Adam Zaatar

Professor Stone

Econ 3561: Behavioral Economics and Socially Responsible Capitalism

May 2025

Who Rules? Lobbying's grip on Democracy

Corporate lobbying has emerged as one of the most influential yet least transparent forces shaping U.S. policy. It no longer merely nudges policy decisions, it often defines them outright. Against this backdrop, this paper explores a pressing and under examined question: When does corporate lobbying become socially irresponsible?

Lobbying crosses into social irresponsibility when there is a clear mismatch between a company's public commitments to corporate social responsibility (CSR) and its private political behavior. If firms publicly pledge support for ethical practices, sustainability, or social welfare, but privately lobby Congress against these very principles, they betray the public's trust and undermine democratic accountability. Such actions represent not corporate citizenship, but corporate manipulation. The practical consequences are profound. Despite broad public support, crucial policies frequently fail due to aggressive corporate lobbying efforts. For example, in 2021, Pew Research Center found that 70 percent of Americans favor a single-payer healthcare system or an expansion of Medicare. Yet, these reforms remain elusive largely because pharmaceutical lobbyists spent more than $350 million in 2022 successfully blocking meaningful action. Likewise, a KFF poll from 2022 indicated over 60 percent of Americans support increasing the minimum wage to $15 per hour, but lobbying by retail and restaurant associations has consistently thwarted legislative progress.

This paper synthesizes insights from three academic fields: political economy, corporate responsibility, and behavioral economics. On corporate responsibility, I draw heavily on Thomas Lyon's framework of Corporate Political Responsibility (CPR), which emphasizes transparency, accountability, and the imperative to "do no harm" in political engagements. I also incorporate Lock and Seele's (2016) concept of CSR decoupling, describing how firms publicly promote ethical ideals but privately lobby for conflicting interests. Finally, behavioral economics concepts such as framing effects and motivated reasoning help explain why the public tolerates corporate lobbying despite its harmful effects on democracy.

Understanding the rise of lobbying requires tracing key Supreme Court decisions that granted corporations increasing political influence. In *Buckley v. Valeo* (1976), the Court ruled that independent political expenditures constituted protected speech under the First Amendment. Although limits on direct campaign donations remained, this opened the path for money to profoundly influence electoral outcomes.

The tipping point occurred with *Citizens United v. FEC* (2010). Here, the Court further expanded First Amendment protections, permitting corporations and unions unlimited spending on political communications. This decision led directly to the rise of Super PACs, dramatically increasing corporate political spending. Within just two election cycles, total independent political expenditures more than doubled, significantly shifting electoral influence toward corporate interests.

McCutcheon v. FEC (2014) continued this trend, removing aggregate limits on individual donations across multiple candidates and parties. Wealthy individuals and corporations could now broadly influence elections and legislative agendas with minimal constraint. By 2022, OpenSecrets reported that the top 50 lobbying organizations spent over $4 billion shaping U.S. policy, with sectors such as pharmaceuticals, defense, technology, and finance dominating expenditures.

These legal changes have altered democracy's landscape fundamentally. Economist Thomas Piketty cautions in *Capital and Ideology* (2020) that when money equals speech, democracy risks becoming symbolic, masking the true influence of elite interests. Legality thus cannot be the sole standard of responsible corporate behavior; democratic integrity demands a deeper ethical evaluation.

Despite widespread public dissatisfaction with lobbying, substantial resistance remains limited. Behavioral economics provides valuable insights into why citizens often fail to recognize or actively oppose corporate political influence. Central to understanding voter passivity are cognitive shortcuts, biases, and information-processing limitations.

One fundamental concept, introduced by Daniel Kahneman (2011), distinguishes between fast, intuitive thinking ("System 1") and deliberate, analytical thinking ("System 2"). Most voters default to intuitive judgments due to information overload or limited engagement, leaving them vulnerable to persuasive yet misleading political messaging. Terms like "job creators," "freedom," or "national security" trigger emotional responses, preventing critical reflection on the underlying corporate interests shaping policy.

Framing effects, studied extensively by Thaler and Sunstein (2008), reinforce these biases. Corporations rarely frame lobbying activities directly. Defense lobbying, for instance, is portrayed as necessary for national security rather than as financial gain for contractors. Similarly, tax cuts are promoted as essential economic stimulus rather than redistributions favoring wealthy corporate interests. Such strategic framing effectively shapes public perception, nudging citizens toward passive acceptance.

The availability heuristic further limits voter awareness by causing people to emphasize readily accessible information. Most citizens do not actively seek out lobbying disclosures or track campaign finance; instead, they rely on media coverage that rarely connects lobbying explicitly to policy outcomes. For example, while polls show strong support for increasing the minimum wage (Pew, 2021), few voters connect stalled legislation directly to lobbying efforts by industry groups like the National Restaurant Association.

Present bias compounds this issue by encouraging voters to prioritize immediate concerns over future impacts. Corporate lobbying frequently targets regulations whose harms or benefits unfold gradually over years. Environmental protections or healthcare reforms, for instance, offer diffuse long-term benefits, making short-term lobbying gains harder for voters to perceive and oppose.

Finally, overconfidence in democratic control further distorts accountability. Research by Gilens and Page (2014) highlights a stark reality: public preferences have minimal impact unless aligned with elite interests. Yet citizens persist in believing their votes meaningfully shape policy outcomes, limiting pressure for reform.

Collectively, these psychological tendencies explain widespread inaction against corporate lobbying. Lobbying thrives not because citizens approve, but because they often struggle to notice or effectively counteract its subtle manipulations.

Understanding these dynamics clarifies why even well-documented cases of corporate lobbying continue without significant public backlash, as the pharmaceutical industry's lobbying clearly illustrates.

Few industries highlight the tension between corporate interests and public welfare more clearly than pharmaceuticals. The U.S. pharmaceutical industry consistently ranks among the largest lobbying spenders, channeling over $373 million into political advocacy in 2022 alone (OpenSecrets). Major firms like Pfizer and Johnson & Johnson publicly emphasize commitments to innovation, patient access, and affordability. Yet privately, these same companies aggressively lobby Congress to block legislation aimed at reducing drug prices and enabling market competition from generics.

One prominent example is pharmaceutical lobbying against Medicare's authority to negotiate drug prices, a policy supported by 83% of Americans (KFF, 2023). Despite overwhelming public support, pharmaceutical firms, through lobbying organizations like PhRMA, have effectively prevented meaningful reform. This opposition directly contradicts their public commitments to health equity, affordability, and patient welfare, illustrating what Lock and Seele (2016) call "CSR decoupling."

Companies claim socially responsible objectives publicly while their lobbying activities push for policies undermining those very goals.

Moreover, Scherer and Palazzo (2011) describe this behavior as “post-democratic governance,” where corporations wield political power akin to elected bodies but lack public accountability. This dynamic was starkly evident during the creation of Medicare Part D in 2003. Pharmaceutical lobbyists successfully included a “non-interference clause,” explicitly barring Medicare from negotiating drug prices. According to the Congressional Budget Office (2022), eliminating this clause could save taxpayers approximately $456 billion over a decade, yet pharmaceutical lobbying remains a formidable obstacle to change.

Using Lyon’s Corporate Political Responsibility (CPR) framework further exposes pharmaceutical lobbying as socially irresponsible. Pharmaceutical lobbying practices fail CPR standards by lacking transparency, accountability, and violating the “do no harm” principle. Their opaque disclosures obscure lobbying objectives; their actions routinely contradict stated corporate values; and their policy influence consistently undermines public health affordability and accessibility.

Understanding the broader implications of lobbying also requires examining other sectors, particularly the defense industry, where the consequences extend beyond financial impacts to questions of human life and global stability.

Defense contractors represent one of the most influential lobbying forces in American politics. In 2023, the top five U.S. defense firms, Lockheed Martin, Raytheon, Boeing, Northrop Grumman, and General Dynamics, collectively spent over $114 million lobbying policymakers (OpenSecrets). Their efforts extend beyond securing government contracts; these firms actively shape defense policy, budget allocations, and even foreign policy decisions.

This outsized influence raises serious concerns regarding transparency and accountability. Despite receiving over $850 billion annually, the Department of Defense has failed multiple financial audits, most recently unable to account for 61% of its assets (DoD Inspector General, 2023). Yet lobbying by major contractors has consistently ensured continued funding increases, including support for controversial programs such as Lockheed Martin's F-35 fighter jet. A 2023 Government Accountability Office report identified ongoing performance and reliability issues with the F-35, yet lobbying secured an additional $10 billion in its 2024 budget. Such lobbying clearly serves corporate profits at the expense of public accountability.

This dynamic aligns closely with Scherer and Palazzo's (2011) notion of "post-democratic governance," where corporations influence critical public decisions without direct electoral oversight. Defense contractors effectively shape military budgets and strategies with minimal public scrutiny. Lock and Seele's (2016) concept of CSR decoupling is also evident, as defense firms publicly emphasize commitments to veterans' welfare and global security while privately lobbying for arms sales and expanded militarization.

Most troubling from a Corporate Political Responsibility (CPR) standpoint is the defense industry's failure to meet the "do no harm" criterion. Lobbying frequently supports policies promoting or prolonging conflict. A 2021 Brown University study through the Costs of War Project highlights how contractors benefit financially from ongoing conflicts in regions like Yemen and Ukraine, suggesting profit motives entwined with global instability.

Also, the pervasive use of former Pentagon officials as corporate lobbyists further obscures transparency. A 2023 Project on Government Oversight (POGO) report found over 670 former Defense Department personnel now employed as lobbyists or policy advisors for major defense firms, illustrating systemic institutional capture.

While defense and pharmaceutical lobbying often attract public attention, the tech industry's growing political influence demands equal scrutiny. In 2023, Amazon and Alphabet led corporate lobbying expenditures, spending $21.6 million and $20.1 million respectively (OpenSecrets). Though these companies publicly champion progressive values like innovation and equity, their private lobbying frequently undermines such claims, particularly regarding labor practices, data privacy, antitrust legislation, and taxation.

The contradiction between tech companies' public positions and lobbying activities is clearly visible in labor market policies, especially the H-1B visa program. Firms such as Meta and Google publicly highlight commitments to diversity and global talent recruitment, yet internal documents from a 2022 Congressional hearing revealed active lobbying to increase visa quotas while simultaneously suppressing domestic wages (Senate Judiciary Committee, 2022). This approach directly violates Thomas Lyon's Corporate Political Responsibility (CPR) framework, particularly the principle of "do no harm," by exacerbating wage stagnation and job insecurity domestically.

Privacy legislation further illustrates this conflict. Despite high-profile CSR campaigns by tech firms emphasizing transparency and user privacy, behind-the-scenes lobbying often opposes stringent privacy regulations. For example, in 2022, Google deployed over 120 lobbyists to weaken enforcement provisions of the proposed American Data Privacy and Protection Act (Washington Post, 2022). This lobbying activity sharply contrasts their public statements on user protection, demonstrating Lock and Seele's (2016) concept of CSR decoupling.

Antitrust policy provides another significant example. While publicly advocating competition and open markets, tech giants have actively lobbied against antitrust enforcement. Public Citizen (2023) reported that Amazon and Meta collectively spent over $60 million opposing the "Ending Platform Monopolies Act," despite overwhelming public support (73% favorability according to Pew Research, 2022). These lobbying efforts stalled meaningful legislative action, demonstrating a clear divergence from democratic interests.

Scherer and Palazzo’s (2011) notion of corporate “post-democratic governance” describes this phenomenon accurately. Tech companies increasingly occupy roles traditionally reserved for democratic institutions, shaping crucial areas like labor policy, consumer protection, and market regulation without corresponding transparency or public accountability.

Still, corporate lobbying need not always contradict the public good. An examination of the renewable energy sector illustrates how lobbying can responsibly align corporate and public interests.

While much of corporate lobbying distorts democratic priorities, there are notable cases where firms align their political advocacy with public interest. These examples clarify the difference between responsible and irresponsible lobbying, showing that influence alone is not the issue, intent and impact matter.

NextEra Energy, a leading U.S. clean energy producer, spent over $4 million in 2022 lobbying for renewable energy tax credits, grid modernization, and infrastructure investment. Unlike fossil fuel firms, which often lobby against environmental regulation, NextEra’s positions supported broader climate goals and the provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act. Public sentiment was on their side: a 2023 Pew Research Center report found that 65% of Americans favor transitioning to renewable energy. NextEra’s lobbying aligned both with democratic preferences and the company’s own environmental mission.

From a Corporate Political Responsibility (CPR) standpoint, NextEra met the three key criteria. Their lobbying activity was transparent, detailed in public reports; their actions were consistent with stated values; and their goals promoted measurable public benefits such as emissions reduction and infrastructure resilience. This stands in sharp contrast to firms that publicly claim sustainability while lobbying against green policy.

Apple provides another example. In 2021, it publicly supported the American Data Privacy and Protection Act and introduced stronger app tracking controls. Unlike other tech giants, Apple's lobbying reinforced its privacy messaging. Although the company's position also benefited its premium hardware model, it still advanced public interest. According to a 2021 Axios poll, 85% of Americans supported stronger data protections. Apple's position aligned with both democratic preferences and CPR principles.

What sets these firms apart is not just the issues they lobby on, but the way they conduct that lobbying. They act with consistency, disclose their intentions, and seek policies that reflect public priorities. These cases show that lobbying can strengthen democracy when it supports transparency, public accountability, and long-term social outcomes.

Corporate lobbying is not inherently harmful. In theory, it allows firms to communicate expertise and advocate for their interests. But when lobbying consistently contradicts public opinion, masks private gain behind ethical branding, and skews policymaking toward concentrated power, it becomes socially irresponsible.

In contrast, companies like NextEra and Apple demonstrate how lobbying can align with public priorities when rooted in transparency and ethical consistency. As Lyon's Corporate Political Responsibility framework makes clear, firms must be judged by whether their political behavior aligns with the public good, not just with their quarterly goals.

Reforms should include stricter lobbying disclosures, enforceable links between CSR claims and political activity, and limitations on financial influence over elections. These measures won't eliminate lobbying, but they can shift it from a market for power back to a tool of democratic participation.

As economist Joseph Stiglitz put it, "The more unequal a society, the less the voices of ordinary citizens are heard, and nowhere is this more evident than in how public policy gets shaped." If lobbying is to serve a legitimate role in society, it must be held to a higher standard, one that prioritizes democratic fairness over private control.

The question is not whether lobbying should exist, but whether we're willing to define and enforce the conditions under which it strengthens rather than subverts democracy.

Bibliography:

Allcott, H., Knittel, C. R., & Taubinsky, D. (2015). *Energy policy with externalities and internalities*. Journal of Public Economics, 112, 72–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2014.12.004

Anastasiadis, S. (2014). *Toward a view of citizenship and lobbying in corporate social responsibility*. Business & Society, 53(2), 260–299. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650312448622

Bursztyn, L., & Jensen, R. (2017). *Social image and economic behavior in the field: Identifying, understanding, and shaping social pressure*. Annual Review of Economics, 9, 131–153. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-063016-103738

Fehr, E., & Schmidt, K. M. (1999). *A theory of fairness, competition, and cooperation*. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 114(3), 817–868. https://doi.org/10.1162/003355399556151

Favotto, A., & Kollman, K. (2019). *Mixing business with politics: Does corporate social responsibility end where lobbying transparency begins?* Regulation & Governance, 13(3), 370–389. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12216

Gilens, M., & Page, B. I. (2014). *Testing theories of American politics: Elites, interest groups, and average citizens*. Perspectives on Politics, 12(3), 564–581. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592714001595

Hart, O., & Zingales, L. (2017). *Companies should maximize shareholder welfare not market value*. Journal of Law, Finance, and Accounting, 2(2), 247–274. https://doi.org/10.1561/108.00000022

Keeley, T. (2022). *Sustainable: Moving Beyond ESG to Impact*. Greenleaf Publishing.

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Lock, I., & Seele, P. (2016). *CSR governance and departmental organization: A typology of CSR coordination*. Journal of Business Ethics, 136(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2355-5

Lyon, T. P., Montgomery, A. W., & Wren, B. (2018). *Greenwash: Corporate environmental disclosure under threat of audit*. Journal of Economics & Management Strategy, 27(1), 3–35. https://doi.org/10.1111/jems.12265

Lyon, T. P. (2021). *Corporate Political Responsibility: Re-Thinking the Role of Business in Public Policy*. Ross School of Business Working Paper Series. https://sites.google.com/a/umich.edu/thomaslyon/corporate-political-responsibility

Pew Research Center. (2021). *Public trust in government: 1958–2021*. https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2021/05/17/public-trust-in-government-1958-2021/

Piketty, T. (2020). *Capital and Ideology*. Harvard University Press.

Scherer, A. G., & Palazzo, G. (2011). *The new political role of business in a globalized world: A review of a new perspective on CSR and its implications for the firm, governance, and democracy*. Journal of Management Studies, 48(4), 899–931. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2010.00950.x

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. Yale University Press.

Allcott, H., Knittel, C. R., & Taubinsky, D. (2015). *Energy policy with externalities and internalities*. Journal of Public Economics, 112, 72–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2014.12.004

Anastasiadis, S. (2014). *Toward a view of citizenship and lobbying in corporate social responsibility*. Business & Society, 53(2), 260–299. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650312448622

Bursztyn, L., & Jensen, R. (2017). *Social image and economic behavior in the field: Identifying, understanding, and shaping social pressure*. Annual Review of Economics, 9, 131–153. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-063016-103738

Fehr, E., & Schmidt, K. M. (1999). *A theory of fairness, competition, and cooperation*. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 114(3), 817–868. https://doi.org/10.1162/003355399556151

Favotto, A., & Kollman, K. (2019). *Mixing business with politics: Does corporate social responsibility end where lobbying transparency begins?* Regulation & Governance, 13(3), 370–389. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12216

Gilens, M., & Page, B. I. (2014). *Testing theories of American politics: Elites, interest groups, and average citizens*. Perspectives on Politics, 12(3), 564–581. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592714001595

Hart, O., & Zingales, L. (2017). *Companies should maximize shareholder welfare not market value*. Journal of Law, Finance, and Accounting, 2(2), 247–274. https://doi.org/10.1561/108.00000022

Keeley, T. (2022). *Sustainable: Moving Beyond ESG to Impact*. Greenleaf Publishing.

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Lock, I., & Seele, P. (2016). *CSR governance and departmental organization: A typology of CSR coordination*. Journal of Business Ethics, 136(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2355-5

Lyon, T. P., Montgomery, A. W., & Wren, B. (2018). *Greenwash: Corporate environmental disclosure under threat of audit*. Journal of Economics & Management Strategy, 27(1), 3–35. https://doi.org/10.1111/jems.12265

Lyon, T. P. (2021). *Corporate Political Responsibility: Re-Thinking the Role of Business in Public Policy*. Ross School of Business Working Paper Series. https://sites.google.com/a/umich.edu/thomaslyon/corporate-political-responsibility

OpenSecrets.org. (2024). *Lobbying Database*. Center for Responsive Politics. https://www.opensecrets.org/federal-lobbying

Pew Research Center. (2021). *Public trust in government: 1958–2021*. https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2021/05/17/public-trust-in-government-1958-2021/

Pew Research Center. (2022). *Majority of Americans support raising the federal minimum wage*. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2022/01/28/

Piketty, T. (2020). *Capital and Ideology*. Harvard University Press.

ProPublica. (2023). *Congressional votes and lobbying records*. https://projects.propublica.org/represent/

Scherer, A. G., & Palazzo, G. (2011). *The new political role of business in a globalized world: A review of a new perspective on CSR and its implications for the firm, governance, and democracy*. Journal of Management Studies, 48(4), 899–931. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2010.00950.x

Stiglitz, J. E. (2012). *The Price of Inequality: How Today's Divided Society Endangers Our Future*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. Yale University Press.