioned by the editors of *Political Quarterly* which have related to British pressure groups have included: Samuel H. Beer, "In Defense of Pressure Groups," *The Listener*, June 7, 1956; "Group Representation in Great Britain and the United States," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 319 (Sept. 1958), pp. 130-140; "Pressure Groups and Parties in Great Britain," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (Mar 1956), pp. 102-123; "The Future of British Politics: An American View," *Political Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 1, (1955), pp. 33-43; „The Representation of Interests in British Government," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 51, No. 3 (Sept. 1957), pp. 613-650; S. E. Finer, "The Federation of British Industries," *Political Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Feb. 1956), pp. 61-84; "Transport Interests and the Roads Lobby," *Political Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Jan.-Mar. 1958), pp. 47-58; W. J. M. Mackenzie, "Pressure Groups in British Government," *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 6 (June 1955), pp. 133-148; „Pressure Groups: The Conceptual Framework," *Political studies*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (1955), pp. 247-255; John H. Millet, "British Pressure Group Tactics -- A Case Study," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 72, No. 1 (Mar. 1957), pp. 71-82; "The Role of an Interest Group Leader in the House of Commons," *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 8 (1956), pp. 915-926; editors, "Notes and Comments: Pressure Groups in Britain," *Political Quarterly*, Vol 29, No. 1 (Jan.-Mar.1958), pp. 1-4; Allen Potter, "Attitude Groups" *Political Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Jan.-Mar. 1958), pp. 72-82; "British Pressure Groups," *Parliamentary Affairs*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Autumn 1956) pp. 418-

active in British politics. The existence of groups, in fact, would seem to have been so much a part of British politics that one wonders how it was possible for them to go unquestioned and unrecognized for so long a time.

One possible reason for the lack of attention paid to pressure groups is that they have acquired a prominence in the British Political system relatively recently. Although many groups and interests can trace their origins back for several centuries, the majority of groups in British politics today are products of the last fifty to thirty years.<sup>(4)</sup> In addition, the Second World War, and particularly the nationalization policies of the Labour Government in the five years following the war, brought a much greater inter-action between groups and the Government than had existed previously. Another reason may also be that, compared with the somewhat dubious position of the "lobby" or pressure group in the United States, such groups have had a greater acceptance by the Government and public in Britain so that they did not readily call attention to themselves. The nature of this acceptance will be seen a bit later in this article, as it has been one of the formative influences on the nature of pressure group tactics. Whether or not these reasons suffice to explain the dormant state of pressure group study, the fact fo the

---

426; "The Equal-Pay Campaign Committee: A Case Study of a Pressure Group," *Political Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (Feb. 1957), pp. 49-64; Parities, Pressure Groups, and Public Relations," *Public Relation* (Institute of Public Relations), Vol. 10, No. 4, (July 1958), pp. 22-30; Peter Self and Herbert Strong, "The Farmers and the State," *Political Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Jan.-Mar. 1958), pp. 40-46; Leonard Rivey and Ernst Wholgemuth, "Trade Associations as Interest Groups," *Political Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Jan. Mar. 1958), pp. 59-71; Ian Waller, "Pressure Politics: M. P. and P. R. O.," *Encounter*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Aug. 1962), pp. 2-16; Philip Whitaker, "The Roman Catholics and the Education Act of 1944," *Political Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (June 1956), pp. 186-190; H. H. Wilson, "The Techniques of Pressure -- Anti-Nationalization Propaganda in Britain," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (Summer 1951), pp. 225-242; Graham Wooton, "Ex-Servicemen in Politics," *Political Quarterly* Vol. 29, No. 1 (Jan.-Mar. 1958) pp. 28-39.

(注 4.) Potter, *Organized Groups*, pp. 29-32, 64-65.

matter is that today, such groups are a cause of much concern and study. What have been the results of this study can be seen in the list of references provided above, and, hopefully, by the comments to follow.

## II

Studies of British pressure groups breakdown into two major categories ; the general survey, and the single-group case study. In both instances, the scholar or scholars must give some attention to analytic norms by which useful generalizations can be drawn from the data presented. By its very nature, however, the comprehensive study more readily raises the problem of generalization, and it is to the efforts of such studies that the bulk of this article is directed. Before so doing, however, there are two single case studies which deserve mention.

The most recent work in the field is Mr. Graham Wooton's book on the work of the ex-servicemen's associations<sup>(5)</sup> in which he offers some standards by which political groups can be assessed. He suggests categories: Density, or the number of members in relation to the activities of the group ; Concentration, or the representativeness of the group, both in terms of the population as a whole, and of those with like interests who might be expected to be in a given group ; Leadership, or what is the concept of authority and representation within the group ; Leavening, or the channels of internal communication and confidence ; Wealth, where does it come from, how much, and on what is it spent ? ; Prestige, or the nature of the public image sought, and the image held. Mr. Harry Eckstein, in his work on the British Medical Association<sup>(6)</sup> also tried to bring to bear some of the generalizations of group theory on his particular case study, especially with an eye to finding a means of assessing group

(注 5.) *The Politics of Influence.*

(注 6.) Eckstein *Pressure Groups Politics: The Case of the B. M. A.*

“effectiveness.” Both these works are very suggestive for student of British government, or of pressure groups generally, but their value, beyond the individual case in which they were used, remains to be established.

From the comprehensive studies, more valuable observations can be drawn. Once the field had been opened for study, those men who attempted to produce comprehensive surveys of the pressure group system found they had to devise some descriptive categories into which to fit the many thousands of groups of which they had become aware. Initially, they had to struggle with the question of a term with which to identify the general phenomenon involved. Thus far, four such terms have been used to indicate those persons, banded together by some common tie of group existence, who seek in some way to influence the government to act favorably in policy decisions and their implementation which affect one or all of the agreed-upon goals of the group. These terms have been; “the lobby” -- a particular favorite of S. E. Finer,<sup>(7)</sup> “interest group,” “pressure group,” and, in the latest general work on the subject, by Allan Potter,<sup>(8)</sup> the very broad term “organized group.” The term lobby has been put to good use to label a particular kind of group tactic, and for that reason is less helpful as a general term. As for the remaining three terms, they have been adopted with the same aim in mind -- that is to name a particular kind of group phenomenon with an adjective as fully descriptive, and as free from value judgement as possible. Because of the perjorative connotation that “pressure group” seems to have gained in journalism, and from thence in the public mind, the terms “interest” -- denoting groups with interests to be pursued -- and “organized” -- indicating a group with more than an *ad hoc* existence -- have been selected by the students of British politics.<sup>(9)</sup>

Once a general term has been established, one is faced with the

(注 7.) *Anonymous Empire.*

(注 8.) Potter. *Organized Groups in British National Politics.*

problem of making some understandable scheme of order out of the proliferation of many types of groups in Britain today. J. D. Stewart<sup>(10)</sup> found a topical listing helpful in which he gathered groups under such titles as labour, business, farmers, veterans, teachers, animal welfare, etc. Thinking that there was a more significant spectrum to be seen in group types, Finer and Potter attempted to devise concise terms. Finer worked with shadings of organization that ranged from what he called "aggregate groups" -- or groups with a pattern of interests to be realized -- and "single interest" groups -- those existing for one goal and one goal only. Potter proposed a scheme based on both group composition and goals sought, which refined the single-many scale proposed by Finer.

To do this, Potter used two overlapping categories of "sectional" and "cause" groups. The sectional groups are those purporting to speak for a segment of the population tied together by some common bond which provides them with a number of interests *vis-a-vis* the government. Cause groups are organized around given single goals or issues, drawing into membership any persons, or representatives of sectional groups, who are anxious to promote this goal or issue. Thus, sectional groups have the characteristic of being spokesmen for groups as a whole; cause groups have promotion as their chief characteristic. An example of the sectional group would be the large British Trades Union Congress; an example of the cause group would be the recently publicized Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. The fact that both of these groups have addressed themselves to the matter of Britain's nuclear deterrent, and test-ban nego-

---

(注 9.) The efforts exerted to avoid the term pressure group seem, to this writer, to be a little strained, for though the groups do indeed have interests as a primary concern, and they are more organized than most, their essential characteristic is that they try to exert influence to further their interests through their organizations and, therefore, ultimately to bring pressure, of some kind, to bear. For this reason, and for convenience, the general term pressure group will be used in this article.

(注 10.) *British Pressure Groups.*

tiations illustrates the overlapping nature of the categories. In this sense they are a helpful refinement upon the observations of Finer. though they retain the value of being able to provide fairly clear distinctions among groups. To this point, Potter himself points out:

An organised group that organises social workers, organises a section. But one that organises people to do social work does not. The basis [ for distinction ] lies, second in the fact that while spokesmen groups seek to organise particular sections in order to acquire authority to speak for them, promotional groups seek either to organise particular sections to promote pertinent causes . . . ., to organise within sections in order to promote pertinent causes. . . , or (most often) do not organise particular sections at all.<sup>(11)</sup>

As the quotation indicates, Potter has provided us with two additional concepts which indicate the type of leadership or elite groups which underlie the basic structure of the two overlapping kinds of groups. The terms spokesman, and promotional describe something of the basic motivation behind the group's initial *entrée* into the pressure group field of activity.

One many wish further to debate and to refine the methodological criteria utilized by Potter, but the chief value of his scheme, as it stands, is that for the study of pressure groups it points to a basis for a difference in approach to the decision making processes of the government, or, if you will, a variation in pressure group tactics. It is an awareness of these tactics that is necessary for the explaining of the work of any given group, and for comparing between groups. Too, the nature of pressure group tactics can provide a means for distinguishing among the critical points of decision making in differing political systems. Relying on both Messers Potter and Stewart, this writer has been able to discern three distinct types of pressure group activity, or tactics, by which the work of any given group, or number of groups, can be initially analysed.

(注11.) Potter, *Organised Groups*, p. 261



### III

*The Direct Lobby.* Pressure group activity as it is directed toward the decision making process has often been broken down according to the areas where different types of decisions are made -- for example the legislature and the executive. Such a distinction relies rather heavily on the classic political theory of the separation of powers, whose validity in modern government can be seriously questioned.<sup>(12)</sup> Although the Parliament and the bureaucracy are quite distinct in the British constitutional and political system, their concurrence in the institution of the Cabinet invested with Parliamentary responsibility have made them sufficiently similar in the eyes British group strategists that there is no division made.

(注12.) David B. Truman in devising a theoretical framework for the study of pressure groups in United States politics differentiated types of "access" according to the classic division, and provided one for the judiciary as well. As for British politics, the judiciary is also a part of the legislature, or Parliament, and the Law Lords participate actively in the legislative process. The chief Judge of the realm, in the person of the Lord Chancellor, is also a member of the executive, in that he is in the Cabinet of the Government in power. Therefore, it is difficult to make a differentiation, in Britain, even for this traditionally distinct area of decision making. Indeed the traditional imperviousness of the judiciary to political pressure would seem to remove them from any serious consideration in the first place. To this point, however, Truman has many reservations regarding the myth of impartiality, reservations which are being born out by some of the more recent research into the field of judicial behaviour. Too, Potter notes that "Judges may have been connected with organised groups earlier in their careers. They may as judges be members and honorary officers of groups so long as such activities accord with the notion of judicial independence and impartiality and the ordinary understanding that Her Majesty's Judges do not state their views in public on political matters." Whether these restrictions can erase the effect of earlier associations, or indeed, whether they fully restrain the Law Lord in Parliament is not made clear, but the inference is that Potter too shares some of Truman's reservations. cf. David B Truman, *The Governmental Process*, Alfred. A. Knopf, New York, 1960, pp. 479-600; Potter, *Organised Groups*, p. 186, and the statement of the Attorney General, *House of Commons Debates*, 1959, vol. 605, col. 212.

This fact will be apparent as the three types of tactics are explained. For example, the direct lobby is directed equally to the end of seeking remedial legislation, and to gaining a needed ministerial or departmental directive. The most overt means by which an interest can be presented to the Parliament of England, and then argued or pressured in to fruition is that of direct lobbying. Such lobbying takes a number of different forms including meetings at the constituency level to confront a Member of Parliament with a proposal or grievance, letter writing campaigns to M. P.'s and Ministers, the wide circulation of petitions, mass meetings in such favorite gathering points as the Albert Hall in London, and openair meetings with marches upon, or demonstrations at Westminster Palace. For the latter one often finds the group members rallying in Hyde Park, Trafalgar Square, or Central Hall, Westminster, for a series of addresses from their leaders followed by a public march to the Parliamentary halls where the leaders are sent into the lobbys to call out as many M. P.'s as possible to be confronted with the claims of the group. Sometimes, when the group is meeting in Central Hall, Westminster, M. P.'s and Cabinet Ministers will be "sent for" from across the road to appear and justify their position, or the Government's, on the issue at hand. It is usually not politically expedient for a Member, if on the Palace premises, to avoid such a summons, although a Minister of the Crown can get away with a promise to meet the leadership of any group, privately, at a later date.

An excellent case study of the whole gamut of direct lobbying procedures has been provided by Allan Potter in an article on the equal-pay campaign committee.<sup>(13)</sup> In chronicling the concerted efforts of a number of women's groups to do away with the dual salary scale provided for men and women doing essentially the same jobs,

---

(注13.) Potter, Allen, "The Equal-pay Campaign Committee; a Case-Study of a Pressure Group," *Political Studies*, vol. 5, no. 1, February 1957, pp. 49-64.

he has set forth both the tactic of the direct lobby *per se* as well as its articulate, if ineffective means of bringing an issue or interest to the attention of the Government. Graham Wooton has provided an interesting view of the protest march as used by ex-servicemen. A tactic of the early, and more desprite days of the group, its use has been formally discouraged by the leadership, and, to all intents and purposes, abolished. After rather heated debate, it was determined to be "too extreme" for a group which had come to have an established and respected image.<sup>(14)</sup>

*The Sponsored Member.* The second means by which a pressure group can pursue its goals is to secure, through various means, the allegiance and services of a member of either of the Houses of Parliament.<sup>(15)</sup> Active propagation of special interests within the Parliament by its members has been tolerated to a far greater extent in Britain than it has in the United States.<sup>(16)</sup> It has been realized more readily that once a person has been elected or elevated to a position in the Parliament he will not, indeed can not, divest himself of his former associations and interests. Rather than demand that his loyalties be given solely to an often ill-defined "national interest" the Parliamentary system makes provision that, within limits of propriety, he continue to contribute to the working of Parliament with information and influence based on knowledge gained in his normal associations and interests, or from such interests as he might

(注14) Wooton, *The Politics of Influence*, pp. 182.

(注15) M. P.'s are sought for this role because of thier participation in tthe most vital half of the Parliament where their influence would be more apt to effect changes in legislation. Members of the House of Lords, though in a less effective position, make perstigios members for a group's governing board, and are sought after more for image than effort by industries, benevolent societies, and reform bodies. In their role, they can exercise some of the role expected of the sponsored member, and in certain areas, especially committee work, can not be discounted as totally ineffective for a groups aims.

(注16) cf. Beer, Samuel, "Group Representation in Britain and the United States," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 319, September, 1958, p. 139.

acquire during his tenure of office.

There is not an unlimited freedom for interest in the Commons, however, for both the Member and the House are protected by the strictures of Parliamentary Privilege. The rules of privilege were designed to forestall undue pressure on the individual, and more importantly, to preserve cherished freedom of thought and decision for the Parliament as a whole. One practice which runs afoul of these rules is accepting any fees for "professional services" rendered in connection with the business of Parliament.<sup>(17)</sup> The implication of this regulation would seem to be clear, but it has not as yet stopped many groups, notably the trade unions, from legally underwriting some or all of the election expenses of candidates for Parliament, or from providing Members with a supplement to their income.<sup>(18)</sup> Persons aided in this way are usually members or officers of the groups, if in title only, and it must be made explicit that the financial support provided in no way obligates the candidate or Member to act on the group's behalf. In spite of this disclaimer, it is quite apparent that only those whose natural sympathies are akin to those of the sponsoring group will be chosen for such an honor.<sup>(19)</sup>

Many titled Parliamentarians, particularly Peers, provide for a group both glamour and prestige, and accept membership, or official positions with the group without remuneration, simply because they share in and would hope to further the aims of the group. However

(注17) May, (Sir) Thomas Erskine; editors -- Sir Edward Fellowes, T.G.B. Cooke, and Lord Campion, *Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings and usages of Parliament*, Butterworth and Co. (Publisher) Ltd., London, Sixteenth Edition, 1957, p. 115. (Hereinafter cited as Erskine May.)

(注18) Stewart, *British Pressure Groups*, pp. 156-58. Potter, *Organised Groups*, pp. 277-30, 282-85.

(注19) The National Union of Teachers has in the past, offered to support three members from each of the political parties should they be in sympathy with the aims of teachers as proposed by the N. U. T. Although in the 1950's one Conservative took up their offer for a while, it has only been the Labour Party candidates that have been supported as a result of this general offer. cf. Stewart, *British Pressure Groups*, p. 176.

allied with the group, the relationship must not have any aspect of coercion, for it is a breach of privilege to attempt "to influence Members in their conduct by threats...."<sup>(20)</sup> Any expression of intended action by groups or individuals, contingent upon the response or action of a Member of Parliament (save for the declaration of intention not to vote for a person should he or his party pursue an undesired course of action) constitutes "a threat," and the Parliament is very sensitive to any such inferences in their relations with groups and individuals. There is an additional ruling that a relationship between a group and a Member can not be properly interpreted as "conduct not amounting to a direct attempt to influence a Member in the discharge of his duties but having a tendency to impair his independence in the future performance of duty...."<sup>(21)</sup> This limits the possible liaison between a group and its sponsored member or members. It is reduced to a relationship of information and moral encouragement, but such a role is valued enough by some that it is worth their while to provide financial considerations on the side.

With the phenomenon of the sponsored member recognized, but so hedged about with restrictions of privilege, is such a member any more than a figure head for the group? an impressive name with which to adorn your official stationery? No, it does not. Potter's answer to the question, "what does a sponsored member do?" was:

Parliamentary spokesmen lobby. They write to Ministers, perhaps supplying them with evidence of pressure from constituencies. They lead deputations to the Departments. They sponsor meetings at which the representatives of organised groups put their points of view to other M. P.'s. They are hosts at luncheons in the Palace

---

(注20) A letter written by a constituent to his M. P. in which a questionnaire was enclosed was declared to be a breach of privilege when the sender informed the Member that if he did not answer the questionnaire, he (the sender) would feel free to inform the constituency at large that the Member favored those proposals upon which he had been questioned. Erskine May, p. 123.

(注21) *Ibid.*

of Westminster. They are active in the appropriate subject groups in their parliamentary parties. They press their views at meetings of the Conservative 1922 Committee, and the Parliamentary Labour Party. They concert their activities informally and in parliamentary groups.

Parliamentary spokesmen ask questions to prod the the government and to obtain statements of Government policy and information of use to organized groups. They may try to counter the questions of others....

Parliamentary spokesmen move prayers to annul statutory instruments. They move amendments to Government Bills. They table substantive motions, some of which are debated, though the object may simply be to attract as many signatories as possible.<sup>(22)</sup>

As long as the Member's ties to extra-Parliamentary groups is in the open.<sup>(23)</sup> and he takes care to observe the protocol of Privilege, the relationship will not be questioned. Indeed, either House will often welcome informed, expert opinion and data which a sponsored member is in a position to provide. Parliament would rather have its lobbyists in the open and among its membership where the misuses of influence can be more readily ascertained, and are capable of discipline.

*Consultation.* The tactic most important to the sectional group, as

(注22) Potter, *Organised Groups*, pp. 186-87.

(注23) F. G. Richards cites two quotations from *Hansards*; one from Winston Churchill to the effect that a member with an interest in a bill will declare it, and one from Herbert Morrison to the effect that if what Sir Winston had said were true, in fact, it would be difficult to conduct Parliamentary business in the midst of all the declarations. Richards, *Honourable Members: A Study of the British Backbencher*, Faber and Faber, Ltd., London, 1959, p. 189, Keeping these somewhat contradictory statements in mind, it is safe to say that interests in Parliament are declared, particularly when involving sensitive areas of finance or favor but that this may only be done on occasion to keep the House informed of matters of which it is already aware. Declarations, therefore, are not regularly interjected into debate, the positions of members having been made clear at another time, or being generally well known in the House.

over against the cause group, has been that of consultation, a procedure by which representatives of a group enjoy a free face to free contact with a Government minister or his aides in order to work legislative or administrative actions which are mutually satisfactory to both.

Rather than being a suspect or less than honorable tactic pursued by interested persons, the process of consultation is openly admitted and relied upon by the British government. A desire to know more of the needs and the opinions of segments of the society has fostered this as a normal, if informal, part of the political process, a factor which has worked to the benefit of both the group and the government. Indeed, some groups have found in consultation their most effective voice. Certainly Eckstein's study of the British Medical Association showed that the benefits for the medical profession under the National Health Scheme were hammered out in meetings of B. M. A. leaders and ministry officials, and not on the floor of the House of Commons.<sup>(24)</sup> It is not true, that all groups find this tactic the most effective, however advantageous it may seem. The cause group, particularly, has little access to this process, and indeed, achieves better results through the two tactics mentioned above. Stewart points out, for example, that the R. S. P. C. A., one of the most "successful" or effective of the pressure groups in Britain, has achieved almost all of its gains on behalf of the "dumb animal" in the chambers and lobbys of Westminster Palace.

The initiative in consultation lies wholly with neither of the potential parties. Groups will very often set up meetings with, or at least request a hearing from, various government departments and officials.

This most usually occurs when a well thought out proposition regarding a need has been devised. For the Government's part, the necessary role of consultation to the decision making processes has been articulated many times. Sir David Maxwell-Fyfe, while Home Secretary (just prior to his elevation to the Lord Chancellorship)

(注24) Eckstein, *Pressure Group Politics*.

told the House of Commons that prior consultation on legislation with the group or groups to be affected by it was "normal."<sup>(25)</sup> On the administrative side, consultation was noted by the Minister of Education who said that no regulations from his Ministry were issued without full consultation with the outside bodies concerned.<sup>(26)</sup>

Of what, exactly, does consultation consist? Although there are many references to it, the actual content of the process of consultation has remained obscure. It is not because there has been any conscious attempt at secrecy, but the actual formalities of contact and discussion have grown up *ad hoc* in response to specific requests, or particular groups, and once the ground rules were agreed upon, no need has been felt to keep written records or accounts of the resultant proceedings.<sup>(27)</sup> In spite of the importance of such discussions, the fact that they have "worked" in an informal way has been sufficient both for the government and the groups involved, and any attempt to make the process regular, or to record its work would be to the minds of the participants an unnecessary bother.<sup>(28)</sup>

Needless to say, this works somewhat of a hardship on the student of government. One is forced to rely upon references to consultation made outside of the context of consultation itself. At times, the publications of the Government or debates in the legislative chambers will reveal something of what has occurred. More often, as Stewart, Eckstein, and Wooton all discovered, references can be found in the publications or deliberations of the groups. This is especially true when successful consultation gives them cause to point with pride,

(注25) *House of Commons Debates*, 1953, vol. 496, cols. 1181-82.

(注26) Stewart, *British Pressure Groups* p. 17.

(注27) The Government's concern for the conduct and propriety of these relations led to the setting up of a committee on "intermediaries" which reported in 1950, and which is helpful in illuminating the general fact of consultation without providing much detail as to its internal workings. See *Cmd. 7094*.

(注28) cf. Stewart, *British Pressure Groups*, p. 10.



for the benefit of the membership as a whole, to the ways and means by which a significant victory was won. On the other hand, a disappointing consultation may lead to revelations of proceedings as the leadership seeks to place the blame for returning empty handed upon those representing the government.

There are two explicit, or formal arrangements for government dependence on outside groups. One of these is the area of delegated legislation. Although concern has been expressed in the House of Commons that the Parliament is allowing its responsibilities to slip from its power by such delegation, it has proved necessary, as matters of legislative concern have grown both more numerous and more complex, to allow interested, and therefore informed groups to suggest, or even draft proposed legislation. Very often bills, with Government support, become law, and the pressure group can be said at that point to have made its most penetrating incursion into the decision making process of the legislature. In addition to delegated legislation, the government has made provision for advisory committees, which include representatives from interested or affected groups to work in conjunction with various offices and ministries. Stewart observed that, "the Advisory Committee is the means by which the Pressure Group has been given a place in the formal structure of the Government."<sup>(29)</sup> These committees operate less in the field of legislation than they do in expressing opinions on day to day regulations devised by the government offices, or to assist in the distribution and acquisition of goods and services.<sup>(30)</sup>

A distinction has been made concerning the process of consultation; that is, to differentiate between consultation and negotiation. The difference would seem to be negligible, except, as presented to the House of Commons, the connotation given by the term "negotiation" is that the conversations conducted are thought to bind the Govern-

(注29) Stewart, *British Pressure Groups*, p. 8.

(注30) cff. *Advisory Committees in British Politics*, George Allen and Unwin London, 1960.

ment to any agreements reached with a party or parties therein. Negotiation takes place in such bodies as the as the Whitley Councils, and the Burnham Committee, both of which are primarily concerned with wages and hours policies of certain types of civil servants. The Commons, however, is very wary of extending the privilege of negotiation to many other outside groups. Any placing of a final decision beyond the Parliamentary Halls is seen, as in the case of delegated legislation, as a serious diminution of parliamentary supremacy.<sup>(31)</sup>

Consultation, then, provides a direct channel for the expression of opinions and requests for pressure groups, or the Government to assure and confide in such groups without actually committing itself. The procedure is informal. in a constitutional sense, and is in no way binding. But, as Potter has observed:

The Government is much more cautious about consulting groups, because while receiving a deputation is an act of grace, consultation creates the presumption that the group is to be consulted on the same sort of matters in the future. The recognition of claims varies according to how representative groups are, how responsible, they are, and how relevant to their interests are the matters about which they wish to be consulted.<sup>(32)</sup>

(注31) Mr. Aneurin Bevan summed up this point in the debates on the National Health Service Bill when he stated, "of course, the real criticism is that I have not conducted negotiations. I am astonished that such a charge should lie in the mouth of any Member of the House. If there is one thing that will spell the death of the House of Commons it is for a Minister to negotiate Bills before they are presented to the House. I had no negotiations, because once you negotiate with outside bodies two things happen. They are made aware of the nature of the proposals before the House of Commons itself; and furthermore, the Minister puts himself into an impossible position, because, if he has agreed to things with somebody outside he is bound to resist Amendments from Members in the House....The House of Commons is Supreme, and the House of Commons must assert its supremacy and not allow itself to be dictated to by anybody, no matter how powerful and how strong he may be." *House of Commons Debates*, 1947-48, vol. 422, cols. 60-61

(注32) Potter, *Organised Groups*, p. 204.

#### IV

The nature of British Parliamentary government and politics, and the nature of the extra-parliamentary groups seeking to affect policy, both in the Parliament and in ministries, are the foundation on which pressure group tactics have been based. The groups seem best identified by a process which takes account of the number and variety of members, as well as the goal or goals of the groups. The terms sectional and cause, as explicated by Allan Potter, provide a more multidimensional framework into which the groups can be placed. From that point, the interaction between the groups and the government has followed along channels of access which the groups could best exploit to seek their goals.<sup>(33)</sup>

In seeking to influence policy making in the British government, pressure groups have found that the channels of access, or the means of reaching the points of decision, open to them have led to three basic tactics ; the direct lobby, the sponsored member, and consultation. The use and effectiveness of each seems to correlate somewhat with the type of group, that is cause groups seem both to be more active and more effective through the use of the direct lobby, while the sectional group tends more readily to be invited or allowed into the processes of consultation.

These conclusions are tentatively drawn with the hope that students and teachers of comparative government and politics who

(注33) As a technical term, David B. Truman has defined the concept of access as the reaching or gaining entry to... "one or more key points of decision in the government. Access therefore, becomes the facilitating intermediate objective of political interest groups. The development and deployment of such access is a common denominator of the tactics of all of them, frequently leading to efforts to exclude competing groups from, all equivalent access or to set up new decision points access to which can be monopolized by a particular group. To whatever institution of government we observe interest groups operating, the common feature of all their efforts is the attempt to achieve effective access to points of decision..." Truman, *The Governmental Process*, p. 264.

may chance to read this brief resume will be enticed to look further into the phenomemon of British pressure groups which is still being unveiled, and into the value of the comparative assessment of presssure groups as a means to finding the dynamics of the decision making proces in any number of nation-states, established and emerging.