



Gatekeepers, Enablers or Technicians

*The contested role of lawyers as facilitators of
kleptocracy and grand corruption*

Public opinion & default justifications

Robert Barrington
Georgia Garrod
Centre for the Study of Corruption

CSC Working Paper Series no 20
January 2025

The **Centre for the Study of Corruption** (CSC), founded in 2011, is the UK's foremost academic centre for studying corruption. Located within one of the world's leading universities, CSC is regarded as a highly credible source of independent and objective research and ideas. It is widely recognised for combining world-class academic approaches and research with the practical experience of how corruption can be addressed in the real world. We operate in three broad areas:

- **Research:** undertaking rigorous academic research to address the world's major corruption issues
- **Courses & Teaching:** training the next generation of anti-corruption professionals around the world with campus-based and online courses for undergraduates to Masters and PhDs
- **Policy:** ensuring that our research informs evidence-based policy and helps change the world.

The **Centre for the Study of Corruption** publishes Working Papers to make research results, accounts of work-in-progress and background information available to those concerned with the study of corruption and anti-corruption. The Centre does not express opinions of its own; the views expressed in this publication are the responsibility of the author(s).

Acknowledgements

The coding and data recording for this project was substantially undertaken by John Lawes of the Centre for the Study of Corruption. The authors would like to acknowledge those who have kindly supported this research: it was originally funded through a grant from the Open Society Foundations; the data have subsequently been fed into the GI ACE Programme's workstream on professional enablers; and the Centre for the Study of Corruption's on-going work has been supported by the Joffe Charitable Trust. We particularly thank those who have contributed to numerous discussions on this subject, including Steven Vaughan, Richard Moorhead, Alex Jacobs, Mark de la Iglesia, Russel Pickard, Elizabeth David-Barrett, and members of the Institute of Business Ethics Taskforce on Business Ethics and the Legal Profession. We would also like to thank our colleagues at the Centre for the Study of Corruption for their lively critiques of our work, and Francis McGowan, the series editor for the CSC Working Papers, for his review of the draft text.

Citation

Barrington, R. & Garrod, G., 2025. "Gatekeepers, Enablers or Technicians: The contested role of lawyers as facilitators of kleptocracy and grand corruption - Public opinion and default justifications." Centre for the Study of Corruption Working Paper 20. Brighton: University of Sussex.

Published in January 2025

© *Centre for the Study of Corruption*

Centre for the Study of Corruption University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9QE

CSC Working Papers are available from our website at: <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/scsc/discussion-papers>

Gatekeepers, Enablers or Technicians

The contested role of lawyers as facilitators of kleptocracy and grand corruption

Public opinion & default justifications

Contents

1. Overview

- *Summary of findings*
- *Enablers or gatekeepers?*
- *Moral, ethical and regulatory elements of client and matter onboarding*
- *Structures and incentives*

2. Comments Analysis

- *Table 1: Defence vs criticism of lawyers in Comments*
- *Table 2: Principal arguments*

3. What do the Comments tell us?

4. Counter-arguments

- *Table 3: Principal arguments and counter-arguments*

5. What do lawyers say? Qualitative data from expert interviews

6. Conclusions

1. Overview

This is the first paper derived from a research project on '*Gatekeepers, Enablers or Technicians: the contested interpretation of lawyers as facilitators of kleptocracy and grand corruption.*' The full research results will be published in due course, but meanwhile this interim working paper is being published to help inform the lively public debate on this subject and to elicit feedback prior to journal submission. Although there are wider implications for the legal profession throughout the United Kingdom and beyond, this research focussed primarily on solicitors in England & Wales, generically referred to in this paper as 'lawyers and 'law firms.' The research focusses on the rules and normative environment shaping the behaviour of 'downstream' lawyers – professionals who are at some distance both geographically and transactionally from the original acts of kleptocracy and grand corruption – as opposed to 'upstream enablers', who are conceptualised as the 'fixers' who are knowingly involved in the earliest stage of the laundering process.¹

¹ Prelec, T. and de Oliveira, R.S. 2023. Enabling African loots: tracking the laundering of Nigerian kleptocrats' ill-gotten gains in western financial centres. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 26(2): 272- 300.

The full research project used a mixed methods approach, with the following elements:

- literature review: drawing on two different disciplines that have each contributed to thinking on legal ethics and the role of lawyers (law and political science)
- interviews: twenty elite interviews with lawyers and others involved in the debate on professional enablers
- legal education: a survey of the ethical content of undergraduate law degrees at leading British universities
- comments analysis: an analysis of 1600 comments posted in response to 10 relevant media articles, presented in this working paper
- code of conduct review: a survey of the codes of conduct of the top 20 UK law firms, analysing their statements on values and ethics.

Summary of findings

The research found that while it is correct to state that various City of London-based law firms have been identified in media reports and by civil society as having provided services to likely beneficiaries of grand corruption and kleptocracy, these are not the target client-base of most firms. The various examples of firms acting for these clients may therefore be characterised as being mostly by default rather than by design. The research found that whether described as gatekeeping or enabling, addressing this issue is not a question of anti-money laundering (AML) risk management: existing mechanisms to prevent 'dirty money' entering the UK, built on identifying risks or red flags which indicate a predicate crime linked to a client's wealth or source of funds, do not adequately address the proceeds of grand corruption and kleptocracy or the related situation of state capture.

The research found that there are persuasive grounds for which it can be argued that, in the absence of more stringent legislative or regulatory action, this legislative gap can be – and in many cases already is – filled by the choices made by lawyers and law firms themselves. Lawyers can and do make a choice as to whether they will or will not act for clients who are the beneficiaries of kleptocracy and grand corruption. This can be a risk-based choice, an ethical choice or a choice based on a certain understanding of what it means to be a legal professional.

However, the tools, training and structures examined as part of this research have been found to emphasise an approach to lawyering, sometimes described as the 'standard conception', centred on zealous advocacy for one's clients and a minimalist adherence to rules and standards.² This reinforces a conception of lawyering that does not encourage considered decision-making around ethical grey areas. This in turn is reflected in the default justifications from the legal profession in the debates surrounding the 'enabling' role of the profession, with common defences resting on the conception of the lawyer as impassive neutral technician, with little recognition that such a

² Vaughan, S., 2023. Existential Ethics: Thinking Hard About Lawyer Responsibility for Clients' Environmental Harms. *Current Legal Problems*, 76(1): 1-34.

characterisation of the professional's role is contested in legal theory and often mis-applied. This is in tension with interpretations of the lawyer's role that prioritise the public interest and public trust and confidence in the profession, sometimes described as 'socially responsible lawyering'. The full conclusions of the research will be published in due course along with more detailed description of the methodology and detailed research results, but meanwhile the preliminary conclusions are:

Enablers or gatekeepers?

- The term 'professional enabler' is considered provocative, and lawyers in particular found it to be objectionable. The reasons for this were diverse: some are concerned about the reputational aspects of such a label, others are concerned about the provision of enabling services but see it as a minority issue within the profession, and others are simply resistant to the notion that lawyers are acting inappropriately.
- Lawyers, however, are perceived by their critics to play a keystone role in the relationship between professional services and grand corruption.
- Many of the arguments and principles that have been used in defence of the legal profession are contested in legal theory (except in the circumstances of criminal defence, or where liberty or assets are at risk). It can be seen as a conceptual leap to apply notions such as 'access to justice' or 'right to representation' to straightforward commercial transactions.

Moral, ethical and regulatory elements of client and matter onboarding

- Lawyers rightly make choices about client take-on and retention based on their understanding of AML regulations; but for most such clients who are beneficiaries of kleptocracy or grand corruption, there is an absence of a predicate offence in the country of origin, and so they are not covered by existing AML laws or regulations. As a consequence, there are also ethical choices to be made, and law firms do have agency over such decisions – described by Vaughan (2023) as 'business decisions with (some) moral components.'
- Reducing the question solely to one of risk management has two consequences: first, it encourages firms to focus on their own reputational risk, without regard to wider questions such as risk to the profession's reputation as a whole, the risk to society or risk to the global rule of law (e.g., through providing services to kleptocrats who in other contexts are undermining the rule of law); secondly, it can remove the question of ethics – or the notion of doing the right thing – from decision-making.
- Based on the ethical content of legal education and the codes of conduct of major law firms, we conclude that professional education emphasises a conception of lawyering

³ *Ibid.*

that does not incentivise or promote considered decision-making around ethical grey areas.

- While there is a legitimate debate over ‘thin’ versus ‘thick’ interpretations of the lawyer’s role, there is little visibility or discussion within firms or the profession of the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) guidance on the public interest, which might usefully be applied to this situation.

Structures and incentives

- There is a widespread perception that changes in the legal industry (broadly, the ‘commercialisation’ of law firms) have influenced the way (ethical) decision-making happens.
- Decision-making on such matters in large law firms is complex, particularly when they operate globally.
- No proposed solution to the issue of ‘professional enablers’ has yet gained widespread support within or outside the profession.
- There is a read-across to human rights and climate change. The principles that apply to client take-on with regard to kleptocracy and grand corruption have resonance in other ESG areas.

2. Comments analysis

The purpose of this working paper is to identify and present the key arguments used by lawyers as a self-defence against the concept that they are ‘professional enablers’ of kleptocracy and grand corruption. This has been done using an experimental ‘Comments Analysis’ methodology. The research team undertook an analysis of the comments posted beneath 10 media articles that covered the theme of lawyers as professional enablers (see Annex I for list of articles). Of these, 7 articles were broadly critical of the legal profession, and 3 broadly supportive of the legal profession. The articles were in the Financial Times (5 articles), Law Society Gazette (3 articles), The Guardian (1 article) and New York Times (1 article). The purpose of the comments analysis was two-fold:

- To identify the recurring themes, arguments and counter-arguments in the public debate over lawyers acting as professional enablers
- To gain an insight into the quantitative distribution of the arguments (noting the caveats below on sampling bias).

Sample and potential sample bias

A total of 1,596 Comments were analysed (see Table 1).

The basis for selecting the articles for Comments Analysis was:

- The article was no more than five years old at the time of the research⁴
- The article is in a mainstream media outlet (to gauge wider public opinion) or the specialist legal press (to gauge opinions from within the legal profession)
- The article is dealing with the cross-border (i.e., the movement of funds and assets from one country to another) phenomenon of kleptocracy and grand corruption
- The article specifically addresses the role of lawyers
- The article has a sufficient number of comments to contribute substantially to the Comments Analysis.

The sample should not be taken as fully representative of public opinion as it was restricted to a) readers of those newspapers and magazines b) readers who self-selected to read articles on lawyers as professional enablers, and c) readers who self-selected to post a comment.

Moreover, taking into account the editorial line of the 10 articles selected for analysis, there was not an even balance between those which were broadly critical and those which were broadly supportive of the legal profession. This may or may not have affected the profile of the readers and those who chose to comment.

The media outlets selected were a mixture of international (Financial Times), UK (The Guardian) and US (New York Times) in focus, with one specific outlet targeted at lawyers rather than the wider public (Law Society Gazette). The addition of one explicitly non-UK article (New York Times) enabled the researchers to review comments made on the same issue in a non-UK context to discern whether there were arguments that might be missed by reviewing primarily UK-based media.

In some cases, it may be expected that the majority of readers and comment-posters were themselves lawyers – for example, readers of the Law Society Gazette. In other cases, the comment-posters declared themselves to be lawyers. To allow for the likely sampling bias, we note that the quantitative data should be viewed as representative only of the sample group; however, the number and range of comments are sufficient to fulfil our qualitative objective of identifying the principal themes, arguments and counter-arguments. Elsewhere in our research, we have triangulated the Comments against other data sources (literature review and interviews) and are confident that the comments analysis broadly represents the public debate.

The comments were coded using 21 indicators to determine a) whether the comments were broadly defending or criticising the profession and b) which category of argument was used.

⁴ An exception was made for the Law Society Gazette's 'Society raps report branding solicitors 'corruption enablers' of September 2016, which was so obviously relevant – for details see Annex 1

Table 1 illustrates the distribution of Comments between those who were critical of lawyers, and those defending them.

41% of the Comments were discarded as being irrelevant to this discussion – for example, ‘*Comment A: Not just lawyers; auditors. Zeromax being the latest case in point. How do the senior people at the Big Four live with themselves? Comment B: This is a good point. Does any auditor have the honesty to take a similar stance?’ (Financial Times 7-11-21).*

Category	Number of comments	% of valid comments (ie excluding discarded comments)
Defence of lawyers	263	28.2%
Critical of lawyers	647	69.3%
Neutral	23	2.5%
Sub-Total	933	100%
Discarded (comment not relevant)	663	n/a
Total	1596	100%

However, due to the likely sampling bias, the purpose of the exercise was not principally to determine whether those who commented were broadly in favour or critical of the legal profession, but to tease out the key arguments that are used to criticise and defend the profession. From amongst the Comments, we identified five distinct categories of argument. We triangulated these with the expert interviews and literature review to ensure that we had identified the full range of arguments being used to criticise and defend the legal profession.

Category	Total comments in this category	Number of comments defending or supporting this position [% of total]	Number of comments opposing or criticising this position [% of total]	Number of comments neutral [% of total]
Law firms as businesses: Law firms should be expected to make rational business decisions and not to be arbiters of ethics.	320	38 [11.9%]	277 [86.6%]	5 [1.6%]
Access to justice and right to representation: all citizens, irrespective of their background, wealth or	176	87 [49.4%]	88 [50%]	1 [0.6%]

crime, have a right to access justice and to be represented by a lawyer; they are innocent until proven guilty. This representation in itself helps to uphold the rule of law.				
Lawyers are technicians: they do not make the law but are responsible for implementing laws made by others.	101	33 [32.7%]	67 [66.3%]	1 [1%]
Role of a lawyer in relation to client: the lawyer has a duty to act in the best interests of the client and should not be associated with the client or their alleged crime.	92	15 [16.3%]	77 [83.7%]	0 [0%]
The collective action problem: if we as a firm do not act for these clients then another firm will take the business, so we might as well do it ourselves.	16	10 [62.5%]	6 [37.5%]	0 [0%]
Other	228	80 [35.1%] (supporting lawyers)	132 [57.9%] (criticising lawyers)	16 [7%]
Total	933	263	647	23

3. What do the comments tell us?

We can see from these comments that there are five principal categories of argument in which comments are typically made when lawyers are criticised for providing services which are perceived to facilitate grand corruption and kleptocracy. We describe the responses from the profession as ‘default justifications.’ Both the support and the criticism of the profession coalesce around these five categories. The counter-arguments are outlined below in Section 4. Within the parameters and constraints of the sample, as outlined above, these comments represent a form of public opinion.

These five categorisations are reinforced by further research in our literature review and expert interviews. However, it is worth noting that around 24% of the comments fell into the ‘Other’ category, indicating that there is a range of views and opinions in the comments, some very left field, which fall outside the five core categories. Only 2.5% of comments were ‘neutral’, indicating that those who posted comments had (as might be expected from those who take the step to post a

comment) strong feelings on the subject.

Five principal categories of argument

From the comments, we are able to discern five principal categories of argument in relation to the role of lawyers as 'professional enablers', representing both public opinion and default arguments from within the legal profession. These are:

- **Law firms are businesses:** Law firms should be expected to make rational business decisions and not to be arbiters of ethics.
- **Access to justice and right to representation:** all citizens, irrespective of their background, wealth or crime, have a right to access justice and to be represented by a lawyer; they are innocent until proven guilty. This representation in itself helps to uphold the rule of law.
- **Lawyers are technicians:** they do not make the law but are responsible for implementing laws made by others.
- **Role of a lawyer in relation to client:** the lawyer has a duty to act in the best interests of the client and should not be associated with the client or their alleged crime.
- **The collective action problem:** if we as a firm do not act for these clients then another firm will take the business, so we might as well do it ourselves.

The largest comment category in this sample group by some distance was over the question of whether law firms are businesses like any other or whether they should be judged by different standards than ordinary businesses. This category also had the largest majority critical of the legal profession, indicating some discomfort about the commercialisation of law firms and how that may lead to ethical missteps.

The second largest comment category was over access to justice and the right to representation. This was evenly split between those who felt that it was the role of the lawyer to represent unquestioningly (akin to the Cab Rank Rule for barristers), and those who felt that law firms (essentially solicitors) should be making choices about who they act for.

4. Counter-arguments

Combining the Comments Analysis, Literature Review and expert interviews, we are also able to discern the counter-arguments that are used as a rebuttal to the principal defences. Although many lawyers, and some law firms, have defended their choices around client take-on as representing key legal principles, our research suggests that application of those principles to non-criminal areas of the law is contested by scholars of legal ethics. While law firms and senior lawyers reflexively retreat behind a set of standard defences, legal theorists regard such arguments as being mis-applied, not least because many of the legal services the law firms offer are provided in non-criminal areas of the law.

Our expert interviews suggested that by and large, law firms find the debate around ‘professional enablers’ uncomfortable, stressing instead principles which cast their role as that of a technician. When criticised, these arguments have been deployed in public statements. Moreover, from the expert interviews, there was consensus that since lawyers find the term ‘professional enablers’ objectionable, using the term – or even adding it to the description of a piece of research – pre-disposes them to discount the substantive concerns about facilitating grand corruption and kleptocracy which have led to that label being applied by campaigners.

Table 3 Principal Arguments and Counter-Arguments	
<i>Argument</i>	<i>Counter-argument</i>
Law firms are businesses: law firms should be expected to make rational business decisions and not to be arbiters of ethics.	The legal profession should be held to a higher standard than an ordinary business: lawyers operate under professional codes and standards which reference the public interest and wider duties and obligations. These need to be reconciled with commercial considerations and not simply subordinate to them.
Lawyers are technicians: they do not make the law but are responsible for implementing laws made by others.	Lawyers have agency: lawyers have a professional duty to uphold principles such as the rule of law, often expressed as Duty to the Court; this places them in a position of being ethical arbiters of their own actions and not simply technicians. Moreover, through lobbying, professional associations of lawyers and large law firms often seek to influence or shape the law, and so they are not in reality neutral technicians.
Access to justice and right to representation: all citizens, irrespective of their background, wealth or crime, have a right to access justice and to be represented by a lawyer; they are innocent until proven guilty. This representation in itself helps to uphold the rule of law.	These justifications do not apply to non-criminal areas of law: these principles are well-established in the case of criminal law. However, most dealings with the beneficiaries of kleptocracy and grand corruption are non-criminal, and usually relate to commercial advice or transactions; legal theorists dispute whether the principle applies in such circumstances, and have generally concluded it does not or is at minimum a contested concept. Moreover, there is an unresolved tension in upholding the rule of the law in England & Wales on behalf of those who ignore the rule of law in their

	country of origin and/or deny the rule of law to others.
Role of a lawyer in relation to client: the lawyer has a duty to act in the best interests of the client and should not be associated with the client or their alleged crime.	The public interest should at times be prioritised over the client interest: as with Access to Justice, the lawyer's duty to the client and right not to be associated with the client's harms are well-established principles in the case of criminal law. However, most dealings with the beneficiaries of kleptocracy and grand corruption are non-criminal, and usually relate to commercial advice or transactions; leading legal theorists argue that in such circumstances lawyers should consider the wider public interest before acting. Moreover, the SRA guidance on the Principles is clear that where Principles come into conflict, the public interest takes priority. ⁵
The collective action problem: if we as a firm do not act for these clients then another firm will take the business, so we might as well do it ourselves.	Lawyers have a duty to protect the wider reputation of the profession: firms should act both to protect their own reputations and to uphold public trust and confidence in the profession.

5. What do lawyers say? *Qualitative data from expert interviews*

From the Comments Analysis, unless explicitly stated in the comment, it is not possible to determine definitively whether the person posting the comment is a lawyer, although this may sometimes be inferred from the nature of the comment and the forum in which it made (for example, the *Law Society Gazette*). To gain insight from lawyers themselves, we undertook 20 expert interviews, 12 of which were with practising or retired lawyers (including legal academics). The data from these interviews enabled us to triangulate with the Comments Analysis to verify whether there were additional categories of argument that might not have been surfaced by the Comments Analysis. The interviews did not reveal any additional categories but, as might be expected from interviews lasting 45-60 minutes, gave additional nuance to the categories.

⁵ 'The SRA Principles comprise the fundamental tenets of ethical behaviour that we expect all those that we regulate to uphold... Should the Principles come into conflict, those which safeguard the wider public interest (such as the rule of law, and public confidence in a trustworthy solicitors' profession and a safe and effective market for regulated legal services) take precedence over an individual client's interests.' - see <https://www.sra.org.uk/solicitors/standards-regulations/principles/>

One common theme was that the use of terminology is important. Lawyers themselves bridle at the term 'professional enabler' variously describing it as 'provocative' (Interview 9 - civil society representative, lawyer) 'unfortunate' (Interview 10 – lawyer, practising partner at large international law firm based ex-UK) and 'objectionable' (Interview 15 – lawyer, retired partner from large City law firm). The following extracts from the interviews further illustrate the complexity of the debate.

Difficulty of drawing ethical lines and who should decide where to draw them:

'What's the ethical principle that lets you act for a large Chinese bank owned by the government, but not a Russian bank. I'm not sure.' On acting for a Kleptocrat: 'I would regard it as personally unethical to act for someone like that. But I don't think it's right that it should be a professional ethical breach to act for someone like that when it is legal.' (Interview 17 - retired partner, Magic Circle firm)

Validity of right to representation argument

'I think the starting point is: is there a right to representation? Actually, as I understand it, save in respect to criminal proceedings: no, there isn't.' (Interview 8 - legal academic)

Validity of access to justice argument

'There's an obvious difference between the right to representation in a criminal trial, which is a fundamental right that's protected by the European Convention. The situation is rather different where you're instructing a lawyer to help you to hide money in some way, or you know, even if it's within the bounds of the law, set up some clever trust, or whatever it is that that these people are doing. I mean, I draw a very bright line distinction between those two scenarios.' 'My overriding duty is in the administration of justice. So my overriding duty is to the Court, that outranks the best interests of my client.' (Interview 3 - barrister and legal academic)

Validity of access to justice argument

The access to justice argument 'is almost a get out of jail free card.' 'The principle of access to justice and access to justice itself is a really contested concept. There is no absolute definition of when access to justice is relevant when it can be relied on. It's a very fluid concept.' 'There's two competing practice principles that come into play. So we look at a solicitor's duty. On the one hand, it is that they have to act with integrity, and not act in a way that will damage public confidence in the legal profession... but I'm also meant to act without discrimination and my view of my client is not meant to come into play, and that is also part of upholding public confidence in the legal profession.' (Interview 1 - practising solicitor, legal academic)

Client take-on and law firm culture

'They also have the freedom to turn down certain clients. So I think it depends on the nature of the of the firm you work for as well.' 'My own view is that that's maybe a step too far. But I suppose the counter argument to that is well, it's a free market. I'm legally allowed to do it, so I'll do it as long as I'm satisfying the ML checks.' 'A lot of lawyers see themselves as being similar to surgeons, for example. So you know you're called in to do a job. And you kind of do that indiscriminately of the body on the table, if you like.' (Interview 2 - barrister, formerly with small firm of solicitors)

Tension between ethical and commercial decision making

'If you read Putin's people, as a lawyer you must think "How could anybody ever have touched any of this money?" They must have known it.' 'Many lawyers are devoted to the idea that what the client wants the lawyer does, and they cannot believe that the lawyers' ethical code does not permit that and require that.' 'They say it's a problem for the Government to resolve and to change the law, because as long as it's legal, the lawyer should be able to do it, and it's very difficult to tell them that's not actually a correct statement of their ethics.' 'They always call themselves centres of excellence. You know the great glistening foyers with marble and staircases and vast spaces. It's impossible not to get a heavy sense that you're king of the world. If you work in one of these places, if everything you touch turns to gold. So I think it goes beyond commercialisation. It's that the history of their success has turned their heads and corrupted them.' (Interview 6 – lawyer, former professional body senior officer)

6. Conclusions

- The Comments Analysis approach can help to determine the principal arguments that are used to criticise and defend the role of lawyers as 'professional enablers'; five such categories of argument can be determined.
- Based on this sample – and noting the potential for sample bias - opinions were split into two broad categories: those that were generally critical of law firms, and those that defended the profession through justifications which draw on well-established but contested conceptualisations of the profession and explanations of the lawyer's role.
- The five principal arguments from the Comments Analysis can be triangulated with a Literature Review and expert interviews, which confirm that these are the most prevalent arguments on this topic.
- This approach also surfaces strong counter-arguments to each of the five principal arguments, with the notable finding that the default justifications used to defend the profession have a weak basis both in legal theory and with reference to the profession's regulatory guidance.

Annex 1 List of articles used in Comments Analysis

Title	Date	Link	Total no. of comments	Summary of article / Is article critical of or defending legal profession?
City lawyers cannot hide behind 'the law' over Russian clients	3-3-22	Financial Times https://www.ft.com/content/71468746-5e48-493a-8d13-c4b520c9ee22	493	Article is generally critical of lawyers, argues that lawyers should not represent Russian clients in light of the war in Ukraine, also takes issue with their method of 'hiding' behind the law in their defence // critical of legal profession
England's law, not its lawyers, is to blame for the oligarch gold rush	4-3-22	Financial Times https://www.ft.com/content/e6c7b0e1-f02c-413c-a318-f0c4030d07b8	333	Article places blames 'oligarch gold rush' on England's law and government rather than the lawyers themselves // defends legal profession
Wagner Inc: a Russian warlord and his lawyers	24-1-23	Financial Times https://www.ft.com/content/8c8b0568-cdd1-4529-a4fd-82e57983ddc5	374	Article discussing Yevgeny Prigozhin, founder of Wagner Inc. and how prominent legal firms have been used to defend him // critical of legal profession
The Power of Money: How Autocrats Use London to Strike Foes Worldwide	18-6-21	New York Times https://www.nytimes.com/2021/06/18/world/europe/uk-courts-russia-kazakhstan.html	109	Discusses how certain English courtrooms have aided oligarchs // critical of legal profession
Pressure mounts for action against 'enablers' of Russian regime	28-1-22	Law Society Gazette https://www.lawgazette.co.uk/news/pressure-mounts-for-action-against-enablers-of-russian-regime/5111668.article	21	Article discusses role of English law firms acting for powerful Russian clients in the context of the UK announcing legislation aiming to stem the flow of dirty money // critical of legal profession
Deripaska trial delayed after lawyers query UK sanctions regime cap	28-11-22	Financial Times https://www.ft.com/content/ac5f4b77-6876-4315-9072-1baebef242f3#comments-anchor	27	An attempt to imprison or fine Oleg Deripaska for alleged contempt of court has been delayed after London's High Court heard that lawyers set to represent the Russian tycoon had raised the prospect of his legal fees exceeding the £500,000 limit imposed by the UK sanctions regime // somewhat critical of legal profession
Solicitors attack latest 'professional enablers' slur	14-11-2018	Law Society Gazette https://www.lawgazette.co.uk/practice/solicitors-attack-latest-professional-enablers-slur/5067550.article	19	Article discusses the assertion that lawyers are 'enablers' of financial crime and law firms' response // balanced view of legal profession

Society raps report branding solicitors 'corruption enablers'	13-9-16	Law Society Gazette https://www.lawgazette.co.uk/law/society-raps-report-branding-solicitors-corruption-enablers/5057606.article	19	Law Society today condemns official report that brands solicitors as facilitators of corruption, claiming it fails to acknowledge the work the profession has done to clamp down on economic crime // Defends legal profession.
Letter: Britain is damaged by the provision of legal services to dictators	7-11-21	Financial Times https://www.ft.com/content/1d984cec-4d34-4ac0-9d32-effac1f84206	25	Article discusses the role that lawyers have played in enabling financial crime. Argues that whilst people have a right to representation, some firms providing it have lacked a moral compass and deny this is an issue // Critical of some parts of the legal profession
The unsavoury alliance between oligarchs and London's top lawyers	26-5-18	The Guardian https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/may/26/unsavoury-alliance-between-oligarchs-and-london-top-lawyers	186	Article discusses the role that lawyers play in dealing with repressive states, and whether they should potentially be seen as a threat to the national interest // Critical of legal profession

Annex II List of Interviewees (by type)

Interview 1: Legal scholar

Interview 2: Lawyer: practicing barrister

Interview 3: Legal scholar, lawyer: practising barrister

Interview 4: Civil society representative (non-lawyer)

Interview 5: Lawyer: solicitor, retired partner from large City law firm

Interview 6: Lawyer and former professional body senior officer

Interview 7: Civil society representative (non-lawyer)

Interview 8: Legal scholar, non-practising

Interview 9: Civil society representative (legal scholar)

Interview 10: Lawyer: practising partner at large international law firm based ex-UK

Interview 11: Lawyer: solicitor, practising partner at large City law firm

Interview 12: Civil society representative (non-lawyer)

Interview 13: Lawyer: solicitor, practising partner at large City law firm

Interview 14: Legal scholar, non-practising

Interview 15: Lawyer: solicitor, retired partner from large City law firm

Interview 16: Legal scholar, non-practising

Interview 17: Senior civil society executive (lawyer)

Interview 18: Civil society representative (non-lawyer)

Interview 19: Lawyer: solicitor, practising partner at large City law firm

Interview 20: Civil society representative (lawyer) and civil society representative (non-lawyer)

CSC's research activities are based around five themes:

- Corruption in politics
- Corruption in international business
- Corruption in international development
- Corruption in sport
- Corruption in geographical context – with particular strengths in the UK, Germany & Eastern Europe, China and Africa.

Full details of the published and current research undertaken by our core faculty can be found in the detailed biographies of each faculty member at:

<https://www.sussex.ac.uk/research/centres/centre-for-study-of-corruption/>

Other papers in this series:

CSC publishes working papers to make research results, accounts of work-in-progress and background information available to those concerned with the study of corruption and anti-corruption. Recent titles include:

- Corruption, Shell Companies and Financial Secrecy: Providing an evidence base for anti-corruption policy
- Corruption and Anti-Corruption Theory: an introductory guide for students
- A Bibliography for UK Corruption Studies
- Resourcing UK law enforcement to tackle grand corruption and kleptocracy
- Corruption in UK Prisons: A Critical Evaluation of the Evidence Base
- The Role of the G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group in Influencing the Global Agenda