



The Campaign for Scotland's Parliament

Winning Scotland's Parliament

Scotland Forward

Final Campaign Report

March 1998

SCOTLAND FORWARD - FINAL REPORT

Winning Scotland's Parliament

INTRODUCTION

Scotland Forward was formally launched at a press conference on 15 May with the intention that it should be the single cross-party and non-party unifying campaign for a YES YES vote in the two question Referendum on whether Scotland should have a Parliament with tax-varying powers. The Referendum, which was held on 11 September, less than four months after the creation of Scotland Forward, resulted in overwhelming Yes votes in the two questions.

The concept of a broad campaigning organisation to mobilise support for a YES YES campaign emerged in the latter part of 1996. Labour Party leader Tony Blair had announced in the summer of that year that, if elected, a new Labour government would hold a Referendum on the question of a Parliament for Scotland. Following great discussions and argument, it emerged that the Referendum would ask two questions

- did the people of Scotland want a devolved Parliament
- would they be prepared to give that Parliament limited tax-raising powers.

In Scotland, this announcement disturbed a consensus on the Parliament - John Smith's 'settled will of the Scottish people' - which had seen the move towards a devolved Parliament as an inevitable consequence of the election of a new government. Now it was clear that a major effort would have to be made following the General Election to win the subsequent Referendum votes. In particular, the separation out of the question on tax-raising powers was met with dismay in Scotland. However, after the shock began to die away, realisation began to dawn that new organisations as well as new thinking would be required if the Referendum questions were to be won.

The Scottish Constitutional Convention had been the central organisation in drawing up the detailed consensual planning for the Parliament, and was again central to the process of thinking through what was required over the next period. There was an early recognition that a broad-based approach would be required to win the Referendum questions, but that the Scottish Constitutional Convention would not be well placed to mobilise for this result.

The Convention represented the broad range of opinion and groups in civil society who had long campaigned for a Parliament in Scotland. Its strength was also that it had the support of two political parties, Labour and the Liberal Democrats, who had put aside party differences in working to draw up a consensus position.

However, the consensus agreed by the Convention did not have the support of the SNP, and with a General Election looming, party political rivalry would be the order of the day and the ability of the Convention to build a new broad based organisation was at best unlikely.

There was another reason which drove the notion of a new organisation being founded. Nigel Smith, one of those active in the 'Business says Yes' campaign of 1979, had argued in the Convention for a single campaign, avoiding the damaging splits and wasted energy of the previous Referendum. With the support of trade unions UNISON and the EIS and fellow businessman Harry Lymburn, he had approached the Convention with the results of research they had sponsored on the likely voting patterns associated with the Referendum. System Three had carried out a detailed research project, the results of which focused the mind of those campaigning for a Parliament.

Research from around the world on referenda, including New Zealand, Ireland, Denmark and Austria, held important lessons. There had to be a single unifying campaign. Above all disunity on the side advocating change had to be avoided, as mixed messages confused voters and led to apathy or voters sticking with the status quo. In short, the research reinforced what many had seen as the errors of the 1979 campaign.

The research showed that support for the establishment of a Parliament was not uniform across party political fault lines. While there was obviously more support among SNP and Labour voters for a strong Scottish Parliament, there were also substantial opposition across the supporting parties - and a sizeable support among the Tories supporters in Scotland! What was clear was that if the votes in the Referendum were to be won, and won in a manner convincing enough to safeguard the passage of a Bill through a potentially hostile Parliament, then support for the concept would have to be harnessed from across all the political parties. Indeed the principal message was that a divided campaign could only lose votes in the Referendum. Faced with the prospect of snatching defeat from the jaws of victory, the formation of a broad based campaign was not an exercise in political correctness, but a political necessity if the Parliament was ever to see the light of day.

Credit should be given to the maturity of the political parties in Scotland during this period. The ability of the Labour and Liberal Democrat parties to put aside differences to promote the Convention position has been mentioned earlier. Similarly, while it was plain that there could be no public or private involvement of the SNP at that time in the formation of a broad based, all party devolution campaign, the SNP were kept informed with the aim of encouraging them to keep their options open until after the General Election had been decided.

The Scottish Constitutional Convention endorsed the establishment of a broad-based campaign, and in the latter part of the year work began to identify individuals who could lead the campaign while commanding enough confidence among the political parties to make it effective. An organisation was established - in fact a 'not for profit company limited by guarantee' called 'Partnership for a Parliament' - and work began on winning enough financial support to make the organisation viable.

The breakthrough for what was to become Scotland Forward was winning the support of the two trades unions which had sponsored the original research, UNISON and the EIS. Both unions guaranteed the fledgling organisation £40,000. This was no fortune when compared with the kind of money a NO campaign could access, but it was enough to guarantee the establishment of an office and the recruitment of professional staff to service the campaign.

In the run-up to the May 1 General Election, Partnership for a Parliament slowly metamorphosed into Scotland Forward, establishing premises, building financial and political support, recruiting a Campaign Executive and local groups, and conducting further focused research on voting patterns and intentions. With the May 1 landslide for Labour, organisation of the Scotland Forward campaign for the Referendum began in earnest.

THE SCOTLAND FORWARD ORGANISATION

Scotland Forward was established as the campaigning arm of a not-for-profit company called Partnership for a Parliament. The 12 members of the Executive Board of the company became the Campaign Executive of Scotland Forward and were augmented by additional appointees throughout the campaign. By the end of the campaign the Campaign Executive had 20 members (see Annexe A). The Campaign Executive was chaired by Nigel Smith, and there were no other office bearers other than a Company secretary to the Executive Board. The Campaign Executive met monthly to begin with and then weekly for the final four weeks of the campaign. During the final week of the campaign a small subcommittee of the Campaign Executive met on a daily basis.

Scotland Forward operated from a two room office in the centre of Edinburgh. An additional room in the nearby Edinburgh Trades Council office was used as the campaign material distribution centre for the last four weeks of the campaign and a room in the Glasgow Trades Council building was used as the Scotland Forward Glasgow office.

The core Scotland Forward staff consisted of the National Organiser, Campaigns Organiser, Office Manager (part-time) and Office Administrator. Two full-time press officers began work towards the end of July. The press team was augmented by a part-time secondment from the STUC and another press officer taken on for the final four weeks of the campaign. There were also two part-time staff taken on to assist with the campaigns Organisation. In addition four regular unpaid volunteers and an unquantified number of irregular volunteers helped out with various duties in the office, in particular with press cuttings and the distribution of campaign material. A London contact group also operated from midway through the campaign, with a volunteer organiser.

The amount of work required to resource and service the local groups may have been underestimated. More staff should have been appointed at an earlier stage of the campaign to build up the local group network and pursue campaign activities and projects. These were some of lessons to be drawn from this level of organisation. Similarly, the amount of preparatory work required before the launch of Scotland Forward was underestimated as was the need for office equipment and systems. This may have been overcome had a small executive been appointed earlier, but as with many similar campaigns, fast moving political events often make reflection a luxury you can't afford. In the case of Scotland Forward, the decisive factor was the General Election campaign itself, which naturally took the main focus for activists' time and energies. Scotland Forward had to bide its time.

Scotland Forward's aims and objectives

Scotland Forward's aims and objectives were determined at a strategy meeting held over the weekend of 31 May / 1 June. The Campaign Executive agreed that Scotland Forward would have a single aim *"to maximise the YES YES vote"* It also agreed that Scotland Forward's essential objective would be *"to create a climate of understanding and opinion that assists the political parties to mobilise the vote. "*

It is worth detailing in full the strategy adopted by the Campaign Executive to try to meet the aim and objective as this clearly states what type of organisation Scotland Forward aimed to be, and how it planned to operate.

"In the short period of time before the Referendum Scotland Forward cannot expect to become a full-blown mass membership campaign. It is expected that the political parties will have to carry out the work to get the vote out. Scotland Forward is, and will act as:

- *an umbrella organisation* - bringing together and encouraging co-operation between the parties supporting a YES YES vote;
- *a facilitator* - encouraging and supporting organisations and individuals who want to support the YES YES campaign
- *a catalyst* - initiating activities and campaigns which involve organisations and individuals in an inclusive way."

The strategy recognised that separate national and local organisational priorities would be required for Scotland Forward.

At the national level the strategy's priorities were to:

- make it easier for the political parties to collaborate and co-operate to maximise voter turnout on Referendum day;
- encourage local party co-operation and minimise conflict;
- play a key role in encouraging/ facilitating activity by civic groups including Gaelic and minority ethnic communities.

The priorities for Scotland Forward at the local level were to:

- use regional meetings to stimulate and identify local campaigns and activists, and identify gaps which need to be plugged;
- identify regional co-ordinators to act as the Scotland Forward contacts/ facilitators;
- encourage spontaneous activity and involuntary publicity;
- support local groups by providing Scotland Forward material including a campaign pack and ideas;
- produce material which pushes and delivers the key Scotland Forward messages;
- plan, produce, encourage and support some high profile stunts and events from the centre.

Any objective analysis of the campaign would suggest that Scotland Forward was successful in achieving these priorities.

Scotland Forward - the all-party campaign

The most significant achievement of Scotland Forward was in providing a forum which allowed the Labour Party, Liberal Democrats and SNP to work together in a single unified campaign. One of the basic aims of Scotland Forward was to provide such a unifying vehicle for the political parties to fight a campaign which showed unity of message and purpose.

The inability of the SNP to come on board the Scotland Forward/ YES YES campaign until after the publication of the White Paper at the end of July delayed the development of this unified campaign. However, once the SNP took the decision to support a YES YES vote and to work with Scotland Forward, the cross party alliance worked extremely well.

The benefit of having Scotland Forward, and of getting the party agreement to work through the all-party campaign, was that it provided a vehicle for, and encouragement to, party branches and members to work co-operatively. Also it was a very public expression of the new type of inclusive politics that it is hoped will be brought about by the Scottish Parliament.

Undoubtedly the cross party alliance was a major positive factor throughout the last six weeks of the campaign. The strategy adopted by Scotland Forward, and agreed to by the three parties, was that the parties would run their own campaigns, concentrating mainly on their heartland support, but would do so under the Scotland Forward umbrella.

At the national level the cross party alliance had several major practical successes:

- the first and final cross party press conferences;
- the co-operation between the party leaders in television programmes;
- behind the scenes co-operation on research and information;
- several all party press calls and events, such as the Sean Connery and party leaders rally;
- the all party eve of poll leaflet published via Scotland Forward.

Scotland Forward was particularly successful in providing the impetus for the use of jointly agreed messages. Several of the slogans which were favoured by the focus groups commissioned by Scotland Forward became part of the language used by the three political parties in speeches and campaign literature.

The four meetings between the three party chief executives, organised through Scotland Forward in the last four weeks of the campaign, were crucial in ensuring maximum co-operation and minimising conflict. These meetings were especially useful in agreeing the joint eve of poll leaflet, planning the joint national press conferences and events and in putting in place the broad agreement about local campaign working - each party to concentrate work in the council wards they hold and where possible to share out leafleting and canvassing at the ward level.

The existence of Scotland Forward was essential in allowing the parties to co-operate at the local level. Even before the SNP officially joined Scotland Forward some SNP activists had joined and become active in local groups. The alliance allowed many constituencies to co-operate in the distribution of leaflets and in getting the vote out on Referendum day.

Scotland Forward activity at local level also provided a vehicle for individual members of the only mainstream party not part of the alliance - the Tories. A number of individual Tories supported Scotland Forward and worked on the ground to promote our policies and handle our literature.

The co-operation between parties at the local level worked very well in several areas, in particular, Edinburgh, Galloway and Dundee. Where parties were not able to work together the alliance meant that at least there was very little open hostility between party activists.

Scotland Forward - the non-party campaign

As well as being an all-party campaign Scotland Forward succeeded in being a non-party campaign. Scotland Forward allowed many individuals and organisations that would not have been able to join, or want to be involved in, a specifically party political campaign, to participate and make a contribution to the Yes campaign.

Scotland Forward was very successful in encouraging and supporting individuals who wanted to get involved in the YES YES campaign. About 600 people had attended the public launch of Scotland Forward in the Edinburgh Assembly Rooms on 17 May, and over 600 people attended the six regional launch meetings held during June. By the end of the campaign around 1,500 people were registered on Scotland Forward's database. Many other people joined, or got involved with local Scotland Forward groups without registering as supporters with the national office.

By the end of the campaign there were just over 50 formally organised local Scotland Forward groups, however material was being distributed to around 170 places across the country. Whilst some of these groups only consisted of a handful of activists some groups had a good number of active members and end of campaign reports from the more active groups indicated an enormously varied amount of campaigning work that was undertaken by local Scotland Forward groups. One of the most impressive features of Scotland Forward's network of local groups was that it covered almost every part of Scotland. This ensured that there was at least some Scotland Forward campaigning activity in areas that might not be priority areas for the political parties.

The non-party nature of Scotland Forward's umbrella also allowed a wide range of organisations to come out publicly in support of the YES YES campaign. The STUC, COSLA, SCVO and the Church and Nation Committee of the Church of Scotland are among the prominent national organisations that publicly supported the Scotland Forward campaign. This was not an accidental development. There was an unwritten intention to try to create an all encompassing coalition of civic and social organisations working under the Scotland Forward umbrella.

The Scotland Forward National Forum was set up to provide a mechanism for liaison between the many organisations wanting to be associated with the campaign. About 50 groups were on the National Forum mailing list - mainly organisations that have been involved in the fight for a Scottish Assembly and Parliament for many years.

The National Forum met on four occasions and played a useful role, although the timescale of the campaign limited its potential impact. There were many other civic and social organisations that would have joined Scotland Forward and broadened and strengthened the coalition for a YES YES vote. However, mainly due to other priorities, limited staff time, the short timescale and the fact that the campaign took

place mainly during the summer , it was not possible to capitalise fully on the considerable goodwill which existed for the organisation.

One positive aspect of the broader campaign was the successful creation of Women FOR, the grouping organised through the auspices of Scottish Women's Co-ordination Group. Women FOR organised a successful one day conference and published a very good leaflet highlighting the positive benefits a Scottish Parliament would have for women. This leaflet was well received and was in demand throughout the campaign.

However, a major lesson that should be learned from the campaign is that it was too ambitious to run an intensive campaign whilst at the same time trying to build up the broad coalition of civic and social organisations and groups that we would ideally have liked to have brought under the Scotland Forward umbrella. In particular, a wider range of mailing lists could have been profitably used in the early stages of the campaign to broaden its base from the outset. However, it should also be recognised that more staff resources would have been required to meet with, inform, enthuse and organise all the various groups that we were aiming to involve in the inclusive campaign.

The attempt to get a broad based Youth FOR campaign off the ground was not as successful as had been hoped. The initial enthusiasm and activity - presence at T in the Park, and a one day conference - faltered as activists became more heavily involved in other aspects of the campaign. The situation was not all gloom, however. A core of young people assisted with many of the events targeted by Scotland Forward throughout the campaign. NUS Scotland carried out campaigning work with students - colleges returned from holidays just prior to the Referendum - and the STUC Youth Committee did other work with young trade unionists. Unfortunately plans to produce a youth leaflet and poster were never finalised.

Scotland Forward is self-critical that contact with the ethnic minority communities was too late and too little. Attempts were made to translate campaign leaflets into five minority languages but this material was not made widely available. Not enough time was set aside to make direct contact with ethnic minority groups and to do real campaigning work within ethnic minority communities, and the Campaign Executive greatly appreciated the efforts of activists within the ethnic minority communities who used their own networks and contacts to seek to correct this failing. Similarly, although some contact was made with Gaelic speakers, no formal Gaels FOR campaign was established, and little targeted campaigning took place beyond printing a Gaelic car sticker and including a Gaelic page on the website.

THE CAMPAIGN

The Campaign strategy

The Campaign Executive's 31 May/ 1 June strategy meeting decided that the Scotland Forward campaign should be:

- popular - appealing to all sections of society;
- inclusive - drawing in people from outwith politics; and,
- exciting - creating a sense of being part of something really vital.

Scotland Forward and the three political parties agreed that there should be a short, sharp three week political campaign in contrast to the six week general election campaign. It was also recognised that hard political campaigning work could be a waste of time and resources - even be counter-productive - during the holiday period.

However, Scotland Forward's view was that it would be a mistake to do nothing in June, July and early August since that might allow the No campaign to gain the initiative. Scotland Forward recognised that we would need to initiate campaigning work and get some public activity going as soon as possible in order to try to build a profile for the campaign and to keep supporters motivated. But it was also acknowledged that the campaign needed to be carefully planned and paced - building up from a solid base and from a small number of well planned successful events.

One complicating factor was the difficulty of planning a campaign without knowing the date of the Referendum. Another lesson is that journalists and people outside the Campaign Executive needed to be better briefed and acquainted with the strategy and the political realities of mounting a referendum campaign in only four months. There were unrealistic expectations about how much visible presence Scotland Forward could have. Many millions of pounds are spent every year in advertising campaigns for products which fail to achieve significant market share. Scotland Forward could not afford to buy a visible presence. Instead we had to rely on our major, key resource - our support on the ground.

Following the successful national launch, the emphasis switched to six regional launch meetings in Dundee, Edinburgh, Dumfries, Aberdeen, Inverness and Glasgow. The local groups which emerged from these events were very important in sustaining the campaign throughout the summer and ensuring that public campaigning continued to take place prior to the launch of the party political campaigns in August. Scotland Forward groups began holding street stalls and carrying out publicity seeking local activity from an early stage. This ensured that individuals and groups from all parties and none who 'wanted to do something' had a vehicle through which their energies could be harnessed.

The campaigning work undertaken by Scotland Forward's 50 local groups was never quantified, but it was undoubtedly very significant in certain parts of the country, particularly the major cities, East Ayrshire, Dumfries & Galloway and Fife. In some parts of Glasgow, the only public campaigning work throughout the course of the Referendum campaign was carried out by Scotland Forward groups. Scotland Forward had a presence at several major events such as the Open Golf Championship, the Tall

Ships Race and the Scotland-Belarus match. There was a float and high profile at the Edinburgh Festival cavalcade - a presence mirrored at a large number of local galas and festival events during the summer.

An adtrailer tour was undertaken with the poster which had been launched at the official start of the YES YES campaign on 29th July. It is important to note that the tour was aimed at smaller towns and villages - areas that traditional political campaigns often ignored. The ad trailer visited among other places Alloa, West Calder, Linlithgow, Cupar, Dunfermline, Dundee, Meigle, Alyth, Coupar Angus, Perth and Stirling and was met by local Scotland Forward groups and the local press.

This activity also illustrated the benefits of an alliance which brought together local enthusiasm and professional campaigning methods. In the South-West, the Transport & General Workers' Union used its advertising caravan to tour the local agricultural shows in Stranraer, Castle Douglas and Wigtown as well as being used as a town centre base in Dumfries. Such activity helped turn what was previously a strongly No area into returning a Yes on the first question.

Some local groups were very successful in generating local media interest in their activities, sometimes even attracting national media coverage; for example, the East Ayrshire group's launch of the Referendum ice cream.

The Parties

With less than four months from its launch to the Referendum date, and with limited resources, Scotland Forward would never have been able to achieve the type of campaign that the public and media have come to expect at General Elections. The strategy followed by Scotland Forward and its political allies was that the political parties would mount a General Election type political campaign in the three weeks prior to the Referendum.

However, an unprecedented six week General Election campaign had taken its toll of both party machines and party activists. Finances were tight, and the character of the campaign did not lend itself to detailed door-to-door or telephone canvassing.

It is a tribute to the will power of party activists of all political colours that they were able to lift the campaign in the last few weeks to generate the crucial turnout, and equally crucial YES YES vote. While the work of Scotland Forward, the Scottish Office and the press had set the scene, it was the traditional efforts of 'on the ground' party activists which stuck up the posters, staffed the polling stations, leafleted doors, and helped get out the vote on the day.

The death of the Princess of Wales had a major impact on the format of the campaign. The impact of that event on the British media and the loss of the crucial second week of campaigning had a substantial effect on the overall level of campaigning work that was achieved. It took out the crucial middle week when Cabinet Ministers were scheduled to get involved in the campaign, and when most of the door to door leafleting would have taken place.

The loss of the week's campaigning also meant that many local and some very high profile national events had to be cancelled or at best postponed. For example, a major celebrity event that was planned for Edinburgh's Ross Theatre on the final Sunday to provide a final last push to the campaign, had to be cancelled. Again, a lot of effort had gone into organising a weekend of Scotland Forward Ceilidhs in the final weekend but most of these had to be cancelled. One of the largest events of the campaign, Glasgow Sings FOR Scotland, was cancelled then re-arranged as an eve of poll celebrity concert for an audience of more than 1000.

The moratorium also led to the postponement of the publication of the 16 page supplement carried by the Daily Record. Publication of the supplement on the Thursday before the Referendum would have had much more impact than its eventual publication on the eve of Poll. However, the Daily Record is to be commended for sticking with the campaign when press and commercial considerations might well have justified lesser coverage, and the Campaign Executive acknowledge that newspaper's support and contribution to the success of the campaign.

Many local groups and activists felt a great deal of frustration at having to cancel all public campaigning activity. The previous Saturday, the 'Scotsman' newspaper had carried three separate reports of local activities by Scotland Forward groups; now the action had to be mothballed, or in many cases lost altogether. The loss of a final week's campaigning, especially the last weekend, substantially reduced the amount of material that could physically be distributed by party branches and Scotland Forward groups and contributed to the amount of material left unused at the end of the campaign.

The No campaign probably benefited initially from the moratorium since it would not have been able to compete with the political campaigning the allies in the Yes campaign had planned during that week. However, it lost out in the last four days since it was completely swamped by the re-launch of the Yes campaign involving Sean Connery, Gordon Brown and the three party leaders, Donald Dewar, Alex Salmond and Jim Wallace, and the campaigning work at the start of the final week begun by the Prime Minister, Tony Blair.

In this respect as in many others, the attempt by Think Twice to run a campaign without any grassroots support or workers, thus relying solely on newspaper adverts and a few advertising hoardings was a failure.

The final 100 hours campaign carried out by the three parties and Scotland Forward had a significant impact with the electorate. It may not have converted many voters but it certainly helped to confirm voting intentions and secure a good turnout. The squeezing of 10 days campaign activity into the final four days provided a strong climax to the campaign. It helped to focus the minds of politicians, activists, the media, and the public on the Referendum and created the sense of energetic political activity that the media was demanding. It meant that the campaign had to focus on two or three key positive messages, and this may have helped to cement these in the public mind. In particular, Scotland Forward's key message to the electorate of 'trust yourselves' was reinforced by the public unity of the three party leaders.

Campaign materials

The quality of Scotland Forward printed material was consistently very high and received praise from activists and the public, especially the final street stall leaflet and the all colour eve of poll leaflet. For much of the campaign the only material available for party branches as well as Scotland Forward groups to hand out at street stalls was Scotland Forward leaflets and campaign material. This contributed to some of the problems the campaign office had in supplying materials. The demand for Scotland Forward material was higher than we anticipated or could cope with and we ran out of leaflets, badges etc. at the start of several weekends.

Ironically, subsequent orders for bulk materials, especially posters, badges and pledge cards, were badly hit by the embargo on activity in the penultimate week of the campaign, with much material not able to be used.

Scotland Forward produced an enormous quantity and range of campaign material including:

- 750,000 A5 leaflets for use at street stalls
- 2.5 million eve of poll A5 leaflets
- 350,000 posters
- 400,000 lapel stickers
- 200,000 car stickers
- 100,000 metal YES YES button badges
- 10,000 carrier bags
- 50,000 balloons
- 30,000 flags
- 10,000 hats
- 200,000 beer mats
- 100,000 pledge cards

One of the most significant successes of Scotland Forward was the production of 2.5 million copies of the eve of poll leaflet which was distributed by the three political parties. Getting approval for the wording and design of the leaflet from the Labour Party, SNP and Liberal Democrats was a major achievement for Scotland Forward and the three party chief executives.

FOR or YES YES?

Scotland Forward was conceived as a campaign slogan as well as a campaign organisation title. The concept was to try to tag as many aspects of the campaign as possible with the key word *FOR*, and in this way to relate back to Scotland Forward and forge a common identity. All the original Scotland Forward material included prominent use of the *FOR* logo. However, our subtitle was always ‘the YES campaign’, and it became obvious once the wording of the Referendum questions became clear, that the basic campaigning message and slogan would have to be YES YES.

The YES YES logo adopted by the campaign was devised by the Labour Party's design team. Scotland Forward's involvement was vital in ensuring that the design for the logo

was capable of being used by all political parties thus allowing the SNP and Liberal Democrats to adopt this logo.

The timing of the move from using *FOR* as the basic Scotland Forward strapline to using YES YES caused a great deal of anxiety in the campaign team but when it was carried out it worked surprisingly well and without any real problems.

Celebrities

By the end of the campaign Scotland Forward had the names of over 100 celebrity supporters of a YES YES vote.

The experience of modern public campaigning is that the use of celebrity supporters is an expected part of the agenda, albeit the use of celebrities can be a double edged sword. Although the media want these names they would also be the first to complain about too much gloss and not enough hard stories, and deride celebrities getting involved in politics.

Also the danger of being disowned by a celebrity who either is not really a supporter, or who resents being used can be counter productive. This was highlighted by the Think Twice campaign's problems with Bill McLaren who was listed as one of their supporters but who denied supporting the No campaign when approached by the Sunday Mail.

Scotland Forward was fortunate in that there was a genuine groundswell among celebrated Scots to associate themselves with the campaign, and as importantly, we were able to utilise the talents of professional PR and marketing personnel in making the best use of that talent.

The biggest 'ex-pat' celebrity event was held in London, designed to influence the magazines and London weeklies in the last days of the campaign. Unfortunately, the pictures and press coverage of a successful Saturday night event were lost in the blanket media coverage of the death of the Princess of Wales the very next morning.

By the last 10 days of the campaign, Scotland Forward was under constant pressure from newspapers and TV to provide lists of names of celebrity supporters. The problems of issuing such lists and contact phone numbers meant that there was the occasional difficulty and problem, and we had the added problem that people who may be household names in Scotland might not be well known in England or abroad and many of the requests we got for names came from London based or foreign media. However, we would like to record our appreciation of the support - and the forbearance - of many 'names' who helped us keep the media satisfied.

There were many others who were unable to lend support through contractual or sometimes geographical difficulties, but there were none who turned us down flat. The goodwill for the project among Scottish celebrities was considerable, and very much appreciated.

History will show that the unofficial battle between the No and Yes campaigns to get the better and larger list of celebrity supporters was undoubtedly won by Scotland Forward!

The business case

One very successful aspect of the Scotland Forward campaign was the contribution we made to neutralising the attempt to mount a business offensive against the Scottish Parliament having tax varying powers. The No campaign obviously hoped that the business community and leading business people would come out strongly against the Scottish Parliament. However, apart from what seemed at best the lukewarm involvement of a small number of known Tory supporting business people, a statement from Sir Bruce Patullo, and the botched intervention of the Chief Executive of the Scottish CBI, there was little sign of a Business Says No campaign.

The General Election result obviously did much to secure the neutrality of many major companies and leading business people. However, Scotland Forward provided a very useful vehicle for several prominent business people to ally themselves with the Yes campaign. The business people on the Campaign Executive put in a lot of work in developing the Business Case For aspect of Scotland Forward. We were able to provide business speakers for TV and radio interviews on many occasions and issued several press releases putting the business case for a YES YES vote.

As with some other aspects of the campaign the response of the media to our efforts was sometimes disappointing. Whilst comments from anti business people such as Sir Bruce Patullo received substantial coverage, the more positive comments of the Scotland Forward business people received scant mention.

However, although Patullo's intervention caught the headlines in the middle of the campaign, by the last week the Yes side was being very effective in its counter attack - with the Labour Party, SNP, Liberal Democrat and Scotland Forward each bringing forward their own business supporters.

THE MEDIA AND COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

The communications strategy

The Campaign Executive had a clear three stage communications strategy throughout the campaign.

Stage 1: Informational communications - Providing information to plug the ignorance gap as much as possible - mainly through the Government but also through the media, the civic groups and in our literature by:

- providing a visual representation and model of the 'shape of Parliament;
- clarifying the role and remit of the Parliament;
- re-assuring people about the relation between the Scottish Parliament and Westminster,
- providing examples of stability abroad.

Stage 2: Persuasive Communications - answering the essential question - 'Why should I vote for a Scottish Parliament with tax-varying powers?' by:

- providing the key motivating messages and neutralising the negatives; and,
- providing these messages not as bland statements but through using clear examples.

Stage 3: Final Motivational Push -

- utilising the emotional arguments;
- calling to action with a 'now or never' message."

Almost all of the objectives identified above were carried out successfully during the campaign. In particular we made a very strong case to the government, backed up by our research, to help to persuade them to undertake a large scale public information campaign. Although we never managed to provide a visual representation of the 'shape' of the Parliament, Scotland Forward leaflets did provide answers to the main questions being asked by the public. Scotland Forward campaign literature tried to pre-empt the negative campaigning around the tax question by providing positive answers to the obvious attacks about extra cost, bureaucracy and tax. The final stage of the campaign, and the eve of poll leaflet, included the call to action and the 'now or never' message.

The key messages

One of the crucial tasks for Scotland Forward was to come up with the main campaign messages that could be used by all the parties in the Yes campaign. Scotland Forward's original opinion poll research carried out in November 1996, and two sets of focus groups held in May and June, were invaluable in the process of determining the key messages.

The key phrases which came out of the Scotland Forward research included:

- giving Scots more control over Scottish affairs;
- Scottish solutions to Scottish problems/ issues;

- devoting more time to Scottish issues;
- spending the existing Scottish Office budget more wisely on education, health and jobs;
- no more Poll Tax being imposed on Scotland;
- politicians more answerable through a new type of politics;
- taxes will only go up if you vote for them to go up at the elections;
- Scotland will only move to independence if people vote for this at future elections.

The sharing of the research findings with the three political parties ensured that the key motivating messages were used repeatedly not only by Scotland Forward but also by the parties and the politicians. All parties kept to the key motivating messages throughout the campaign.

Although we kept very closely to the strategy and key messages we were also able to adapt according to circumstances. For example, the message that the Scottish Parliament could open the way to a new type of modern and open politics was given more prominence towards the end of the campaign in response to the public concern about the allegations of sleaze and cronyism in Paisley and Glasgow.

The media strategy

Scotland Forward adopted a detailed media strategy based on:

- making Scotland Forward the organisation representing the YES YES campaign;
- holding a small number of press conferences
- concentrating on devising unusual stories and photo opportunities;
- targeting local and regional media.

The very successful launch of Scotland Forward, the support provided by the three political parties and the total absence of any other Yes campaign meant that Scotland Forward very quickly became recognised by all sections of the media as the voice of the Yes campaign. The highpoint in terms of public profile for Scotland Forward undoubtedly came on the day of the publication of the White Paper. Scotland Forward spokespeople appeared on a large number of TV and radio programmes (from Breakfast News to Newsnight) and were adjudged to have won the media battle with Think Twice.

However, as was recognised in the media strategy, once the parties became fully involved in the campaign, journalists increasingly looked for comments from politicians rather than Scotland Forward, and our profile dropped in the latter stages of the campaign.

It is fair to say that the main problem which emerged was related to the very uniqueness of the campaign - there was a persistent misunderstanding of the role and strategy of Scotland Forward as a facilitating and consensual organisation. The important thing for the campaign was that Scotland Forward did not over-react to the criticism and was not panicked into making drastic changes to the media strategy, despite taunts and challenges that the campaign was lacklustre and low key. The final result proved this a wise course of action.

However, if the press had unrealistic expectations about the level, nature and visibility of the campaign, then there should have been better briefing of the press about the Scotland Forward strategy in order to reduce this misunderstanding. Here our organisation was lacking, although hampered too by the fact that the media has an increasing tendency to comment on the process of a campaign rather than on the issues covered by the opposing sides.

Generally, although the media complained of a lack of real issues it was very difficult to get any coverage for issue based stories. The media was much more interested in trying to uncover conflict between the parties and to try to manufacture a No campaign than in covering positive issues. This confirmed the efficacy of the strategy of concentrating on trying to get coverage for photo opportunities.

The coverage given to two contrasting photo opportunities held at the same time three days before the Referendum illustrates the nature of the media interest. A photo call and press conference with 65 women, designed to highlight the issue of gender balance and of the new politics of the Scottish Parliament, received almost no coverage on TV and only one newspaper photograph; whereas a light-hearted photo-call held at the same time of a group of line dancers displaying YES YES boards, received prominent coverage in several news programmes.

The attempt to get media interest in non-political photo opportunities worked extremely well on several occasions, in particular:

- the launch of the Referendum Whisky on the same day as the launch of the Government's White Paper received world-wide TV and newspaper coverage for the campaign;
- the launch of the Scotland Forward beer mats resulted in prominent photos in several newspapers;
- the arrival in Parliament Square of the Scotland Forward Parliament petition on 10th September was extensively covered in newspapers and TV alongside the final all party press conference.
- The launch of YES and NO ice-cream and cakes as a deliberate effort to take the campaign into the market place achieved good publicity

Unfortunately several other events, including the flagging of the Munros and the launch of the Parliament petition received disappointing coverage possibly because they were held on Sundays.

General press coverage

The criticism of the organisation and handling of the second press conference encouraged a re-appraisal of the operation of the campaign. office and plans for future press conferences. Daily meetings of the campaign team concentrated on trying to maximise good media coverage for Scotland Forward events and photo opportunities.

The appointment of two full time press officers from mid-July, along with a temporary secondment from the STUC and a further full time press officer from mid-August provided the staff resource required to mount the media campaign.

The press team developed a very effective instant response capability which reached its pinnacle when Scotland Forward was able to issue a comment about the Scotsman's report of Lady Thatcher's statement about the Referendum before the paper hit the news-stands. This ensured that Scotland Forward's response was covered by other newspapers, TV and radio bulletins.

Over 100 press releases and press notices were issued in the final six weeks of the campaign. Although many of these did not get used, the sheer volume of press releases must have had an impact. Particular emphasis was placed on trying to get coverage in regional and local papers, and several articles placed by the Scotland Forward press officers did appear in the local press.

A lot of effort was put into ensuring that the Yes campaign was well represented in the letters pages of newspapers at all levels. It was not possible to monitor this effectively however, a subjective look at letters pages showed a very good balance in favour of Yes votes.

A major headache during the campaign, especially the final two weeks, was the constant and heavy demand for information and interviews from foreign media. There were no apparent votes to be won here, but it is worth noting that many people on holiday and on business tune into the world service and SKY TV and the effort given over to foreign coverage was probably not wasted.

The biggest source of frustration was the nature of the coverage given to the Referendum campaign by television especially the London based programmes. The rules on political balance meant that TV news and current affairs programmes sometimes came very close to manufacturing a No campaign and definitely gave it more prominence than it merited. Think Twice were usually used as the spokesperson for the No campaign but the Yes side would normally be represented by a politician from one of the political parties. UK programmes also went out of their way to try to highlight the No side of the argument. For example there was an inordinate amount of coverage from the North East of Scotland, Dumfries & Galloway and the Borders - perhaps not unconnected to the fact that these areas voted No in 1979 and it was assumed might vote No again.

Advertising

Scotland Forward's budget did not permit any significant expenditure on advertising. It is arguable whether prominent advertising in newspapers and in hoardings would have had much impact in convincing voters - certainly it didn't seem to do much for Think Twice ! - but it would certainly have contributed to giving the campaign a higher profile.

The only advertising purchased by Scotland Forward was:

- a three day tour of an adtrailer carrying the new YES YES logo shortly after the launch of the YES YES campaign at the end of July;
- a back page ad in the Big Issue, small adverts in several football fanzines and two local community papers;
- a half page ad in the Press and Journal on the day before the Referendum; and

- a 16 page supplement in the Daily Record on the day before the Referendum.

A 26 ft blimp balloon with the Scotland Forward logo proved to be an effective form of advertising at outdoor events such as the Open Golf Championship and the Edinburgh Festival Cavalcade. In addition a plane carrying a banner reminding people to vote, (sponsored by a supporter), flew over the central belt for about two hours on the evening of Referendum day itself.

On the Internet, the Scotland Forward website was a great success, receiving well over 200,000 hits in the course of the campaign. The site, designed and regularly updated by a Scotland Forward supporter, included information about the campaign, press releases, examples of leaflets, a Gaelic page and a Scots language page, as well as facilities for e-mailing membership details and donations. .

FINANCES

Scotland Forward had a total expenditure of approximately £200,000 (see Annexe B). In addition to this there was approximately £26,000 of ex-account spending, which included the initial opinion poll research.

The contribution of individuals across the country was extensive. Scotland Forward could not hope for corporate support from firms and businesses but a considerable number of business people contributed substantial sums to the campaign. Tens of thousands of pounds were raised from these sources - a very significant sum when compared with 1979. The business community showed that devolution not only had support from that quarter but that they were prepared to put their hands into their pockets to make it happen.

Special mention must be given to the role of the trade union movement in the success of Scotland Forward. While two unions, UNISON and the EIS gave the lion's share of funding - the Scottish trades unions as a whole were responsible for over half of Scotland Forward's total funding. This support included both national and local donations and in addition unions such as the TGWU, GMB and AEU gave significant support to both the national and local groups in a period where their organisations had already faced considerable demands through an extended General Election campaign.

This is testimony to the long involvement of the unions and the STUC in the devolution campaign, but shows also the deep understanding of the need for broad-based popular campaigning in this area to complement the overtly political work of the parties. Arguably, it was the experience of their own campaigning over the long hostile years of the previous government which helped the unions to understand the need for a campaign of this type - and convinced them to back up their understanding with what was probably the most significant trades union financial support for a public campaign in Scotland ever.

The expenditure broke down approximately 30% on staff, office and administration costs and 70% on campaign materials, activities and events.

There was a shortfall before the final, post referendum fund-raising appeal. This deficit on projected break-even budgets was due to several factors:

- there was an overspend on campaign activity and material due to disruption of the final period of the campaign and subsequent over-estimate of demand from local groups;
- it was not possible to hold a major fund-raising event - the large celebrity event and the Ceilidhs planned for the final weekend had to be cancelled;
- there was no major public fund-raising appeal although a Press Advert appeal which was issued to Scotland Forward supporters raised the excellent sum of £9,000.

More hard-headed and systematic fund-raising at an earlier stage of the campaign might have avoided the uncertainty about funding that hampered the campaign at certain stages. A professional fund-raiser could have been utilised by the Campaign Executive from the start of the campaign to advise and provide support for the fund-raising effort.

However here as in so many of the demands generated by the campaign hindsight is often 20/20 - the real trick was in bringing in the financial support when it was needed.

At the end of the day, Scotland Forward represented around 40% of the total spend within the combined YES:YES campaign. This figure would rise if the spending by local Scotland Forward groups is added. This was a tremendous achievement under very difficult circumstances. However, what is perhaps of more significance is the turnaround in financial support for the YES and NO camps between 1979 and 1997. In 1979, the NO campaign's finances bettered the YES campaign by a factor of 3 to 2 - by 1997, the YES campaign had not only overtaken its rival but gone on to outstrip it by 2 to 1. The 'canny Scots' knew how to back a winner.

THE RESULT

Question 1:
“I agree / disagree that there should be a Scottish Parliament.”

Agree (Yes)	1,775,045	74.3 %
Disagree (No)	614,400	25.7 %
Total votes 2,389,445	Majority 1,160,645	

Question 2:
“I agree / disagree that a Scottish Parliament should have tax-varying powers.”

Agree (Yes)	1,512,889	63.5 %
Disagree (No)	870,263	36.5 %
Total votes 2,383,152	Majority 642,626	

The full Referendum result is given at Annexe C below,

The turnout of just over 60% exceeded most expectations. Although no figure had been put on what a respectable turnout would be, most pundits were expecting that the turnout would be less. It is estimated that the electoral register loses at least 1% of voters every month. Since the Referendum was held on a register which was 11 months out of date, the 60% turnout was equivalent to an actual turnout of over 72%. Bearing in mind that the register was several months older and more out of date, the turnout compares very favourably with the 63.5% achieved in the March 1979 Referendum and with the 69% turnout at the May 1997 General Election.

Turnout in 24 council areas exceeded 60% and in one area, East Dunbartonshire, it was just over 72%. In only 8 council areas the turnout was less than 60%. The lowest turnout was in Glasgow where only 51.3% of people on the register voted.

One of the most satisfying aspects of the overall result was that there were very clear majorities for the Yes vote in both questions in almost all 32 council areas. No-one predicted that almost 75% of voters would vote Yes in the first question, and that over 63% would vote Yes to tax-varying powers. All 32 areas voted Yes in the first question, and there were majority No votes in the second question in only two areas - Orkney and Dumfries & Galloway.

Comparison with the 1979 Referendum

A large part of the reasoning behind the creation of Scotland Forward was a determination not to repeat the mistakes of the Yes campaigns in the 1979 Referendum for a Scottish Assembly. An analysis of the 1979 Referendum by a leading journalist (Ray Perman; Scottish Government Yearbook, 1980) concluded that the Yes side failed to achieve a satisfactory result for three main reasons:

- without a unified campaign the Yes side was hopelessly divided, and its arguments and efforts were often contradictory.
- it underestimated the strength of the opposition.
- it made several tactical errors. For example, the Labour Party's decision to run a short campaign allowed the No campaign to set the agenda for the campaign and get its negative arguments firmly implanted in the public mind.

A straightforward comparison of the Yes votes in the 1979 Referendum and in the first question in the 1997 Referendum shows that over 500,000 more people voted Yes in 1997 than in 1979. This would suggest that the Yes campaign co-ordinated by Scotland Forward was more successful than the various Yes campaigns had been in the earlier Referendum. The lessons of the 1979 Referendum had been learned and acted upon.

CONCLUSION

Scotland Forward was very successful in achieving the sole aim it set itself, "to maximise the YES YES vote" through its single objective which was "to create a climate of understanding and opinion that assists the political parties to mobilise the vote". The strategy of creating a unifying all-party, non-party campaign with Scotland Forward acting as the umbrella, facilitator and catalyst for all the political parties, civic and social organisations and individuals supporting the YES YES vote worked extremely well.

The campaign run by Scotland Forward at national and local levels achieved almost all it was meant to achieve in terms of party co-operation, delivery of common key motivating messages, local campaigning, production and distribution of campaign material and involvement of a broad cross section of public opinion formers.

The media and communications strategy followed by Scotland Forward from the start of the campaign was successful in ensuring that Scotland Forward was recognised as the single unifying Yes campaign, generating the positive and minimising the negative press coverage. Scotland Forward certainly had a substantial impact on the media coverage of the Referendum.

The failings of the Think Twice campaign and the lack of support given to it by the Tory Party and the business establishment highlighted the depth to which the Tories and the anti-devolutionist cause had sunk since 1979. The No campaign never managed to exploit the potential weaknesses in the case for the Scottish Parliament with tax-varying powers because of the fragility of the Tories in Scotland after 18 years of anti-Scottish Thatcherism with which the Tory Party had colluded and become identified with.

Undoubtedly the work of the Scottish Constitutional Convention in creating a consensus around its scheme for a Scottish Parliament played a great part in allowing Scotland Forward to form a unifying all-party, non-party campaign. Similarly, the vision and energy of the early supporters of a broad based campaign and the maturity of the Scottish party political leaders was acknowledged and rewarded by the votes of ordinary people.

Ultimately the Scottish electorate shared the Scotland Forward vision. The electorate knew they wanted a Scottish Parliament. They were less interested in the detail of how a Scottish Parliament might operate, how it was to be elected and what powers it was to have. The linking of the two questions through the YES YES campaign was successful in countering any tendency people might have had of voting against taxation powers.

It is impossible to ascertain for certain the impact that Scotland Forward had on the final result of the Referendum. Certainly, if Scotland Forward had not existed then the political parties and Scotland's civic and social establishment would have lost the vital element of a single organisation which promoted a unifying campaign. In the final analysis, the Referendum result was always going to be the measure against which we would be judged. On that judgement, we are happy that we clearly achieved our aim of maximising the YES YES vote. The settled will of the Scottish people was confirmed.

Annexe A

Scotland Forward - Campaign Executive

Morag Alexander	Equal Opportunities Commission	
Rowena Arshad	Moray House Institute	
Jackie Baillie	Labour Party	
Rhona Brankin	Labour Party	
Mike Donnelly	Labour Party	
Kevin Dunnion	Friends of the Earth	
Margaret Ford	Eglington Management Centre	
Cllr Liz Harris	Liberal Democrats	
Robert Hynd	Magnum Power plc	(Company Secretary)
Stefan Kay	Inveresk Paper plc	
Ian McKay	Educational Institute of Scotland	
Dr Malcolm MacLeod	Edinburgh University	
Cllr Joan Mitchell	Dumfries & Galloway Council	
Alex Neil	Scottish National Party	
George Reid	Scottish National Party	
Esther Robertson	Scottish Constitutional Convention	
Cllr Margaret Smith	Aberdeen City Council	
Matt Smith	UNISON	
Nigel Smith	David Auld Valves Ltd	(Chairperson)
Bill Speirs	STUC	
Yvonne Strachan	Transport & General Workers Union	
Kay Ullrich	Scottish National Party	

(All members of the Campaign Executive served in their personal capacity; designations are given for identification purposes only)

Scotland Forward - Staff and Campaign Helpers

National Coordinator	Paulo Vestri
Campaigns Organiser	Kay Caldwell
Office Manager	Heather Smart
Administrative Assistant	Zoe Johnston
Press Officers	John McInnes
	Sam Ghibaldan
	Bob Cuddihy
	Mary Picken
Campaign Assistants	Jeanette Timmins
	Lynn Henderson
London Co-ordinator	Scott Ballintyne
Celebrities Co-ordinator	Heather Baird
Celebrities Organisers	Maggie Monteith
	Ricky Ross

The Campaign Executive would like to place on record their sincere thanks to the staff and helpers of Scotland Forward. The efforts of this small group of very dedicated individuals helped make the whole organisation a success and the campaign a victory.

Accounts

These are the accounts of the National Campaign of Scotland Forward. They do not include the spending of over 50 independent Scotland Forward local groups except where they donated funds to the National Campaign. Campaign materials were sent direct to the Scotland Forward groups and many allied groups totalling 170 around Scotland. In addition material was distributed through the three party organisations.

Ex Accounts

Some £26,000 was spent mainly before the Campaign was established as a legal entity. These sums therefore did not flow through the certified Accounts but for the sake of completeness is part of the analysis.

Credits

Additional help was given by people and organisations not all listed below to which no financial value has been attributed and is thus not included in the analysis. The Board wish to thank all those who helped in this way. *Office Equipment:* Eglinton Management Centre, Keywest, David Auld Valves Ltd; *Car Loan:* STUC; *Accommodation:* Trades Councils in several cities; *Legal Services:* Brodies; *Media Services:* Beattie Media, Tait & McLay; *Telephones:* Scottish Telecom; *Accountancy Services:* David Auld Valves Ltd, Nelson & Co; *Secretarial Services:* Magnum Power; *Computer Programming:* Charter 88

Volunteers

The Campaign was supported in many ways by volunteers both nationally and locally from all parties and none. In a few special circumstances volunteers were assisted with expenses. All members of the Board served on a voluntary basis.

Foreign Funding

Less than 2% of Scotland Forward's income was raised outside the UK. As almost all of the remainder was raised in Scotland, Scotland Forward can claim to be the principal target for donations.

Campaign

The Board's initial estimate was that the unified Campaign would cost between £300,000 and £500,000. In the event, it is clear that the Campaign total exceeded £600,000 when the additional monies spent by the bigger unions, in direct support of their members efforts is added to the figures given below.

Scotland Forward	£225,000
Scottish Labour Party	£270,000
Scottish Liberal Democrats	£ 45,000
Scottish National Party	<u>£ 45,000</u>
	<u>£585,000</u>

This spread compares favourably with 1979 where in current money (1998) the No side £150,000 and the 'Yes' varies significantly £75,000.

Campaign Comparisons (approximate figures in current 1998 money value)

	1979	1997
Combined 'Yes'	£175,000	£600,000
Combined 'No'	£250,000	£270,000

SCOTLAND FORWARD

Annexe B

ACCOUNTS FOR PERIOD 1ST APRIL 1997 TO 20TH FEB 1998

	Accounts Certified	Ex Accounts	Total Analysis	%	
INCOME					
Unions	121,300	10,875	£132,175	58%	
Business: Corporate & Personal	20,110	15,062	£ 35,172	16%	
Civic Grps & Joseph Rowntree Reform Trust	17,674		£ 17,674	8%	
Individual donations	19,776		£ 19,776	9%	
Merchandise, Whisky, T-Shirts	20,477		£ 20,477	9%	
	199,337	25,937	£225,274	100%	
EXPENDITURE					
Research: Polls & Focus Groups	8,630	22,075	£ 30,705	14%	
Printed leaflets & materials	74,247		£ 74,247	33%	
Advertising:					
RM remote areas mailshot & Internet site	1,291				
Ad trailers & Plane streamer	5,208	1,200			
Adverts: <i>Big Issue, Press & Journal, Record</i>	13,836	20,335	£21,535	10%	
Events: Rallies, press conferences, concerts	22,443		£22,443	10%	
Press Office & Campaign Team ¹					
Staff Wages & Salaries	44,077				
Rent	8,503				
Other office costs, mass mailouts etc, Post, Insurance, phone	11,482	64,062	2,662	£ 66,724	29%
Merchandise	9,620		£ 9,617	4%	
	199,337	25,937	£225,271	100%	

ACCOUNTANT'S REPORT

I have examined the above Statement of Income & Expenditure ("accounts certified" only) and confirm that it is in agreement with the books and records provided to me.

Colin McIntyre, Chartered Accountant

Glasgow 2nd March 1998

¹ Over 7,000 inward telephone calls were taken by the office during the Campaign, the rate reaching over 200 a day in the last three weeks.

² Scotland Forward is the trading name of Partnership for a Parliament LtdA not- for- profit company limited by Guarantee Registered in Edinburgh No. 173974

Annexe C

Scottish Parliament Referendum Results 1997

Parliament	Yes	No	Tax	Yes	No	Turnout
	1,775,045	614,400		1,512,889	870,263	
	74.29%	25.71%		63.48%	36.52%	60.2%
Aberdeen	65035	25580		54320	35709	53.4
Aberdeenshire	61621	34878		50295	45929	56.7
Angus	33571	18350		27641	24089	60.0
Argyll & Bute	30452	14796		25746	19429	64.6
Clackmannan	18790	4706		16112	7355	65.8
Dumfries/Galloway	44619	28863		35737	37499*	63.8
Dundee	49252	15553		42304	22280	55.3
East Ayrshire	49131	11426		42559	17824	64.5
East Dunbartonshire	40917	17725		34576	23914	72.4
East Lothian	33525	11665		28152	16765	65.0
East Renfrewshire	28253	17573		23580	22153	68.0
Edinburgh	155900	60832		133843	82188	60.0
Falkirk	55642	13953		48064	21403	63.0
Fife	125668	39517		108021	58987	61.0
Glasgow	204269	40106		182589	60842	51.2
Highland	72551	27431		61359	37525	60.3
Inverclyde	31680	8945		27194	13277	60.0
MidLothian	31681	7979		26776	12762	65.0
Moray	24822	12122		19326	17344	57.8
North Ayrshire	51304	15931		43990	22991	63.1
North Lanarkshire	123063	26010		107288	41372	60.4
Orkney	4749	3541		3917	4344*	53.2
Perth & Kinross	40344	24998		33398	31709	63.0
Renfrewshire	68711	18213		55075	31537	62.4
Scottish Borders	33855	20060		27284	26497	64.4
Shetland	5430	3275		4478	4198	53.0
South Ayrshire	40161	19909		33679	26217	66.4
South Lanarkshire	114908	32762		99587	47708	62.8
Stirling	29190	13440		25044	17487	65.5
West Dunbartonshire	39051	7058		34408	11628	63.4
West Lothian	56923	14614		47990	23354	62.3
Western Isles	9977	2589		8557	3947	55.3
SCOTLAND						
Parliament	1,775,045	614,400	Tax	1,512,889	870,263	
	74.29%	25.71%		63.48%	36.52%	