11/02/2010 11:48 John Mitchell: My Telegraph

Where am I? > Telegraph.co.uk > My Telegraph > johnmitchell



Switch to BT Total Broadband today to get a great deal.



Log in

Go

Home

**Posts** 

Comments

People

Tags

**Announcements** 

Help

# Uncommon purpose: Charities, quangos and the Cabinet Office

Wednesday, January 13, 2010, 10:05 PM GMT [General]

After a month's absence, cpexposed.com is back. When Common Purpose, a political 'charity' and leadership development organisation operating internationally from the UK, successfully demanded that a US hosting service take the site down, it was hardly an issue of public concern. After all, it was only a website, only a charity. And yet, if a better-known charity such as the RSPCA had sought to silence an awkward animal rights group on grounds of copyright infringement, might the news coverage and reaction have been different?

Interestingly, not only opposition material has been removed; at least one Police 'statement of common purpose' has vanished, as has a paper on education from Common Purpose's own site. Have these people something to hide?

Anti-CP speaker Brian Gerrish has received a hearing from some fringe broadcasters such as <u>BCFM Radio</u> and <u>Edge Media</u>; <u>BBC5 Live</u> didn't involve Gerrrish directly, but left a number of open questions about CP (which CP weren't entirely happy about). Most interest appears to come from groups disenchanted with 'mainstream' politicians, e.g. the British Constitution Group, which yields noticeably increasing audiences.

Gerrish's presentations do sound like a conspiracy theory, from which Conservative MEP Roger Helmer, who chaired one, is eager to  $\underline{\mbox{distance himself}}.$  But could Gerrish be right, or should we dismiss everything he says outright? As KGB defector Yuri Bezmenov asked in 1985, might we go on dismissing a theory 'until the military boot crashes our fat bottoms'? By then, of course, it's too late.

### So what's the fuss about?

'Common Purpose' - the name itself might be enough, as it conjures up images of triumphant workers marching to a glorious future, while Lenin sweeps monarchs, bankers and capitalists from the face of the earth. But there are probably better

Concern about CP arises mainly from the widespread presence of its 'graduates' throughout government and public services, as well as charities and pressure groups. This, combined with the fact that it provides networking opportunities for its people, suggests unusually widespread influence for a charity.

Its charitable status derives from its provision of education. But its leadership development courses appear to be of a left-wing nature, with emphasis on 'constitutional, civic, economic and social studies with special emphasis on civil and social awareness and responsibility', and its founder, Julia Middleton, was influential in setting up the Fabian-linked Demos think-tank which helped Labour re-invent itself and gain power.

Course information suggests that to be eligible for training, applicants must already have attained some leadership status in their organisations, so instead of the customer choosing the supplier, it seems that this supplier chooses its customers.

Is this a normal for a training organisation? Is charity being dispensed to the genuinely needy? Why should influence be a prerequisite?

### Third Sector or Fifth Column?

If anyone hasn't heard of the Third Sector, don't worry - neither had Eamonn Butler when he started writing The Rotten State of Britain. According to its website, it

Recent Blog Posts Greenism and speeding matter more than the military Uncommon purpose: Charities, quangos and the Cabinet Office cpexposed.com site removed Lisbon: The crucial 100 days LabourList calls for 'federal' UK Blog Categories General (2) Politics (10) Search My Telegraph

Search My Telegraph

Page controls

Print this page



represents 'charities, voluntary organisations and social enterprise' - it is even a fixture in the  $\underline{\text{Cabinet Office}}$ .

It is in this soft, fuzzy politics area that Common Purpose appear to have a real hold. Take NAVCA, which styles itself 'the national voice of local third sector infrastructure in England'. Apparently it's a sort of super-charity, which encompasses all voluntary organisations in the country; it deals with local government, and has a strategic policy to influence local democracy; it even has a national policy. Through Common Purpose, it seems to feel 'empowered', thanks to a Fabian Society report. Not surprising really, with the Cabinet Office at its disposal... so where does the Fabian Society fit in here?

Many government, NGO and charity web-sites mention 'common purpose' (with or without capitals) rather like a code-word or <u>mission statement</u>. Most, possibly all, have links to the political left and advocate 'real change', so we should not be surprised to hear <u>Gordon Brown</u> speaking about CP. On the other hand, when we hear <u>David Cameron</u> making communitarian declarations of 'common purpose' and trumpeting his <u>progressive</u> credentials, we might well ask whether this organisation has infiltrated not just the New Way (sorry, Third Sector), but political parties too.

Even if Common Purpose were politically neutral and completely benign, can it be healthy for democracy and accountability when so many charities, quangos and government departments seem to be linked through networks of the same organisation, run by similarly trained (or indoctrinated), like-thinking people? After all, we often complain about quangos replacing democratic representation; are we looking straight at the mechanism by which they do so and failing to recognise it?

And should it be that CP are not as neutral and benign as we'd like, then what are they? A single organisation with tentacle-like networks throughout government, both elected and unelected, and having control over the pressure groups which call for (or feign public approval of) government policy, sounds rather like a cancerous parallel civil service embedded in the governance of this country. If we don't treat it now, it will almost certainly be terminal by 2015.

#### Examples

The following are examples of bodies which appear to have Common Purpose connections:

**education** - Many - possibly most - Ofsted reports seem to mention 'a strong sense of common purpose', e.g. <u>St Keyna, Keynsham</u>; <u>EMNGPS</u> encourages CP involvement in schools, because 'Schools in the East Midlands recognise, value and implement global perspectives as a core element of the educational entitlement of young people'

**healthcare** - The NHS produced a <u>handbook</u> on Integrated Governance, which is the means to enable good governance; however, the handbook said it was part of the journey towards optimal governance. Er, right. And the Heath Professions Council was so excited about CP that they prepared a <u>Revised Draft Statement of Common Purpose!</u>

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{policing} & \textbf{-} & \textbf{Lothian Police give an outstanding Statement of Common Purpose in their} \\ \hline & \textbf{Policy Framework} \\ \end{tabular}$ 

**EU and 'universalism'** - <u>The European project is in crisis</u> according to E3G, who state that Europeans are no longer able to define themselves, and need 'all at once, one single highly dynamic and multidimensional explosion of change'.

climate change - Friends of the Earth 'move forward... with a common purpose of building an even stronger call for climate justice in 2010'; and the Department for International Development, which states the need 'to develop a framework that integrates research, communication and development values, to allow a common purpose' (in relation to research communication); and of course, ANPED's Action on Climate Change: From a Divided Europe to a Common Purpose.

**everything and more** - Forum for the Future is an EU-funded (Equal Opportunity Initiative Programme) 'sustainable development charity' with a wide range of interests, covering health, justice, environment, tropical timber, and developing world supply chains. They issue guidance on <u>Buving a better world</u>, and say 'Public service is the common purpose of all public sector organisations... publicly funded organisations, councils and NHS Trusts have a duty to spend money... in ways that support their objectives'.

# See also

Brian Gerrish 24-Jan-09 State of the nation

Tags: common purpose, politics

[ 17 comments ]

# Comments



# fretslider

Revolution anyone? You know it makes sense.

January 13, 2010 10:17 PM GMT



#### **Araminta**

John: a well researched and interesting blog. Without having followed your links, which I will do at some point, I do feel you have a valid reason for your suspicions, if only because they appear to favour the Socialists.

January 13, 2010 10:20 PM GMT



#### **Paul**

Which is another way of saying 'one party state'.

Fret, can I suggest we urge all bloggers to 'wear a V mask for a day' in an expression of discontent?

January 13, 2010 10:27 PM GMT



# John Mitchell

Araminta: Too long as usual - and I really was trying to keep it short. It's probably worth looking at a few of the Examples links, or even seeing what comes out of a search for 'ofsted common purpose'. Hope I can persuade one or two people to at least think about what Gerrish is saying.

Yes, they do seem to favour the socialists, just at a time when all the parties seem to have gone all progressive and Demos-like. Strange.

fretslider: An election would do!

January 13, 2010 10:30 PM GMT



# fretslider

Paul

Good idea. I think it might need more than a day, though.

I'd call it an elected dictatorship.

January 13, 2010 10:36 PM GMT



# fretslider

JM

An election will change nothing, merely red for blue. Do wake up.  $\,$ 

January 13, 2010 10:37 PM GMT



# John Mitchell

fretslider: You mean a bluer shade of Demos? Even that would be optimistic. I think the best hope is if the media

catch on to the one-party state message, which is what we appear to have.

January 13, 2010 10:46 PM GMT



## fretslider

JM

Nothing will change without an uprising. If you believe an election will change anything you are going to be bitterly disappointed.

It is the system that is the problem. The parties love it.

January 13, 2010 10:50 PM GMT



### John Mitchell

fretslider: I suppose an uprising would give the EU a chance to test the skills of their armed Gendarmerie.

I agree, the parties love it; at the same time, the electorate seem to accept this and keep voting for them. When the links between them are so blatantly obvious, I can't understand why. Do people not know, or do they just turn a blind eye to it?

January 13, 2010 10:57 PM GMT



#### John Mitchell

fretslider: I suppose an uprising would give the EU a chance to test the skills of their armed Gendarmerie.

I agree, the parties love it; at the same time, the electorate seem to accept this and keep voting for them. When the links between them are so blatantly obvious, I can't understand why. Do people not know, or do they just turn a blind eye to it?

January 13, 2010 11:01 PM GMT



# John Mitchell

fretslider: Could that simply be from lack of information?

It's a pity 1S can't do their testing locally instead of on a live site.

January 13, 2010 11:13 PM GMT



### fretslider

JM

It could be, but that would suggest they can't be bothered to find out. They are used to being spoon fed...

"If you have been affected by any of the issues in tonights episode of..... call the BBC helpline...."

A nation of numpties.

January 13, 2010 11:16 PM GMT



## O Zangado

JM - I'm still awake and working my way through your links. Scary stuff! I have always been concerned at the seemingly unstoppable march of EU expansionism and the increasing promotion of "global solutions" for everything from finance to climate change. The point is what to do about it, and how?

ΟZ

January 13, 2010 11:26 PM GMT



### John Mitchell

fretslider: I'd have thought that after Tebbit's warnings back in May, and Cameron's new progressive aims, people might have started thinking a little harder. Well, there's still time.

OZ: I'm not a revolutionary, so I still favour the option of voting for the minor parties which at least represent their members, whose cash they need. The links are a condensed version of the Brian Gerrish YouTube video (at See also) in the hope that somebody, somewhere might sit for an hour and watch it. There's also a download here.

January 13, 2010 11:50 PM GMT



# Jack'd Ripp'd

Have dugg this >>> digg.com/d31Fe3x

Not enough can be said in regards to the "Corruptibles' Guild" that is Common Purpose.

January 14, 2010 07:09 PM GMT



#### **Paul**

Why don't we simply vote for the Bilderberg group now and get it over with?

Voilent reaction only plays into the hands of the authorities. They play the law & order card and assume moral high ground.

By playing the morality card, they have nowhere to go but for reform or face derision. If they act overtly, they are a police state, they have no option but to ignore opposition or bow to it. In time they must bow to sustained pressure and true democratic principles. which they pay only lip-service to in their one party parliament.

January 14, 2010 07:23 PM GMT



# John Mitchell

Paul: Looks like the unelite comrades of the one-party system (sorry, political consensus) will save us the trouble of voting Bilderberg. Shouldn't cause too much bother now that they've got the police state in place.

Revealed: police databank on thousands of protesters (and with a special interest journalists)
The 20,000 snooper army: Vast number of town hall

bureaucrats get power to enter your home without a warrant Council snoopers watch us on 60,000 CCTV cameras

Fury as police file children's DNA DNA profiles removed at rate of only one a day

Jack'd Ripp'd: Many thanks!

January 14, 2010 08:35 PM GMT

You are here: telegraph.co.uk My Telegraph

About us Contact us Forgotten your password? Advertising Press office Terms and Conditions Privacy and cookie policy