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OUR FIRST YEAR

DEAR FRIENDS OF FINN PARTNERS:

When we started Finn Partners last December, we said we would be defined by collaboration. A year later, that collaborative approach defines who we are and what we do, and energizes our commitment to our client partners and to each other. Step off the elevator at the newly renovated reception area in our New York headquarters and that commitment springs to life in a dynamic video wall of images that illustrates the power of collaboration in the arts, in the sciences and in business.

Collaboration is at the core of our brand, and it’s helped us achieve some powerful results. In less than 12 months we have become one of the brightest stories in the PR business. Our 2011 US fees rank us as one of the top ten independent agencies — in 2012 we will achieve more than 30 percent growth (far above the growth rate of the PR industry) and have been named new agency of the year by a leading trade publication. And while our name is new, we have a deeply rooted team. Our 30 Managing Partners, Senior Partners and Partners have worked together for an average of 10 years, and have a shared commitment to our mission and our future.

We are an agency of commitments. While we prize new business, we hold the importance of existing client relationships above all else.

And, we care about every one of our colleagues. Our first Finn Partners ad last year proudly displayed the names of the 180 people who work in our six offices. One year later, our staff has grown to over 220, with a host of talented newcomers joining that original roster. Finn Partners is leading the industry with a very low turnover rate.

Finally, as we look to the future, we want to be an agency that makes a difference — through our award winning pro-bono work for numerous not-for-profit organizations, through the global peace work of my sister, Dena Merriam, who has joined me in launching Finn Partners, and through some of my own foundation work supporting the arts. Most of all we want to make a difference in the lives of the people who work here and, through business, in the lives of the clients we serve.

If you would like to know more, please contact me at peter@finnpartners.com or at my direct line, which is 212-593-6428.

Best wishes,

Peter Finn
FINN PARTNERS
WELCOME TO THE PARTNERSHIP
EDITORIAL

On shooting oneself in the foot

Unless you don’t have access to a television — or a nutty uncle who forwards every email he receives — you’d know America is currently ensnared in yet another row over gun control.

In January, President Obama signed 23 executive orders to address a growing spat of senseless gun violence. As Machiavellian as a term like “executive orders” sounds, in truth these actions were relatively benign. They force law enforcement officers to trace firearms found in criminal investigations, require the Attorney General to submit reports on “gun safety technologies,” and call on the Centers for Disease Control to research the potential causes of gun violence. They also ask for the national launch of a “responsible gun ownership campaign,” and suggest the nomination of a full-time ATF director.

Obama simultaneously called on Congress to update our nation’s gun laws: he suggested national background checks on guns sales, stricter penalties for those who sell guns to felons, and, controversially, to ban “military-style assault weapons” and guns with magazines that hold more than ten rounds. Don’t count on any of these ideas taking traction. A standard definition for what constitutes an “assault weapon” is tenuous at best, and the Republican House is sure to laugh down any proposed legislative changes to our laissez-faire gun culture.

In other words, Obama’s overtures were little more than empty gestures. In classic fashion however, the event has served as one big confirmation bias to the gun enthusiast community: namely the NRA, various tentacles of the conservative media and our nation’s legions of armchair pioneers. These people seriously believe any proposed changes to our nation’s gun laws, no matter how insignificant, are somehow a slippery slope to mass gun repossessions, home invasions, even full-scale tyranny. We’re witnessing the largest onset of irrational paranoia since the Red Scare.

Stunt gymnastic routines in fatuous logic from pundits like Sean Hannity and Eric Bolling have cited recent “statistics” claiming violent crimes in the United States have gone down because gun sales have gone up. Numbers are fun, but only when their correlation reveals causation. There is no data linking lower national trends in violent crime to the increased market viability of firearms, just like there is no corollary linking my ability to finally quit smoking and Obama being elected President, even though they both occurred in late 2008. The same lapses in logic have been used to attack history with an eraser, suggesting genocides in Poland, Hitler, Stalin, Pol Pot, Obama. A connection is clear — albeit not the one these nut jobs were hoping for.

A salient trait of conspiracy theories is that, even though the most powerful governments in the world ostensibly orchestrate them, they’re invariably first decoded by the world’s biggest morons. Which scenario is more likely: that updating regulations to federal firearms laws is an open invitation for the Feds to storm our homes and take our guns, or that these regulations allow the talons of a tyrannical government. One might say the Amendment was written in a different time, and is woefully outdated in its language. So, in order to ensure their arguments maintain relevance, gun diehards have to claim we’re being besieged by the threat of tyranny today.

Nevertheless, the Second Amendment, we have been told, is written to protect us from the talons of a tyrannical government. In the meantime, I’d like to reflect on a deeper irony here. The modern patriot is now some-
Talking about it is another

Environmental issues play a crucial role in shaping today's world. The stakes are high. The impact is profound.

Sound environmental policy judgments depend, in large measure, on effectively articulating the issues to public officials, the media, third party interests and the greater community.

The Stanton Communications Public Affairs team understands that environmental and energy issues are among the most daunting challenges facing corporations and their industry associations. Striking the right tone and maintaining reasoned dialogue are vital when the potential for controversy is great. We have a proven record of successfully communicating on sensitive and complex subjects and building support for our clients' positions.

When it comes to talking Green, we make it easy.
PR pro sues Mediabistro blog for libel

Wendy Gordon, who runs Flash PR in Washington, D.C., has sued Mediabistro news and gossip blog FishbowlDC for libel, alleging it intentionally set out to portray her as a “self-promoting, attention-seeking, loose party girl/cougar” at the expense of her reputation and business.

Gordon, former Corporate Director of Food and Beverage PR for The Ritz-Carlton Hotel Company, filed the civil action in D.C. superior court on Jan. 17 against the blog, Mediabistro, parent WebMediaBrands, and writers Peter Ogburn and Betsy Rothstein, charging defamation and invasion of privacy.

She seeks at least $2 million in punitive and compensatory damages.

She alleges an “unprovoked, online smear campaign” by the blog, alleging publication of “false, defamatory, malicious, nasty, and tasteless statements” which harmed the PR pro’s reputation, business and “overall well-being,” according to the suit.

FishbowlDC did remove some of the content after a complaint by Gordon’s lawyer last October, but the suit says not all of the pieces were removed and the blog declined to retract the series or apologize.

“One FishbowlDC post cited in the complaint reads: “It’s our weekly look at D.C. publicist Wendy Gordon and the insane pictures that she posts of herself on the Internet. Today, we have a classy Wendy at a party. That is, if your definition of classy is wearing a low cut a dress that allows your boobs to to spill out …”

The post later suggested Gordon was looking for sex.

Gordon, who says she is a PR professional and not a public figure, claims the blog continued the alleged attacks despite requests from her and others to stop and rebuffed a demand for a retraction, “despite their knowledge that what they had written about her was completely false.”

Gordon says she lost business opportunities because of the coverage.

Gordon has responded to the FishbowlDC posts in the past. In November 2011 she wrote on her Facebook wall: “I’m a little perplexed as to why you seem to find me so interesting to the point of constantly cannibalizing photos … from my personal Facebook page? … Just for clarification, the term ‘cougar’ neither fits nor describes me at all. I happen to prefer those my own age or above in my personal life, just so you know — since apparently you don’t know me at all and are hell bent on presenting a false representation.”

Study: Obama favors ABC News at press conferences

President Barack Obama took more questions from ABC News correspondents than any other outlet during the 36 solo news conferences of his first term, according to a study by the Univ. of Minnesota’s Eric Ostermeier.

ABC got the call from Obama 29 times, according to the study, followed by CBS (28), the Associated Press (27), NBC (26) and Bloomberg (20).

The New York Times was tops among newspapers at No. 7 (16 questions), while Fox News was at No. 9 (14 queries).

Fifty news outlets have received at least one question at Obama news conferences, according to the study.

Ostermeir found that NBC’s political chief Chuck Todd and ABC News White House correspondent Jake Tapper got the most chances to question Obama with 23 times each.

The analysis noted that Todd was able to parlay his time into 52 series of questions and follow-ups.

Meanwhile, Politico, citing a tally by Martha Joynt Kumar, reported that Obama held fewer press conferences — 79 — than Presidents George W. Bush, Bill Clinton and George H.W. Bush during the same span. The study included joint appearances with foreign leaders.

George H.W. Bush held 143 pressers, followed by Clinton’s 133 during his first term. George W. Bush had 89, but Reagan appeared for only 27.

Obama drastically cut down on short Q&As with reporters, by comparison, holding only 107 such sessions compared to Clinton’s 612, George W. Bush’s 354 and George H.W. Bush’s 313.
PR giant Dan Edelman dies at 92

Daniel Edelman, PR pioneer and founder of the company that bears his name, died January 15. He was 92.

By Greg Hazley and Jack O`Dwyer

Edelman, a native New Yorker born in Brooklyn, worked PR for Edward Gottlieb & Associates after serving in the Army analyzing German propaganda during World War II, and following stints at CBS Radio and Musica craft Records, where he publicized artists like Duke Ellington and Dizzy Gillespie.

Gottlieb hired Edelman to work on the hair styling brand Toni, which was a sponsor of a CBS radio show Edelman worked on and wanted a PR rep near its Chicago base. “Since I was the only single man at Gottlieb, I went,” Edelman recalled at his 90th birthday party in Chicago in 2010.

He later moved in-house at Toni and then opened up the firm in a small office in Chicago’s Merchandise Mart on October 1, 1952 with Toni as its first client.

Edelman kept the firm as a family-owned enterprise, fending off overtures from advertising agencies and marketing conglomerates, and recruiting son Richard in the late 1970s to work for the firm.

Richard marked the firm’s 60th anniversary in October with a tribute to his father in Chicago, noting Dan brought PR, traditionally associated mostly with corporate reputation, to the product side.

Dan essentially created the first product media tour with six sets of twins touting Toni products on a 71-city sojourn. When a set of twins was arrested in Oklahoma for practicing cosmetology without a license, Dan called the Associated Press and made it a national story.

Speaking of his father in October, Richard said, “it is a rare gift to find work that sustains you, and keeps you curious for a lifetime. But it is rarer yet to share that gift for 34 years with your father.”

The Chicago operation expanded to New York, Los Angeles, Washington, D.C., and London in the 1960s, before wider expansion across Europe and, later in the 1980s, into Asia.

Edelman’s pioneering tactics, foresight and management led him to become one of the most respected leaders in the field.

Asked in 1968 by O’Dwyer’s to outline his thoughts on the future of PR, Edelman said:

“For many years, public relations people felt that they were on the periphery of corporate affairs. They found their way to the front of the class in financial public relations and, more and more in marketing public relations. In the field of social responsibility, they are out in front carrying the banner. It is their responsibility to define the problem, relate their company to it to help establish the company’s position on it and to communicate this viewpoint to all concerned. The emergence of the new public relations has ended for the public relations man the isolation of the past, and he represents the interdependence of many elements in our society. Here is perhaps the greatest challenge ever issued to public relations people.”

At age 11, Edelman and a friend produced a community newspaper. He graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Columbia College in 1940 and earned an MS degree from Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. He was a sports editor and reporter for a Poughkeepsie, N.Y., newspaper before being drafted into the Army in 1942.

The Army was Edelman’s introduction to PR. He produced a daily newspaper for his fellow soldiers, reporting on developments in the war gleaned from the ship’s radio and later moved into psychological war operations in London.

“My job was to write an analysis of Germany propaganda,” he said. “I provided information about what they were claiming, so we could answer it with our own broadcasts.”

In addition to his son, Richard, of New York, Edelman is survived by his wife of 59 years, Ruth Ann Rozumoff Edelman, a mental health advocate and member of the firm’s board of directors; a daughter, Renee, of New York, an Edelman Senior VP; a son, John, of Chicago, the Managing Director of Edelman’s Global Engagement and Corporate Social Responsibility initiative, and three granddaughters, Margot, Tory and Amanda Edelman.

Edelman eulogies include belief in PR

A memorial service was held Jan. 18 at Temple Sinai in Chicago.

Edelman received many eulogies at his services, but among those was by daughter Reneé, who said “Dan felt PR is a higher form of communications … the conscience of a corporation.”

The remarks by Ruth, his wife of 49 years, and sons Richard and John, provided details of a life devoted to serving others.

Reneé said one of the bedrock beliefs of her father was to remain independent. “He was never going to work for anyone, never sell to an ad agency, he had to be his own boss,” she said.

Among people he admired the most were entrepreneurs, she noted, adding that the Edelman firm has represented numerous people who started major businesses from scratch.

Richard, who succeeded his father as President and CEO, said that he talked to his father every day no matter where in the world either one of them was.

After Richard had spent 15 years with the company, Dan told him it was time for Richard to take the helm but added, “I’m still here, call me every day,” Richard recalled.

The company ran a full page ad in the New York Times Jan. 16 with a picture of Edelman above the inscription, “There will never be another Dan Edelman — indomitable, ever modest, always resilient, ready for the next challenge. His story inspires us all.”

The Times story noted that Edelman is the world’s largest PR firm with net fees of $660 million in 2012, a gain of 9.2% over 2011, employing 4,600 in 63 offices in 26 countries.
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Investing in nature, in a post-Sandy world

As the images of the devastation caused by Sandy finally begin to lose their painful edge, two things are becoming clear. The first is the scale, in both time and money, of the rebuilding effort. The second is the equally enormous opportunity that comes with such rebuilding.

By Mark Tercek

I’m proud to have served on Governor Cuomo’s NYS 2100 Commission, which released its report on January 6. The governor has shown great leadership at a critical moment, and at his urging the commission has developed wide-ranging recommendations, including expressly recognizing that infrastructure includes not only man-made structures such as roads and bridges, but also the natural systems that provide key protection from the changing climate. My experience on the commission has convinced me that New York can now be the champion of investments in natural capital that benefit human and natural communities alike.

The key to those investments is understanding how we use land, our most basic resource. The Land Use and Environment Committee on which I served examined that fundamental issue and developed recommendations for three areas: protecting coastal communities; reducing damage from flooding and drought in inland areas; and protecting and upgrading wastewater infrastructure.

New York’s coastal regions — including the Atlantic Ocean, Hudson River, and Great Lakes — account for only 12 percent of its land mass, but 90 percent of the state’s population lives and works here. On the fringes of New York City, communities that not so long ago were small, seasonal escapes like Totenville, Coney Island, the Rockaways, and Long Beach have become year-round home to thousands of people.

Communities like these up and down the Atlantic seaboard depend on natural features that serve as green infrastructure — beaches, dunes, barrier islands, and wetlands — for their survival. Sandy changed the profile and location of these ecosystems, and in turn exposed the fragility of much of the critical infrastructure that we have built, like roads, bridges, floodwalls, and storm drains. Catastrophic consequences of severe storms are not inherent in nature, but rather are a direct function of the decisions we have made in the past about where we build, what we build, and how we build. And our future resilience will depend upon the decisions we make now with respect to both our built and natural infrastructure.

The built infrastructure needed to support dense coastal development threatens the natural processes that, when intact, protect coastal communities. Naturally functioning beaches, dunes, barrier islands and wetlands rely on the flow of sediment, water quality that promotes ecosystem health, and the necessary space to move and change over time. Poorly thought out development of our shores does not account for the realities of such an interconnected and dynamic natural coastal system. This destructive cycle will only increase as climate change and sea level rise continue.

Hurricane Sandy has made it clear that addressing coastal resiliency and protecting coastal communities is fundamental to public safety, health and economic well-being. The commission’s recommendations recognize that a capital investment in natural coastal systems is cost-effective, provides permanent protection, offers significant co-benefits, and is an essential part of a solution which will ultimately be the right mix of natural and built approaches.

Sandy may be a harbinger of new and challenging weather patterns. Such extremes will have impacts far beyond the coast. Droughts hit communities across the country last year, so millions of people saw first-hand the damage they do to drinking water, agricultural production, top-soil resources, water-based transport, and water dependent industrial and recreational economies. Many of those same communities know the devastation that deluges bring as well, including damage to public and private infrastructure, threats to public safety, and the release of toxic chemicals, petroleum, debris, sediment, nutrients, and sewage. Together, the cycle of drought and deluge poses significant challenges for every part of our landscape and infrastructure.

As with our coastal areas, investing in natural capital can help here, too. Conserving our natural defenses include protecting and restoring critical features such as wetlands and flood plains. Natural engineering systems include green infrastructure such as green roofs, street trees, and parks. Both of these nature-based options are designed to keep more rainwater where it falls and away from infrastructure. These systems also provide multiple co-benefits such as cooling urban areas, habitat preservation, and open space protection. Engineered systems include dams, levees, and floodwalls that should be hardened and re-sized to serve as critical protections during large floods. The natural and engineered systems approaches in tandem will help to re-establish the natural water-cycle on urban and rural landscapes to protect people and infrastructure.

The final component of the commission’s land-use recommendations concern protecting and upgrading our vulnerable and outdated wastewater treatment infrastructure — the pipelines, treatment plants and pumping stations that together make up a fundamental pillar of the state’s public and environmental health. This infrastructure transports wastewater from homes, buildings, and factories to treatment plants, which treat sewage and discharge effluent to New York waters, directly impacting upon water quality and the health of our communities. As we focus on ensuring that these facilities will survive severe weather, we also have the opportunity to upgrade the systems to meet water quality standards that protect public health.

New York is not the only place facing these challenges. On the strength of Governor Cuomo’s commitment and the recommendations of the NYS 2100 Commission however, it can be a leader. The expertise the state is developing matches or exceeds that found anywhere in the world, including the Netherlands, rightly praised for its foresight in planning for environmental change. That expertise will help New York adapt to the changing climate and will also bring new business opportunities as other cities and states look to New York for guidance. A partnership — among governments, financial and academic institutions, businesses, and the environmental community — that finds innovative ways to invest in and benefit from our natural capital can offer a brighter future for a post-Sandy world.
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How to fail in cleantech

Companies’ transition to cleantech inevitably entails change, which implies risk. Of course, it also implies some companies making this transition will fail.

We’ve already seen more than a few failures, and we’ll no doubt see many more.

As long as the successes outweigh the failures, that’s all that ultimately matters. Indeed, sometimes failure actually enables later successes.

As Thomas Edison has been quoted, “I have not failed. I’ve just found 10,000 ways that won’t work.” And, then finally — ta-da! — he discovered an approach that worked for the incandescent lightbulb, thereby changing the world forever.

But, sometimes failures can get in the way of success — particularly, if they’re the wrong kind of failures.

Edison failed quickly, cheaply and — perhaps most importantly — invisibly. Some of cleantech’s most painful failures have been anything but.

Consider two prominent examples: Solyndra and A123. The technologies being developed by the two companies actually work well enough, but couldn’t compete effectively in the marketplace.

The management teams and the backers of these companies promised great things with premature hype in innumerable press releases. The companies blew through lots of capital — including substantial government funding.

Then, they fly off the cliff and go bust, and the media and blogosphere — much of which is adverse to cleantech — report their demise with barely-hidden Schadenfreude.

OK, so it’s not like a mass shooting spree: no-one got killed in these failures. But equity holders lost every dollar, creditors took a deep haircut, taxpayer money was wasted, and pretty much everyone active in the cleantech sector gets tainted by extension.

As bad as economic failures, worse is when technologies fail because they simply don’t work.

The earliest windfarms of the mid-1980s in California became an eyesore of inoperative machinery, because the turbines were deployed in mass quantity before many engineering and manufacturing problems had been fully resolved. In the wake of this debacle, the U.S. wind industry took more than a decade to recover. By the time wind energy had regained credibility in America, European wind turbine manufacturers dominated the market.

These visions returned to me during a recent trip to Oahu, where my lodging provided me an ongoing view of the Kahuku windfarm standing idle in the face of a week of strong trade-winds. My first thought was a serial failure of the turbines — a relatively new 2.5 megawatt design from Clipper, a manufacturer with known technical issues.

However, as this report indicates, the root cause of the shutdown was unrelated to the wind turbines, but rather some problem with a set of grid-scale batteries being developed by Xtreme Power, and being piloted at the site to test the ability of such batteries to buffer the variable output of a windfarm. The pilot deployment had caused not one but three fires somehow involving the interconnection between the windfarm and the Hawaiian Electric grid, thus causing the windfarm to be idled while sorting out the battery issues.

Why weren’t these batteries tested in smaller scale and in a less obvious setting? Not only is the image of Xtreme Power (and grid-scale energy storage) being adversely affected, the long shutdown of Kahuku is dampening enthusiasm for wind energy in Hawaii.

It is these kinds of visible economic or technical failures that give the cleantech sector a black eye. The bad reputation diminishes civic goodwill, support for favorable public policies, and appetite for private capital to be allocated to the sector.

Unlike Edison’s failures, largely unnoticed by the rest of the world while he returned again and again to the drawing board, visible cleantech failures are distinctly unhelpful. Such episodes are very painful for those of us on the sidelines working humbly to maintain forward progress in spite of the setbacks that inevitably occur in this long and challenging cleantech transition.

In the venture capital world, it is axiomatic to fail fast, so as to minimize capital at risk. For cleantech, this adage should be modified: fail fast, and stealthily.

The implication: cleantech ventures — and their investors — are well-advised to maintain a low profile for a long time, until their success is reasonably assured. It’s far better to underpromise and overdeliver than vice versa. Humility is essential. Premature bragging is very easy to eviscerate by the pundits hungry for a tussle when things later go bad.

The more that cleantech entrepreneurs can avoid shooting themselves in the foot when the spotlight is on them — first and foremost, by not encouraging the spotlight to be shined upon them — the better.

Richard Stuebi is a founding Principal of NorTech Energy Enterprise. He is also a Managing Director in charge of cleantech investment activities at Early Stage Partners, a Cleveland-based venture capital firm.

By Richard Stuebi
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Anti-environment PR a scourge on the industry

Why do some public relations professionals knowingly champion industries that pollute air, contaminate vital water supplies, circumvent protective regulations and make false claims against clean, renewable energy? Would it be an indictment of our industry to recognize that PR agencies working to advance petroleum, natural gas and nuclear energy are part of the problem?

By Aric Caplan

Many of today’s “environment” and energy agencies employ the same tactics used by the tobacco industry to defend cigarettes from public health claims, keep Americans addicted to nicotine, and thwart liability and smoking’s factual link to lung cancer. Similarly, well-funded misinformation campaigns and efforts to malign all environmental regulations are working to help fossil fuels push our survival to the brink.

PR agencies can often face this dilemma: whether to represent clients that politicize science and blur reality in relation to public safety. But there should be no dilemma. When the facts are unimpeachable, PR has a responsibility to do the right thing. For example, the book “The Cigarette Century: The Rise, Fall, and Deadly Persistence of the Product That Defined America” by Harvard Medical School professor Allan M. Brandt, details the “culture, science, politics, law and global spread” of cigarettes. The industry’s public relations arm, Brandt writes, was “adept at taking a single disserter and assuring widespread media coverage of his views.” This purposeful agnosticism, which served the tobacco industry well, will sound eerily familiar to anyone following the global warming “debate” — another case in which a few pedigreed skeptics, whose views align with those of a powerful industry, are framing consensus as controversy. “The industry,” Brandt writes, “insisted on scientific criteria that it knew full well could not be attained then, or ever.”

After all, the climate impacts and public safety costs are far too high to risk what we convey to trusted press contacts. Considering all the scholarship and evidence linking pollution to exacerbating climate change, to remain a global warming skeptic someone would either have to work for the dirty energy lobby or be in complete denial of science. The League of Conservation Voters and other environmental proponents are demanding answers from Big Oil and gas companies that continue to raise doubt while they benefit from billions in taxpayer subsidies annually, special accounting rules, and drilling without paying royalties for exploiting our natural resources. They are also exempted from the federal Safe Drinking Water Act, which leaves regulation up to states, many of which have inadequate laws. Claiming to protect “trade secret” formulas, drilling companies are not required to publicly disclose the types of chemicals used in fracking and the total amounts of toxins being injected thousands of feet underground. Before the natural gas boom arrives in your hometown, the industry owes communities an explanation.

The dangers of denial
Whether or not you subscribe to global warming, severe droughts, flooding, wildfires, extreme heat, rising sea levels, super storms, and fierce amounts of precipitation are resulting and putting us all at risk. Our warming climate makes millions of Americans more susceptible to respiratory diseases like asthma and allergies that result from exposure to ozone, soot, air pollution, smog, pollen and smoke from wildfires.

According to the Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America (AAFA), an estimated 20 million people in the United States have asthma and, it is the cause for almost 500,000 hospital stays each year. AAFA says asthma is a chronic, debilitating condition that has no cure. It keeps kids out of school and sidelines them from physical activity. Employers lose 12 million work days every year when asthma keeps adults out of the workplace. The disease is also responsible for nearly two million emergency-room visits a year. In recent years, scientists have shown that air pollution from cars, factories and power plants is a major cause of asthma attacks.

Rejecting human caused global warming and ignoring its correlation to severe public health dangers and shortened lives, fossil fuel companies are denying their real energy burden on America. Frankly, burning coal and drilling gas and oil releases mercury, particulate matter, nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, and dozens of other substances known to be deadly to humans. Describing fossil fuel pollution’s effects on the human respiratory, cardiovascular, and nervous systems, Alan Lockwood, MD, a former President of Physicians for Social Responsibility and author of “The Silent Epidemic: Coal and the Hidden Threat to Health” said, “Coal is a major contributing factor to the top four causes of death in the U.S.: cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and stroke, but” Dr. Lockwood continued, “I think people are completely unaware that pollution from coal is responsible for huge numbers of deaths.”

Why regulations matter
Due to climate change, there is a direct link between deaths and failure to enforce environmental laws: the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) says heat-related deaths are escalating. According to NRDC’s report titled “Killer Summer Heat; Projected Death Toll from Rising Temperatures in America Due to Climate Change,” estimates a rising death toll through the end of the 21st century in the most populated U.S. cities. The findings suggest three with the highest number of total estimated heat-related deaths through 2099 are Louisville, KY (19,000 deaths); Detroit (17,900 deaths); and Cleveland (16,600 deaths). Other cities’ estimated death tolls through the end of the century include: Baltimore (2,900 deaths); Boston (5,700 deaths); Chicago (6,400 deaths); Columbus (6,000 deaths); Denver (3,500 deaths); Los Angeles (1,200 deaths); Minneapolis...
Anti-environment PR a scourge on the industry
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(7,500 deaths); Philadelphia (700 deaths); Pittsburgh (1,200 deaths); Providence, R.I. (2,000 deaths); St. Louis (5,600 deaths); Washington, D.C. (3,000 deaths).

“This is a wake-up call. Climate change has a number of real life-and-death consequences. One of which is that as carbon pollution continues to grow, climate change is only going to increase the number of dangerously hot days each summer, leading to a dramatic increase in the number of lives lost,” said Dan Lashof, Director of NRDC’s climate and clean air program. “To prevent the health impacts of climate change from getting even worse, we need to establish a comprehensive program to reduce heat-trapping pollution from all sources, by building on the Environmental Protection Agency’s proposals to limit carbon pollution from new power plants and cars.”

Science versus punditry

The Climate Reality project estimates that 90 million tons of carbon (i.e. greenhouse gas pollution) enters the atmosphere every day. Accordingly, maintaining current levels or burning more fossil fuels will cause the Earth to overheat as 97% of scientists and others agree that humans are the cause. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) found December 2011-November 2012 to be the sixth-warmest consecutive year that the contiguous U.S. has experienced and the warmest November-October 12-months on record.

According to the report, “Sick of Soot: How the EPA Can Save Lives by Cleaning Up Fine Particle Pollution,” released by the American Lung Association, Clean Air Task Force and Earthjustice, as many as 35,700 premature deaths can be prevented in the United States every year if the Environmental Protection Agency modernizes and strengthens the health standards for fine particulate matter — also known as soot.

Regrettably, some media outlets either selectively report on global warming’s impacts or neglect to take it seriously. In December, Media Matters for America exposed the 10 “dumbest” things that Fox News said about climate change in 2012. Among them, Fox Business reporter Tracy Byrnes claimed that “the temperature basically hasn’t changed much since the Ice Age,” before she confused global warming with the depletion of the ozone layer.

Then, during the third warmest summer on record in the U.S., David Asman — who hosts programs on Fox News and Fox Business — claimed “it’s getting colder.” Fox Nation, a section of FoxNews.com, linked to a story about the study with a headline declaring that wind farms “cause global warming.” When, National Review Online’s Deroy Murdock, a Fox News contributor, argued that NASA shouldn’t explain the facts about global warming because the science is still up for debate, claiming “there are scientists on both sides — there are hundreds of thousands on both sides debating” the causes of climate change. All such so-called reporting was a bunch of malarkey.

A “conspiracy” that doesn’t exist

Not all conservative commentators and writers manipulate the facts. In November, a former speechwriter for President George W. Bush, David Frum appeared on MSNBC’s Morning Joe to assess the GOP’s post-election 2012 agenda. He insisted that, “Republicans have been fleeced and exploited and lied to by a conservative entertainment complex.” Just days earlier, Mr. Frum tweeted, @daviddfrum “Let’s just say that you’re more likely to get the truth about climate change from the geeks than from the editors of the WSJ.”

Last fall in Slate, astronaut and author Phil Plait said he considered writing a lengthy climate change piece to deconstruct climate denial arguments as “completely unscientific nonsense” when geochemist and National Science Board member James Lawrence Powell beat him to it. He concluded that, “If global warming isn’t real and there’s an actual scientific debate about it, that should be reflected in the scientific journals.” So, Powell researched how many peer-reviewed papers had been published in professional journals about climate change, and compared supportive ones about the planet warming against challenges to that premise. Out of 13,950 articles that disputed the reality of climate change, guess how many Powell discovered? “Twenty-four. Yup. Two dozen. Out of nearly 14,000.” The only disagreement within the scientific community is among scientists working for the fossil fuel industry.

As TV host, actor and comedian John Fugelsang says, “Climate Change” is a conspiracy by the World Scientific Community to brainwash people into believing pollution is bad. You might be surprised at today’s profile of the typical American working to mitigate the effects of a rapidly warming planet. They are no longer just “crunchy” environmentalists and scientists shrouded in sterile, white lab coats conducting tests with bubbling beakers. In reality, they are the U.S. military, family farmers and ranchers, small business owners, hunters, anglers, clergy, and many other professional-types making some pretty strong arguments and every effort to combat the effects of climate change.

Truth, in the public interest

You don’t have to be a person of faith to grasp that we are burning the proverbial candle at both ends. Of “creation care,” the stewardship and sustainable use of natural resources including clean air and water, public lands, oceans, forests, rivers, lakes, and our wilderness, the Rev. Richard Cizik described his greatest fear would be failing “to be obedient to the command that God has given me and my role here in Washington. That given the authority I have, entrusted by 54 denominational leaders and church pastors from around the country, that I fail to heed God’s call to effectively influence our nation’s public policies. That is the mandate I have been given and entrusted with. That is the greatest fear I have. Because, God doesn’t intend to ask me, ‘Rich, how did I create the Earth?’ He won’t ask me that. He’ll say ‘Rich, what did you do to protect that which I created?” And that is an awesome question that deserves a good answer.”

The public relations industry has been grappling with declaring an official definition of PR for years. As it is important to know what the profession stands for, it is equally worth mentioning what the profession is not. Maybe a journalistic code or license should be put in play. Otherwise, what standard of fairness, truth, accuracy and completeness should PR represent? That standard could be corrosive to some agency folks who have never worked in a newsroom, been accountable to a readership or an audience and held responsible for their content by advertisers. For that reason, PR should be advocating in the public interest instead of creating obstacles and unreasonable doubt about peer reviewed, scientific rationale and more. I guess it’s plausible for some politicians to deliberately manipulate the facts to polarize the electorate or raise money to become reelected. Though that’s a pretty low bar for PR when as writers, messaging consultants, campaign strategists, media trainers, and special event planners daily endeavor to make a difference in the world.

Aric Caplan is President of Caplan Communications in Rockville, MD.
Companies, investors seeing risk in climate change

Nonprofits and science organizations play an important role in educating corporations to the dangers posed by climate change.

By Bill Hewitt

Several months after the 2006 launch of the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change — considered by many to be the most comprehensive review ever carried out on the economics of climate change — John Llewellyn, a longtime top economist with the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and then an economist with Lehman Brothers, released another seminal report. Llewellyn noted that “In the world of business and finance, climate change has developed from being a fringe concern, focusing on the company’s brand and its Corporate and Social Responsibility, to an increasingly central topic for strategic deliberation and decision-making by executives and investors around the globe.”

He further said, “Businesses are likely to be affected both by climate change itself and by policies to address it through regulatory exposure, physical exposure, competitive exposure and reputational — including litigation — exposure.”

Nonprofit organizations like the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP) play an important role in bringing a focus to the risks that corporations are incurring from climate change. The first step in managing these risks is measuring the greenhouse gas output of a business’s operations, “because in business what gets measured gets managed.” CDP gathers this data from 3,000 companies worldwide and promulgates the information to governments, investors and other businesses, academics, think tanks and NGOs.

The Climate Registry is another nonprofit doing similar work with a focus on North America. In order to create a global standard for this sort of reporting, the Climate Disclosure Standards Board was formed in 2007 at the World Economic Forum. Two of the members of the founding board said “Climate change and the implications on business process and disclosure are finally becoming the topic of discussion that they deserve to be.” Mindy Lubber, another founder of the CDSB, said at the time: “This initiative is a key step to improving and standardizing company disclosure on the risks and opportunities from climate change, whether from new regulations, physical impacts or growing global demand for clean technology products.”

Lubber is the head of Ceres. Ceres, like the U.S. Climate Action Partnership and so many other highly effective organizations dedicated to sustainability, is a coalition of scores of groups from the public interest sector as well as investment institutions and foundations. Ceres works on a number of fronts, but one of its principal jobs is making sure that corporations know that investors are watching and concerned. It works to promote awareness in the investment community of the risks and the opportunities presented by climate change.

The 90 institutional investors and financial firms of the Investor Network on Climate Risk (INCR) (launched by Ceres) have some juice: The members collectively manage nearly $10 trillion in assets. When INCR talks, Wall St. and corporate boards listen.

Are Wall Street and industrial and commercial enterprises getting the message? Echoing John Llewellyn, Lubber notes: “There is no question in my mind that we are no longer debating the issue of whether or not climate change is real and has a real financial impact within the corporate community.”

For example, the interest in and attendance at climate and sustainability sessions at the World Economic Forum have continued to mushroom over each of the past several years. “It is seen as a world class environmental, national security, public health and financial issue within the financial and corporate sectors. It is radically different from five years ago.”

One way to pressure a company is to bring shareholder proposals calling for greater attention to climate risk to a vote at annual general meetings. As the number and strength of these proposals have grown each year, many more of them are being addressed by the companies by their agreeing, without the actual vote, to meet the terms of the proposals.

Other groups like Ceres keep the focus on climate change with public statements, shareholder activism, conferences and by engaging directly with companies. The Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change (IIGCC) has over sixty-five members in Europe managing around €6 trillion ($8 trillion). In November 2010, Ceres, IIGCC and others issued a call to world governments: “Take action now in the fight against global warming or risk economic disruptions far more severe than the recent financial crisis.” The statement was signed by 259 investors from the United States, Europe, Asia and Australia with collective assets totaling over $15 trillion.

Even with all the focus and energy that is being brought to bear, the news is not all positive. A survey of top investment managers by Ceres revealed that they are not adequately seeing and addressing the risks, many going so far as to say they don’t believe that climate change is financially “material” to their investment decisions.

Al Gore refers to fossil fuel and related inventory and investments as “subprime carbon assets.” With the advent and advance of the movement toward putting a price on carbon, Gore thinks “the owners of these assets will soon face a reckoning in the marketplace. They are in roughly the same position as the holders of subprime mortgages before they realized the awful mistake they had made.”

The great renewable-energy seer and activist Herman Scheer described our post-industrial economies as being in transition from being based on fuels to being “technology-based.” If we are able to successfully effect this change, and rapidly emerging economies are able to “leapfrog” to this paradigm, then the pressures on the environment, public health and the climate system will be radically diminished.

If major corporations from sectors as diverse as manufacturing, insurance, retail and finance — and even some of the biggest energy and fuel companies — fully recognize and embrace the opportunities in this transformation (and the risks in not making it), then we have considerable hope for the future.

Bill Hewitt has held public affairs positions with the NY State Department of Environmental Conservation, and worked on environmental issues for mayoral and presidential campaigns. He teaches at NYU’s Center for Global Affairs. This article is an excerpt from his book “A Never World: Politics, Money, Technology, and What’s Really Being Done to Solve the Climate Crisis.”
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The recent announcement that Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Lisa Jackson would step down signals forthcoming changes for the Obama administration’s environmental policies, as well as a surge of renewed environmental debates.

By Peter V. Stanton

The announcement that Jackson would step down prior to President Obama’s second term was not a total surprise. As one of the Obama Administration’s most polarizing figures, Jackson aggressively pressed the President’s environmental agenda, earning the ire of energy producers, manufacturers and other commercial interests as well as some Democrats and state environmental departments across the country. Jackson was so effective at pushing the President’s agenda that the Wall Street Journal referred to her as “… his repressed green id.” She was a leader in the Obama Administration’s first-term efforts to legislate through regulation and as a result enjoyed a great degree of leeway in steering the President’s environmental agenda. Her influence was such that when the President delayed an EPA rule on ozone in 2011, it’s said Jackson went ballistic and threatened an ugly public resignation, a move sure to anger environmental advocates just as the campaign was heating up.

While Jackson may have won that round, ruffling the White House’s feathers during a campaign is not a good way to secure a second term as an agency head or cabinet secretary. It’s no secret that myriad regulations were put on hold during the campaign. Many believe the pent up internal tsunami is about to break on several intensely controversial issues such as hydraulic fracturing, greenhouse gas emissions, clean water, soot and the expected return of the Keystone Pipeline debate. To pursue these wide ranging and controversial goals, the White House must have confidence its EPA Administrator is a team player and Jackson’s blowup likely undermined that trust.

The Green Lobby surely views President Obama’s re-election as reason to believe they are free to press their priorities even more aggressively. Certainly, a lame duck term gives a president the latitude to open the throttle on the more controversial elements of his agenda. Still, environmentalists are leaving nothing to chance. They have made clear their willingness to use the courts to compel action on issues such as power plant emissions, diesel fuels in hydrofracturing and similar priorities not only to force EPA’s hand, but to amplify its efforts. Whomever the President nominates as Jackson’s successor, the new administrator will find the green groups ready simultaneously to help and threaten. Emboldened as they are by the election outcome, environmental activists are further energized by the EPA’s own success in court rulings that affirmed the agency’s prerogative to declare greenhouse gas emissions a significant public health risk, perhaps Jackson’s most prominent legacy. They expect the agency to wield that authority and are breaking new ground to ensure it happens.

Already, there is evidence of this strategy. The Natural Resources Defense Council threw down the gauntlet by handing the EPA a draft regulation and plan for going after greenhouse gas emissions saying essentially, take it or else. The plan calls for using the Clean Air Act and the powers that law grants the EPA as a means for circumventing Congress where the Republican House surely would take the “ghost-written” draft regulation to task.

As such, industry groups and their agency partners are wasting no time considering how to rebuff these efforts and make their case. The play book will surely include the following:

Continued on next page
It's still about jobs

The energy, chemical, technology and transportation industries face daunting regulations in the new term. While sympathetic congressional leadership in the House will help, challenges from an activist EPA and a president prone to Executive Order policy remain. That said, those industries hold a vital and valuable card. They are investing and creating jobs. The unemployment crisis did not fade away with the election. It’s real. It’s persistent. And the public considers it a priority.

A 2009 study from the University of California found that as unemployment rises, interest in the environment and climate change declines. A few years have passed since the study was issued, but unemployment remains inordinately high and seemingly intractable. Beyond that, it is unlikely any elected official at either the state or federal level will argue against job creation and increased employment opportunities for his or her constituents.

The more a direct correlation can be made between new regulations and a deleterious effect on job growth, the more likely a fair and balanced hearing — if not an outright win — by industry can be achieved. The need is to make employment arguments real and personal. By putting a face on the issue, showing the folks working and being hired in these industries, the arguments become more than a numbers game. Jobs matter, but people count. The industries would do well to humanize their story.

Keep it simple

The default posture for industry communication on environmental regulatory policy is a discussion of sound science. This remains imperative as no less than the National Academies of Science have taken the EPA to task for failing to provide satisfactory scientific evidence to support certain conclusions.

The challenge, however, is to make those arguments clear in layman’s English. Hard scientific data are often difficult to explain in terms that are both meaningful and compelling to the average consumer. As any PR professional in the business of discussing parts-per-quadrillion knows, the battle is lost if the media and consumers lapse into jargon-induced narcolepsy.

When we talk instead about risk, we have a greater opportunity to put complex information into context for consumers bombarded with technical information. Americans are pragmatic. They want to do what is best for themselves, their families and the environment, but they also strive to be reasonable. It is the rare consumer that goes through the pantry tossing all canned food and beverage products because of a vague suspicion about the purported effects of bisphenol-A. They may opt instead to reduce the potential for consumption by the infant in the family, but still enjoy a cold can of Budweiser at Sunday’s tailgate party.

Put risk into meaningful perspective and consumers will thank us for helping them cut through the hype and paranoia.

Power remains in the states

Jackson turned the EPA into a formidable force on regulatory policy. She fought tenaciously on key issues and won legal battles the agency and green lobby view as authority to do even more. The next wave is certain to impact the states where environmental policy is still influenced by local concerns and economic priorities. Administrator Jackson was known for her adherence to the concept of federal superiority over state environmental issues. The new administrator no doubt will be measured by activist groups on his or her willingness to maintain that posture.

A key example is hydrofracturing for natural gas extraction. In states such as Pennsylvania, endorsement of this technology has led to a jobs and economic boom. Much the same is occurring in Ohio where long dormant manufacturing towns are coming back to life on the strength of this new activity. These and other states have drawn a clear line in the sand against federal interference in local matters. Pennsylvania’s DEP Secretary Michael Krancer, an outspoken advocate for state control, has been successful in creating a coalition of Republicans and Democrats in the Pennsylvania congressional delegation opposed to EPA overreach in the fracking debate. He is not alone. Others are unlikely to take lightly any attempt by the EPA to curtail hydrofracturing through regulatory fiat. They must and will bring pressure to bear on their representatives in Congress to challenge the EPA should the agency attempt to impose onerous restrictions on drilling.

If the Green Lobby has proven anything, it has shown it can turn people out to express support for restrictive policies. This was on full display during the Keystone pipeline debate in which Jackson, at minimum, won a stay during the election. The next round will be even more contentious. Industry groups will need to play by the same set of rules and bring out the ground troops that can give congressional delegations and state leadership essential cover to push back against what they characterize as EPA overreach.

The Jackson departure signals nothing if not a moment when both sides of environmental policy debates are measuring the challenges ahead and preparing their plans. For industry communicators and their agency partners, the tsunami can be countered with sound strategy. Such strategy must be framed in terms that resonate with an American public genuinely concerned about protecting the environment, but equally concerned about their economic well being. Now more than ever, there seems to be an opportunity to balance those concerns in practical real-world terms.

Peter V. Stanton is President & CEO of Stanton Communications, Inc.
Understanding today's public affairs disconnect

Why don’t more companies integrate their communications and government relations functions?

By Doug Pinkham

Natural synergies exist among those who manage relationships with government, the media, local communities, employees and other stakeholders. It seems inefficient — and even dangerous — to build “silos” that separate people and programs with similar goals.

Twenty years ago, it was common in the U.S. for these two functions to report to the same person. In Europe, Asia and Australia, it is still customary for a global head of public affairs to be responsible for both reputational and policy matters.

Yet, according to a 2011 study by the Foundation for Public Affairs, only half of large American companies currently locate communications and government relations functions in the same corporate unit. Why the disconnect? Here are four reasons:

1. Management consultants told U.S. corporate leaders they needed to decentralize. Remember the mantra that we needed to move employees in corporate functions “closer to the customer”? Back in the 1990s, many firms shifted responsibility for communications, government relations, marketing and other functions to the business units. It’s ironic that many of these same consultants brought in to decentralize leading companies are now recommending a more centralized approach.

2. Maintaining separate functions was supposed to allow each department to focus on what it does best. Some companies, generally brand firms that focus more on marketing than public policy, have favored single-mindedness over synergy.

3. Many companies said they lacked an executive qualified to manage both communications and government relations. In a 1999 Public Affairs Council survey, this factor was mentioned as a major roadblock preventing greater integration. Fourteen years later, because firms have persisted in their decentralized approach, it has become even more difficult to find top executives with the needed range of experience.

4. Employees have been recognized and rewarded for “owning” issues. Many U.S. firms have sought to improve performance by making individual staff responsible for company-wide issues. But most issues are not purely reputation-based or policy-related; they are both. While the common approach does centralize expertise and accountability, it doesn’t encourage collaboration. Ideally, the company itself should “own” all of its issues, and those issues should be managed by cross-functional teams.

In recent years, the arguments for joining forces — or at least coordinating forces — have become stronger than ever. First and foremost, public perception and public policy are closely related. News travels fast, and bad news travels faster. Companies that take an unpopular stand on an issue may find themselves subject to protests and boycotts. Firms that are frequently criticized in the media have a difficult time advocating a legislative agenda.

If the smallest business unit in a large multinational makes an unethical business decision, the entire enterprise suffers, including the communications and government relations functions.

It’s also important to remember that as corporate brands become more valuable, they become more vulnerable. A brand may be an intangible asset, but some are worth billions. (Apple’s brand has an estimated worth of more than $130 billion.) Growing anti-brand activism, however, has placed many global brands at risk. In fact, the more well-known your brand is, the more likely it is to be a target. Companies must have a well-coordinated response to these campaigns.

The Internet and social media have made the world smaller, and that demands consistency. Smart companies don’t give one message to Wall Street and another to employees and consumers. They don’t fund activist groups through corporate contributions and then oppose those same groups on public policy issues. Journalists and congressional investigators are on the lookout for examples of corporate hypocrisy and inconsistency.

Taking an integrated approach to public affairs can create efficiency and effectiveness. Having said that, some of the leading corporations in America don’t have integrated public affairs departments — but they do have strategic issues management systems. These systems help companies prioritize issues and strategies. In the 2011 Foundation for Public Affairs study, 30% of large companies said they maintained a formal system for setting priorities and coordinating activities, and another 44% said they maintained informal systems. More than 60% had formal or informal systems for coordinating government relations with the firm’s corporate social responsibility function.

It is much easier, of course, to operate an effective issues management system when all parties are housed in the same division. Scanning the environment, setting priorities, defining objectives, executing plans and measuring outcomes require cooperation. If one senior executive is accountable for this entire process, the company is more likely to stay focused on the right challenges and opportunities.

Every corporation is different, and a firm may have good reasons for not wanting to blow up its org chart or add a major line of responsibility to a busy executive’s plate. But, sooner or later, everyone will face an angry public, a suspicious news media, disenchanted employees, a skeptical financial community or a negative climate for public policy. If you have broken down internal barriers and have everyone collaborating on common issues, you will be better able to respond quickly and effectively.

If you are the top government affairs and communications executive at your firm, your goal should be to have every management employee throughout the entire company understand the implications that business decisions have on both public policy and corporate reputation. When you achieve that level of awareness, you have begun reaping the benefits of integration.

Doug Pinkham is President of the Public Affairs Council, a nonpartisan, nonpolitical organization that provides training and advice on public affairs ethics, laws and strategies.
PR counsel brought in over Herbalife war

Weight management and nutritional supplement company Herbalife is locked in a PR war with hedge fund manager Bill Ackman, who says the company is a pyramid scheme.

By Greg Hazley

Ackman, who runs Pershing Square Capital Management and is betting heavily against Herbalife, holding a widely reported and lengthy investor conference presentation where he called the company out on its sales practices.

Now, at least four PR agencies are engaged to help with the daily skirmishes between the two parties that are playing out in the press. The PR push, which includes help from Global Strategy Group and Edelman, includes a Website, factsaboutherbalife.com, outlining Ackman’s criticisms of its multilevel marketing business model of selling to sales reps.

Herbalife, which operated overseas for years before growing its U.S. operations and is based in Los Angeles, has blasted Ackman’s “malicious attack” as misinformed and inaccurate. Barbara Henderson is Senior VP of Corporate Communications for Herbalife, which is working with Joele Frank, Wilkinson Brimmer Katcher and GF Bunting.

The company says its operates at the highest ethical and quality standards, hiring outside experts to ensure its operations comply with laws and regulations. “Herbalife is not an illegal pyramid scheme,” said a statement responding to Ackman.

Herbalife offered a nearly point-by-point rebuttal of Ackman’s December 20 presentation with its own investor pitch on January 10 in New York.

Joele Frank has tussled with Ackman before. It helped Procter & Gamble and Canadian Pacific Railway in proxy battles against the hedge fund titan last year, and backed Target in a similar battle in 2009. Slate dubbed the showdown the “Great Herbalife War of 2013,” after another hedge fund, Third Point Capital, entered to fray last week to back Herbalife by taking a more than eight percent stake. Writes Matthew Yglesias, “Herbalife’s various accounting and business practices are now being put under the microscope in a way that doesn’t happen to most companies. If the company survives, it will be by withstanding scrutiny rather than flying under the radar — exactly the way it should be.”

Study: ethical PR counsel often comes at cost

PR pros who counsel senior management on ethics issues see a duty to the public interest, not just the organizations they serve. This is a role that can have repercussions, according to research by professors at Baylor Univ. and the Univ. of Texas at Austin.

By Greg Hazley

Neil said participants acknowledged that they were often in a “kill the messenger” situation, making it difficult to make a case to or criticize executives above them. A few said they were fired or demoted for refusing to do something “blatantly unethical,” while two said they resigned when their advice went unheeded, include one exec who refused to put false information in a press release.

As one study participant noted: “I can’t afford to lose my credibility … As PR professionals, it’s all we have. And if I lose my credibility here, it’s not like I can just go start over with someone else, somewhere else.”

While PR’s migration to marketing has broadened the field, it has also had consequences, according to the research. PR pros noted a common misperception among senior executives that PR is simply a tool of the marketing department, limiting its role in strategic counsel at a company or organization.

Two approaches cited for communicating with management without seeming judgmental were mock news conferences and the “headline test,” where managers are asked to imagine a good headline and a bad headline that could result from an approach they championed.

The study has been published in the Journal of Mass Media Ethics.
last year, my firm completed an extensive global study of how corporate public relations activities were developed, managed, staffed, funded and evaluated at multinationals across over a dozen industries and on three continents.

Over the past 25 years or so, we have conducted more of this kind of benchmarking and best practices research for more clients in more sectors than any other consulting firm.

But the findings of this particular research helped us to connect more dots across disparate PR functions we had explored separately before. Here are a few things we learned:

Most public relations activities at one-third of the 100 largest corporations in the world today report to their marketing functions.

Our analysis shows that at current rates, more than half will adopt this as an operating model by next year.

We have seen earlier waves of consolidation between marketing, sales and PR functions, of course — followed by an unbundling later.

In the past, these moves were typically driven by top management and/or portfolio changes and significant marketplace tumult.

But calls starting in the early 1990s for more well-integrated, targeted and cost-efficient marketing and sales support communications this time around were aided and abetted to some extent by a parallel transformation of agency/supplier and related media business models.

This integration trend was further accelerated by the evolution of the Internet and a range of new web-based tools.

Indeed, several client studies we conducted in recent years found that some of the fastest growing line items of corporate communications budgets in recent years have been earmarked to activities that didn’t exist a decade ago.

Many of these activities have been associated with the advent of so-called “social media.” The notion that these are “media” in the classic sense of the word is something of a misnomer that merits more scrutiny and discussion.

But our research has shown that social media activities were one of the first cases in memory where most “early adopter” multinationals failed to benefit from being first.

More striking: a surprisingly high share we tracked continued to be punished for their early gaffes, in some cases for years afterwards. In a more recent study, we also found that far too many corporations were following in the footsteps of these pioneers — without learning from their mistakes.

The assimilation of marketing and PR (along with at least some activities once managed out of IT) plus parallel shifts in recruitment have only exacerbated this situation.

More corporate communications activities are following the path forged by investor relations and government affairs over the past four or more decades, reporting in to executives with little or no PR training or experience.

As Advertising Age predicted in December, we are also seeing “more outsiders in the CMO suite,” including a handful hailing originally from public relations but with no formal training in marketing.

Where does PR fit in?

Our latest study found that not just social media but also employee communications, traditional media relations and philanthropic efforts, among others, were increasingly getting lost in this shuffle. More often than not, these efforts lacked a cohesive internal strategy, focus and ownership — and they frequently conflicted with already existing efforts carried out through other channels. As more firms outsource more different kinds of work, this has represented something of a bonanza for agencies, with one hand often not knowing what the other is up to, until something goes awry, typically via the Internet.

Interviews we conducted with executives at a cross-section of these companies further revealed that the intrinsic benefits of public relations-centric knowledge, expertise, skills, etc. were being sublimated at best and ignored at worst by many organizations. This perceptible shift away from clear “core competencies” — what differentiates their capabilities from all other business functions — is also making corporate communications teams more vulnerable to disintermediation. This often happens in subtle ways. For example, see one survey of PR executives cited in a Journal of Public Relations Research article last year, in which a majority of respondents:

• Placed qualities like “strategic decision-making capability,” “ability to solve problems and produce results” and “communication knowledge and expertise” ahead of their “relationship-building abilities,” “ethical values and orientation” and “team collaboration ability” when it came to identifying “qualities of excellent PR leadership.”

• Deemed “a clear and compelling vision of how communications connects the organization to its publics,” “comprehensive understanding of media and information systems” and “ability to strategically construct messages,” among others, as being features they most associated with PR leadership, behind other more differentiating characteristics like “comprehensive understanding of the needs and concerns of diverse publics” and “an unwavering belief in the importance of honest and ethical organizational communications and actions.”

It seems clear from our work with clients in recent years that part of what’s behind the widespread integration underway is that CEOs as well as senior management teams at too many corporations today don’t appear to fully appreciate that PR is not the same thing as marketing — or vice-versa, for that matter.

While they have always shared some
of the same strategies, goals and even messaging, PR and marketing have historically been distinctly different but critical business functions. This is in part because they have fundamentally different objectives and attract/develop talent with demonstrably different training, skills, capabilities, interests, expectations, etc.

Bottom line: the benefits that have historically accrued to organizations which took a cross-stakeholder approach to communications and engagement are at risk at a time when more multinationals need to take this very kind of platform-view, perhaps more than ever.

“Conscious businesses consider the needs of all their stakeholders — which is to say everyone touched by the business: employees, suppliers, customers and affected communities, as well as investors,” observes Alan Murray stating the no longer necessarily obvious, in a Wall Street Journal op-ed review of a new book, “Conscious Capitalism.”

The authors, John Mackey and Ray Sisodia, simplistically single out two industries — financial services and pharmaceuticals — which they claim have failed to follow this mantra even as they hold up Google, Southwest Airlines and Whole Foods, among others, as better stewardship models.

Our research suggests that there’s a different, more compelling way to look at this phenomenon.

A renewed sense of perspective

Regardless of industry, among the most all-around vulnerable insofar as their reputations are the “most admired” corporations (as ranked by the Financial Times and Fortune) of the past five or more decades. These are also many of the companies held up as models followed by others for their best practices, and a striking percentage of them have all but stopped differentiating marketing from public relations strategically and organizationally.

It’s hard to write any of this and not sound like a pie-in-the-sky purist, ponting for “public relations the way it was once practiced.”

However, this is not a genie that can be put back in the bottle and I’m not advocating that it should be, even if that was possible. But I do believe that all of our trade associations (PR Society, IABC, Arthur Page et al.) are falling all over each other and yet short on leading an intelligent, free-flowing discussion about these and other significant shifts underway that are reshaping the practice of PR.

The irony here is that even as the PR business is deemed to be “booming” overall and spending more resources year after year than ever to help identify an updated raison d’être for the profession, the resulting research, conference agenda topics, books, college curricula and such seem to move further away from marketplace realities.

This is no longer a conversation that can be dominated by a handful of the same stalwarts. I would argue that more of today’s senior corporate communications leaders — including more of those who are not members or active in any trade groups — need to pick-up this baton and carry it forward.

Collectively, they have the most to gain (as well as lose under the status quo) from any such endeavor. The very future of public relations is at stake.

Byron Reimus, former director of corporate communications of Boston Consulting Group and VP of corporate communications at New England Mutual Life Insurance Co., has run Byron Reimus & Associates since 1989. He was a senior VP at Ruder & Finn, director of public and community relations at Consumer Credit Counseling Service, and director of PR of the advertising agency of Kamp Paiste Hammer & Beaudrot. He started out as a general assignment reporter with Gannett Newspapers.

PR services briefs

FTI PLAYS ATARI CHAP. 11

FTI Consulting is handling the Chapter 11 bankruptcy filing of Atari, the videogame pioneer that produced the classic “Pong” game.

The move follows the failure of key shareholder and lender BlueBay to find a buyer for its ownership position that had been up for sale in October 2010. Though Atari reported operating profit for the past two years, it says that BlueBay’s decision to pull the plug on future outlays has made it “starved for funds.”

CEO Jim Wilson said in a statement: “In light of the current situation with BlueBay, we have decided to take what we think is the best decision to protect the company and its shareholders.”

He expects the sale of the company or Chapter 11 reorganization to be completed within three months.

Founded in 1972, Atari bills itself as the “original innovator of video gaming.” Its portfolio of more than 200 games include Asteroids, Centipede, Missile Command, Test Drive, Backyard Sports and RollerCoaster Tycoon.

FTI senior VP Guillaume Granier and media relations consultant Nicolas Jehly are handling the Atari chapter 11 filing.
Obama’s drone war bombs in popularity

The U.S.-led global war on terrorism has evolved, and so have its rules of engagement. Unmanned combat air vehicles, or drones, have become the de facto tool in fighting enemies in the Middle East and Africa. As the use of drones escalates in foreign conflicts, the internal protocols and clandestine methods used to select targets are now being called into question.

President Obama in January announced U.S. troop reduction in Afghanistan would commence months sooner than previously planned. Beginning in spring, the U.S. would relieve some of the 66,000 military personnel currently stationed in the country; after 2014, when the U.S. mission in Afghanistan is formally slated to end, Obama said American forces would retain “a support role” in Afghanistan along with NATO forces. According to a January 8 Washington Post report, this could now mean as few as 2,500 troops, a far cry from the 30,000 figure discussed only a year ago.

It’s an anti-climatic end for the Afghanistan conflict, America’s lengthiest military engagement and a war that has grown astronomically expensive and increasingly unpopular. After the withdrawal update, the Obama administration made another announcement, one that equally forebodes the future of our conflicts abroad. The U.S. military is now preparing for the construction of a drone base in northwest Africa that would gather intelligence on Al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups in the region. A January 28 New York Times article posited its location would probably be Niger, and would be used to aid French-led skirmishes in neighboring Mali, where Al-Qaeda-backed militants now control the northern part of that country.

Taken together, an accurate picture of forthcoming U.S. military engagements might include increasingly global areas of coverage, with fewer bodies on the ground. It’s an oddly Orwellian take on both warfare and foreign affairs. Soldiers are replaced by darts on a screen, increased observatory power effectively elevates the U.S.’s role in monitoring the world — and enforcing international law — from the confines of control rooms.

The effects drone technology has had on the rules of modern combat cannot be overstated. Unmanned aircraft — like the MQ-9 Reaper — prowl war-torn corners of the Middle East and Africa, controlled remotely from control centers thousands of miles away, in clandestine locations near Syracuse, or at military bases in Nevada and New Mexico. Insurgents can be killed with the push of a button, not unlike a video game.

There’s little doubting the program’s efficacy. The State Department claims drones are responsible for eliminating 22 of Al-Qaeda’s top 30 leaders. During a counter-terrorism strategy announced to the public in June, Counter Terrorism Advisor John Brennan said the administration now views drones as the most effective way to fight terrorism, and cited the technology as a future staple of U.S. military engagement. Not surprisingly, drone use has proliferated, not only in countries like Afghanistan where the U.S. is engaged in military conflict, but also by the CIA in Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia and, if the headlines are accurate, possibly Mali.

It also saves American lives. The unmanned aircraft — which require no cockpit, control panels or ejection seats — not only allows greater payloads and increased maneuverability, but puts no pilots at risk. In many cases it removes the impetus to put any physical troops on the ground.

Instead, the increased power of drones and their prevalence in the skies have sparked an international debate regarding their legality and ethical fortitude.

Silent weapons for quiet wars

The first drone killing occurred in 2002, against an Al-Qaeda cluster stationed in Yemen. Soon after, it became a regular feature in CIA operations during strikes in Pakistan under the Bush Administration.

Bush may have introduced the world to drones, but Obama has made it his signature weapon in the U.S. war on terror. By September 2012, Obama had authorized 283 strikes in Pakistan alone, six times more than the total number of strikes authorized during Bush’s tenure. Drones have been responsible for 35 deaths in Pakistan alone since January 1, with seven strikes in the first 10 days of 2013 (2012, by contrast, saw 40 total drone deaths in that country). According to The Long War Journal, a Website that tracks drone activity, there were more than 40 strikes in Yemen in 2012, a huge increase from two years prior — when there were only four.

No one knows exactly how many insurgents have been killed by drones since they were introduced a decade ago. According to a January Council on Foreign Relations report titled “Reforming U.S. Drone Strike Policies” by Micah Zenko, drones have been responsible for as much as 95% of U.S.-led targeted killings since 9/11. Some groups, like the Bureau of Investigative Journalism, estimate the total to be somewhere between 2,562 and 3,325 killed in Pakistan, as well as 655 killed in Yemen and 114 killed in Somalia.

Yet, the program’s failings have been notorious. Last September in Yemen, a U.S. drone strike targeting Al-Qaeda suspects accidentally killed 13 civilians, including three women. In March 2011, a single drone strike in Pakistan killed 42 people, most of them civilians. In February 2010 a drone strike in Afghanistan’s Urozgon Province killed 10 civilians traveling by car, who had been misidentified as terrorists.

It’s practically impossible to know the total number of innocent people who have been killed by drone strikes, not only because news reports vary in reliability by region, but also because, according to a May 2012 New York Times report, the U.S. military “… in effect counts all military-age males in a strike zone as combatants, according to several administration officials, unless there is explicit intelligence posthumously proving them innocent.”

The Bureau of Investigative Journalism reports that since 2007, U.S. covert actions in Somalia — including drone strikes, as well as foot and manned aircraft operations — have resulted in deaths of which 19% to 34% were non-combatants. In Yemen, the New America Foundation reported that civilians have so far comprised a casualty rate between 4% and 8.5%. In Pakistan, The Bureau of Investigative Journalism reported a civilian kill rate between 18% and 26%, or somewhere between 474 and 881 civilian deaths.

Other reports suggest the numbers could be higher. A recent study by Stanford Law School and the New York University
School of Law found that drones may have killed as many as 700 innocent people since 2004, including about 200 children. All together, a compilation of news reports assembled by the New America Foundation estimated about 20% of people killed in drone strikes have been non-militants.

Brennan in June 2011 claimed drones’ precision and protocol had improved, so much so that there had not been “a single collateral death” during U.S. drone strikes that year. He later amended this statement slightly to account for the event that occurred months prior in Pakistan.

The hazards drones pose for civilian populations and the reactions that may result from accidental drone deaths, critics contend, is a colossal deterrent to their efficacy. Many experts believe drone strikes can have a deleterious effect on the War on Terror because they effectively increase tensions in already volatile regions, and are at least partially responsible for reigniting anti-American sentiment in these areas, possibly resulting in renewed recruitment for terrorist organizations.

The September drone strikes in Yemen sparked large protests in that country. Drone strikes have become so unpopular in Pakistan its government in early 2012 demanded an immediate end to the activity, stating in a letter read during the UN general assembly that “no overt or covert operations inside Pakistan shall be permitted” (drone strikes continue in Pakistan today). A 2012 Columbia Law School report titled “The Civilian Impact of Drones: Unexamined Costs, Unanswered Questions,” claims rising anti-U.S. sentiment in some areas may be the result of increased drone campaigns. “Since the drone program in Pakistan began, there has been an increase in deaths due to terrorist incidents, peaking at 2,500 civilians killed in 2011,” the report reads. “Civilians have been caught in a dangerous position between local militant groups and U.S. troops prior to 9/11 to as many as 25,000 today. Drone strikes by the JSOC are carried out from a network of remote bases, like Camp Lemonnier in Djibouti, which was described in an October Washington Post report as being a place where “around the clock, about 16 times a day, drones take off or land.”

Drones target individuals from a culled database known colloquially as a “kill list,” which also includes targets to be killed by means other than drones. No one has publicly said how many people are on the list, or how it’s compiled. Indeed, the National Security Council, the CIA and the military each assemble their own “kill lists,” and the process for adding targets to these lists apparently differs by agency, though many of the individuals on these lists apparently overlap, according to “The Civilian Impact of Drones” report.

The National Security Council investigates potential targets in tandem with the military, and allegedly proposes its selected targets to the President. A May 2012 New York Times report interviewed several current and former Obama advisors, who detailed weekly White House video-conferences — dubbed “Terror Tuesday” — where potential target individuals are reviewed and then recommended as additions to the President’s “kill list.” The President still allegedly approves most military targets, however, according to Jane Mayer’s essay “The Predator War” in the October 2009 issue of The New Yorker, at least some CIA drone strikes in Pakistan do not require Presidential approval. In other words, there are some planned assassinations that require no input from the White House.

There are “personality strikes” — where the U.S. targets someone whose identity is
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Thomas P. Butler, President
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CooperKatz has significant experience helping clients respond to complex business, public policy or environmental issues with integrated communications solutions that deliver results. Our expertise helps organizations strategize issues, articulate key perspectives and leverage opportunities. Relevant cases include:

Major national strike that shut down an industry; Marketing of controversial products; Copyright / trademark protection in digital realm; Issues regarding healthcare reform / delivery; Environmental impact of motor vehicles; Annoucing top sports team’s major renewable energy investment; Publicizing global corporate environmental initiatives; Privacy / tracking issues related to online behavioral advertising; and Expansion of top-level Internet domain. CooperKatz has developed public affairs and/or environmental issues-oriented campaigns for a wide range of clients, including American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers (ASCAP), Association of National Advertisers (ANA), Digital Advertising Alliance, Otis Worldwide, Philadelphia Eagles, Piaggio Group Americas, The Physicians Foundation and US Preventive Medicine.

COOPERKATZ & COMPANY
205 Lexington Avenue, 5th Floor
New York, NY 10016
www.cooperkatz.com

Andy Cooper, Principal
Ralph Katz, Principal
Anne Green, President / CEO

Coyne Public Relations is a leading independent public relations agency, representing some of the world’s most well-known brands in categories including Automotive, Beauty & Fashion, Food & Nutrition, Health & Wellness, Media & Publishing, Pet & Animal, Retail & Restaurant, Sports, Technology, Toys & Juvenile Products and Travel. From traditional to social media, we combine strategy and creativity to generate the best possible results for our clients — taking each and every client exactly where they want to be, and beyond.

Coyne PR specializes in a range of services, including brand building, product launches, events & promotions, sponsorship activation, corporate communications, cause marketing, social media, corporate social responsibility and crisis management. Recently named a finalist for PRWeek's 2013 Midsize Agency of the Year, Coyne PR boasts an employee retention rate over 90 percent, an internal digital design studio to support our clients’ needs and always provides a best team approach to every account. Recent experience includes work with UPS on their sustainability initiatives as well as Sealed Air Corporation’s SmartLife platform.
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808 State Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
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John Davies, CEO
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Those who need to win the highest stakes matters, the toughest crises, and the most difficult regulatory problems increasingly turn to Davies Public Affairs.

Since 1983, Davies has grown to become the nation’s third largest dedicated public affairs firm. This success is based on results across multiple industries, for clients including Fortune 100 companies and top names in 47 states.

From traditional outreach to highly structured online cam-
Our portfolio encompasses a broad array of media, content, and services designed not just to move the public opinion needle, but to win. This drive to win is what many clients say sets Davies apart.

Impeccable tactical execution is the starting point, but is not sufficient. Success requires the ability to articulate why. That is, from the standpoint of the public, why should a client succeed? Most public affairs fights are lost because that question is never answered.

Davies not only knows how to answer the all-important why, the firm knows how to use that message to motivate individuals to stand up, speak out, and take action.

**GIBBS & SOELL, INC.**

60 East 42nd Street, 44th Floor New York, NY 10165 212/697-2800 Fax: 212/697-2646 www.gibbs-soell.com

Luke Lambert, President & CEO Jeff Altheide, Executive Vice President Ron Loch, Sr. Vice President and Managing Director Sustainability Consulting Practice

Gibbs & Soell is a business communications firm that serves as a trusted adviser to top-tier clients and organizations to help build effective reputation management and leadership positioning on sustainability, corporate social responsibility and risk management issues.

With headquarters in New York, offices in Chicago, Raleigh and Basel, Switzerland, and affiliates in 40 countries, G&S speaks the language necessary to educate and prompt action among key stakeholders.

Our team of senior counselors collaborates with clients to develop and implement strategies that communicate the business value of their sustainable development. Our portfolio encompasses a broad array of media, content, creative and digital services.

Also, Gibbs & Soell and Centre for Sustainability and Excellence combine communications and measurement expertise to offer Green Assure Product Marketing programs, which include message creation, green verification, influence engagement and marketing communications.

Media and subject matter experts rely on insights from our annual Sense & Sustainability® Study for unique research into consumer and business opinions on the corporate commitment to environmental, social and governance responsibilities.

From marketing green products and technologies to managing ESG issues, we combine solid strategy and creative thinking with tactical know-how to impact your business.

**MARX LAYNE & CO.**

31420 Northwestern Hwy., #100 Farmington Hills, MI 48334 248/855-6777, x105 Fax: 248/855-6719 mlayne@marxlayne.com www.marxlayne.com

For more than 20 years, suburban Detroit-based Marx Layne & Company has provided outstanding, results-oriented communications counsel to a broad spectrum of clients in the business, government and non-profit sectors. Our proven ability to design and launch successful public relations campaigns, develop creative communications solutions and exceed client expectations has earned us a reputation as a valued partner and an industry leader.

Our public affairs professionals customize high impact strategies to deliver clients’ messages and influence opinion on legislation, regulation and appropriations at the state and local levels.

We’re routinely engaged by lobbyists to reinforce their efforts by generating constituent messages, news coverage and talk show appearances, editorial commentaries, expert testimony and research studies.

Our clients include publicly traded multinational corporations, mid-sized companies and small private practices.

We’re knowledgeable in many industries including environmental services, energy, financial services, healthcare, higher education, hospitality, legal, manufacturing, nonprofit, real estate, retail and telecommunications.

**OGILVYEARTH**

111 Sutter Street, 11th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104 415/677-2800 eddie.fernandez@ogilvy.com cabira.hatland@ogilvy.com gil.jenkins@ogilvy.com

Eddie Fernandez, Managing Director, OgilvyEarth West Cabira Hatland, Director of Client Services and Internal Relations, OgilvyEarth West Gil Jenkins, Director of Business Development and External Relations, OgilvyEarth West

OgilvyEarth’s unique expertise in public relations is rooted in our deep, multi-disciplinary approach. We combine strong technical and sustainability industry expertise with best practices from Ogilvy PR’s corporate, consumer marketing, social media, technology PR and public affairs teams to bring a level of insight unparalleled in our industry.

OgilvyEarth specializes in conducting strategic communications programs that reach media, influencers, consumers, employees, policymakers and investors to meet clear objectives for clients. We help both entrepreneurial start-ups and major corporations tell a credible and compelling story about how products, services, and processes either harness renewable materials and energy sources, reduce the use of natural resources and/or cut emissions and waste. Businesses need strategic communications to navigate the complex regulatory, legal, reputational and reputational challenges facing the industry — and ensuring that brands compete and prevail in today’s market is why our clients selected OgilvyEarth.

Our staff have worked as business journalists, former entrepreneurs, authors, academics, technologists, environmental advocates, non-profit leaders, political strategists and managers for some of the world’s largest brands. Our team has represented clients across multiple environmental and energy sectors, including solar energy, wind power, biofuels & biomaterials, water, air & emissions, green transportation, energy storage, green buildings, smart grid, mobile technologies, recycling & waste, agriculture, renewable energy finance, materials and more.

As agency leaders for one of the country’s largest green PR campaigns, OgilvyEarth has successfully established Ford as the most environmentally-friendly U.S. automaker in the eyes of consumers. This has been achieved through a pioneering PR approach of online and traditional media outreach, thought leadership and consumer engagement activities focused on translating niche, environmental innovations and achievements into mainstream media campaigns.

**POWELL TATE**

733 10th Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20001 www.powelltate.com

Pam Jenkins, President

Powell Tate, based in Washington, D.C., is one of the most respected names in public affairs. Established in 1991 as a bipartisan firm, Powell Tate staff include top communications and policy experts from both parties on Capitol Hill, the White House, federal agencies, trade associations, advocacy organizations and the media. No matter which party controls Congress, Powell Tate professionals help craft and deliver powerful messages and activate advocates to achieve results.

While Powell Tate can help clients reach top opinion leaders in Washington, the agency also specializes in state and public affairs campaigns and grassroots outreach, especially through digital communications and social media advocacy. Major areas of expertise include healthcare, nonprofit advocacy, financial services, education, energy and environment, technology, international communications and defense. The firm’s leadership in crisis and litigation communications practice helps clients prevent, proactively respond to and recover from severe threats to their organization, reputation or brand. Powell Tate is a division of Weber Shandwick.
Rasky Baerlein Strategic Communications is a nationally recognized public and government relations firm with more than a decade of experience providing exceptional client service to organizations that operate at the intersection of business, politics and media. With offices in Boston and Washington, D.C., the firm offers a comprehensive range of services, including public affairs, government relations, public relations, corporate & marketing communications, crisis & reputation management, international representation, and media & presentation training.

Rasky Baerlein’s Public Affairs practice has extensive experience representing multinational clients’ interests before local, state and federal governments, and can help you take advantage of the strong relationships we have built with elected officials in both New England and on Capitol Hill.

The Energy and Environment practice, led by 12-year EPA Veteran, Jim Cabot, excels in helping clients achieve their business objectives through integrated communications strategies, working with companies ranging from large utilities to clean tech start-ups and a burgeoning roster of renewable energy companies.


ROGERS & COWAN

PACIFIC DESIGN CENTER
8687 Melrose Ave., 7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90069
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www.rogersandcowan.com

Tom Tardio, CEO

Rogers & Cowan is the leading entertainment marketing and PR agency with U.S. offices in Los Angeles and New York. We offer clients a proven approach to building awareness and support for their environmental and public affairs initiatives by leveraging the powerful influences of the entertainment industry coupled with a strong corporate and trade PR strategy.

Our team manages and executes environmental PR and PA campaigns for clients in the technology, entertainment, food and beverage, automotive, aviation and non-profit industries, including Fortune 500 companies, philanthropies and organizations, trade associations, filmmakers and distributors and international celebrities and recording artists.

Whether we are supporting the launch of the ECOCYCLE brand, a partnership with Coca-Cola and will.i.am; the launch of Hangar 25, the world’s first solar-powered aircraft facility at the Burbank airport; raising awareness for the Green Business Roundtable, a public/private green event featuring former President Bill Clinton and Los Angeles public officials; building excitement for the eco-documentaries; or securing media coverage for environmentally-friendly automakers, we provide our clients with the PR and marketing strategies, access and relationships to secure the right print, broadcast and social media coverage with the right messaging to ‘help’ clients promote their various initiatives.


RUDER FINN, INC.

301 East 57th Street
New York, NY 10022
212/593-8400

Kathy Bloomgarden, CEO
Rachel Spielman, Global Head of Corporate Communications
Heather Gartman, Director, Washington DC Healthcare
Sarah Coles, Senior Vice President, Corporate Social Responsibility

Ruder Finn, a leading independent global communications agency, has vast experience developing and deploying strategic public affairs programs. The firm’s expertise lies in working with clients to shape opinions, create awareness and mobilize audiences around corporate social responsibility and environmental initiatives across our four pillars of Corporate & Public Trust, Health & Wellness, Technology & Innovation and Consumer Connections.

At Ruder Finn, we believe that corporate responsibility and corporate citizenship should be central to the business model. Through comprehensive communications programs, our dedicated Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) practice has counseled clients on how to creatively and strategically integrate CSR into their business models and core values, resulting in initiatives that are a natural extension of what the company already stands for. Ruder Finn has extensive experience in creating and implementing plans that increase visibility, build support to drive initiatives into the general public around causes such as recycling, solar energy, water usage and environmental protection.

Ruder Finn takes a multi-disciplinary approach to public affairs, specializing in crisis communications, lobbying and influencer engagement. With strong beltway and media relationships, we have created and implemented strategic public affairs programs to help educate policy makers, build support for regulatory and legislative actions, manage critical issues and drive bottom line results for our clients. Ruder Finn’s public affairs experts are well-versed on legislative and regulatory issues facing a range of industries and have cultivated high-level personal and professional relationships with key players and influencers in the US and across the globe.

SCHNEIDER ASSOCIATES

2 Oliver Street, Suite 901
Boston, MA 02109
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www.schneiderpr.com

Joan Schneider, President and Creative Director
Phil Pennellatore, Chief Operating Officer/Partner

At Schneider Associates, we define public affairs as anything that impacts public opinion and drives behavior. That covers a lot of territory, especially in today’s complex communications cycle where missteps can result in crisis situations instantaneously. Whether you’re facing a media crisis, securing Town Meeting approvals, advancing social or environmental causes, or need to persuade decision-makers at all levels of government, Schneider Associates can help. We implement a proprietary process known as Community Launch to develop campaigns and government relations strategies for premier commercial, retail, and residential real estate developers as well as corporations, nonprofits, and municipalities. We build support to drive initiatives through the public process, and execute campaigns for clients such as Partners Partners, Equity Office, The Gutierrez Company, National Development, Cassidy Turley, Nordblom Company, Campanelli Companies, Comar Real Estate Trust, and General Chemical. Learn more about Schneider Associates.

Continued on page 30
Leading the Travel Industry by Providing Professional Travel Services Since 1972

- Business Travel Consultants
- Strategic Meetings Management
- Government Travel Contractors
- Over 200 Offices Worldwide
- Competitive Online Booking
- One-on-One Travel Consultation
- Leisure Travel Experts

Locations:
- North America
- Middle East
- Europe
- Asia

212-563-3500 • OmegaNewYork.com

World Headquarters • 3102 Omega Office Park • Fairfax, VA 22031 • 703-359-0200
Continued from page 28

how Schneider Associates launches products, services, companies, and communities at www.schneiderpr.com

STANTON COMMUNICATIONS INC.

1150 Connecticut Ave., NW Suite 810 Washington, DC 20036 202/223-4933 www.stantoncomm.com

Peter Stanton, President Catherine Imus, Managing Director/Public Affairs

To provide effective advocacy and communication on complex environmental issues, the Stanton Communications Environmental Public Affairs Group brings together a specialized team of skilled professionals who know the subject. Our team offers the right mix of experience and capability to enable clients to successfully address challenges and controversies. From climate change and the introduction of new technologies, to project permitting, chemical safety and community health concerns, our professionals have experience dealing with the full spectrum of scientific and sensitive matters.

Based in Washington, D.C., our Environmental Public Affairs Group offers support nationwide through media outreach, ballot initiatives and materials development. Our programs encompass strategic traditional and social media relations, coalition building and community engagement, issue advertising and spokesperson preparation.

For more information visit www.stantoncomm.com or call us at 800/426-1887.

TREVELINO / KELLER

949 W. Marietta St., Suite X-106 Atlanta, GA 30318 404/214-0722 dtrevelino@trevelinokeller.com william@trevelinokeller.com www.trevelinokeller.com www.wheelhousetk.com

Recognized as one of the 30 best firms to work for in North America, Trevelino/Keller features a GreenWorks practice which serves as its environmental strategy for its protecting, preserving and promoting the reputation of B2C and B2B companies. Working with emerging and established companies who position themselves as environmental or non-environmental companies seeking a green strategy, the firm is sought after for corporate positioning, industry relations, product and company launches and crisis communications. Its services include public relations, social media and marketing communications.

Relevant experience includes the launch of the first carbon neutral zone in America, working with early stage company, Verus Carbon Neutral. The firm managed the launch of the world’s first biodegradable foam cup, branded Vio, working closely with the Plastics Environmental Council (PEC) and other industry authorities to ensure that Vio’s brand identity and messaging were on point with the FDA’s strict Green Guidelines. Its work with Kleiner Perkins-backed Lehigh Technologies, recognized innovative Micronized Rubber Power (MRP) products, utilized the firm’s full suite of services. Trevelino/Keller executed the company’s rebranding with new logos, new websites and new advertising and spokesperson services along with in-depth subject matter expertise needed to navigate the complexities of the sustainability, social responsibility, environmental and energy-related arenas.

Weber Shandwick is one of the world’s leading and most innovative communications firms with 126 offices in 81 countries. Through our specialized Social Impact and Cleantech offerings, we bring clients a full-range of strategic, integrated communications services along with in-depth subject matter expertise needed to navigate the complexities of the sustainability, social responsibility, environmental and energy-related arenas.

Weber Shandwick’s global Social Impact team partners with major corporations, non-profits and foundations to drive engagement with key stakeholders, thought leaders, consumers and media. Our team brings experience working in senior-level sustainability positions across sectors to build best-in-class, award-winning integrated social responsibility and sustainability programs. Our global Cleantech practice is a trusted partner to leading and emerging renewable energy companies providing strategic, integrated communications services to leading and emerging companies in the Cleantech and Renewable Energy sector.

These teams counsel clients on sustainability and environmental public affairs strategy in partnership with the agency’s specialized public affairs division, Powell Tate, based in Washington, D.C. Powell Tate staff include top communications and policy experts from both parties on Capitol Hill, the White House, federal agencies, trade associations, advocacy organizations and the media.
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Edelman</td>
<td>New York</td>
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<td>20</td>
<td>McNeely Pigott &amp; Fox</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>$475,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>APCO Worldwide</td>
<td>Wash., D.C.</td>
<td>30,360,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>CRT/tanaka</td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>420,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>8,253,463</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Vaughan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cerrell Associates</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>4,467,127</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fahlgren Mortine</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>392,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MWW Group</td>
<td>E. Rutherford, NJ</td>
<td>4,395,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kaplow</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Levick Strategic Comms.</td>
<td>Wash., D.C.</td>
<td>3,393,489</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Seigenthaler PR</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>302,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Development Counsellors Int’l</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>4,332,188</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Schneider Associates</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>194,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rasky Baerlein Strategic Comms.</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>2,944,355</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Standing Partnership</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>181,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Finn Partners</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2,254,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Gibraltar Associates</td>
<td>Wash., D.C.</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Singer Associates</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>2,004,948</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Trevelino/Keller</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Moore Consulting</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>1,560,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>JW Group</td>
<td>W. Hollywood</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Crosby Marketing Comms.</td>
<td>Annapolis</td>
<td>1,444,955</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Padilla Speer Beardsley</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>105,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nyhus Communications</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>909,014</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Maccabee</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>79,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ruder Finn</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>905,586</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Formula PR</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>70,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Allison+Partners</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Rosica Communications</td>
<td>Paramus, NJ</td>
<td>62,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jackson Spalding</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>661,078</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Red Sky PR</td>
<td>Boise, ID</td>
<td>59,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Butler Associates</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>614,060</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Open Channels Group</td>
<td>Ft. Worth</td>
<td>52,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>rbb Public Relations</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>534,711</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Coyne PR</td>
<td>Parsippany, NJ</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Gregory FCA</td>
<td>Ardmore, PA</td>
<td>1500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Crisis management: Manti Te’o fumbles apology

By Fraser Seitel

But now, most folks have heard the saga of Notre Dame All American linebacker Manti Te’o and his fictional girlfriend.

The story of beloved Lennay Kekua, whom Te’o wooed for three years, right up until the day she was involved in a horrible car accident, diagnosed with leukemia, and died three days before her devoted Te’o recorded 12 tackles in an upset win over Michigan State, was well known to every fan of the Fighting Irish.

It was a love fable that not even Lance Armstrong could have concocted. It was sweet, it was noble, it was strong. And, as we eventually learned, it was baloney.

Since that beacon of investigative journalism, Deadspin.com, spilled the beans on Te’o and his university and his imaginary girl friend, the scandal-seeking public has been fixated on one question, “What did Manti know and when did he know it?” (Maybe that’s two questions.)

In any event, Te’o and his advisors’ fumbling of his ultimate choreographed Katie Couric “apology” is a text book example of what not to do when your image takes a hit.

Even if you believe that Manti Te’o was telling the truth that he was “duped” by and not a willing participant in the girlfriend hoax, here’s how Team Te’o still fumbled the public relations ball.

First, Te’o lied. Lying, of course, is the cardinal sin of public relations.

Te’o, as he haltingly confessed to Couric, lied in two interviews about his imaginary girl friend, even after telling Notre Dame Administrators the whole thing was a hoax.

“Katie put yourself in my situation. Everybody knew that this girl I committed myself to, died on Sept. 12. You know, what would you do?”

How about this.

First, if I was Notre Dame and I agreed that we would prefer that nothing be said until after the Bowl Game with Alabama, I would have cancelled the Te’o interviews. Of course, reporters would’ve been mad; but what’s worse, a couple of angry reporters or a lying linebacker?

Bad advice. Bad decision.

Second, Notre Dame rushed out way too early.

As soon as the Te’o hoax was exposed, Notre Dame Athletic Director Jack Swarbrick conducted a press conference, tearfully vouching for the impeccable integrity of his star.

Unfortunately, evidently nobody cued Te’o that his alma mater was going public. He was nowhere to be found, so Swarbrick’s ringing defense was followed up by silence.

Two days later, with Te’o still off the radar screen, a starting-to-get-a-bit ticked Swarbrick, said the school had “encouraged” Te’o to come forward.

“Encouraged?”

Why wouldn’t Notre Dame have orchestrated Te’o — or at least checked with him — prior to its going public.

Nature and reporters abhor a vacuum, and they fill it — as they did in this case — with all sorts of rumor and innuendo.

Notre Dame’s “ready, fire, aim” press relations backfired resoundingly on the school’s silent star.

Third, Te’o fumbled the timing.

Crisis managers talk about the early part of a crisis, as the “golden hour” that sets the tone. Sometimes the “golden hour” can be a day or even a week.

But nobody heard anything from Te’o until two weeks after the Deadspin “Blarney” piece.

One reason the Te’o team didn’t let their boy face the media in a more timely manner was that they were jockeying for just the right interviewer, reportedly pitting Katie against Diane and Oprah. (In the end, it was Couric — coincidentally represented by the same public relations advisor who represented Te’o — who was selected.)

In the meantime, the advisors concocted a ridiculous, pre-Katie “off camera” interview with ESPN, where an invisible Te’o claimed his innocence.

While the public waited for Te’o to come forward, the linebacker’s credibility — and presumed position in the NFL draft — continued to wither.

Fourth, Te’o fumbled the story.

While Te’o and Notre Dame first trumpeted that the Heisman runner up was victimized by a hoax, it was later revealed that Te’o subsequently lied about the phony relationship so as “not to distract the team” in advance of the Alabama game.

So right out of the box, Te’o sounded inconsistent.

And when the blessed day finally arrived and Te’o sat down to tell his story to Couric, client Te’o was torpedoes by client Couric.

The Couric program, eager to promote its big “get” leaked early clips that Te’o admitted “lying” about fictional Kekua. Sure enough, the “lie” was what the media ran with.

The best thing that can happen to young Te’o is the story now dies. If what he says is true, then he was dumb but not duplicitous. He was also ill-served by his university and his crisis management advisors.

If he succeeds in the NFL, then all will be forgotten over time. But largely due to this bizarre drama in which he, unwittingly or un, has been centrally cast, he begins his NFL career as “damaged goods.”

FRASER P. SEITEL has been a communications consultant, author and teacher for 30 years. He is the author of the Prentice-Hall text, The Practice of Public Relations.
All in the family and more

By Richard Goldstein

Many employers have a general understanding of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, but the particulars can be a bit fuzzy. Because missteps in FMLA compliance can lead to conflicts with employees and even costly lawsuits, it is important to be familiar with the requirements. Here is a primer that was sent to our clients in our Focus newsletter. (Please send me an email if you would like to be added to our mailing list.)

FMLA basics

The FMLA requires covered employees to allow eligible employees to take up to 12 workweeks of unpaid leave (or paid leave if the employer’s policy allows for it) during any 12 months for certain family or health related reasons, such as the employee’s own serious health condition or to care for a family member with a serious health condition or a newborn or newly adopted child.

The rules differ slightly when an employee is caring for an injured or ill family member who’s in the military. One of the differences is that the employee’s leave may be allowed to extend to 26 weeks in a 12-month period.

Your PR firm generally will be considered a covered employer if it’s had 50 or more employees for each working day in each of 20 or more weeks in the current or proceeding calendar year.

To be eligible for FMLA leave, employees must meet several requirements. Among them: The employee must have worked for your company for at least 12 months. The months don’t have to be consecutive; even seasonal work can count toward that 12-month minimum. However, the employee must have worked at least 1,250 hours in the last 12 months.

Definition of a “parent”

While it is often assumed that an individual using FMLA to take leave of absence is the actual parent or legal guardian of a child, that is not always the requirement. An employee can take leave if he or she has an “in loco parentis” relationship with the child. That is, the employee has the daily care and financial responsibilities of a parent, yet has no legal or biological connection to the child.

An employee also can use the FMLA for leave to care for parent who is injured or ill. Again, the word “parent” can be defined rather broadly, including biological, step, foster, and adoptive parents, as well as individuals who acted as “in loco parentis” to the employee.

Other requirements

Employees can take their leave in a single block of time, or, in certain circumstances, in multiple smaller blocks. An employee using multiple blocks, however, must try to schedule them in a manner that minimizes disruption to the employer.

If the leave is foreseeable (not an emergency), advance notice is required. You can require documentation about the health condition that is prompting the advance FMLA request in order to determine whether the leave is covered under the FMLA. However, the employee does not have to disclose the diagnosis.

While an employee is on leave, you must allow his or her health benefits (if you provide them) to be maintained. But you can require the employee to cover more or all of these costs while on leave.

When an employee returns from leave, you generally must allow him or her to return to the same or an equivalent position, earning pay and benefits equivalent to what he or she earned before taking the leave. This does not automatically hold true for what the department of labor terms “key” employees, however.

Be in the know

Make sure your HR department has a solid understanding of the FMLA. Doing so will help ensure you remain in compliance and minimize the likelihood of costly lawsuits.

More information on the FMLA can be found on the Department of Labor’s website at dol.gov. (Click on the topic “Leave Benefits” and subtopic “Family & Medical Leave.”)

And more

I want to disseminate some information supplied by Management Strategies in its January, 2013 issue. I am using this space because I believe this information is important and do not want to wait until next month. Al Croft, the publisher, can be reached at acroft@npgeable.com.

For 2012, the average income generated per professional according to a survey of independent agency principals was $177,125. Benchmark this against yours.

According to the survey, 2012 revenue increased over 2011. 84% of independent agencies increased income in 2012 over 2011 by 12.5% (I have no idea if this is organic or by merger.)

Slightly more than half of the independent firms increased their operating profit in 2012 over 2011 by an average of 17%. The remainder were down or flat over 2011.

Just under half of the firms reported average productivity of at least 80%.

Average number of billable hours - 1,440. 57% of firms showed a higher billed-hours average of 1,600 hours.

Principals spent an average of 32% of their working hours chasing new business.

All of the survey respondents — 100% — expect their 2013 revenue to be up at least 12%.

PR services briefs

BONNIER TAPS FIRST CHIEF CONTENT OFFICER

Special interest publisher Bonnier Corp. has named its first chief content officer, promoting David Ritchie to the newly created post.

All editorial, digital, TV, audience development and web development teams now report to Ritchie, who previously directed editorial operations for the company’s active interest division, and now has responsibility for how content teams create, package, execute and optimize content.

Bonnier titles include Skiing, Field & Stream, Savour and Babtalk; among others. It has closed Caribbean Travel + Life, Spa and Snow in the past year.

“For us to achieve audience growth in this media landscape, it’s essential to have a strong editorial voice to oversee content,” said newly minted Bonnier CEO Dave Freyand.

He started out at Marlin magazine before taking a marketing post at Hatteras Yachts. He returned to Bonnier in 2008 as editorial director for its marine titles.

Bonnier on Jan. 13 announced the retirement of CEO Terry Snow, CEO.
“Toothless” PRSA code ignored member wishes

By Jack O’Dwyer

The removal of enforcement provisions from the Code of Ethics of PR Society of America in 2000 was done in defiance of the wishes of the general membership, Society leaders, and the advice of the Ethics Resource Center, Washington, D.C.

Details of how the Code was rewritten are in two articles totaling 45 pages by Prof. Kathy Fitzpatrick of Quinnipiac Univ. that appeared in the Journal of Mass Media Ethics in 2002.

Fitzpatrick also authored a 1,070-word essay on the Code moving from enforcement to “inspiration” that is on the Society website.

ERC in January 2000 created and conducted a poll of the 20,266 Society members that drew a response from 2,099 members (10.4%). [There were 21,192 members as of Dec. 12, 2012, a gain of 926 in 12 years].

Ninety percent of the respondents “agreed that the Society should deny or revoke membership for failure to meet Code standards,” said the Fitzpatrick article that is titled “From Enforcement to Education: The Development of PRSA’s Member Code of Ethics 2000.”

Belief that a “formal mechanism should be in place to resolve allegations of ethical misconduct” was expressed by 92%.

Half of the respondents said they “feel an extraordinary amount of pressure to compromise their ethical standards,” said the article. One interviewee told ERC that “in some ways, lying permeates everything we do.”

ERC recommended that the Code “be rewritten and its enforcement provisions revised as part of a larger campaign to position the Society as the integrity leader in the PR field,” said the Fitzpatrick article.

Ethics Board members were pushing a Code that would be “aspirational” and “inspirational” and avoid accusing any members of wrongdoing. Fears that members might sue the Society were expressed

**Ethics board ignored Society abuses**

Members of the Ethics Board were thinking about long term ethics policy but were ignoring numerous ethical abuses and wrongful practices at the Society itself involving its governance, allocation of funds, relations with the PR press, reporting its finances, and lack of its own members on staff.

The Society had a loss of $1,105,181 for 1999-2000 and saved money by not printing the 2000 members’ directory, a nearly 1,000-page volume that was one of the most valued if not the most valued member services.

Where had the money gone? Part of it was lavished on the accreditation program that lost $2,204,423 from 1986-99.

The yearly loss reached a record $441,467 in 2000 when it cost $1,794 to create each of the 246 new Society APRs. Spending on travel, meals and hotels for leaders and staff was excessive, totaling $3,272,162 for the seven years from 1994-2000.

Worst abuses came in 2000 when the board met in London from April 5-8, its first ever meeting outside of North America. Its July 13-15 meeting was at the Northstar-at-Tahoe resort. Travel, meals and hotels that year totaled a record $717,478. The board found plenty of money for meetings at highly desirable locales but not enough money for the members’ directory. The printed directory was discontinued after 2005, a decision that was not run by the Assembly.

**APRs go on rampage**

The APR members, who had exclusive control of the board since the mid-1970s, not only splurged on the APR program and board expenses, but beat back all attempts to place non-APRs in the board or even get the topic discussed at the Assembly.

APRs twice over-ruled attempts by the nominating committee to place New Yorkers on the board who wanted the APR rule removed from the bylaws.

The APRs’ candidate for treasurer, Joann Killeen of Los Angeles, defeated official candidate Michael McDermott of Riverside, Conn., at the 1999 Assembly. Killeen had some financial background but McDermott was a financial specialist who lived about an hour from Society h.q.

The parliamentarian, noting that delegates were using electronic voting devices for the first time and many had not voted, called for a second vote on Killeen/McDermott but was over-ruled by Arthur Abelman, the Society’s lawyer. Robert’s Rules are actually advice and can be disregarded by an organization professing to follow them.

Killeen, again as a write-in candidate in 2000, defeated Art Stevens of New York who was the official candidate for chair-elect.

Stevens, an ardent foe of the APR rule who wanted Assembly delegates to be reachable via a single e-mail and for annual conferences to be in New York every second or third year, claimed “foul” since Killeen had the public support of nine sitting directors. Joining him in the same criticism were 1987 president Jack Felton whose committee on nomcom reform said directors were not to elect fellow directors, and Mary Cusick, 1998 president and chair of the 2000 nomcom.

The strategic planning committee of 1999, headed by Steve Pisinski, unanimously urged dropping the APR rule. The 1999 board expressed its opposition to that and refused to put the topic on the agenda of the 1999 Assembly.

**Leaders polled, assembly demurs**

Frause in 2000 polled national directors, chapter presidents, Assembly delegates and section and district chairs (more than 300 members) and received 20 responses.

Fitzpatrick’s 24-page article on Code revision says respondents supported a revised Code “with most supporting enforcement and suggesting various degrees of punishment be used.”

Respondents also supported ethics education and said members “should be held responsible for the actions of non-Society members they supervise and should identify employers, clients and front groups.”

Rank-and-file members, leaders and ERC thus had lined up in favor of enforcement but the 1999 Assembly, all of whose members were accredited, thought otherwise. ERC and Society leaders discussed a possible new Code with the 240 delegates in 1999 who were split into 18 focus groups.

The focus groups “seemed to support” an ERC preliminary finding that eliminating enforcement would be “a step in the wrong direction and would send the wrong signal,” writes Fitzpatrick, but at the same time they were “split in their views on whether enforcement was desirable, possible, or both.”

Frause had contended in a memo to leaders March 17, 1999 that it had become nearly impossible to enforce the Code because of legal challenges by some accused members and the refusal of others to cooperate. “Our entire committee is frustrated powerless and unable to do justice to the spirit” of the Code, he wrote.
OBAMA’S DRONE WAR

Continued from page 25

known — and “signature strikes” — where the person is allegedly unknown. Why a
person is a target if he/she is “unknown” remains a matter of question, but according
to the Columbia Law School “The Civilian Impact of Drones” report, “Signature
strikes make up a significant proportion of the covert drone campaign, constituting
the majority of strikes in Pakistan … Indeed, an unnamed U.S. official said in 2011 that
the U.S. has killed twice as many “wanted terrorists” in signature strikes than in personality
strikes. U.S. officials have also reported that most of the people on the CIA’s “kill
list” have been killed in signature strikes.”

In October, the Washington Post outlined the Obama administration’s development
of a new “blueprint for pursuing terrorists,” with the use of an intensive targeting database
it called the “disposition matrix.” According to the article, this “matrix” contains a wide sampling of terrorism suspects culled from numerous classified sources, and is designed to go beyond existing “kill lists.”

Program’s future uncertain

Many have assailed the supposed illegality of drone strikes occurring in countries like Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia, nations that are not currently at war with the United States. At least some militants targeted in Yemen or Somalia allegedly have had no known ties to terrorist organizations with which the United States is at war; they seem to be individuals interested solely in committing crimes against their own country. Some locals claim this practice essentially makes the U.S. a surrogate of its domestic police force.

Then there’s the fact that some operators who work for the CIA’s drone program allegedly aren’t military personnel at all, but are contractors. In other words, there may be American civilians paid by the U.S. government to kill. Moreover, according to a September 2011 Washington Post report, the President has now allegedly given JSOC the authority to select individuals for its “kill list” without approval from the White House. Some critics have claimed this practice is a violation of U.S. law, as it is essentially tantamount to assassination.

Then there’s the fact that the program has been used to target American citizens. A 2011 drone attack killed Anwar Awlaki, an American-born Muslim militant and known terrorist. Several weeks later a drone also killed Anwar Awlaki’s 16-year-old son, also a U.S. citizen, who locals claimed was not a militant and did not belong to any terrorist organization. A federal judge in January ruled the U.S. government did not have to release secret memos related to Anwar Awlaki’s killing. The U.S. government is also currently attempting to dismiss a lawsuit brought on as a result of the 16-year-old’s death.

Some studies suggest the U.S. is getting better at avoiding civilian causalities. Data gathered by the New America Foundation shows non-militant deaths accounted for about 10% of those killed by drones in 2012, a sharp decline from the Foundation’s estimated 60% civilian death rate in 2006.

There are also reports that President Obama, behind closed doors anyway, has discussed with his closest advisers the possibility of scaling back on the use of drones. Several senior officials told Newsweek in a December feature that Brennan has also discussed potential changes to the drone program. The Washington Post in January reported that the CIA is close to finalizing a new series of guidelines on drone strikes.

Meanwhile, dissent and disapproval of the practice has grown palpable at home. At least one elected official, Congressman Keith Ellison (D, MN) has been publicly critical of the drone program. Ellison, the first Muslim to be elected to Congress, called on increased transparency into the use of drones in a January Washington Post editorial, asking the Obama administration to answer details on how the drone program selects its target individuals.

Grassroots groups such as CodePink, Veterans For Peace and U.K.-based rights group Reprieve have waged well-attended public protests to voice their opposition to the practice. During President Obama’s inauguration in January, one protest group lay in bloody sheets in the streets near Capitol Hill to raise public awareness on the issue.

On January 24, it was announced that the United Nations plans to launch an investigation into drone strikes. According to the New York Times, Ben Emmerson, Special Investigator for the United Nations Human Rights Council, said the UN plans to conduct a nine-month study that would examine “25 selected drone strikes that had been conducted in recent years in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia and the Palestinian territories.” The inquiry will be coordinated through Emmerson’s UN office in Geneva, and Emmerson plans to report his finding to the UN general assembly in New York this fall. According to a January 23 Guardian article, Emmerson has previously stated that some drone attacks could possibly constitute a “war crime.”
WASHINGTON REPORT

Obama press aide exits super PAC for GSG

Bill Burton, the Obama press aide who left to advise a super PAC that supported the president’s re-election campaign, has landed at Global Strategy Group in a PR role in D.C. Burton takes an executive VP role focused on strategic communications and public affairs for the firm, which worked with the Priorities USA Action super PAC during the recent election cycle. GSG was the lead consultant to PUSAA, which has been credited with inflicting early damage on the image of challenger Mitt Romney in the campaign.

On the corporate side, GSG, based in New York, has worked with ESPN, IBM and A&E Networks. It is helping hedge funder Bill Ackman in his campaign to discredit the nutritional products giant Herbalife.

Burton, a Hill PR aide and Communications Director for the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee when it was led by then-Rep. Rahm Emanuel, was National Press Secretary for Obama’s 2008 campaign. He joined the White House as Deputy Press Secretary before leaving to work on the re-election push for PUSAA.

Jen Psaki left her Senior VP/Managing Director role at GSG to be Obama’s traveling press secretary during the campaign. Jim Papa now heads the D.C. office of GSG.

Gibraltar merges with DC shop

Five-year-old Washington-based PR and public affairs shop Gibraltar Associates has merged with D.C. research, lobbying and advisory firm McBee Strategic Consulting, leaving Gibraltar as the strategic communications business unit of McBee.

That unit, known as McBee/Gibraltar, is headed by Gibraltar co-founder and CEO, Eric Bovim, who takes a managing director title. Tom Pernice, another Gibraltar co-founder, takes a Senior Advisor role and remains in Los Angeles.

Bovim, a former Senate aide and journalist, said the move “is a way to stay ahead of the consulting trend lines and capture a bigger share of the market.”

Gibraltar clients have included Teva Pharmaceuticals, GeoEye, Xe Services (formerly Blackwater) and Dole Food Company, among others.

Steve McBee, President and CEO of 10-year-old McBee and a former aide to ex-Rep. Norm Dicks (D-Wash.), added that government risk is at an all-time high for business leaders, noting the “failure to anticipate, shape, and adapt to Washington trend-lines can cost billions of dollars.”

Gibraltar, which had revenue of nearly $5 million in 2011 with about 20 staffers, has relocated its team to McBee’s D.C. headquarters at 455 Massachusetts Avenue, NW.

AIG returns to lobbying scene

AIG, which cut Washington lobbying activity after its massive federal bailout in 2008, has retained Patton Boggs to clear approval for its $5 billion divestiture of the bulk of its International Lease Finance Corp. aircraft leasing arm to Chinese investors.

The New York Times (Dec. 9) called the transaction “one of the biggest acquisitions of a U.S. company by Chinese investors.”

The Committee of Foreign Investment in the U.S. is scrutinizing the sale to the group that includes New China Trust and China Aviation Industrial Fund.

PB is line for a $120,000 retainer from AIG. Tommy Boggs spearheads the push for clearance of the transaction.

He’s assisted by Jeff Turner, head of PB’s public policy, administrative and regulatory department. On its website, PB bills Turner the lobbyist who is most involved in “bet the company” projects.

AIG claims U.S. taxpayers made a $22.7 billion profit on the $182.3 federal bailout of the New York-based insurer.

Levick banks on Bartlett

Steve Bartlett, who retired late last year as President and CEO of the Financial Services Roundtable, has moved to Levick Strategic Communications in an “of counsel” role.

Bartlett, a former Congressman and Dallas mayor, held the top Roundtable post since 1999.

“We are thrilled to have Steve Bartlett join our ranks,” said Richard Levick. “There are few like him for expertise.”

Former Minnesota governor and presidential candidate Tim Pawlenty took the reins on Nov. 1 of the Financial Services Roundtable, the D.C. lobbying group for the heads of large banks and financial institutions.

Levick said Bartlett counsels clients in public affairs, financial and other areas.
Qorvis works Al Jazeera-Current deal

Qorvis Communications is guiding PR for Al Jazeera in its acquisition of U.S. cable network Current. The deal, pegged by news reports at around $500 million, kicks off Qatar-based Al Jazeera’s latest plan to gain a foothold in the U.S. after failing to establish a significant presence here over the past five years.

Qorvis has extensive ties to the Middle East and senior director Sol Levine is a former producer for Al Jazeera English. The firm declined to comment on its relationship with AJ. Stan Collender, national director of financial communications at Qorvis, told Bloomberg that the network is carried by seven companies arching 4.7 million households in the U.S.

“By acquiring Current TV, Al Jazeera will significantly expand our existing distribution footprint in the U.S., as well as increase our news gathering and reporting efforts in America,” said Ahmed bin Jassim Al Thani, director general of the Qatar-based news network.

AJ, which has worked to shake a reputation for sympathetic coverage of so-called terror groups and gained credibility with its coverage of the 2011 Arab Spring, launched an English-language channel based in the Middle East in 200. But most U.S. viewers had to tune in over the Internet as cable providers declined to pick up the station.

“Our commitment to the voice of the voiceless, bringing stories from under-reported regions across the world and putting the human being at the center of our news agenda is at the heart of what we do,” added Al Thani.

Al Jazeera English has previously worked with Brown Lloyd James and Global Strategy Group.

Saudis select Interpublic

Saudi Basic Industries, the $50 billion petrochemical outfit, has selected Interpublic Group as its global communications agency of record for PR, advertising, media buying, branding, design, events, sponsorship and web marketing.

IPG edged holding company teams from incumbent WPP, Publicis and Omnicom in the six-month competitive pitch. Hill+Knowlton Strategies handled the bulk of the SABIC work. Samir Al-Abdrabbuh, SABIC’s VP-corporate communications, said IPG emerged victorious in the “fair and rigorous technical and commercial evaluation and procurement process” because it’s a “one stop shop and the team best positioned to take us to the next level; strengthening and leveraging our brand worldwide.”

Key staffers of Team Interpublic will come from Weber Shandwick, McCann Worldgroup McCann Enterprise business specialist.

The government of Saudi Arabia controls a 70% stake in SABIC, which has 40,000 employees in 40 nations and total assets of $85 billion.

FAR News

NEW FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT FILINGS

Below is a list of select companies that have registered with the U.S. Department of Justice, FARA Registration Unit, Washington, D.C., in order to comply with the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, regarding their consulting and communications work on behalf of foreign principals, including governments, political parties, organizations, and individuals. For a complete list of filings, visit www.fara.gov.

Dilenschneider Group Inc., New York, NY, registered January 11, 2013 for Government of Mongolia, Mongolia, to to provide PR and strategic counseling services to Mongolia’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade.


The Harbour Group, LLC, Washington, D.C., registered December 31, 2012 for Embassy of Libya, Washington, D.C., to provide consulting services related specifically to the implementation of a public diplomacy program on behalf of the Embassy.

Lobbying News

NEW LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT FILINGS

Below is a list of select companies that have registered with the Secretary of the Senate, Office of Public Records, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Legislative Resource Center, Washington, D.C., in order to comply with the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995. For a complete list of filings, visit www.senate.gov.


While we specialize in search engine marketing, we are more than just an SEO firm. We blend a variety of marketing tactics to maximize the effectiveness and return on investment of search engine campaigns.

We excel in non-traditional search marketing environments where the next steps are rarely obvious and there are not any existing models to copy or fall back on.

Since every client’s situation is unique, we focus to understand their specific needs and create customized solutions that accomplish their goals online.

Impact Communications, 11 Bristol Place, Wilton, CT 06897-1524. (203) 529-3047; cell: (917) 208-0720; fax: (203) 529-3048; JRImpact@aol.com. Jon Rosen, President.

BE PREPARED! Impact Communications trains your spokespeople to successfully communicate critical messages to your targeted audiences during print, television, and radio news interviews. Your customized workshops are issue-driven and role-play based. Videotaping/criticquing. Groups/privately. Face-to-face/telephone interviews/news conferences. Private label seminars for public relations agencies.

Make your next news interview your best by calling Jon Rosen, Impact Communications. Over 30 years of news media/training expertise.

At Point, Inc., P.O. Box 361, Roseland, NJ 07068. 973/324-0866; fax: 973/324-0778. services@atpoint.com; www.atpoint.com. Mick Gyure.

At Point provides the services of developing websites and managing the Internet operations of businesses, both small and large, that do not have the experience or the resources in-house to perform these functions.

Clients receive personalized and high quality customer service, solutions that fit their budgets, and the assurance of At Point’s reliability.

**PR Jobs** - [http://jobs.odwyerpr.com](http://jobs.odwyerpr.com)

**Dir. of Public Relations & Editorial**

The Stephen M. Ross School of Business at the University of Michigan is a dynamic, distinctive learning community that is consistently ranked among the world’s leading business schools.

The Director of Public Relations (PR) & Editorial leads and manages a team that is responsible for utilizing earned and owned media to achieve overall school and client-specific goals for the Ross School of Business. This person and his/her team will create and disseminate content that is meaningful, relevant, and compelling to a sophisticated and global audience of business leaders and decision makers (e.g., prospective and current students, alumni, current and prospective donors, corporate partners, and media).

He/she will be an expert in the utilization of public relations, search, and social media to create and share compelling content that (1) organically reaches audiences searching for the right information at the right time, and (2) is available and distributed via owned media, (e.g., website, blogs, brochures, magazines). This position will enhance the school’s reputation by presenting Ross - and its research and intellectual capital - as the expert and go-to source for help and information. This person will work closely with the marketing communications team to execute integrated communications that will deliver on established strategies established by the brand management team. He/she will work with the marketing analytics and research team to develop and monitor success metrics to evaluate each deployed tactic.

To apply, please visit: [http://umjobs.org](http://umjobs.org) and apply to position 78191.
Get O'Dwyer’s Newsletter, Magazine & 2013 Directory of PR Firms plus a year's access to all the content on odwyerpr.com for $295/year

You’ll get the news first in the eight-page weekly O’Dwyer letter, the “bible” of PR according to the New York Times—tips and stories that can lead to jobs, new accounts, media placements—sent as a PDF to your inbox every Monday afternoon.

Plus, you’ll have access to all the news and commentary posted daily on PR’s #1 website, odwyerpr.com, which has over 10 years of searchable content and O’Dwyer’s exclusive database of RFPs for PR services.

O’Dwyer’s magazine, now in its 27th year, examines a different area of PR each month. Issues include practice-area specific feature stories as well as profiles of PR firms with strengths in the focus area. The agency profiles constitute the ideal starting point for companies beginning their search for PR counsel.

Editorial Calendar:
January, PR Buyer’s Guide/Crisis Comms.
February, Environmental PR & Public Affairs
March, Food & Beverage
April, Broadcast Media Services
May, PR Firm Rankings
June, Multicultural/Diversity
July, Travel & Tourism
August, Prof. Svcs. & Financial/Investor Rels.
September, Beauty & Fashion
October, Healthcare & Medical
November, Technology
December, Sports & Entertainment

O’Dwyer’s 2013 Directory of PR Firms gives you quick access to large, medium-sized, and small PR firms and even experienced freelancers who work out of their homes. 1,600 firms are listed. 7,000 clients are cross-indexed. O’Dwyer’s directory is the only place you can look up a company and determine its outside counsel.

Listed firms have expertise in:

- Public Relations
- Social Media
- Branding
- Investor Relations
- Employee Communications
- Internet PR
- Product Publicity
- Crisis Communications
- Integrated Marketing
- Corporate Advertising
- Lobbying
- Proxy Solicitation
- International PR

Easily research past issues of O’Dwyer’s newsletter on odwyerpr.com
Get the latest RFP announcements and pick up new business

Contact magazine editor Jon Gingerich to profile your firm in an upcoming issue: jon.gingerich@odwyerpr.com

Subscribe online at odwyerpr.com or call toll free: 866/395-7710
Let's SHAKE IT UP!

Ogilvy PR. Classic. NEW TWISTS.

Ideas with punch and purpose. Media that reverberates.
New behaviors, influencers, conversations and relationships.
Your brand and brand marketing at Ogilvy PR. Let's get together.

Markson, Maloney and Fox, now proud to be part of this esteemed mix.
mitch.markson@ogilvy.com  •  brian.maloney@ogilvy.com  •  margie.fox@ogilvy.com

* with a dash of David Ogilvy's signature spirit