

analysis of legislative or executive oversight. Yet, in view of the challenges faced by agencies like the FDA and NASA, some nod might be given to the idea that pathologies exist in how institutions of political accountability are designed in the United States. This problem is particularly troubling as it applies to whether and how agencies might be buffered from some of the cruder, short-term demands of politicians. This is a relatively minor shortcoming, however, in an otherwise sensible and important contribution to our understanding of the design of reliable administrative structures.

Heimann pulls together threads from a number of important traditions in public administration and political science and weaves them into a compelling analysis. There are important insights here for the followers of Gulick, Simon, and Landau. *Acceptable Risks* is a welcome addition to political science and administrative theory. Let us hope it signals more quality work on organizational reliability within political science.

**Lobbying Together: Interest Group Coalitions in Legislative Politics.** By Kevin W. Hula. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2000. 208p. \$55.00 cloth, \$23.95 paper.

Scott Ainsworth, *University of Georgia*

Many political scientists like institutions, in particular exogenous institutions, which guide and constrain actions and allow scholars to concentrate more narrowly on behaviors within well-defined settings. For the interest groups subfield, institutions tend to be more mercurial than those in other areas of American politics. For instance, fundamental aspects of Congress may be institutionalized, but groups and lobbyists come and go. The environment of interests is ever changing. Characterizing the interactions between legislators and lobbyists is made more difficult because of the lack of clear institutional structures that guide or constrain behaviors. The iron triangle concept was powerful and meaningful because it provided at the least a loose framework for the analysis of legislator-lobbyist interactions. Kevin Hula's new book follows the reasoning of Hugh Hecl and William Browne, who argue that the iron triangle concept is outdated and inappropriate. That convenient metaphor suggested an informal institutional structure that is simply no longer appropriate. Without the iron triangle, what can fill the void? For Hula and a growing number of scholars, group coalitions play an increasingly important role in the structuring of legislator-group interactions.

Numerous scholars have noted the increase in the sheer number of organized interests operating in Washington. The growing tendency for groups to work within coalitions expands the potential number of players exponentially. Given these facts, it is particularly important to develop some general characterizations of the interest group environment. How and when do coalitions form? How and when do they act? To address these and other questions, Hula interviewed 130 group representatives connected to the transportation, civil rights, or education policy areas. Citing the work of Burdett Loomis, he characterizes coalitions by their breadth of membership and longevity. Not surprisingly, his interviews suggest that some members are more equal than others.

Hula neatly defines three types of coalition members: core members, players, and tag-alongs. They vary considerably depending on their long- and short-term goals. Core members seek a bill or a key element of legislation. Players are satisfied if they can alter a paragraph or two in a bill. Tag-alongs seek a photo opportunity for their own narrow goals. Hula finds the tag-alongs the most intriguing, and I

agree. They lend their support, even though everyone recognizes that they will not marshal their membership or be particularly active (p. 47). In the words of one lobbyist: "All right, as a favor, use our name" (p. 47). Two possibilities immediately come to mind. The first is that groups may arrange logrolls as they form various coalitions. The second is that the breadth of coalitions should be discounted by legislators and others as they come to recognize that coalitions are less comprehensive than their masthead might lead one to believe.

Hula's attention to interlocks is particularly commendable. Formal or informal links across organizations reduce the coordination costs associated with the formation of coalitions. Interlocks at the board of director level are common and sometimes formally instituted. For instance, the American Council of Education reserves seats on its board for representatives of other education associations. More generally, Hula finds that interlocks are most important for short-term coalitions. Long-term coalitions have fewer, even though they have more time to reinforce their relationships with interlocks. When establishing coalitions, Hula finds that interlocks work in one direction only. Individuals call on their former employers, but organizations virtually never work to track down their former employees.

After reading this book, my appetite was whetted for more. For instance, it is unfortunate that no legislators were interviewed for this project. Hula's group representatives frequently note that they are sensitive to the legislative environment. Education lobbyists differentiate between their authorizing and appropriating environments (p. 163). More than once a representative suggested that a coalition was organized or encouraged by legislators themselves. "They have oftentimes told us . . . get together . . . work out what you want . . . [then] let us know" (p. 103). Or "Dingell was on the . . . Committee. He says, 'you guys get together . . . see if you can't find some common ground and come back to us'" (pp. 28–9). One committee highlighted is Transportation, and Chairman Shuster was known to be particularly active in the coordination of group activities. In sum, Hula's interviewees suggest that committee structures and legislators are key aspects of the access game, but Hula did not pursue these issues in the present work.

A greater emphasis on committee structures would complement the increasing focus of interest group scholars, including Hula, on policy areas. For instance, transportation policy is a fairly narrow area and primarily affected by only one committee. In contrast, civil rights and education policy are much broader, and numerous committees have a potential stake. Although Hula asks respondents about their breadth of interests, he does not ask about the number of committees they monitor or lobby directly. Indeed, a strong and compelling result in Hula's work is that groups concerned with multiple issue domains are more likely to work with coalitions. Breadth of interests leads to coalitional efforts. Even within single domains, group representatives may work with a small, medium, or large number of committees. The simple point is that access is affected by structures within Congress.

Although I wanted more information about the legislative issues involved, the importance of what was explored is not diminished. By highlighting the strategic concerns of group representatives as they contemplate forming coalitions, Hula makes a valuable contribution to an area of increasingly importance.