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ABSTRACT
At this present rate of supersaturation of the markets, the interaction between 
economic actors and political officials gains a momentum without precedent. 
Difficulties faced by corporations generate lobby activities intended for soliciting 
financial support, public-private partnerships are sought, which provide income and 
safety during crisis, and governments are also inclined to dialogize with the business. 
There is also an increased risk of occurrence of negative externalities, such as 
corruption, especially in emerging economies. All this, along with the natural tendency 
of the corporations to pursue at all levels achieving their interests, increasing profits, 
creating competitive advantage, lead to an intense corporate political activity.

We propose to examine in the article an overview of business strategies and 
corporate policies, as they appear in the literature and a comparative analysis on this 
type of action in various parts of the world.

In concluding this article, in fact an “introduction” to the corporate political 
activities, we’ll build a glossary of keywords, which, by its very nature, will create an 
overview of the issues discussed.

KEYWORDS: competitive advantage, political capabilities, corporate political 
activities, stakeholders, public choice, interest group, lobbying, campaign finance/
campaign contributions, statism, corporatism

Introduction

In a constantly changing world, in difficult economic conditions, 
Romania, and all other countries of the world follow their own paths. It would 
be desirable that our country’s path would lead to balance and wellbeing. In the 21st 
century, once more, in Europe, in America, in Asia, all over the world there is a lot 
of interference between economic and political arenas, interference that appears to 
justify the “Public Choice” vision of politics.

Thus, as James M. Buchanan and Gordon Tullock contend, (Buchanan, 
Tullock, 1995), political behavior is similar to the behavior on the market of goods 
and services, i.e. individuals get into a relationship of exchange and each of them 
pursues its own interest by offering goods that are in favor of the one that is on the 
other side of the transaction. On the political market, politicians running for official 
high places and after a while those who are already inside the system, supply 
public goods, public services and public policies, initially as promises, then as
facts. The citizens, businesses, interest groups are on the other side of this exchange, demanding, in a certain way, these public “goods”.

It is obvious that the strongest companies, corporations, especially those whose businesses depend on the particular regulations of the state will act for influencing in their favor of those who set the rules. They act like this in order to enhance their competitive advantage and to counteract, if possible, those regulations that disadvantage them. In this context, it would be against human nature and especially against the orientation towards profit of the companies that possess the necessary resources and capabilities, not to take any action, to be passive, just to execute, and so not to have what is called a corporate political activity (CPA), a term already used in the literature devoted to this subject.

Political activities are included in the policy strategy of the company and may be several types: campaign finance; lobbying or legislative advocacy activities, direct or through specialized companies, orientated to the institutions involved in drafting laws or regulations aimed at, or affecting the corporation (the parliament, parliamentary committees, government regulatory agencies); participation in the formation of the electorate of a candidate or political party; information exchange with political factor.

The nature of these activities and how they are conducted varies from one country to another, from one region of the globe to another, according to the cultural characteristics of the area / country, to the historical, social, and political conditions, and to the laws in force. They can degenerate in illegal actions like bribery, generating corruption.

On the other hand, firms can act individually or they can join in groups of economic interests. It’s proven that, in certain conditions, the lobby actions are most effective, i.e. when they are taken by interest groups, than when firms act individually. Since the mid-nineteenth century research was made related to interest groups (Olson, 1965). Research has continued, and is presented in a vast specialized literature dedicated to this topic, fact that demonstrates the importance and the major impact the actions of these interest groups, especially groups of economic interests, have on the political factor.

Olson describes some strong motivations that companies have to conduct political activities together. Thus, economic interest groups, such as a group of companies that seek to obtain financial support from the state, with a few members in comparison with the large group of the taxpayers of a nation, have much more chances of success than the citizens. This happens for several reasons, but, mainly, the incentives for the members of the interest group are stronger, because, if they are successful, the get enormous payoffs, moreover, because they know each other, their managers “can look into each others eyes”, so they can’t have a “free ride” attitude. In return, for the citizens it’s more difficult to organize themselves as a group, for them the loss through taxes is small, and they can have a “free ride” attitude because “they can wiggle through the crowd.”
Economic and political conditions in the world are continuously transforming, the large corporations operate all over the world, all the countries are going through a serious crisis (of trust, financial, economic, of overproduction), the political power of the European Union or of other supranational bodies are enhancing.

David Bach and Gregory C. Unruh (Bach, Unruh, 2004) argue that, along with the globalization of the markets and the heavy balance of the policies designed to reduce the pressure of the government on business, politics seems to become, paradoxically, increasingly important in business. They expose at least three reasons why this happens:

- Managers are faced with increasing demands from the stakeholders as a result of the impact of businesses on society and natural environment. According to the authors, the demands of different categories of stakeholders can be brought to a common denominator, reconciled only at the political level.
- In the technologically dynamic economic sectors, the ability to influence politics is a key strategic capability, because the political factors, through their regulations, can influence the viability and the profitability of the strategic innovation.
- Due to the decrease of the transaction costs of the international business in the globalization, companies are in the position to face the political and regulatory environments differently, hence resulting need to develop skills in terms of political management.

The corporate political strategy and the political activities integrated in Political activities of the company may be included in the corporate political strategy, “a battle” for a long term that takes into account the political contextual determinants of the company, often accompanying the market strategies designed to increase the competitiveness and the competitive advantage. An example would be the political activities that a company can carry out to remove / reduce the protectionist barriers for entering on a new market, or those of a company wishing to obtain support from the state for certain activities. Political factors are exogenous factors of the company; they are part of the environment and influence in many cases the extent the company reaches or not its specific goals.

David Bach and Gregory C. Unruh (Bach, Unruh, 2004) identify the political resources necessary for the implementation of the corporate political strategy as several types: financial – used for campaign contributions for certain politicians or political organizations like political parties, in the United States through Political Action Committees (PAC); information – for understanding political processes; social – networks of relationships and contacts with politicians, potential allies, opinion leaders; institutional – legal recognitions or positions held by the managers or the companies in the political processes, such as participation in experts committees.

As such, the ability to use all these resources into political actions represents, as David Bach and Gregory C. Unruh argue, political capabilities.

Political activities of the company are determined by its political strategy. And the corporate political strategy is included in what David P. Baron (Baron, 1995) calls “integrated strategy”. In his vision, an effective strategy of a company is consisted of two integrated components: a market and a non-market component. The non-market component of the strategy is oriented to elements from the
company’s environment that influences the company, others than those belonging to the market. These elements, the company interacts with voluntarily or involuntarily, is in Baron's opinion the following: the public, stakeholders, the state, public institutions, media.

The corporate political strategy is one of the non-market strategies, following the features that Baron attributes to this type of strategy: “a concentrated pattern of actions taken in the non-market environment to create value by improving its overall performance, as in the case in which a firm works through its home government to use trade policy to open a foreign market”. And yet the two types of strategies, market and non-market are interconnected, they act unitary: “[...] many nonmarket issues arise from market activity, one approach [is] to view nonmarket strategies as complements to market strategies that in some cases can be used to directly address the five market forces Porter identifies”. This is why the two types of strategies form a whole – the corporate integrated strategy.

Non-market strategies represent one of the main research themes of the scholars specialized in strategic management all over the world. Strategic Management Society organized in 2007, in San Diego, a conference on “The Challenges of Non-market Influences on Market Strategies”, and the event chairman, Peter Smith Ring, was showing in the Conference Program: “Non-market strategies can be employed to create and/or maintain a firm’s source(s) of competitive advantage or to erode or destroy the sources of competitive advantages of its competitors. How firms compete against each other in market contexts can and will be impacted by treaties, regulations, legislation, litigation, the media and a diverse and rapidly increasing population of non-governmental organizations (NGOs). And a wide variety of institutions are available to firms pursuing non-market strategies: the WTO, the courts, legislative and regulatory bodies, the media.”

Baron makes an extremely important remark: to be effective, integrated strategy must be appropriate both to the environment in which business operates and to the competencies it has.

And the managers (along with other categories of employees specializing in PR, legal issues, relations with the political environment) must take the responsibility for obtaining performance in non-market and in the market environment as well.

Corporate political strategies are pursuing, by „tailoring” public policies, to reduce uncertainty, to reduce or eliminate threats and to create opportunities, to build competitive advantages or to determine the reduction of the competitive advantages of the competing companies (Lord, 2000), all of these for increasing its performance and profits.

A comparative analysis over the corporate political activities

Depending on the area/country in which a company functions, whether local or a subsidiary of a multinational corporation, management must adjust to the modalities, to the patterns, often particular, in which business are made here, to the type of relationships between business and political factors, as to other features related
to specific interactions with other categories of stakeholder. Company managers must
give special attention to these features of the area. They are due to both tradition and
culture, and the type of political system and state organization in the country/area.

In a study on relations between state and business (Iankov, 2007), Elena A.
Iankov shows that such relationships fall, generally, in one of the following models:

- **The neo-liberal, Anglo-Saxon model** states for the free market
  supremacy; the role of the state is to ensure an appropriate environment for
  business, suited for success by maintaining the institutional infrastructure and
  accessing macroeconomic procedures to avoid recession and inflation; the
  relationships between firms and political factors are more of adversity than
  cooperative and the major political activities of the companies are lobbying to
  reduce costs of compliance and obtaining benefits;

- **The statist model – specific in countries like France** – is
  characterized by the fact that the role of state is much more extended. The state
  assumes a leadership role, identifying the long term, based on the information it
  holds markets and products, which appear to be profitable in the future. It shows an
  increased interest in corporate strategies and activities.

- **The corporatist model** is another interventionist model,
in which
  the state forms a partnership with interest groups and together they coordinate the
  economic activity. Corporatism appears in various forms, from the model of fascist
  Italy of Mussolini, continuing with the after the Second World War Japanese case,
  and met today in China (Unger, Chan, 1995), but also in Russia in a special form
  (Zarakhovich, 2005).

  No doubt, the nature of the relationships between business and the political
  factors in one country or another does not fit exactly into a “model”. But the
  models facilitate the understanding of phenomena and we will start from here in on
  our comparative analysis of the situations the corporations are dealing with in
  relation to the state and to the politicians in various parts of the world.

  From the issues presented so far, it can be seen the complexity, the
  diversity of forms of manifestation, the actuality and the importance of corporate
  political activity.

  A measure of the importance of this type of activity is given by the wide
  variety of stakeholders involved: all those directly interested in the company’s
  profit, like owners, employees; owners and employees of other companies from the
  same group of interest; even people involved in other companies that are in the
  same field of activity and may benefit from favorable legislation; citizens who
  leave in the area, receiving welfare generated by the local profitable company.

  There is, of course, and a reverse of the coin – those who have suffered as
  a result of the success of company in its political actions: those who may suffer
  because the environment was polluted; ecology militants; competitors.

  The phenomenon is ample, the implications are multiple and, in addition,
  corporate political activity takes various forms generated by the economic, social,
  political, cultural environment of the country where this activity takes place.
Glossary of keywords

For a good understanding of the main concepts as corporate political activities, strategic management, public choice we introduce some others keywords: interest group, lobbying, campaign finance/ campaign contributions, statism, corporatism
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