

Political Science 306/406  
**Interest Groups in the Policy Process**  
Spring, 2020  
12:45 p.m. – 2:00 p.m., Mondays/Wednesdays  
Clark Hall, Room 210  
(All information is as of January 6, 2020)

**Professor Joe White**

Office: Mather House 113  
Office Hours: 10:00 – 11:30 a.m. Monday/Wednesday

216 368-2426  
jxw87@case.edu

**COURSE DESCRIPTION:**

This course focuses on how interests deal with the government, or governments. We will focus mainly on the processes by which interests of many types participate in making – or preventing any changes in – public policy. How does advocacy proceed? What do government relations people do? How do interests organize? What is the "policy process," and how does it provide opportunities and constraints to which organized interests respond?

Many Americans begin from a presumption that "interest groups," and interest representation of any sort, involves "special interests" winning at the expense of the "public interest." This is silly: any interest is "special" in the sense that some people agree with it and some people do not; or some people would benefit more from the policy than others would. Much of politics involves disputing what the public interest is, and there is lots to dispute.

It is much more sensible to see politics as a process of organizing interests to influence policy, and interests as the basic units of politics. But that does not mean there are no standards for assessing that process. In particular, we can ask whether certain kinds of interests have inherent advantages, and what we think of that balance.

Starting Points

A few basic perspectives have shaped my selection of material for this course. It would be useful to keep them in mind.

First, our topic is not really "interest *groups*." Case Western Reserve University does a lot of lobbying, but in what sense is it a group? That does not seem a useful description. Instead, CWRU acts as an interest, or interested party, in the policy process. There are plenty of interest groups, and the organization and capacities of groups is also an important topic. Yet a great deal of the politics of interest representation involves individuals or organizations that are not organized primarily for political purposes: such as CWRU, Lockheed Martin, and Robert L. Stark Enterprises (Tony Stark Enterprises

also, if it were a real corporation). So this is really a course about "interests," or "organized interests."

CWRU is an "organized interest" in the sense that it has in place a process to gather resources and information and participate in the policy process. It is organized to participate, mainly through its Office of Government Relations. It also participates in interest groups, such as the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) and the Association of American Universities.

Second, interest representation therefore has at least two dimensions, which we might call policy advocacy and organizational advocacy. By policy advocacy, I mean efforts to change the actions of government mainly in order to achieve some desired change in the world. By organizational advocacy, I mean efforts to get some government to do something that helps an organization - or not do something that would hurt the organization. These two efforts can be much the same if the purpose of the organization is to change policy. There also are plenty of times when an interest seeks to change the world in ways that go far beyond its immediate self-interest but also serve that interest. CWRU's leadership, for example, would surely like the federal government to pay for much more medical research, and much – but not all! – of those extra funds would benefit other people and not CWRU. Yet a great deal of interest representation is focused on organizational concerns, such as if CWRU tries to get the city government to fund a project in Uptown.

Third, for this course the best way to think about government action is to view it as a "policy process." The policy process includes not just choosing purposes (should the federal government expand access to health insurance?) but implementing them (will states set up health insurance exchanges and, regardless of who sets them up, how well will the online enrollment system work?). The process has many entry points or venues, and interests will choose at which points and how to participate. Different resources are more useful at different points in the process, so the relative "strength" or "weakness" of an interest will vary with those circumstances. And, while resources matter, so does opposition. An interest could get much of what it wants because hardly anyone objects and it is cheap for government decision-makers to be helpful. Conversely, an interest with huge resources could be blocked by powerful and persistent opponents.

Fourth, this "policy process," or government action in general, then should be seen as part of the environment for any organization or interest. By the environment, I mean those aspects of the outside world that shape an organization's ability to perform its intended tasks, survive, or thrive. By government, I mean all levels of government. So, for example, federal tax code provisions about deductibility of contributions, or state laws about the governance of trusts, are a significant aspect of Case Western Reserve University's environment.

Fifth, advocacy involves a series of dilemmas. One is that different kinds of personalities, skills and tactics are better for different tasks. So there is no

"one-size-fits-all" approach. For example, representing the "have-nots" is quite different from representing the "haves." Second, what is needed in order to *build an organization* to apply pressure within the policy process may be rather different from what is needed in order to *operate effectively* within that process. Third, the professional advocate has to face in two directions, both explaining the policy world to her client and explaining her client (favorably) to the policy world. It can be difficult to get the client to understand what's necessary and possible (this is similar to the situation for attorneys and sometimes accountants). A fourth is the need (for most organizations) to set priorities – when to fight and when to let something go. This is related to the question of timing (knowing what can be done quickly and what will require a long series of steps) and the question of allies (whether the extra resources available from working with others is worth the likely delays and compromises from working out the terms of the alliance).

This course can only begin to introduce you to the questions you would ask and factors to consider if you are ever involved in representing an interest or cause to governments. But my goal is to give you a good overview. That may give you a head start if you ever engage in advocacy, or better understanding when someone tells you the government is about to have some effect on your organization, or a sense of what to look for if, as a leader in a nonprofit organization, you have staff who work on government relations.

Along the way, you may also add to your understanding of how the American political system works. Textbooks talk about “democracy” and whether the U.S. system fits some ideal. That’s not an interesting question: of course it is far from the classic image of a democracy and far from ideal. The interesting questions involve who is served, how well they are served, and why. *Who participates, to what effect?* What resources are needed to participate effectively, and do some interests have advantages because they have more of the most useful resources?

#### COURSE MATERIAL:

Common course readings include **one required text** and a collection of **articles and book excerpts that will be posted on the course Canvas site**. The text is:

Saul Alinsky, *Rules for Radicals: A Practical Primer for Realistic Radicals*. Various editions, including New York: Vintage, 1989. A small and controversial book but as a primer about some aspects of power, hard to match. Also, inexpensive. Potentially extremely so: You can download it in various forms, including pdf, from <https://archive.org/details/RulesForRadicals> I recommend buying the physical book because that will be better for referring to it during class discussion.

There are also books from which I have taken multiple chapters. Three that are sort of recent, and also quite good, you might benefit from purchasing. So we can call these "recommended but not required":

\* Frank R. Baumgartner, Jeffrey M. Berry, Marie Hojnacki, David C. Kimball, and Beth L. Leech. *Lobbying and Policy Change: Who Wins, Who Loses, and Why*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.

\* Allan J. Cigler, Burdett A. Loomis, and Anthony J. Nownes. *Interest Group Politics, 10<sup>th</sup> ed.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2019.

\* Ken Godwin, Scott H. Ainsworth, and Erik Godwin, *Lobbying and Policymaking: The Public Pursuit of Private Interests*. Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2013

Each student will read **one other book**, for the review assignment described below. They will choose from among the following five:

Maureen H. Casamayou, *The Politics of Breast Cancer*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2001.

Douglas R. Imig, *Poverty and Power: The Political Representation of Poor Americans*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996.

Robert G. Kaiser, *So Damn Much Money: The Triumph of Lobbying and the Corrosion of American Government*. New York: Vintage Books, 2010.

Richard Kirsch, *Fighting for Our Health: The Epic Battle to Make Health Care a Right in the United States*. Albany, NY: The Rockefeller Institute Press, 2011.

Michael D. Pertschuk, *Smoke in Their Eyes: Lessons in Movement Leadership from the Tobacco Wars*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 2001.

## COURSE ASSIGNMENTS:

In addition to the weekly readings, your assignments will include a midterm and a final exam, a book review, and a project in which you study one interest's engagement with the policy process.

### **1) Exams**

*Each exam will count for 20% of your grade.* Each will require you to show understanding of the preceding course material. The first exam will be a set of short-answer questions about core concepts from the readings. I will provide a study guide, and the question or questions will be taken from that study guide. It will be administered on **March 2**. The second exam will be an essay about the course. You will have a choice from two questions. We will also discuss in class whether it should be taken in class or done as a take-home exam. My tentative preference is to give you the question(s) on April 22 and have the exam due as a take-home on **April 27**. I do not like giving up the final class session for the exam, but the scheduled exam time is on the same late day, May 6, as for my other class. In addition, since you have a paper assignment, I would prefer to have them due a reasonable amount of time apart – in this case, a week.

### **2) Outside Reading Reports**

Each student will read one book from the list of five above (Casamayou, Imig, Kaiser, Kirsch, Pertschuk). *All students should choose their book no later than by the beginning of class on January 29.* There are two reasons for this requirement: to make sure you have sufficient time to get the book, and to ensure you have time to read it. On January 30 I will assign a book to any student who has not chosen.

Your task is to explain what the book tells us about the role of interests in the policy process. To put this another way, ***you should think of your goal as to explain to the rest of the class what they would learn from the book.*** That includes explaining what the book covers, with what kind of evidence and how convincing it is. But it also includes highlighting its contribution to themes from the course readings. For example, your book may address questions of the motivations of people who participate in interest groups, how they are recruited and persuaded to continue participating. Or it might address the needs to both compromise and convince members to accept compromise. Or it might provide some evidence on how particular resources are used to influence policy, or of influencing policy at specific stages of the process. Note that, looking ahead in the syllabus, you may see topics that have not been covered yet but that seem to be addressed in your book. You may also decide that the book highlights aspects of interest representation that do not seem to be covered in the syllabus (there have to be some), and decide that should be reported.

These reports will be due on **March 23**. Students should be prepared to talk about the books in class. The papers should be no less than 2000 words long. *The assignment will count for 20% of your grade.*

### **3) Advocacy Analysis Project**

This project will involve writing an analysis of the advocacy or public policy concerns of an organization. This means, first, that you should understand the organization's interests: what public policies might affect it, or what public policies its leaders might, in pursuit of the organization's mission, want to influence. Second, you will want to understand what resources the organization can use for advocacy. That includes understanding what an organization can do to attract its members or supporters to work for those advocacy goals. A third factor is what governments, or what parts of what governments, the organization might target for its efforts. A fourth is what allies or rivals the organization might face. A fifth is what stage of the policy-making or decision-making processes the organization would do best to target, and what that might accomplish.

This project then requires a series of steps.

1) Choose an organization. **You should send me a one-page (minimum 300 words) memo about your choice by Wednesday, February 5.** In this memo briefly describe

the organization you have chosen, why, and what you think its main advocacy concerns will be.

2) Gather basic facts about the organization. This will include things like its core tasks, its budget, who does its work, and whether it has customers or members. It will also include a brief description of the main advocacy concerns, and with what governments it deals for those concerns. Send me a memo that summarizes these facts by class time on **April 1**. Note that the length of this memo is likely to depend on the organization you have chosen, but it should be a **minimum of 800 words**.

3) **Your final analysis will be due by Noon on Monday, May 4, submitted by e-mail.** There is no reason, of course, why you could not submit it earlier.

I strongly encourage you to meet with me after you submit each of the first two stages. I will provide written feedback on them, but it might be more helpful if we talk. I am available during my office hours but should also be able to schedule meetings at other times.

I also am willing to review and comment on first drafts of the final papers. Of course I need sufficient time to read a draft and prepare comments. So I will promise that if I receive a draft by April 29, I will provide comments by May 1 for your final revision.

Naturally I would not object to, and would in fact encourage you to do your project about an organization with which you already have experience or connections.

*The advocacy analysis project will count for 30% of your grade.* Reports submitted for POSC 306 should be no less than 2500 words long. Reports submitted for POSC 406 should be no less than 3500 words long. In each case, if you have more to say, please go ahead and write more.

#### **4) Class Participation**

Many of the issues raised in this course call on you to form your own judgments – my job is to help you do so carefully and rigorously. So it would be great if you can help each other through discussion.

*Participation will count for 10% of the overall grade.* This is meant to reward contributions to discussion and encourage class attendance. As this is a small class with long class sessions, I will expect each student to come to class prepared to make one or two comments (which can include posing questions). Students who attend regularly and meet this requirement will receive as a participation grade no less than the same grade they earn for the rest of their work. If students miss five or more class sessions, without a reason I have approved, the participation grade could be lower than their average for the rest of the class. Particularly good participation will receive an "A" for participation, regardless of the student's grades on the rest of the work.

In other words, good participation could raise your grade; steady but not especially verbal participation can't hurt it; and skipping a lot of classes could hurt a little bit.

## GRADING FORMULA

To summarize, grades will be calculated as follows:

- \* First exam: 20%
- \* Second exam: 20%
- \* Book review: 20%
- \* Memo project: 30%
- \* Class Participation: 10%

### **Late or missing assignments:**

If a student has quite a good reason to miss an assignment, I will consider exceptions to the following rules. But no exceptions will be made if a student does not notify me before missing an assignment, or cannot document the reason, or if the reason is not sufficient.

If a student misses an exam without a documented and acceptable reason, I will give a make-up before the next class, but deduct the equivalent of 2/3 of a grade (e.g. from A- to B). If a student does not make up the missing exam before the next class, there will be a further penalty. Even if a student has a sufficient reason and no grade deduction, of course, I will be forced to write a different exam for that student.

Lateness on the written book review report is subject to a reduction of up to 2/3 of a grade (e.g. from A- to B) for each 24 hours that it is late. A student who is absent from the book discussion on March 23, even if she submits the report on time, will have the grade reduced by 1/3 (e.g. from B to B-). In each case, penalty will be waived if the student has an appropriate, documented reason.

Each stage of the memo project is due on the date and time stated. Lateness on any stage will result in a deduction from the final grade for the project. The final stage of the memo must be completed on time, unless the student has requested and I have approved an Incomplete for the course. That means Incompletes must be requested before the assignment is due.

### ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

You must document all sources you use in writing your papers according to an accepted style guide. A good standard approach is in the Chicago Manual of Style (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973), but any standard format will be fine for this class. Plagiarism of any form will be punished by referral to the appropriate university judicial proceedings, as well as by a failing grade in the assignment on which the plagiarism occurs. Plagiarism includes, according to the MLA Handbook (New York: MLA, 1988), two related activities: repeating “as your own someone else’s sentences, more or less verbatim,” and “paraphrasing another person’s argument as your own, and presenting

another's line of thinking as though it were your own." Proper citation of sources will allow you to incorporate others' analyses without committing plagiarism.

## ACCOMMODATIONS

The university has a series of procedures to help both of us when students face health or other issues that may require that course procedures be altered in the interests of fairness. I will gladly work with the Office of Accommodated Testing and Services or other appropriate office to make appropriate accommodations, but I must rely on students to work through the OATS or other appropriate office to document these concerns.

## SCHEDULE OF READINGS AND CLASS ACTIVITIES:

Note: I have selected what I consider particularly useful articles from a variety of sources. In order to avoid repeating bibliographical material below, I refer to some sources by shorthand. Various editions of Allan J. Cigler & Burdett A. Loomis, *Interest Group Politics*, all published by CQ Press, are referred to as "Cigler & Loomis," and the edition.

*Week 1 Introduction to the Policy Process and Policy Perspective on Politics*

January 13: Introduction to topic and each other.  
I will talk about some ideas that you can review later from the following posted readings:  
Joseph White, "Views of the Policy Process."  
Joseph White, "Interests and Advocacy."  
*I apologize for the fact that these are the overviews of the topic of this course that I provide for my introduction to U.S. politics and my introduction to making public policy courses. But it seems worthwhile to post these, as many of the ideas will come up in this class.*

Jan 15: Roger L. Conner, "RADIO: The Life Cycle of a Public Policy Problem," ms. 2008. (8 pages)  
Ken Godwin, Scott H. Ainsworth, and Erik Godwin, "The Policy Process." Chapter 3 in *Lobbying and Policymaking: The Public Pursuit of Private Interests* (Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2013), pp. 49-73.

*Weeks 2-3 Introduction to Interest Organization in the United States*

Jan 20: No Class, Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday

Jan 22: Frances E. Lee, "Interests, Constituencies, and Policy Making." Chapter 10 in Paul J. Quirk and Sarah A. Binder eds., *The Legislative Branch*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005, 281-313.

Burdett A. Loomis and Allan J. Cigler, "Introduction: The Changing Nature of Interest Group Politics," Chapter 1 in Cigler, Loomis and Nownes, pp. 1-32.  
Sophie Roell, "The Best Books on Lobbying, recommended by Mark Bloomfield." (date unknown, from fivebooks.com)

Jan 27: Robert A. Salisbury, "Interest Representation: The Dominance of Institutions." *American Political Science Review* 78(1), March 1984, pp. 64-76.  
Alinsky, *Rules for Radicals*: Front Material, "Prologue," and, "The Purpose."

Jan 29: Kay Lehman Scholzman, Sidney Verba and Henry E. Brady, "Political Voice Through Organized Interests: Introductory Matters." Chapter 10 in Scholzman, Verba and Brady, *The Unheavenly Chorus: Unequal Political Voice and the Broken Promise of American Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012. Pp. 265-311.

**Book for review assignment should be chosen by today.**

*Weeks 4-5 People and Participation*

Feb 3: Alan Rosenthal, "Introduction," and "The People Who Lobby," "chapters 1-2 in Rosenthal, *The Third House: Lobbyists and Lobbying in the States* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2001), pp. 1-40.  
Alinsky, *Rules for Radicals*, "The Education of an Organizer."

Feb 5: Robert H. Salisbury and Laurretta Conklin, "Instrumental Versus Expressive Group Politics: The National Endowment for the Arts," in Cigler & Loomis 5<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 283-302.  
Paul E. Johnson, "Interest Group Recruiting: Finding Members and Keeping Them," in Cigler & Loomis 5<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 35-62.

**One-page memo about organization you intend to study is due today**

**NOTE: Professor White will be traveling on Feb 10-13 to give a couple of talks. So if classes are held, that will be with guest lecturers**

Feb 10: Alinsky, *Rules for Radicals*, "Communication," and "In the Beginning."  
William P. Browne, "Exchange Theory and the Institutional Impetus for Interest Group Formation," in Cigler & Loomis 6<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 313-329.

Feb 12: Burdett A. Loomis, "The Trump Effect: The American Civil Liberties Union Maximizes a Windfall," and Anthony J. Nownes, "The Formation of Transgender Rights Interest Groups in the United States," Chapters 2

and 4 in Cigler, Loomis and Nownes, *Interest Group Politics*, 10<sup>th</sup> ed. Pp. 32-46, 63-80.

*Weeks 6-7 Ideas, Interests, Information and Attention*

Feb 17: Paul A. Sabatier and Christopher Weible, "The Advocacy Coalition Framework: Innovations and Clarifications." Chapter 7 in Paul A. Sabatier ed., *Theories of the Policy Process*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2007). Pp. 189-210 plus notes.

Feb 19: Christina Wolbrecht and Michael T. Hartney, "'Ideas About Interests': Explaining the Changing Partisan Politics of Education." *Perspectives on Politics* Vol. 12, No. 3 (September 2014), pp. 603-630.  
Frank R. Baumgartner et al., "Structure or Chaos?" Chapter 3 in Baumgartner et al., *Lobbying and Policy Change*, pp. 46-67.

**Summary of basic facts about the organization you are studying for your advocacy analysis should be submitted by beginning of class**

Feb 24: Frank R. Baumgartner, "Interest Groups and Agendas," Chapter 27 in Sandy Maisel and Jeffrey M. Berry eds., *The Oxford Handbook of American Political Parties and Interest Groups* (Oxford U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 519-533.  
John Tierney and William Frasure, "Culture Wars on the Frontier: Interests, Values, and Policy Narratives in Public Lands Politics." Cigler & Loomis, 5<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 303-325.

Feb 26: R. Kent Weaver, "The Role of Policy Research." In Weaver, *Ending Welfare as We Know It*. (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 2000), pp. 135-68.

Mar 2: ***First Exam***

*Weeks 8-9 Words and Actions (Sticks and Stones...?)*

Mar 4: Alinsky, *Rules for Radicals*, "Words"  
Frank Luntz, "The Language of Healthcare 2009." ms.

**Week of March 9: "Spring" Break**

Mar 16: Alinsky, "Means and Ends," "Tactics," and "The Genesis of Tactic Proxy."

Mar 18: Roger L. Conner and Patricia Jordan, "Attitudes, Advocacy, and Polarization: The New Iron Triangle of American Public Policy" ms., March 2010,

Mar 23: Book Discussions,  
**Reviews should be submitted to Professor White by e-mail by Noon today.**

*Weeks 10-14: Venues and Methods*

Mar 25: *Lobbying the Legislature (1)*  
Joe White, "What Legislators Want." Unpublished manuscript, 12 pages  
Bertram J. Levine, "The Lobbyist's Ask," Chapter 6 in Levine, *The Art of Lobbying: Building Trust and Selling Policy*, Washington DC: CQ Press, 2009. Pp. 167-210.  
(Note: Obviously the Frances Lee reading is also extremely relevant to this topic)

Mar 30: *Money in Campaigns*  
Paul S. Herrnson, "The Interests Campaign." Chapter 5 in Herrnson, *Congressional Elections: Campaigning at Home and in Washington* 7<sup>th</sup> ed. (Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2015), pp. 131-168, plus notes.  
Michael Franz, "The Old and the New: Political Advertising by Outside Groups on Television and Online." Chapter 7 in Cigler, Loomis, and Nownes, *Interest Group Politics* 10<sup>th</sup> ed. pp. 121-144.

April 1: *Money in Lobbying*  
Richard L. Hall and Richard Anderson, "Issue Advertising and Legislative Advocacy in Health Politics," chapter 10 in Cigler & Loomis 8<sup>th</sup> ed. (221-242).  
Frank Baumgartner et al., "Does Money Buy Policy Change?" Chapter 10 in Baumgartner et al., *Lobbying and Policy Change*. Pp. 190-214.

**Second memo about Advocacy Analysis Project due today.**

April 6: *Lobbying the Legislature (2)*  
Frank R. Baumgartner et al., Chapter 8, "Tactics" and Chapter 11, "Policy Outcomes," in Baumgartner et al., *Lobbying and Policy Change*. Pp. 149-165, 215-238.

Apr 8: *Lobbying Administrative Processes (1)*  
"Interest-Group Participation, Strategies, and Success in the Regulatory Process," Chapter 5 in Godwin, Ainsworth, and Godwin, *Lobbying and Policymaking*, pp. 93-112.

Apr 13: *Lobbying Administrative Processes (2)*  
Suzanne J. Piotrowski and David H. Rosenbloom, "The Legal-Institutional Framework for Interest-Group Participation in Federal Administrative

Policymaking,” and Scott R. Furlong, "Exploring Interest Group Participation in Administrative Policymaking." Chapters 14-15 in Paul S. Herrnson, Ronald G. Shaiko and Clyde Wilcox, *The Interest Group Connection: Electioneering, Lobbying, and Policymaking in Washington*, Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2004. Pp. 258-97.

- Apr 15      *Lobbying for Money or Other Benefits (1)*  
Anthony J. Nownes, "Land Use Lobbying," Chapter 5 in Nownes, *Total Lobbying: What Lobbyists Want (and How They Try to Get It)* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 103-147.
- Apr 20:      *Lobbying for Money or Other Benefits (2)*  
Roy T. Meyers, "Strategies for Spending Advocates," in Roy T. Meyers ed., *Handbook of Government Budgeting*, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999), pp. 548-566.  
Joe White, "Making Connections to the Appropriations Process," in Herrnson et al., *The Interest Group Connection*, pp. 164-188.
- Apr 22      *Advocacy Through the Courts*  
Wayne V. McIntosh and Cynthia L. Cates, "Cigarettes, Firearms, and the New Litigation Wars: Smoking Guns Behind the Headlines," and Hans J. Hacker, "Defending the Faithful: Conservative Christian Litigation in American Politics," Chapters 18-19 in Herrnson et al, *The Interest Group Connection*, pp. 341-384.
- Apr 27:      ***Final Exam.***  
This will either be done as an essay written in class on this day, or as a take-home with the choice of essay topics handed out on April 22 and this class dedicated to discussing the topics. We will discuss these alternatives and choose one well in advance of this date.

**May 4: Memo Project Should be Sent by E-mail to Professor White by 5:00 p.m.**