

Inside the West Wing: Lobbying as a contest

Alastair Langtry*†

July 5, 2022

Abstract

We treat lobbying as a contest. We find that a benevolent government wants to give favourable treatment to certain special interest groups in exchange for contributions. In other words, the government sells “protection”. Doing so improves overall welfare. The government sells protection to build its own “war chest” of political capital, and does so until it wins all remaining contests. It will sell protection to those it finds least objectionable. Treating lobbying as a contest stands in contrast to prevailing models that view lobbying as driven by information or agency problems. *JEL Codes:* D23, D72, D74

Keywords: lobbying, contests, special interest politics.

*University of Cambridge. Email: atl27@cam.ac.uk.

†I am very grateful to Toke Aidt, Matt Elliott, Aytek Erdil, Lukas Freund, Sanjeev Goyal, Max Langtry, Su Min Lee, and Julia Shvets, and to participants at the Cambridge theory and political economy workshops, for helpful comments and discussion. This work was supported by the Economic and Social Research Council [award reference ES/P000738/1]. Any remaining errors are the sole responsibility of the author.

“Making sausage isn’t pretty, Mr President”.

Rahm Emanuel, White House Chief of Staff, 2008

Governments are not omnipotent. It is widely recognized that governments have limited political capital and have to fight to get what they want. Even passing familiarity with American politics of recent decades presents prominent examples where presidents have fought and lost. They have wanted to pass wide-ranging reforms across a series of policy areas, but have been forced to settle for less, or for nothing at all.¹

Taking this idea seriously, we treat lobbying as a fight between a government and special interest groups. This lens allows us to examine how the government spends political capital and the special treatment that appears to be given to some interest groups. When does the government give special treatment? Why? How much? Is it given or sold, and to whom?

As an example, Barack Obama’s White House agreed to drop provisions that would have allowed re-importation of prescription medicines at lower prices from their plans for the Affordable Care Act (often called “Obamacare”). Pharmaceutical companies benefited. But this special treatment did not come free. The US pharmaceutical industry ended up a key backer of Obamacare, and even agreed to provide \$80 billion to help fund expanded insurance coverage [Baker, 2012]. In contrast, insurers received no such special treatment [Norman and Karlin-Smith, 2016]. For the right price, protection was for sale.

Concretely, we model lobbying as a set of contests between one government and a mass of special interest groups over the outcome of laws.² These contests involve the government and special interest groups vying for votes in a legislature. We treat legislators as passive actors who respond to pressures exerted on them by the other agents. Their role is captured by a contest function. Our focus is on the other actors – the government and special interest groups – who care about the outcomes of laws.

Each special interest group cares about the expected outcome of one law and can spend resources lobbying.³ There is one special interest group per law. The government cares about total expected welfare. It is a social planner, with no agenda of its own. This is a stark benchmark, but is to abstract from the agency issues already extensively studied in the literature (starting with Grossman and Helpman [1994]). It has an exogenous budget of political capital it can spend on the contests.

The final component is the contest itself. In line with existing work on contests, we use a contest function that maps the political capital and lobbying that agents spend on the contest to

¹Consider Joe Biden’s recent \$1 trillion infrastructure bill – scaled back from a proposed \$2.3 trillion [Cochrane, 2021].

²This makes the model more tractable. Simulations in the Online Appendix suggest that moving to a finite, even relatively small, number of interest groups has little impact.

³We do not impose any a priori restrictions on which laws a special interest group can lobby for or against. However, given the setup, each interest group will only lobby on the one law it cares about, and obviously in favour of its preferred outcome.

a probability of winning. We use perhaps the best-known contest function of all – the Tullock contest function [Tullock, 1967, 1972]. This contest function can be derived as the outcome of a game where the contesting agents spend resources amassing *evidence* in favour of their preferred outcome, and an arbiter chooses the outcome they think has the most evidence. Agents’ evidence production functions are strictly concave, and so the resulting contest function is also concave.⁴

In a change to the standard contest function we allow the government to do *deals* with special interest groups. A deal is a *quid pro quo* where a special interest group provides some additional political capital to the government in exchange for the government ceding the contest. In effect, this is the government selling protection from having to contest the law.

When the government is unable to do deals with special interest groups, we find that it adopts a “scattergun” approach. It chooses to engage in all contests and spreads out its political capital in proportion to the costliness of losing each contest. Here, the government does not pick its battles. It will spend its entire budget of political capital unless it can guarantee victory in all contests without exhausting its budget. In that case the government always gets its way – (lack of) power ceases to be a binding constraint. This approach is due to the concavity of the contest function – which in turn is due to agents’ concave production functions for evidence in the game that microfounds the contest function.

The situation changes dramatically when the government can do deals with special interest groups. Now, the government will do deals with special interest groups up to the point where it just has sufficient political capital to guarantee victory in all remaining contests (the ones where it didn’t do a deal). Here, the government only picks battles it can win. This happens because there are now two reasons for picking battles. First, ceding some contests allows for greater focus on the remaining ones. Second, the government can extract concessions – in the form of extra political capital – from a special interest group when it cedes a contest. This allows it to build up its political “war chest” that can be spent on the remaining contests. The first reason is present in the world where doing deals is not possible. It is not sufficient on its own. The ability to build the “war chest” is critical.

This tells us *how many* deals will be done – that protection is for sale, but not to everyone. A critical question is then, *to whom?* We find that the government does deals with the set of special interest groups that it finds least objectionable. Specifically, deals are done where bad laws cause the least harm to society *relative to* the benefits to special interest groups. The government may well cede laws with large absolute harms if the benefits to the special interest group are also large. This is because the government can extract large concessions and gain a lot of extra political capital by doing so.

Strikingly, doing these deals with interest groups improves overall welfare. The costs of ceding contests to special interest groups are outweighed by the benefits of additional political capital and

⁴We discuss these microfoundations to the Tullock contest function in the Online Appendix.

the reduction in resources wasted contesting laws. This casts a new light on the much-maligned phenomenon of certain interest groups receiving special treatment. In a world where the government cares about overall welfare, these “sales” can benefit the system as a whole. It therefore highlights a novel tension between overall welfare and equal treatment before the law.

It is easy to see how selling special treatment in exchange for private benefits, perhaps funds to facilitate reelection or to directly enrich a leader, can be harmful [Grossman and Helpman, 1994, Bertrand et al., 2020]. But this is not the case when exchanged for political capital. In line with existing literature, our model suggests that laws that prevent direct bribery or limit political donations can improve welfare. In contrast, our model also suggests that limiting the ability of special interest groups to function at all would be harmful – as doing so would prevent the welfare-enhancing deals they could do with the government.

Related Literature. This paper brings together two literatures that have so far been studied separately – lobbying and conflict. In doing so, we make contributions to both.

There is no scope for lobbying in a frictionless world. A government simply decides what it wants to do, and then does it. We need a friction for lobbying to take place. Existing literature focuses on two core frictions – information and agency. In the former case, largely following Crawford and Sobel [1982], special interest groups have better information than the government. Interest groups can affect what the government wants to do by strategic communication. This alters the information the government has. Alternatively, Grossman and Helpman [1994] (which in turn builds on theoretical advances by Bernheim and Whinston [1986]) model agency issues as the government caring both about social welfare and about direct payoffs to itself from a given policy or law. Special interest groups can then influence what the government wants to do by offering money. In other words, the government is corruptible.

Our key contribution to the lobbying literature is to use a new core friction – power. Even though the government knows what it wants to do, it is not able to simply do it.⁵ The fact that special interest groups can fight the government and win is what provides scope for lobbying. Here, special interest groups do not try to persuade or influence the government. They try to defeat the government. To the best of our knowledge, contests are novel friction to generate lobbying. This leads to new predictions about who receives special treatment and why.

However, power and contests have been studied extensively in existing conflict literature.⁶ An obvious contribution we make is to present a novel application – lobbying and the formation of laws. Within the conflict literature, this paper most closely relates to the literature on Colonel Blotto games [Borel, 1921, 1953, Blackett, 1954, 1958]. These games typically involve two players choosing how to spend resources on a number of bilateral contests [Kovenock and Roberson, 2012],

⁵We abstract from information and agency issues, so the government always knows what it wants to do.

⁶An overview of this very large and varied literature is far beyond the scope of this paper. Some excellent entry points into this large literature include Konrad et al. [2009], Garfinkel and Skaperdas [2012], Congleton et al. [2018].

although n-player variants have been considered more recently [Boix-Adserà et al., 2021]. Our model without the ability to do deals is very similar to n-player Colonel Blotto games – although in our setting all but one agent care about winning only one contest, and there is one central agent who cares about all contests.

Our key contribution to the Colonel Blotto literature is to add the ability to cede contests in exchange for a transfer of resources. To our knowledge, this is a novel feature of Colonel Blotto style games. As our results show, the impact on equilibrium outcomes is dramatic. The government moves from spreading its resources across all contests to only fighting where it will win for certain. This suggests the ability to cede contests has potentially important implications for battles on multiple fronts beyond this application to lobbying.

Some terminology. Before turning to the model it is helpful to discuss what contests, and the resources devoted to them, look like in our setting.⁷ A contest between a special interest group and the government is a battle for the hearts and minds – and most importantly votes – of the members of a country’s legislature. Special interest groups and the government can convince, cajole and pressure these legislators to vote for their preferred version of the law. An agent wins the contest when a majority of legislators vote their way.

In our model, outcomes of laws are binary. Think of this as legislators voting for or against a bill. To avoid confusion, we call these outcomes “good” and “bad”. The “good” outcome is in the general interest, and “bad” benefits a special interest group, at the expense of the rest of society. For example, a law could either impose protectionist tariffs on imported steel (“bad”) or allow free trade in steel (“good”). A special interest group benefits from a bad law, and the rest of society is harmed. To focus on the interesting case, we assume that the harms to society of a bad law exceed the benefits to the interest group.⁸

In principle, political capital [resp. lobbying] here is anything that can be used to persuade or pressure a legislator into voting for the government [resp. interest group]. To fix ideas, one could think of political capital as the government’s ability to provide ministerial jobs/cabinet positions, seats on committees, or visits to the legislator’s district by senior officials. Similarly, lobbying takes the form of well-paid second jobs for legislators, relocation of factories to their districts, or campaigns to build support among local voters.⁹ Note that in our model, the government and the legislators are distinct agents. The contributions that special interest groups make when they do a deal with the government take the same form as lobbying. The difference is that the government *controls* these resources, and this is what matters.

⁷In the Appendix we have equivalent discussion for applications to criminal prosecution and counter-insurgency.

⁸If a special interest group wanted something that increased social welfare, there would be no contest between it and a benign government.

⁹This framing clearly works best for developed countries with relatively low levels of tolerance for corruption. In countries corrupt where corruption is rife and accepted, there is a far less nuanced interpretation of lobbying and political capital. We can simply think of them as money.

1 Model

Players. There is one risk-neutral *government*, G , which is endowed with K^G units of *political capital*. There are measure one of *laws*, indexed $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and one risk-neutral *special interest group* per law, also indexed i . Each law, i , has two possible states. It can be *good*, or *bad*. If it is bad, then special interest group i receives exogenous benefits $\pi_i \geq 0$, and society pays a cost $\alpha\pi_i$, with $\alpha > 1$. If it is good, then the benefits to the interest group and the costs to society are both zero. Formally, $\pi : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ and we let $\pi(i) \equiv \pi_i$. Society is an unmodelled agent, but the government cares about society's preferences. Assume that the π_i can be represented by some continuously differentiable Cumulative Distribution Function and that all values of π_i are finite.

Politics. The state of each law i is determined by a contest between the government and interest group i . If both agents participate in the contest, then law i is good with probability:

$$p_i = \begin{cases} \frac{K_i}{K_i + L_i} & \text{if } K_i + L_i > 0 \\ 0.5 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $K_i \geq 0$ is the quantity of political capital the government spends, and $L_i \geq 0$ is the quantity of lobbying by special interest groups, in the contest over law i . If only the government [resp. special interest group i] participates, then $p_i = 1$ [resp. $p_i = 0$]. If neither participate, then $p_i = 0.5$. In a small abuse of notation denote non-participation by \mathbb{O} . Participation is free.

Additionally, the government can do a *deal* with a special interest group i , where it takes a *contribution*, $B_i \geq 0$, from a special interest group i , in exchange for not participating in the contest over law i (i.e. for choosing $K_i = \mathbb{O}$). The size of the contribution is determined by bilateral bargaining, where both players have an outside option of not taking/making a contribution.¹⁰ If deal is done with a special interest group i , then $B_i = \mathbb{O}$. Denote the set of special interest groups that do a deal (and hence make a contribution) $\mathcal{B} = \{i : B_i \neq \mathbb{O}\}$, and its complement, $\mathcal{B}^c \equiv \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{B}$. Contributions add to political capital. So the government's total political capital is:

$$K^T \equiv K^G + \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}} B_i di. \quad (2)$$

Preferences. A special interest group cares only about its own expected payoff from the state of the single law it cares about, less the cost of lobbying it does and contribution it makes (if any).

¹⁰The precise bargaining process will not matter because we get an analogy to the classical competitive market result. The special interest groups are forced to compete against one another for the "protection" of the government not contesting the law they care about. This bids up the size of the contribution to its value to the special interest group.

Therefore it has preferences:

$$u_i = (1 - p_i)\pi_i - (L_i + B_i). \quad (3)$$

The government cares about total social welfare. This comprises: (i) the costs/benefits to society and to special interest groups from the state of laws, and (ii) the resources wasted contesting laws.¹¹ Formally:

$$u_G = \int_i [(1 - p_i)(1 - \alpha)\pi_i - L_i - K_i] di. \quad (4)$$

Here, political capital is has an outside option (or shadow value). It can be spent on contests, or on some other government project (outside of the model). Note that B_i does not appear in the government's utility function because it is simply a transfer from a special interest group to the government. Preferences are common knowledge.

Timing. There are three stages. In the first stage, agents negotiate contributions. They agree whether to make/take a contribution, and on its size where relevant. In the second stage, the government allocates its political capital across contests where no contribution was agreed in the first stage. In the third stage, special interest groups that did not make a contribution choose how much lobbying to do. Finally, agents realise their payoffs.

Extensions. We have kept the model very simple in order to focus on agents' behaviour and to highlight the role of deals. There are a range of extensions we can accommodate without affecting the core insights of the model. We defer this discussion to Section 2.6, as it is clearer to see the main results first, before comparing them to various extensions.

¹¹From the viewpoint of social welfare, all resources spent contesting laws are wasted. This is a standard result from the public choice literature [Krueger, 1974, Tullock, 1980, Aidt, 2016, Congleton et al., 2018]. To see this, notice that the contest function is homogeneous of degree zero, so any value of p_i can be achieved by spending an arbitrarily small quantity of resources.

2 Results

2.1 Third stage: Interest group behaviour

Special interest groups move last, and so take the government's decisions as given when choosing how much to lobby. An immediate implication is that an interest group i will never lobby for a law $j \neq i$. Doing so is costly but can never affect the outcome of the contest over law i , which is the only contest the interest group cares about. An interest group lobbies for its own law up to the point where the marginal expected return equals the marginal cost. The non-linearity of the contest function causes the best response function to be non-linear in K_i . Specifically, $L_i^* = (K_i \pi_i)^{0.5} - K_i$ if $K_i \leq \pi_i$ and $L_i^* = 0$ otherwise. This follows straightforwardly from equations (1) and (3).

Initially, more political capital spending by the government induces *more* lobbying by the special interest group as it fights harder to maintain the upper hand in the contest and secure the bad law. Once $K_i \geq \frac{1}{4}\pi_i$, however, more spending by the government *deters* lobbying. After this point, a special interest group prefers to conserve resources so that it has a larger net payoff when it does win – even though those wins are increasingly unlikely. Clearly $K_i \geq \pi_i$ completely deters lobbying.¹²

2.2 Second stage: Exogenous Deals

The government can anticipate these best responses and will allocate its political capital accordingly. Further, the total political capital, K^T , and the set of laws available for contest, \mathcal{B}^c , are fixed by the time the government must allocate political capital. Deals, and the negotiations over contributions were concluded in the first stage. The government will spend political capital whenever the marginal benefit of doing so is positive, and will equalise this marginal benefit across contests.

When $\alpha < 2$, then the marginal value of political capital spending is negative – so the government does not contest any laws. That is, $K_i^* = \emptyset$ for all i . This happens because contesting a law entails a waste of resources – both by the government and by the special interest group. The net benefit of a good law (the avoided costs to society, less the foregone benefits to the interest group) must be sufficiently large to justify wasteful spending on the contest. Further, the only benefit of spending political capital is to win contests. So once the government spends enough to guarantee victory, there is no reason to spend beyond that point (as spending is always costly).

When spending political capital is worthwhile, the government equalises marginal returns by spreading it out in proportion to the harm each bad law would do to society. Together, these observations pin down the government's optimal actions in the second stage. This, plus special interest groups' best responses characterise a unique equilibrium of the game conditional on the deals (and contributions) made. The simplest and most interesting case is where deals are not

¹²These claims follow easily from the best response function and from the cross-partial derivative of $(1 - p_i)$. They are proved in Appendix A as Lemmas 1 and 2.

permitted at all, perhaps due to institutional constraints.¹³

Proposition 1 (No Deals). *Fix $B_i = \mathbb{O}$ for all i .*

- *If $\alpha < 2$, there is a unique equilibrium: $K_i^* = \mathbb{O}$ and $L_i^* = 0$ for all i .*
- *If $\alpha > 2$ and $K^T < \int_i \pi_i di$, there is a unique equilibrium:*

$$K_i^* = \pi_i Z \quad , \quad L_i^* = \pi_i (Z^{0.5} - Z) \quad \text{for all } i, \quad \text{where } Z \equiv \frac{K^T}{\int_i \pi_i di} \quad (5)$$

- *Otherwise, there is a unique equilibrium: $K_i^* = \pi_i$, $L_i^* = 0$ for all i .*

The government never tries to focus its resources on just a few contests – instead it adopts a “scattergun” approach of spreading itself across all contests. So unless the government has overwhelming quantities of political capital and is able to completely deter all lobbying, then it will not win any contest with certainty. There is always a chance the government loses a given contest when its political capital constraint binds.

The government here is a social planner, so overall social welfare coincides with the government’s utility. Comparative statics for welfare are straightforward. Welfare is: (i) strictly decreasing in each π_i , (ii) strictly decreasing in α when $K^T < \int_i \pi_i di$, and is invariant in α otherwise, and (iii) strictly increasing in K^T when $K^G < \int_i \pi_i di$ and $\alpha > 2$, and invariant in K^T otherwise.

These results follow from substituting the results from the proposition into Equation (4). The intuitions behind these are straightforward and do not contain material insight in themselves. Formal statements and proofs are shown in the Online Appendix.

2.3 First stage: Endogenous Deals

Next, we turn to the first stage where interest groups and the government negotiate deals. The government will take contributions to build up its “war chest” of political capital – providing more resources for the remaining contests. With many special interest groups, the specifics of the negotiation process does not matter. This is because special interest groups are forced to compete against one another in terms of the contribution they offer to the government. This bids up the contribution to the full value of avoiding the contest.¹⁴

The value to interest group i of avoiding the contest depends on what would happen in the later stages of the game. The more political capital the government can credibly threaten to spend in the second stage, the more the interest group is willing to pay as a contribution. So as the government builds up its “war chest”, its negotiating position improves. It turns out that this process continues

¹³This result extends straightforwardly to any exogenously fixed set of deals/contributions. Merely replace: (i) K^G with K^T , (ii) integrals over all i with integrals over $i \in \mathcal{B}^c$, and apply optimal capital and lobbying decisions to $i \in \mathcal{B}^c$ (rather than all i). Note that the proposition does not cover the $\alpha = 2$ case. In that knife edge case, the government is indifferent between spending and not spending. So an uninteresting “anything goes” result applies.

¹⁴We can see this by a simple contradiction argument. If they paid less than the full value, some other interest group would offer to pay more, and the government would prefer this new, better, offer.

up to the point where the government has enough political capital to completely deter lobbying in all remaining contests (where it does not do a deal). The benefits of additional political capital outweigh the costs of ceding a contest. So competition between special interest groups then bids up the size of the contribution all the way to π_i .

Proposition 2. *If $\alpha < 2$, there is a unique equilibrium: $B_i = \mathbb{O}$, $K_i = \mathbb{O}$, $L_i = 0$ for all i . If $\alpha > 2$ and $K^G \geq \int_i \pi_i di$, there is a unique equilibrium: $B_i = \mathbb{O}$, $K_i = \pi_i$, $L_i = 0$ for all i . Otherwise, in all equilibria:*

- (1) $B_i = \pi_i$, $K_i = \mathbb{O}$, $L_i = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{B}$
- (2) $B_i = \mathbb{O}$, $K_i = \pi_i$, $L_i = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{B}^c$
- (3) and the set \mathcal{B} is such that $\int_{j \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_j dj = K^G + \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \pi_i di$.

When $\alpha > 2$, the government does deals with some interest groups, and receives a contribution equal to the full value the interest group receives from the bad law. It then has just enough political capital (from its endowment plus contributions) to guarantee victory in all remaining contests. However, only the mass of interest groups that do deals is pinned down – not their identities. We know how much protection is for sale, and at what price. But we cannot say who buys it.

This is because the government does not care about the identity of interest groups *per se* – only about the costs and benefits of cutting a deal. The fact that α is constant across all interest groups means that the government is indifferent between doing deals with any interest group (obviously conditional on the contribution being π_i). The “size” of the law (i.e. the size of π_i) does not matter. Larger π_i increases the cost of doing a deal – as the harms to society are larger. But it also increases the benefit – as the interest group is willing to make a larger contribution. These two forces perfectly offset one another, leaving the government indifferent.

There are three forces pushing the government to take contributions. First, ceding a contest allows the government to focus its political capital on a smaller number of contests – increasing political capital per contest. Second, it increases the total quantity of political capital. Third, it allows the government to extract larger contributions in the other instances where it cedes a contest. This is because it can credibly threaten greater political capital spending in the event negotiations break down. Note that the first effect alone is not sufficient. If it were, then the government would cede contests in a setting where deals were exogenous. We can see from Proposition 1 that this is not true. With exogenous deals, the government spreads its resources across *all* contests – it never chooses to withdraw and cede a contest.

An obvious, and yet important, implication of this result is that doing deals with special interest groups is socially optimal.

Corollary 1. *Welfare is higher when the government can do deals than when it cannot.*

The result follows simply from the fact that the government chooses to do deals. Since its preferences are identical to social welfare it wants to take contributions if and only if doing so improves welfare.

2.4 Extension: Heterogeneous Harms

The assumption that all laws are equally harmful (i.e. that α is a constant) drives the inability to identify exactly who makes contributions in Proposition 2. This assumption was useful as it keeps the mechanisms in the model clear, and also allows for very simple constructive proofs of Propositions 1 and 2. However, relaxing this assumption – allowing α to vary across interest groups – pins down the identities of the special interest groups that do deals and make contributions.

The outcome is highly intuitive. The government prefers to do deals with interest groups whose laws are less harmful. It still wants to take contributions up to the point where it will completely deter lobbying in all remaining contests, and so will still extract the full value of π_i in a contribution. However, it now plays a cut-off strategy. It will make a deal with *every* special interest group with an α_i below a threshold, and from *no* special interest groups above the threshold.

We put the same formal restrictions on the α_i as we did on the π_i . That is, assume that $\alpha_i \geq 0$ can be represented by some continuously differentiable Cumulative Distribution Function and that all values of α_i are finite. Given this, we can now pin down who makes contributions. For clarity, we will focus on the interesting case where the harms are sufficiently large and the government's budget constraint binds.¹⁵

Proposition 3. *Suppose $\alpha_i > 2$ for all i and that $K^G < \int_i \pi_i di$. Then there is a unique equilibrium:*

- *the set $\mathcal{B} = \{i : 2 < \pi_i < \bar{\alpha}\}$ is such that $K^G + \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \pi_i di = \int_{j \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_j dj$,*
- *$B_i^* = \pi_i$, $K_i^* = \mathbb{O}$ and $L_i^* = 0$ if $\alpha_i \in (2, \bar{\alpha}]$,*
- *$B_i^* = \mathbb{O}$, $K_i^* = \pi_i$ and $L_i^* = 0$ if $\alpha_i \geq \bar{\alpha}$,*

for some $\bar{\alpha}$.

This extension tells us exactly who does deals and makes contributions. In line with simple intuition, the government cedes contests over the laws that it finds least objectionable. This is because interest groups only care about their own benefits, π_i , and so are all equally willing to make a contribution (conditional on π_i and K^T). The government effectively faces constant benefits but heterogeneous costs from taking contributions. It is natural to seek to minimise costs. The other features of this result are the same as in Proposition 2.

¹⁵It would be straightforward but tedious to relax these restrictions. Doing so would simply add additional cases along the lines of Proposition 2.

2.5 Key Predictions

When the government can do deals, the model generates three key stylised predictions. First, the government *never* loses contests. It either cedes the contest before it even happens, or wins. This is consistent with anecdotes that it is rare for governments to lose votes in their parliament or congress [Mezey, 1979, Mayhew, 2004, Russell and Cowley, 2016].

Second, special interest groups notionally participate in contests, but never devote resources. This is true regardless of whether or not the interest group bought protection from the government. In reality mere participation would likely require some spending, but the core claim is that interest groups spend very little relative to the prize that is up from grabs. This provides a possible explanation for “Tullock’s Puzzle” – an observation, often first attributed to Tullock [1972], that special interest groups spend very little on lobbying relative to the very large consequences of government intervention. According to our model, there is little lobbying either because it is futile or because it is unnecessary.¹⁶

Third, the government takes contributions from those it finds least objectionable.¹⁷ By doing so it can win contests over the more objectionable laws. That is, it does deals with interest groups whose laws have a low value of α_i and successfully contests laws with a high value of α_i . This prediction has parallels to Becker [1983, 1985] in that competition between interest groups leads to a constrained social optimum. While outcomes are far from ideal, the government would need a larger endowment of political capital to improve welfare. Related to this, the model predicts that the government will engage in *more* contests when it starts with more political capital.

Simple comparative statics lead to two concrete predictions about what happens when a government becomes more powerful (in the sense that it has a greater endowment of political capital). First, it picks more battles. It then does correspondingly fewer deals with special interest groups. A stronger government offers special treatment to fewer interest groups. Second, the “price” of that special treatment does not change. Because the government manages its affairs through the quantity of deals it does, it is always in a strong enough negotiating position against any individual special interest group to be able to extract large contributions.

These stark results are driven in large part by simplifying assumptions we make to get clean results. In reality, we would not expect that the government never loses, or that it extracts the full value π_i from special interest groups. Rather, the model seeks to highlight the importance of picking your battles and the benefits of back room deals.

¹⁶It is futile when the government credibly deters lobbying through use of its own political capital. It is unnecessary when the special interest group has already done a deal with the government, and made the contribution.

¹⁷Note that we do not say “harmful”. The total harm is the product $\alpha_i\pi_i$, but the value of π_i is not relevant in the government’s decision. This is because higher π_i causes more harm, but also allows the government to extract a correspondingly larger contribution. These two factors perfectly offset one another.

2.6 Extensions

We have kept the model very simple in order to focus on agents’ behaviour and to highlight the role of deals. There are of course a number of natural variations to our setup.¹⁸ We provide brief discussion here, but they do not affect the core insights of the model. The Online Appendix contains the technical details.

The first, and most obvious variation, concerns timing. Section 1 assumes that the government commits to its resources in a contest before the special interest group. If instead agents choose simultaneously or if the special interest group commits first, the key insights remain unaffected. The government will take somewhat fewer contributions when (it is able to), and will not completely deter lobbying. However, as α becomes large, in the limit we return to complete deterrence of lobbying and certain victory for the government.

The second obvious variation concerns the government’s shadow value of political capital. The main model assumes there is something useful the government could do with its political capital other than contesting laws. Intuitively, we might think that senior officials’ time or committee seats could be used to further some goal outside of the model. However, we could equally think that political capital has no alternative use and is use-it-or-lose it. This would correspond to a setting where officials’ time and committee seats can only be used to persuade members of the parliament, and have no other potential use. Having a shadow value of political capital allows for cleanliness in Proposition 1, but ultimately has no meaningful impact. The key reason for this is that political capital gained through doing deals must have a shadow value – as it comes from interest groups’ resources.

One could also imagine that the government might not care about the benefits that special interest groups receive from bad laws, or discount them by some factor. This would have no impact on the results beyond changing the threshold levels of α that separate the cases within results.¹⁹ More interestingly, the government could conceivably not care about the resources spent (i.e. wasted) by special interest groups on contests. This represents a much more significant departure from an enlightened government. While its impact on (the analogue to) Proposition 1 is minimal, it has a larger impact on the quantity of contributions the government wants to take. This is because taking more contributions in the main model will reduce lobbying by the “remaining” special interest groups. When the government does not account for this benefit, it does less lobbying. Therefore, overall welfare is higher when the government cares about all resources spent on contests – both by itself and by special interest groups.

The main model also makes the benchmark assumption that legislation is perfectly effective – that a law being good reduces the costs to society, and benefits to the special interest group,

¹⁸We build these variations onto the *homogeneous* α case. The heterogeneous α case comes at a significant cost to tractability, which prevents us from adding these extensions on top of it in a clean manner.

¹⁹Discounting interest groups’ benefits by some factor $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ would merely change the $(1-\alpha)$ term in Equation (4) to a $(\gamma - \alpha)$ term. The results would proceed unaffected.

to zero. We could equally relax this, and say that it merely attenuates the costs and benefits by some law-specific multiple. This has no meaningful impact. The government simply considers the portion of the costs it can affect, and proceeds in an otherwise identical fashion.

3 Conclusion

This paper puts conflicts and power at the centre of the lobbying process. Doing so sheds light on how the government spends political capital and sells special treatment. We find that a government adopts a “scattergun” approach, spreading its political capital across all contests when it cannot do deals with interest groups. In stark contrast, a government that can do deals will pick its battles carefully. It will only fight where it can win and will do a deal in all other cases.

This ability to do deals improves welfare. It allows the government to build up its “war chest” of political capital, improving its outcomes in the contests it does engage in. This mechanism can explain why even weak governments do not appear to lose legislative battles very often. They find it better to not fight at all and gain what they can from cutting a deal. Weak governments fight less, rather than less successfully. Conversely, the same mechanism provides a simple explanation to Ansolabehere et al.’s [2003] question: *Why is there so little money in US politics?* Interest groups will either do a deal with the government – avoiding the need to lobby at all – or will be deterred by the government’s ability to spend lots of political capital contesting their law.

Viewing lobbying as a contest shows how the special treatment given to certain interest groups, even if they harm citizens in isolation, can be part of a bigger picture that in fact improves welfare. Our findings highlight a novel tension between overall welfare and equal treatment by the government. Finally, they provide a sympathetic view of politicians who campaign on a promise of a new way of doing politics (or in the words of Donald Trump, to “Drain the swamp”). Leaders who arrive in office without overwhelming political power best serve the citizens they represent by doing dirty deals.

References

- T. S. Aidt. Rent seeking and the economics of corruption. *Constitutional Political Economy*, 27(2):142–157, 2016.
- S. Ansolabehere, J. M. De Figueiredo, and J. M. Snyder Jr. Why is there so little money in us politics? *Journal of Economic perspectives*, 17(1):105–130, 2003.
- P. Baker. Obama was pushed by drug industry, e-mails suggest. *New York Times*, 8 June 2012. URL <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/09/us/politics/e-mails-reveal-extent-of-obamas-deal-with-industry-on-health-care.html>.
- G. S. Becker. A theory of competition among pressure groups for political influence. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 98(3):371–400, 1983.
- G. S. Becker. Public policies, pressure groups, and dead weight costs. *Journal of Public Economics*, 28(3):329–347, 1985.
- B. D. Bernheim and M. D. Whinston. Common agency. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 923–942, 1986.
- M. Bertrand, M. Bombardini, R. Fisman, and F. Trebbi. Tax-exempt lobbying: Corporate philanthropy as a tool for political influence. *American Economic Review*, 110(7):2065–2102, 2020.
- D. W. Blackett. Some blotto games. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly*, 1(1):55–60, 1954.
- D. W. Blackett. Pure strategy solutions of blotto games. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly*, 5(2):107–109, 1958.
- E. Boix-Adserà, B. L. Edelman, and S. Jayanti. The multiplayer colonel blotto game. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 2021.
- E. Borel. La théorie du jeu et les équations intégrales à noyau symétrique. *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Sciences*, 173(1304-1308):58, 1921.
- E. Borel. The theory of play and integral equations with skew symmetric kernels. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 97–100, 1953.
- E. Cochrane. Senate passes \$1 trillion infrastructure bill, handing Biden a bipartisan win. *New York Times*, 15 November 2021. URL <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/10/us/politics/infrastructure-bill-passes.html>.
- R. D. Congleton, B. N. Grofman, and S. Voigt. *The Oxford Handbook of Public Choice*. Oxford University Press, 2018.
- V. P. Crawford and J. Sobel. Strategic information transmission. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1431–1451, 1982.
- Q. Fu and J. Lu. Micro foundations of multi-prize lottery contests: a perspective of noisy performance ranking. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 38(3):497–517, 2012.

- M. R. Garfinkel and S. Skaperdas. *The Oxford Handbook of the Economics of Peace and Conflict*. Oxford University Press, 2012.
- G. M. Grossman and E. Helpman. Protection for sale. *The American Economic Review*, 84(4):833, 1994.
- M. O. Jackson. *Social and Economic Networks*. Princeton University Press, 2008.
- H. Jia. A stochastic derivation of the ratio form of contest success functions. *Public Choice*, 135(3-4):125–130, 2008.
- K. A. Konrad et al. Strategy and dynamics in contests. *OUP Catalogue*, 2009.
- D. Kovenock and B. Roberson. Conflicts with multiple battlefields. In M. Garfinkel and S. Sakperdas, editors, *The Oxford Handbook of the Economics of Peace and Conflict*, chapter 21, pages 503–531. Oxford University Press, 1 edition, 2012.
- A. O. Krueger. The political economy of the rent-seeking society. *The American economic review*, 64(3):291–303, 1974.
- D. R. Mayhew. *Congress: The electoral connection*. Yale university press, 2004.
- M. L. Mezey. *Comparative legislatures*, volume 6. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1979.
- B. Norman and S. Karlin-Smith. The one that got away: Obamacare and the drug industry. *Politico*, 13 July 2016. URL <https://www.politico.com/story/2016/07/obamacare-prescription-drugs-pharma-225444>.
- M. Olsen. *The Logic of Collective Action*. Harvard University Press, 1965.
- M. Russell and P. Cowley. The policy power of the westminster parliament: The “parliamentary state” and the empirical evidence. *Governance*, 29(1):121–137, 2016.
- S. Skaperdas and S. Vaidya. Persuasion as a contest. *Economic Theory*, 51(2):465–486, 2012.
- K. E. Train. *Discrete choice methods with simulation*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- G. Tullock. The welfare costs of tariffs, monopolies, and theft. *Western Economic Journal*, 5(3):224–232, 1967.
- G. Tullock. The purchase of politicians. *Western Economic Journal*, 10(3):354–55, 1972.
- G. Tullock. Efficient rent seeking. In J. M. Buchanan, R. D. Tollison, and G. Tullock, editors, *Toward a theory of the rent-seeking society*, pages 97–112. Texas A&M University Press, 1980.

A Proofs of Main Results

Lemma 1. *No interest group i lobbies for or against any law $j \neq i$.*

Proof of Lemma 1. This follows trivially from the structure of interest group i 's preferences (eq. (3)) and the fact that i treats K_i and K_j for all $j \neq i$ as fixed when making lobbying decisions. \square

Lemma 2. *If $K_i \leq \pi_i$, then $L_i^* = (\pi_i K_i)^{0.5} - K_i$. Otherwise, $L_i^* = 0$*

Proof of Lemma 2. Take the utility function for interest group i (eq. (3)) and substitute in the contest function (eq. (1)). Then find the First Order Condition with respect to L_i :

$$u_i = \left(1 - \frac{K_i}{K_i + L_i}\right) \pi_i - L_i - B_i \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{du_i}{dL_i} = K_i \pi_i (K_i + L_i)^{-2} - 1 = 0. \quad (7)$$

Next, use the standard quadratic formula to solve for L_i . Then notice that $L_i < 0$ is not permitted, so neglect smaller solution (as it is *always* negative) and choose the maximum of the positive solution $L_i = (K_i \pi_i)^{0.5} - K_i$ and zero. \square

Proof of Proposition 1. Recall the government's utility function (eq. (4)) and substitute in the contest function (eq. (1)) and the special interest group's optimal decision rule (Lemma 2). Finally differentiate with respect to K_i . There are two cases in Lemma 2. First, if $K_i \geq \pi_i$ then $L_i^* = 0$ and so $p_i = 0$. Here:

$$u_G = \int_i [(1 - \alpha)\pi_i - K_i] di \quad \implies \quad \frac{du_G}{dK_i} = -1 < 0 \quad (8)$$

irrespective of α . Second, if $K_i < \pi_i$ then:

$$u_G = \int_i \left[(1 - \alpha) \left(1 - \frac{K_i}{K_i + (\pi_i K_i)^{0.5} - K_i} \right) \pi_i - (\pi_i K_i)^{0.5} + K_i - K_i \right] di, \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{du_G}{dK_i} = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - 2) \left(\frac{\pi_i}{K_i} \right)^{0.5} \quad \text{for all } i, \quad (10)$$

which is negative whenever $\alpha < 2$. So the government never wants to choose $K_i^* > 0$ in the case $\alpha < 2$. There can only be an equilibrium when $K_i^* = \mathbb{O}$. Otherwise there does not exist a best response for special interest groups.

Now consider the $\alpha > 2$ case. Notice that any $K_i \geq \pi_i$ induces $L_i^* = 0$. So $K_i > \pi_i$ is clearly non-optimal as $K_i = \pi_i$ achieves the same outcome at lower cost to the government. So we can proceed using the decision rule $L_i^* = (K_i \pi_i)^{0.5} - K_i$.

When $K^T < \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i di$ then $K_i^* < \pi_i$ for some $i \in \mathcal{B}^c$. Therefore $L_i^* > 0$ for some $i \in \mathcal{B}^c$ (by Lemma 2). Therefore, $\frac{du_G}{dK_i} > 0$ for some i . The marginal benefit must then be equated across all

laws, and so must be positive for all laws where a bribe has not been paid.²⁰ This yields:

$$\frac{du_G}{dK_i} = \frac{du_G}{dK_j} \implies \frac{K_i^*}{K_j^*} = \frac{\pi_i}{\pi_j} \text{ for all } i, j \in \mathcal{B}^c. \quad (11)$$

At an interior solution, the government will exhaust its budget constraint (as the marginal benefit of political capital is always positive). So $\int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} K_i^* = K^T$. Integrating over all laws $j \in \mathcal{B}^c$, and rearranging yields:

$$\int_j K_i^* dj = \int_j \frac{\pi_i}{\pi_j} K_j^* dj \implies K_i^* = \frac{\pi_i}{\int_j \pi_j dj} K^T. \quad (12)$$

When $K^T \geq \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i di$ then $K_i^* = \pi_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{B}^c$. This follows from the observation that government utility is increasing in each K_i up to the point where $K_i = \pi_i$, and is decreasing after that point. \square

To characterise equilibrium with endogenous bribes we need to understand interest groups' willingness to pay bribes and the government's willingness to accept them. It is clearer to do this as a separate lemma before proving the main result.

Lemma 3. *Fix B_i for all i and assume $\alpha > 2$. Let B_i^{min} denote the smallest amount the government is willing to accept to do a deal, and let B_i^{max} denote the largest amount interest group i is willing to pay. If $K^T < \int_{j \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_j dj$:*

$$B_i^{min} = \pi_i Z \quad , \quad B_i^{max} = \pi_i (2Z^{0.5} - Z) \quad \text{where } Z \equiv \frac{K^T}{\int_{j \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_j dj} \quad (13)$$

and $B_i^{max} > B_i^{min}$. Otherwise, the government will never do a deal.

Proof of Lemma 3. If an interest group has an offer B_i accepted by the government, then it receives a payoff $u_i = \pi_i - B_i$. If it has an offer rejected, and contests the law with the government, then its expected payoff is $u_i = (1 - p_i)\pi_i - L_i$. So the most the interest group is willing to pay is $B_i^{max} = p_i\pi_i + L_i$. Substitute in the contest function (eq. (1)) and the optimal decision rules for the interest group (Lemma 2). This yields:

$$B_i^{max} = 2(\pi_i K_i^*)^{0.5} - K_i^* \text{ if } K_i \leq \pi_i \quad (14)$$

and $B_i^{max} = \pi_i$ otherwise, where K_i^* is the amount of political capital the government would spend contesting law i if no deal is reached.

If the government does *not* do a deal with i , then $u_G(i) = (1 - \alpha)(1 - p_i^*)\pi_i - L_i^* - K_i^*$.²¹ If a government does a deal with interest group i , then its utility from law i is $u_G(i) = (1 - \alpha)\pi_i$. Therefore the cost of doing a deal with interest group i is: $-p_i^*(1 - \alpha)\pi_i - L_i^* - K_i^*$. Substituting in eq. (1) and Lemma 2 yields: Cost = $(\alpha - 2)(\pi_i K_i^*)^{0.5}$.

²⁰This follows from a simple contradiction argument. If the marginal benefit were not equated across laws, then the government would increase its overall utility by reducing spending where it had low(er) marginal benefit and increasing it where it had high(er) marginal benefit.

²¹Starred values represent what happens after the final stage.

Doing a deal has two direct benefits. First, the government gains additional resources B_i to spend on other contests. Second, it “gets back” resources K_i , which it can reallocate to other contests. Spending these resources has a marginal benefit $\frac{du_G}{dK_i}$.

If $K^T \geq \int_{j \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_j dj$ then $K_i^* = \pi_i$ for all $j \in \mathcal{B}^c$, so $\frac{du_G}{dK_i} = 0$. In this case, the government will clearly never do a deal – as doing so can never provide any benefits.

If $K^T < \int_{j \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_j dj$, then the benefit of doing a deal is: Benefit = $(B_i + K_i^*)0.5(\alpha - 2)(\pi_i/K_i^*)^{0.5}$ (after having substituted in for $\frac{du_G}{dK_i}$ from Lemma 2). Simple rearranging shows that the benefit of doing a deal with i exceeds the cost if and only if $B_i > K_i^*$ (and weakly so iff $B_i \geq K_i^*$). Define B_i^{min} as the minimum value the government would accept. So $B_i^{min} = K_i^*$.

Finally, substituting in for K_i^* from Proposition 1 yields the results: $B_i^{max} = \pi_i(2Z^{0.5} - Z)$ and $B_i^{min} = \pi_i Z$. It is clear that $B_i^{max} > B_i^{min}$ if and only if $Z < 1$. \square

Proof of Proposition 2 . There are three cases to consider: (1) $\alpha < 2$, (2) $\alpha > 2$ and $K^G \geq \int_i \pi_i di$ (3) $\alpha > 2$ and $K^G < \int_i \pi_i di$. Consider each in turn. **(1)** follows from Proposition 1. When $\alpha < 2$, then the government will not participate in the contest. Interest groups know this, and so are not willing to pay a positive bribe in the first stage or devote any resources to lobbying in the third stage.²² **(2)** the government wins all contests even without taking any bribes. Taking a bribe would yield additional resources of at most π_i (as an interest group will clearly never pay a bribe of more than π_i), and result in losses of $\alpha\pi_i$. **(3)** is more involved. First, it follows from Lemma 3 that whenever $K^T < \int_{j \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_j dj$, there exists a bribe that interest groups would be willing to pay and that the government would be willing to accept. Therefore whenever this inequality is true, the government will take additional bribes. Taking additional bribes increases K^T and reduces $\int_{j \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_j dj$.²³ So the government takes bribes up to the point where $K^T = \int_{j \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_j dj$. At this point, $B_i = \pi_i$ is the unique bribe that an interest group is willing to offer *and* the government is willing to accept. The government will never take bribes past this point. The logic is the same as in case (2).

This pins down the size of the bribes, and the total quantity of bribes the government accepts. The choices of K_i and L_i follow straightforwardly. Whenever $B_i^* = \pi_i$, the government must choose $K_i^* = \emptyset$ by assumption. So $L_i^* = 0$ is the clear best response. Whenever $B_i^* = \emptyset$ then $K_i^* = \pi_i$ and $L_i^* = 0$ (this follows from Proposition 1). \square

Given the additional complexity due to heterogeneity in the α_i , it is necessary to first conjecture the equilibrium in Proposition 3, then show it is an equilibrium, and finally prove by contradiction that there are no other equilibria.

Proof of Proposition 3. Budget constraint holds. First, suppose $K^G + \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \pi_i di > \int_{j \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_j dj$. Then the government could increase its payoff by $(\alpha_i - 1)\pi_i > 0$ taking one fewer bribe.²⁴ *Contradiction.* Second, suppose $K^G + \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \pi_i di < \int_{j \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_j dj$. Then it must be the case that $K_i < \pi_i$ for some $i \in \mathcal{B}^c$. WLOG let $K_i^* = \pi_i - s_i$ with $s_i > 0$ for this interest group i . By Lemma 3, i is

²²Note that the government is indifferent between taking a bribe of zero, and not taking a bribe. Strictly speaking, we cannot say whether interest groups pay bribes of zero or not. However, this is a meaningless distinction, as the behaviour by interest groups and the government is identical whether or not a bribe of zero is paid.

²³Recall that K^T is defined as the government’s exogenous political capital, plus the resources from bribes, and that taking additional bribes removes interest groups from the set \mathcal{B}^c by definition.

²⁴This is an increase of $\alpha_i \pi_i$ from winning one additional contest, less π_i from increased spending. Recall that when the government has sufficient political capital to win all remaining contest for certain, it does so, and does so by spending π_i on the contest.

willing to pay a bribe up to $B_i^{max} = 2(\pi_i K_i^*)^{0.5} - K_i^*$. And $B_i^{max} > K_i^* = \pi_i - s_i$ whenever $s_i > 0$. So i would be willing to pay a bribe $B_i > K_i^* = \pi_i - s_i$. It follows from the proof to Lemma 3 that the government wants accept any $B_i > K_i^*$ from i . So there exists a profitable deviation for both i and the government. *Contradiction.*

Deal size. The government's budget, found above, it must be the case that $B_i^* = \pi_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{B}$. If not, then some interest group $j \notin \mathcal{B}$ would want to outbid some $i' \in \mathcal{B}$. The government would then prefer to do a deal with j than with i' , leading to a simple contradiction.

Other final outcomes. So far, we have found the amount interest groups $i \in \mathcal{B}$ pay to the government and the government's total budget. Remaining outcomes follow from the proof to Proposition 1. $B_i^* = \mathbb{O}$, $K_i^* = \pi_i$ and $L_i^* = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{B}^c$. And $B_i^* = \pi_i$, $K_i = \mathbb{O}$ and $L_i^* = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{B}$.

Threshold value of $\bar{\alpha}$. Suppose that there exists two groups, A and B each with positive measure, such that $\alpha_i > \alpha_j$ but $B_i = \mathbb{O}$ and $B_j = \pi_j$ for all $i \in A$ and all $j \in B$. Then the government could stop taking bribes from members of group B and start taking bribes from members of group A , in such a way as to keep $\int_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \pi_i$ constant. This would increase the government's utility by reducing the value of the payoffs it concedes, without affecting its budget. Hence this represents a profitable deviation. So this is not permissible in equilibrium. So in equilibrium $\alpha_i \geq \alpha_j$ for all $i \in \mathcal{B}$ and all $j \in \mathcal{B}^c$. Given that α_i is finite for all i , there then must exist some threshold $\bar{\alpha}$ such that $\alpha_i \geq \bar{\alpha}$ and $\bar{\alpha} \geq \alpha_j$ for all $i \in \mathcal{B}$ and all $j \in \mathcal{B}^c$.

We have shown that if an equilibrium exists, then it must take the form in the result. To complete the proof, we now show that it is in fact an equilibrium. **Existence.** No interest group can profitably deviate. (i) Interest groups paying $B_i = \pi_i$ (and receiving $u_i = 0$) would face $K_i = \pi_i$ if they deviated (and so best-respond with $L_i = 0$ and receive $u_i = 0$). (ii) Interest groups not doing a deal face $K_i^* = \pi_i$ and so receive $u_i = 0$. Their choice of $L_i^* = 0$ is clearly a best response. Offering $B_i > \pi_i$ clearly leads to lower payoffs. (iii) The government already has sufficient political capital to win all remaining contests with certainty, so it cannot profitably take additional bribes (the logic is identical to that in Proposition 1). The government cannot profitably take fewer bribes as shown in part (A) Finally, the government cannot profitably change the set of interest groups it takes bribes from – as doing so would involve winning a contest for a less harmful law in exchange for ceding a contest for a more harmful law. \square

B Other Applications

The main text focuses on lobbying and sets out the model correspondingly. However, the model we set out in Section 1 is more general and can be applied to a range of important settings. We interpret the model and the results in two additional applications: counter-insurgency and criminal prosecution. For convenience, we restate the three equations that substantively define the model before proceeding.

$$p_i = \begin{cases} \frac{K_i}{K_i + L_i} & \text{if } K_i + L_i > 0 \\ 0.5 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

$$u_i = (1 - p_i)\pi_i - (L_i + B_i) \quad (2)$$

$$u_G = \int_i [(1 - p_i)(1 - \alpha)\pi_i - L_i - K_i] di \quad (3)$$

B.1 Counter-insurgency

Model. There is a *government*, G , and a mass of *insurgent* groups \mathcal{I} that contest the territory of a country. The country is split up into a series of *towns* (these are in fact any contiguous parcels of land, such as villages, cities, oil fields, etc.. For clarity, we will always call them towns). The towns are also indexed i , and there is one insurgent group per town.

The government has some endowment of *soldiers*, K^G . Conceptually, this covers both soldiers and weapons of all types. While obviously both soldiers and weapons are highly differentiated in modern warfare, we assume that any collection of people and weapons can be summarised by a single real number. This is standard. An insurgent group i can spend resources on *fighters*. Fighters are insurgents' equivalent to soldiers. The same conceptual discussion about differentiation applies. For consistency with Section 1, let K_i [resp. L_i] denote soldiers [resp. fighters] deployed to town i .

For simplicity (and to remain aligned with the theoretical model), we are assuming that the government does not face geographic constraints. That is, it can deploy soldiers to any town – regardless of the towns it already controls. This corresponds to relatively modern counter-insurgency, where advanced logistics allow for long supply lines and soldiers can be moved by air or along metalled roads. For fixed quantities of soldiers and fighters contesting a town i , the contest function $p_i(K_i, L_i)$ determines the probability that the government gains (or retains) control of the town.

An insurgent group i receives profits π_i from controlling a town i , and imposes costs $\alpha\pi_i$ on the citizens of the town, with $\alpha > 1$. The profits from controlling a town can arise from taxing or extorting the citizens, looting businesses, extracting natural resources, or any other source. The precise source of profits is not important for the argument, and can differ across towns. The costs to citizens are myriad. They obvious include being taxes, extorted or looted. They also include the deadweight loss that accompanies such practices bring and the non-monetary costs of loss of freedom, human rights violations, to name but a few. Given this, it is intuitively perfectly plausible that $\alpha > 2$.

An insurgent group can spend these profits on fighters to contest the town i . It aims to maximise expected profits less spending on fighters.

The government aims to minimise the net costs that insurgent groups impose on the country (this is the costs to citizens less the benefits insurgent groups receive), less the total resources spent

on contests. We argue that it is reasonable for the government to care about insurgents' spending on fighters. More heavily resourced conflicts intuitively involve more casualties – clearly something a social planner wants to avoid.

Results. If the government cannot negotiate with insurgent groups, then it must choose where to deploy its soldiers in order to maximise welfare of its citizens. This is clearly the model without bribery discussed in Section 2.2. So Proposition 1 holds. That is, we expect the government to deploy troops to towns in line with the profits each town generates. Larger towns and towns with more economic activity should attract greater troop deployments.

However, the government's control over its territory (the probability that it gains/retains control of towns) should *not* vary with the economic importance of towns. There will be more intense contests over larger or more prosperous towns, but the model predicts that the government's control over these towns will not be stronger (in expectation). The contest over these larger towns will be more intensely fought by both the government and insurgent groups. These two effects will cancel each other out.

If instead the government *can* negotiate with insurgent groups before it deploys soldiers, then the setting corresponds to the model with bribery discussed in sections 2.3 and 2.4. Therefore Proposition 2 and (if we think α is heterogeneous) Proposition 3 hold. While negotiations with insurgent groups are more likely to be called diplomacy, they are conceptually identical to the bribery of Section 2. Successful negotiations involve the government and insurgent group agreeing not to contest a town, and leaving it to be controlled by the insurgents. In reality we might expect the government to claim to control the town, but the armed personnel present in the town to be principally (or wholly) provided by the insurgents. In exchange, the insurgents will provide some support to the government, in the form of additional fighters. Note that this need not be as stark as insurgents fighting alongside government soldiers. It is more plausible that insurgents provide intelligence, safe passage, or fight in adjacent arenas.

Proposition 2 predicts that the government will negotiate with sufficiently many insurgent groups that all towns in its territory are either directly controlled without contest by the government, or have been ceded to insurgent groups. It may well appear to outsiders that the government controls the all of its territory if insurgents' control of ceded towns is *de facto* but not *de jure*.

A reinterpretation of Proposition 3 for this setting suggests that the government should negotiate with insurgent groups in towns where the harms of insurgency control are relatively larger.

B.2 Criminal prosecution

Model. There is a *prosecutor* (we are really thinking of the head of prosecutor's office, such a UK Chief Crown Prosecutor or a US District/State Attorney), and a mass \mathcal{I} of *criminals* who contest *cases*. There is one criminal per case, and we index both criminals and cases i .

The prosecutor has a budget K to spend. This is perhaps best thought of as lawyers' and investigators' time, rather than dollars and cents. Denote K_i the amount she spends on case i . A criminal i can spend resources L_i on contesting their case. In practice, this involves hiring lawyers and investigators of his own. For any given resources used by the prosecutor and the criminal, the contest function $p_i(K_i, L_i)$ determines the probability of a *conviction* (i.e. the prosecutor winning the case).

Failing to convict a criminal i imposes a cost $\alpha\pi_i$ on society. The source of this cost is not important for the argument. It could be a discounted stream of expected future crimes, society’s moral failing in letting criminality go unpunished, or anything else. A criminal receives a benefit π_i if he avoids conviction. This is the counterfactual benefit of not being convicted and punished.

A criminal can spend money on his defence to maximise his total pay-off, which is the benefit of avoiding conviction, less the costs of his defence. The prosecutor must spend her resources to maximise social welfare.

Then allowing the prosecutor to make *plea bargain* with criminals – where she agrees to not seek to convict a criminal i in exchange for resources that increase the probability she will convict other criminals. The resources that a criminal provides as part of plea bargain are typically evidence (whether physical evidence, intelligence, or witness testimony). Note that here we are considering the simplified setting where the prosecutor only offers plea deals that involve no punishment for the criminal i (rather than reduced sentences, as more commonly seen in reality).

Results. If the prosecutor cannot strike plea bargains with criminals, then this is the model without bribery described in Section 2.2. So Proposition 1 holds. We expect the prosecutor to adopt a “scattergun” approach, and spread her resources across of the cases, in proportion to the social harms of failing to secure a conviction. This ought to correspond closely to the severity of the crime, although the identity of the criminal could also play a role (for example, failing to convict high-profile individuals may be particularly detrimental to certain norms of equality before the law). The prosecutor would have an equal probability of losing any given case.

If instead the prosecutor *can* strike plea bargains, then the setting corresponds to the model with bribery discussed in sections 2.3 and 2.4. Therefore Proposition 2 and (if we think α is heterogeneous) Proposition 3 hold. The results then predict that the prosecutor will strike plea deals with sufficiently many criminals to be able to secure convictions against all of the criminals that she does fight in the courtroom.

A reinterpretation of Proposition 3 for this setting suggests that the prosecutor should strike plea deals with criminals who cause less harm to society, relative to the benefit to the criminals of avoiding conviction. For example, we might expect that criminals at a low risk of re-offending should be prioritised for plea bargains. A more dispiriting interpretation of this result is that criminals with more to lose by being convicted are more likely to make plea deals precisely because they have more to lose. This is because they are willing to offer more to the prosecutor in exchange.

This model contains an important insight for policymakers when deciding on the level of funding for public prosecutors. The fact that prosecutors achieve high conviction rates should not be used as evidence that a public prosecutor is adequately funded or that cuts to her budget would have limited welfare impacts. Armed with the insights of this model, we can see that such a conclusion is highly erroneous.

B.3 Key Features

The model could also be applied to a range of other settings. An attempt to cover all useful settings would be tedious. So we now discuss the four key features of the model. It would be potentially illuminating in any setting where these general features are present.

1. A network structure. The first key feature is that there must be a single “central” agent (the government) that engages in a series of bilateral contests against many “peripheral” agents (special interest groups). This amounts to a requirement that the network of contests forms a star network.

The star network – formally an unweighted and undirected star here – is a particularly well-known network structure. Jackson [2008] provides a general introduction to networks and various discussions of star networks. Note that this is a restriction on the *resulting* network of contests. There is no restriction on which agents are allowed to engage in which contest. Neither is there an ex ante assumption that contests are bilateral. Rather, agents’ preferences mean that “peripheral” agents would only ever want to engage in a contest with the “central” agent.

2. Transfers. Second, “peripheral” agents are able to transfer resources to the “central” agent. Section 1 assumes that these transfers take place in exchange for the central agent ceding the relevant contest. However, relaxing this assumption would have no impact – a peripheral agent making a transfer without an accompanying cession of the contests is clearly not maximising behaviour. While the model allows agents to not participate – distinct from choosing to spend zero resources on the contest – this is merely to allow the existence of best responses. It is not a conceptually important feature.

Permitting transfers between different peripheral agents in principle would have no impact. Because the resulting network of contests is required to be a star, no peripheral agent would ever want to transfer resources to any other peripheral agent.

3. Asymmetric payoffs. Each peripheral agent receives a payoff from winning their contest and bears a cost of losing. The central agent receives a payoff from winning, and bears a cost of losing each contest. In Section 1 we normalised the peripheral agents’ cost of losing to zero, and the central agent’s benefit of winning to zero. These are merely normalisations for clarity of exposition. The key feature is that the cost to the central agent of losing a contest is some constant multiple of the benefit to the peripheral agent of winning. While the model does not rule out zero sum contests, the results in Section 2 show that they are uninteresting in this setting.

4. Asymmetric preferences. Agents are risk neutral. Each “peripheral” agent cares about their own expected payoff from the contest, and the cost of resources spent on the contest. In contrast, the central agent is a social planner who cares about total welfare.

Blank page.

Online Appendix

This Online Appendix provides a range of additional material. The contents of each appendix are summarised below.

Appendix C provides microfoundations for the Tullock contest function (Equation (1)). It shows that the contest function is the outcome of a game where contesting parties produce evidence. An arbiter who observes the evidence with some noise picks the winner based on the evidence she observes.

Appendix D shows that society would want to provide the government with enough political capital to win all contests for sure. However, in line with Olsen [1965], we would not expect society to be able to organise the collective action needed to achieve this outcome.

Appendix E shows the outcome of a set of simulations that use a finite number of special interest groups. These simulations suggest that the assumption a mass of interest groups (as in Section 1) does not meaningfully affect outcomes.

Appendix F provides technical details of the extensions discussed in Section 2.6. First, we consider the other two possible sequential setups: (1) where the government and special interest groups choose political capital and lobbying simultaneously, and (2) where the special interest groups choose before the government. Obviously negotiation always happens before potential contests.

Second, we explore two appealing alternatives for the government's preferences: (1) where political capital is use-it-or-lose-it and so has no shadow value, and (2) where the government neglects special interest groups' utility and only cares about the rest of society.

Finally, we show that allowing for arbitrary heterogeneity in the efficacy of laws (i.e. the extent to which a good law reduces the harms to society/benefits to the special interest group) has no meaningful impact on results.

Appendix G explores heterogeneous contest functions. Specifically, the government has a law-specific relative (dis)advantage in each contest. This can capture heterogeneous bias on the part of the arbiter, or heterogeneous evidence production functions.

It is then straightforward to show that heterogeneity in special interest groups' marginal cost of lobbying is in fact isomorphic to the heterogeneity in the contest function. This means that all of our findings relating to the government's relative (dis)advantage in contests carry through to the heterogeneous cost scenario without difficulty.

Appendix H formalises and proves some claims made in the main text.

C Microfoundations of the Contest Function

The Tullock contest function in Equation (1) is a critical component of the model. Here we provide micro-foundations, showing that it is the outcome of a binary choice problem. The relationship with the Logit model is straightforward and has been noted by Jia [2008] and Fu and Lu [2012]. The micro-foundations here are similar to those in Skaperdas and Vaidya [2012].

Arbiter. There is an arbiter (possibly Nature) who evaluates *evidence* for and against the proposed law and then chooses her most preferred outcome. She is unbiased in that she always chooses the outcome she observes as being better supported by evidence. However, she observes evidence with some additive noise. Define the evidence in favour of the government’s [resp. interest group’s] preferred option as V_G [resp. V_I]. The arbiter observes this evidence, plus some noise, ϵ_G [resp. ϵ_I]. Her utility is then:

$$U_G = V_G + \epsilon_G \quad , \quad U_I = V_I + \epsilon_I, \quad (15)$$

where $\epsilon_G, \epsilon_I \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \text{GEV (Type I)}$. The arbiter chooses the option with higher utility.

Evidence production. The government and the interest group use political capital and lobbying effort (respectively) to produce evidence, according to the following production functions:

$$V_G = \ln(K_i) \quad , \quad V_I = \ln(L_i). \quad (16)$$

We can think of evidence as policy papers, think-tank reports, data analysis, economic theory, or any other type of intellectual output designed to convince a neutral arbiter. We can also take the term “evidence” much more loosely to mean *anything* that would convince the arbiter. We could reasonably consider outright bribery and/or intimidation as evidence production in this loose sense.

Arriving at the contest function. Having set up the binary choice problem, the Tullock contest function follows straightforwardly from well-known facts about the Logit model.²⁵ The arbiter chooses the government’s preferred option if and only if $U_G > U_I$ (otherwise, it sides with the interest group). Therefore, the probability the government “wins” is equal to $Pr(U_G > U_I) = Pr(V_G + \epsilon_G > V_I + \epsilon_I) = Pr(\epsilon_I < \epsilon_G + V_G - V_I)$. This is now identical to the Logit choice probabilities:

$$p_i = \frac{\exp\{V_G\}}{\exp\{V_G\} + \exp\{V_I\}} = \frac{K_i}{K_i + L_i}, \quad (17)$$

which is the Tullock contest function.²⁶ A stark feature of this functional form is that when $K_i = 0$ then $V_G = -\infty$. This corresponds to the idea that if one side provides absolutely no evidence whatsoever (and the other provides at least some), then the decision is for the arbiter is very clear. She (the arbiter) is able to identify when there is no evidence, and avoid that option.

²⁵For more details on the Logit and other binary choice models, see Train [2009].

²⁶The functional form for evidence production determines the functional form of the contest function. For example, a linear production function would obviously lead to the less common (but still fairly well-studied) exponential form of the contest function. In the Online Appendix, we modify the evidence production function to derive a generalized version of the contest function.

D Coordination problems

An obvious corollary of the results in Section 2 is that welfare is increasing in the government’s initial endowment of political capital. Further, a transfer of resources from society to the government is costless – it is merely a transfer. However, such a transfer would increase the government’s political capital, and so increase welfare. Superficially, this appears to be a straightforward solution to the government’s problem. Taking resources from the rest of society would allow the government to win all contests with certainty, deter all lobbying by special interest groups, and avoid having to take any bribes. This would lead to higher welfare than in the equilibria set out in Propositions 1, 2 and 3.

However, we immediately run into the standard public goods problem. While each individual member of society (*‘citizen’*) would like to see a transfer of resources to the government to augment its political capital, they do not want to make this transfer themselves. They want to free ride. While society as a whole is not modelled explicitly in Section 1, it is natural to think of their being many agents. So even if free-riding issues could be resolved, we would expect significant difficulties in achieving collective action [Olsen, 1965].

One potential mechanism for solving the collective action problem is for citizens to vote on whether they want to make a transfer to the government. To set a high bar, we use a unanimous voting rule. This means a schedule of transfers is implemented if and only if every citizen votes for it.²⁷ We also make a pair standard assumptions to simplify the problem. First, that the government is able to costlessly enforce and collect the transfer payments if everyone votes in favour of them. Second, that the schedule of transfers is anonymous, in the sense that the size of the transfer cannot depend on a person’s identity. In principle, citizens in different positions could face different transfers (as happens in a system of progressive taxation). However, all citizens are identical in this model, so this amounts to assuming that the schedule requires an identical transfer from every person. As all citizens are identical in our model, it suffices to consider a single person. For concreteness, a citizen’s utility function is:

$$u_c = \alpha \int_i (p_i - 1) \pi_i di - \tau. \quad (18)$$

where τ is the transfer she makes to the government. She bears costs from laws being closed, and from making a transfer.

If the government proposes a transfer $\tau = \int_i \pi_i di - K^G$, then every citizen prefers making this transfer to no transfer. So it would receive unanimous approval when put to a vote. In fact, this is a citizen’s *most* preferred transfers, from all possible anonymous transfers. It gives the government just enough political capital (its initial endowment plus the transfers) to win all contests with certainty and to not take any bribes.

Further, if the government has the power to propose the schedule of transfers that is put to a vote (often called agenda-setting powers), then the it propose a transfer at least this large. This is because the government’s utility is also increasing in its political capital (initial endowment plus

²⁷As well as setting a high bar, this voting rule also prevents the belief-driven equilibrium multiplicity that would be present with a majority voting rule. A well-known issue with majority voting is that any outcome where there is no pivotal voter can constitute an equilibrium, because everyone is then indifferent between sticking to their current option, and changing to any other option. If we had used a majority voting rule, a further assumption that people vote non-strategically – simply choosing their most preferred option – would be necessary to prevent such belief-driven equilibrium multiplicity.

transfers). However, we cannot rule out cases where the government proposes larger transfers. This is because the transfer itself does not affect the government's utility. So the government is indifferent between all schedules that: (i) people prefer to no transfer (and so are willing to vote for), and (ii) are at least of size $\int_i \pi_i di - K^G$.

The key insight is that if people in society can costlessly make transfers of political capital to the government, then they will want to do so. In particular, they want to do so up to the point where the government is able to win all contests with certainty. This intuition here is simple. The government maximises welfare by increasing its political capital to the point where it wins all the contests it engages in. It is less costly for society to provide this political capital by a direct transfer than by ceding contests to special interest groups.

The equilibrium multiplicity issue does not affect this core intuition. We can also resolve this issue by adding some competition between potential governments. If there are at least two potential governments that can propose a schedule of transfers, then all propose the schedule $\tau = \int_i \pi_i di - K^G$.

Proposition 4. *Suppose $\alpha > 2$, and there at least two potential governments. There is a unique equilibrium where:*

1. every potential government proposes a schedule of transfers $\tau^* = \int_i \pi_i di - K^G$,
2. every citizen votes for τ^* ,
3. $K_i^* = \pi_i$, $L_i^* = 0$ for all i ,
4. $B_i^* = \mathbb{O}$ for all i .

Proof. First, we show that τ^* is the most preferred value of τ . Consider any value of $\tau \geq 0$. It follows from Proposition 2 that after the transfer has been made, the government will take bribes such that:

$$K^T = K^G + \tau + \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}} B_i^* di = \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i di \quad (19)$$

and that the size of each bribe taken is $B_i^* = \pi_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{B}$. It then follows from Proposition 1 that $p_i = 1$ for all $i \in \mathcal{B}^c$ and $p_i = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{B}$. That is, the government then wins all contests where it does not take a bribe, and loses all contests it ceded. A citizen's utility is then: $u_c = -\alpha \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \pi_i di - \tau$. Substituting in for τ and rearranging:

$$u_c = -\alpha \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \pi_i di - \left[\int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i di - \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \pi_i di - K^G \right] + \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \pi_i di - \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \pi_i di \quad (20)$$

$$u_c = K^G - \int_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \pi_i di + (2 - \alpha) \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \pi_i di \quad (21)$$

This is clearly maximised when \mathcal{B} is the empty set. This corresponds to $\tau = \tau^*$. Hence τ^* is citizens' most preferred transfer. That every potential government proposes this value of τ follows from a simple contradiction argument. If no potential government proposed this value, then one could profitably deviate to offering it – and would collect all votes by doing so. If one or more already propose this value, then potential governments get no votes unless they offer this value.

With τ^* proposed and accepted, the governments political capital $K^G + \tau^* = \int_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \pi_i di$. The values of K_i^* , L_i^* , and B_i^* then follow straightforwardly from Proposition 2. \square

E Simulations

This section presents simulations with a finite number of special interest groups. The goal here is to understand what happens when we relax the assumption that there is a mass of special interest groups, and that they are all arbitrarily small. The key finding here is that relaxing this assumption has minimal impact on the results.

Before setting out the procedure for the simulations, we note that there is no need to simulate for Proposition 1. This is because Proposition 1 (and the lemmas that underpin it) do not rely on the mass of special interest groups assumption. The proofs would go through unchanged if there were a finite number of firms. We would merely replace integrals with (finite) summations.

In the proof to Proposition 2, the cases where $\alpha < 2$ and where $K^G \geq \int_i \pi_i di$ do not rely on the mass of interest groups assumption. It is only the middle case that does. Technically, this continuum assumption allows us to ignore (i.e. treat as very small) the impact that an individual interest group has on the government’s total budget. So taking one contribution from a single interest group does not affect the marginal value of political capital. Only contributions from a positive measure of interest groups will do so.²⁸

When we relax this assumption, taking contributions becomes “lumpy” in the sense that a single contribution can have a material impact on the government’s overall budget of political capital. As a result it may want to stop doing additional deals when $Z < 1$, as one further deal would provide it with political capital that it has no use for (by pushing $Z > 1$). Alternatively, it could be that the government ends up doing deals to a point where $Z > 1$. The logic is reversed. It may be worthwhile to do a deal and increase the budget of political capital, even if doing so requires getting some political capital that cannot be used.

These simulations are not designed to provide an extensive search of the parameter space. They are merely designed to provide reassurance that the mass of interest groups assumption we made in the main paper is not driving the insights of the model. To present additional challenge to our model (and to simplify the algorithm) we only allow the government to choose whether or not to do a deal with each special interest group in sequence. This presents two constraints on government behaviour compared to the model in Section 1. First, if the government chooses not to do a deal with interest group $i = n$, then it cannot do a deal with any group $i > n$ (where i is the interest group’s identity, and n is an integer). Second, the government cannot change the interest groups it does deal with. Once a deal is done, it cannot be undone. Given these additional constraints, we should expect these simulations to perform *emph* (i.e. further away from the analytic results) than a more complex where the government does not face these constraints. Nevertheless, the simulated equilibria are close to the analytic predictions.

It is perhaps clearest to see in a single example. For this, we set $\alpha = 3$, $\pi \sim U[1, 11]$, $K^G = 10$, and $I = 10$ (i.e. only 10 special interest groups).²⁹ The small number of interest groups provides a more stringent test of the assumption.

²⁸The assumption shows up in the proof to Proposition 2 in the claim that “Spending these resources has a marginal benefit $\frac{du_G}{dK_i}$ ”, and that this partial derivative is not treated as a function of B_i .

²⁹In this particular simulation, the random draws of π were: 5.17022, 8.20324, 1.00114, 4.02333, 2.46756, 1.92339, 2.8626, 4.45561, 4.96767, 6.38817




Figure 1: Simulated outcomes for $I = 10$, $\alpha = 3$, $K^G = 10$, $\pi \sim U[1, 11]$. Special interest group benefits from bad law reported above the centre line. Contributions and political capital spending reported below the centre line.

Figure 1 clearly shows that the general insight of the model is not lost when moving to a small number of special interest groups. However, it is difficult to see the exact value of K_i and B_i from the image. Exact results are listed in Table 1 for the particularly interested reader.

Table 1: Exact results for the simulation reported in Figure 1.

ID	π_i	B_i	K_i	B_i/π_i	K_i^*/π_i
1	5.170	5.087	0	0.984	-
2	8.203	8.071	0	0.984	-
3	1.001	0.985	0	0.984	-
4	4.023	0	3.586	-	0.891
5	2.468	0	2.199	-	0.891
6	1.923	0	1.714	-	0.891
7	2.863	0	2.551	-	0.891
8	4.456	0	3.971	-	0.891
9	4.968	0	4.427	-	0.891
10	6.388	0	5.694	-	0.891

More substantively, we examine the equilibria as the number of special interest groups changes. Here, we simply keep track of the simulated equilibrium value of Z . Since we know that $K_i^* = \pi_i Z$ and $B_i^* = \pi_i(2Z^{0.5} - Z)$, this is sufficient.³⁰ Recall that

$$Z \equiv \frac{K^G + \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \pi_i di}{\int_{j \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_j dj}$$

and the key characteristic of the equilibria is that $Z = 1$. That is, the government has just enough capital to win all remaining contests with certainty.

In order to keep the comparisons across different values of I fair, we scale K^G linearly with I . For simplicity (and to ensure that $K^G \geq \int_i \pi_i di$ is not possible) we choose $K^G = 1 \times I$. As before, $\alpha = 3$ and $\pi \sim U[1, 11]$. We consider $I \in \{10, \dots, 500\}$.

First, Figure 2 shows results for a single run (for each value of I). Next Figure 3 shows the average values from 100 runs (for each value of I). Clearly there is more variability in a single run than an average, but there is otherwise little material difference.




Figure 2: Simulated value for Z , for $I \in \{10, \dots, 500\}$. Other parameters: $\alpha = 3$, $K^G = 1 \times I$, $\pi \sim U[1, 11]$.

³⁰Note that $K_i^* = \pi_i Z$ does not depend on the mass of interest groups assumption as it follows from Proposition 1. The derivation for B_i^* in Proposition 2 does rely on the mass assumption. However, we could equally have motivated it via a competition style argument where an interest group must pay the maximum it is willing to, lest a different one outbid it.




Figure 3: Mean simulated value for Z , for $I \in \{10, \dots, 500\}$. Other parameters: $\alpha = 3$, $K^G = 1 \times I$, $\pi \sim U[1, 11]$. Average of 100 runs (i.e. draws of π).

F Technical Discussion of Extensions

This appendix formally examines a range of alterations to the model presented in Section 1, and acts as a supplement to Section 2.6.

F.1 Timing: simultaneous choice of lobbying and political capital

Here, the model is identical to Section 1 with the following exception: stages two and three in the game happen simultaneously.

This has no impact on special interest groups' optimal decision rules in the "third" stage. They still take the government's decisions as given when choosing how much lobbying to do. Hence, $L_i^* = (\pi_i K_i)^{0.5} - K_i$ if $K_i \leq \pi_i$, and $L_i^* = 0$ otherwise. The government, however, faces a different problem. While its utility function is unchanged, it must take interest groups' lobbying as given. This means it cannot take into account how its own choice of K_i will affect L_i . This does not change relative allocation of capital across contests. However, it does affect the point at which the government chooses to stop spending more capital.

Additional spending on a contest can deter lobbying by the interest group. In this extension, the government does not account for this "deterrence effect" when making its decisions. This lowers the marginal benefit of spending political capital in a contest. It therefore causes the government to stop spending additional capital sooner. Consequently, interest groups will still do some lobbying in the corner case where the government's budget constraint does not bind.

Proposition 1.a. *Fix $B_i = \mathbb{O}$ for all i .*

- *If $\alpha < 1$, there is a unique equilibrium: $K_i^* = \mathbb{O}$ and $L_i^* = 0$ for all i .*
- *If $\alpha > 1$ and $K^T < \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\right)^2 \int_i \pi_i di$, there is a unique equilibrium:*

$$K_i^* = \pi_i Z \quad , \quad L_i^* = \pi_i (Z^{0.5} - Z) \quad \text{for all } i, \quad \text{where } Z \equiv \frac{K^T}{\int_i \pi_i di} \quad (4.a)$$

- *Otherwise, there is a unique equilibrium: $K_i^* = \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\right)^2 \pi_i$, $L_i^* = \pi_i \frac{(\alpha-1)}{\alpha^2}$ for all i .*

This change to the point at which the government stops spending additional capital feeds through to the setting with endogenous bribes. It reduces the total amount of bribes the government will take. This is because the logic of taking bribes up to the point where additional political capital would no longer be spent is unaffected, but the will stop spending on each contest at a lower level.

In turn, this reduces the size of each bribe. The government cannot credibly threaten to spend as much on the contest if a negotiation breaks down. This means the government can extract a smaller bribe from interest groups (as the consequences of failing to reach a deal are less severe for an interest group).

Proposition 2.a. *If $\alpha < 2$, there is a unique equilibrium: $B_i = \mathbb{O}$, $K_i = \mathbb{O}$, $L_i = 0$ for all i . If $\alpha > 2$ and $K^G \geq \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\right)^2 \int_i \pi_i di$, there is a unique equilibrium: $B_i = \mathbb{O}$, $K_i = \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\right)^2 \pi_i$, $L_i = \pi_i \frac{(\alpha-1)}{\alpha^2}$ for all i . Otherwise, in all equilibria:*

1. $B_i = \pi_i \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\right) \left(\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}\right)$, $K_i = \mathbb{O}$, $L_i = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{B}$
2. $B_i = \mathbb{O}$, $K_i = \pi_i \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\right)^2$, $L_i = \pi_i \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha^2}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{B}^c$

3. and the set \mathcal{B} is such that $\int_{j \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_j dj = K^G + \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\right) \left(\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}\right) \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \pi_i di$.

The key insight from this result is that adjusting the timing of the model has a modest impact on the results, and leaves the key qualitative insights unchanged. Bribery is welfare improving, and the government will take bribes in order to build up its “war chest” and consequently to improve its outcomes in the remaining contests.

An obvious corollary to this result is that as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, the simultaneous move case converges to the sequential move case. When closed laws are very harmful, the marginal benefit of spending political capital will always be positive until victory in the contest is guaranteed, even though the government does not account for its “deterrence effect”. If the government puts very high weight on the harm closed laws do to society then it behaves as if it is a first-mover.

Proofs

Proof of Proposition 1.a. First, set up a standard Lagrangian problem for the government and take First Order Conditions as normal.

$$\mathcal{L} = \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \left[\frac{(1-\alpha)L_i\pi_i}{K_i + L_i} - L_i - K_i \right] di - \mu \left(\int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} K_i di - K^T \right) \quad (22)$$

$$\frac{d\mathcal{L}}{dK_i} = \frac{(\alpha-1)L_i\pi_i}{(K_i + L_i)^2} - 1 - \mu. \quad (23)$$

by setting equal to zero and rearranging terms:

$$K_i^* = \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{1+\mu} L_i \pi_i \right)^{0.5} - L_i \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{B}^c \quad (24)$$

where $\mu \geq 0$ is the shadow value of relaxing the government’s budget constraint. By the same logic as in Proposition 1, the government will never choose $K_i > \pi_i$ for any i . Therefore, we can focus on the first part of an interest group’s decision rule. This gives two equations in two unknowns: $L_i^* = (\pi_i K_i)^{0.5} - K_i$ and eq. (24). Substituting one into the other and rearranging terms yields:³¹

$$K_i^* = \pi_i \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha+\mu} \right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad L_i^* = \pi_i \frac{(\alpha-1)(1+\mu)}{(\alpha+\mu)^2}. \quad (25)$$

³¹During this rearranging, $K_i^* = 0$ appears to be a solution. However, this cannot be an equilibrium because when $L_i = 0$, the marginal return to K_i is infinite. This happens because the contest function is not differentiable at the point $K_i + L_i = 0$ (even though it is differentiable when one of K_i and L_i are zero).

When the government's budget constraint binds then $\mu > 0$ and $\int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} K_i^* di = K^T$. Substituting in the value of K_i^* :

$$K^T = \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha + \mu} \right)^2 di \quad (26)$$

$$\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha + \mu} = \left(\frac{K^T}{\int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i di} \right)^{0.5} \quad (27)$$

$$\mu = (\alpha - 1) \left(\frac{K^T}{\int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i di} \right)^{-0.5} - \alpha \quad (28)$$

Substituting this back into the equations for K_i^* and L_i^* (and rearranging) yields:

$$K_i^* = \frac{\pi_i K^T}{\int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i di} \quad \text{and} \quad L_i^* = \pi_i \left[\left(\frac{K^T}{\int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i di} \right)^{0.5} - \frac{K^T}{\int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i di} \right] \quad (29)$$

When the government's budget constraint does not bind then $\mu = 0$, and $\int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} K_i^* di < K^T$. Clearly this yields:

$$K_i^* = \pi_i \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad L_i^* = \pi_i \frac{(\alpha - 1)}{\alpha^2}. \quad (30)$$

In this case the total government spending is $\int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \right)^2$, so the budget constraint is slack whenever K^T is larger than this term. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.a. The optimal decision rules for political capital and lobbying after the negotiation has concluded or broken down is unchanged compared to the sequential move version of the game. However, the government will not spend more than $\left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \right)^2 \pi_i$ on each contest. This means that its budget constraint will not bind whenever:

$$K^T = K^G + \int_{j \in \mathcal{B}} B_j dj \geq \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \right)^2 \pi_i di. \quad (31)$$

Therefore the government will want to take bribes up to the point where this equation holds with equality. We can see from Lemma 3 that there is space for agents to negotiate. That is, the minimum bribe the government would be willing to accept is smaller than the maximum bribe an interest group would be prepared to pay. Formally:³²

$$B_i^{min} = \pi_i \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \right)^2 < B_i^{max} = \pi_i \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha + 1}{\alpha} \right). \quad (32)$$

We now pin down the size of the bribe by a competition argument. First, notice that in equilibrium there are interest groups, $j \in \mathcal{B}^c$ who do not pay a bribe to the government (and

³²Calculated by taking the terms for B_i^{min} and B_i^{max} from Lemma 3, and substituting in the equilibrium value of total political capital found in Equation (31). Simplifying yields the results.

instead engage in a contest). Now suppose that there exists an interest group $i \in \mathcal{B}$ that pays a bribe $B'_i < B_i^{max}$. Then there must also exist some $j \in \mathcal{B}^c$ that is willing to pay a larger bribe in order to avoid a contest.

To see this, first note that $j \in \mathcal{B}^c$ strictly prefers paying any bribe $B_j < B_j^{max}$ to engaging in a contest. This is true by the construction of B_j^{max} . Second, there then exists some $B''_j < B_j^{max}$ such that the government prefers taking the bribe B''_j to the bribe B'_i . So it is optimal for the interest group $j \in \mathcal{B}^c$ to offer this larger bribe, and for the government to take it – at the expense of rejecting the bribe from i .

The overall consequence of this is that interest groups must offer bribes equal to B_i^{max} in order to have their offers accepted in equilibrium. Failure to offer this amount results in some other interest group will “outbid” them. This pins down the size of each bribe, and the total quantity of bribes. The rest of the characterisation follows from Proposition 1.a. \square

F.2 Timing: interest groups move first

Here, the model is identical to Section 1 with the following exception: stages two and three in the game happen the other way round. That is, the special interest groups (that did not do a deal) choose how much lobbying to do in the second stage. And the government allocates its political capital in the third stage.

Now, the government’s choice of political capital does not deter lobbying by special interest groups. Conversely, lobbying by special interest groups deters political capital allocation by the government.

Proposition 1.b. *Fix $B_i = \mathbb{O}$ for all i .*

- *If $\alpha < 1$, there is a unique equilibrium: $K_i^* = \mathbb{O}$ and $L_i^* = 0$ for all i .*
- *If $\alpha > 1$ and $K^T < \frac{\alpha-1.5}{2(\alpha-1)} \int_i \pi_i di$, there is a unique equilibrium:*

$$K_i^* = \pi_i Z \quad , \quad L_i^* = 0.5\pi_i(1 - 2Z) \quad \text{for all } i, \quad \text{where } Z \equiv \frac{K^T}{\int_i \pi_i di} \quad (4.a)$$

- *Otherwise, there is a unique equilibrium: $K_i^* = \frac{\alpha-1.5}{2(\alpha-1)}\pi_i$, $L_i^* = \frac{\pi_i}{4(\alpha-1)}$ for all i .*

The result is qualitatively similar to the simultaneous move version of the model. However, the the special interest groups’ optimal lobbying rule and the threshold at which the government no longer wants to spend additional political capital is different. This is because the special interest groups now account for how additional lobbying attracts additional political capital. On the other hand, because the government cannot deter lobbying by committing political capital first, it chooses to stop at a point where special interest groups still do some lobbying and win with positive probability.

When the government can do deals with special interest groups here, the outcome is the same as in Proposition 2. The government does deals with interest groups up to the point where it has enough political capital to guarantee victory in all remaining contests. It also extracts concessions equal to the full value of a bad law to the special interest group. The only difference is the threshold conditions where the government has enough political capital to not want to take any contributions in the first place.

Proposition 2.b. *If $\alpha < 1$, there is a unique equilibrium: $B_i = \mathbb{O}$, $K_i = \mathbb{O}$, $L_i = 0$ for all i*

If $\alpha > 1$ and $K^G \geq \frac{\alpha-1.5}{2(\alpha-1)} \int_i \pi_i di$, there is a unique equilibrium: $B_i = \mathbb{O}$, $K_i = \pi_i$, $L_i = 0$ for all i ,
 Otherwise, in all equilibria:

- (1) $B_i = \pi_i$, $K_i = \mathbb{O}$, $L_i = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{B}$
- (2) $B_i = \mathbb{O}$, $K_i = \pi_i$, $L_i = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{B}^c$
- (3) and the set \mathcal{B} is such that $\int_{j \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_j dj = K^G + \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \pi_i di$.

Proofs

Proof of Proposition 2.a. The First Order Condition for the government is as in Proposition 1.a.

$$\frac{du_G}{dK_i} = \frac{(\alpha - 1)L_i\pi_i}{(K_i + L_i)^2} - 1 \quad (33)$$

Since special interest groups move *before* the government, they account for how their choice of L_i affects the government's choice of K_i^* . Therefore the First Order Condition for special interest group i is:

$$\frac{du_i}{dL_i} = \frac{\pi_i}{L_i + K_i^*} - \frac{\pi_i L_i (1 + dK_i^*/dL_i)}{(L_i + K_i^*)^2} - 1 \quad (34)$$

The non-binding budget constraint case. Now we consider the ‘‘corner case’’, where the government's budget constraint does not bind (i.e. where it no longer wants to spend additional political capital). For clarity, we denote the optimal values at this corner case K_i^{*c} , L_i^{*c} . Here, we must have $du_G/dK_i = 0$. (After some tedious rearranging) this yields:

$$K_i^{*c} = ((\alpha - 1)\pi_i L_i)^{0.5} - L_i \quad (35)$$

which in turn yields:

$$\frac{dK_i^{*c}}{dL_i} = \frac{1}{2} \left((\alpha - 1) \frac{\pi_i}{L_i} \right)^{0.5} - 1 \quad (36)$$

Substituting these equations into the special interest group's First Order Condition (and some tedious rearranging):

$$\frac{du_i}{dL_i} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\pi_i}{(\alpha - 1)L_i} \right)^{0.5} - 1 \quad (37)$$

Setting equal to zero and rearranging for L_i^{*c} , and then substituting back into the equation for K_i^{*c} :

$$L_i^{*c} = \frac{\pi_i}{4(\alpha - 1)} \quad , \quad K_i^{*c} = 0.5\pi_i \left(\frac{\alpha - 1.5}{\alpha - 1} \right) \quad (38)$$

This case applies when the government has sufficient capital to spend K_i^{*c} in each contest. That is, when $K^T \geq 0.5 \left(\frac{\alpha-1.5}{\alpha-1} \right) \int_i \pi_i di$.

The interior solution. By definition, at an interior solution we have $\frac{du_G}{dK_i} > 0$. Then the govern-

ment must equalise the marginal benefit of political capital across contests. Hence:

$$\frac{du_G}{dK_i} = \frac{du_G}{dK_j} \implies \frac{K_i + L_i}{K_j + L_j} = \left(\frac{\pi_i L_i}{\pi_j L_j} \right)^{0.5} \quad \text{for all } i, j. \quad (39)$$

Rearranging for K_i , and then integrating over j :

$$K_i^* = (\pi_i L_i)^{0.5} M - L_i \quad \text{where } M \equiv \int_j \frac{K_j + L_j}{(\pi_j L_j)^{0.5}} dj \quad (40)$$

$$\frac{dK_i^*}{dL_i} = 0.5(\pi_i/L_i)^{0.5} M - 1 \quad (41)$$

Substituting this into the the First Order Condition for L_i (and some substantial rearranging):

$$\left(\frac{\pi_i}{L_i} \right)^{0.5} M^{-1} - 0.5 \left(\frac{\pi_i}{L_i} \right)^{0.5} M^{-1} - 1 = 0 \quad (42)$$

$$L_i^* = 0.25\pi_i M^{-2} \quad (43)$$

We can now substitute this back into the optimal political capital allocation rule to find the optimal *amount* of political capital.

$$K_i^* = 0.5\pi_i(1 - 0.5M^{-2}) \quad (44)$$

Integrating over i and noting that the government's budget constraint binds:

$$\int_i K_i^* = K^T = 0.5\Pi - 0.25\Pi M^{-2} \quad \text{where } \Pi \equiv \int_i \pi_i \quad (45)$$

$$\implies M = (2 - 4K^T/\Pi)^{-0.5} \quad (46)$$

Finally, substituting this back into the equations for K_i^* and L_i^* :

$$K_i^* = \pi_i \frac{K^T}{\Pi} \quad (47)$$

$$L_i^* = \frac{1}{2}\pi_i \left(1 - 2\frac{K^T}{\Pi} \right) \quad (48)$$

□

Proof of Proposition 2.b. The first two cases ($\alpha < 1$ and $K^G > \frac{\alpha-1.5}{2(\alpha-1)} \int_i \pi_i di$) are straightforward. The argument uses identical logic to the respective parts of Proposition 2.

In the intermediate case, recall from Proposition 2.a that if no deal is done between i and the government: $K_i^* = \pi_i Z$, $L_i^* = 0.5\pi_i(1 - 2Z)$. This yields $p_i^* = 2Z$. Comparing the interest group's utility function when it does a deal ($u_i = \pi_i - B_i$) and when it does not ($u_i = (1 - p_i^*)\pi_i - L_i^*$), we find that an interest group i prefers to do a deal if and only if $B_i \leq \pi_i(0.5 + Z)$ if $Z < 0.5$ and if and only if $B_i \leq \pi_i$ otherwise (for convenience, we assume i wants to do a deal if indifferent).

The direct cost to the government of doing a deal with interest group i (in terms of additional harm done to society from increased probability of a bad law, less the lower spending on the contest)

is:

$$= [(1 - p_i^*)(1 - \alpha)\pi_i - L_i^* - K_i^*] - (1 - \alpha)\pi_i \quad (49)$$

$$= 2Z(\alpha - 1)\pi_i - 0.5\pi_i \quad (50)$$

The benefit of the deal is two-fold. First, the political capital that would have been spent on i can be redeployed. Second, there is additional political capital in the form of the contribution from the interest group. Both can be spent at a marginal benefit du_G/dK^T . To calculate this, start with u_G , substitute in the equilibrium actions, and rearrange.

$$u_G = \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} [(1 - \alpha)(1 - 2Z)\pi_i - 0.5(1 - 2Z)\pi_i - \pi_i Z] di + \int_{j \in \mathcal{B}} (1 - \alpha)\pi_j dj \quad (51)$$

$$= -2Z(1 - \alpha) \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i di + (1 - \alpha) \int_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \pi_i di - 0.5 \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i di \quad (52)$$

$$= -2(1 - \alpha) \frac{K^T}{\int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i di} \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i di + (1 - \alpha) \int_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \pi_i di - 0.5 \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i di \quad (53)$$

$$= 2(\alpha - 1)K^T + (1 - \alpha) \int_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \pi_i di - 0.5 \int_{i \in \mathcal{B}^c} \pi_i di \quad (54)$$

$$\implies \frac{du_G}{dK^T} = 2(\alpha - 1) \quad (55)$$

So the total benefit of doing a deal is $(K_i^* + B_i)2(\alpha - 1)$. And the cost is $2Z(\alpha - 1)\pi_i - 0.5\pi_i$. So the government wants to do a deal if:

$$(K_i^* + B_i)2(\alpha - 1) > 2Z(\alpha - 1)\pi_i - 0.5\pi_i \quad (56)$$

$$(\pi_i Z + B_i)2(\alpha - 1) > 2Z(\alpha - 1)\pi_i - 0.5\pi_i \quad (57)$$

$$B_i > \frac{-0.5\pi_i}{2(\alpha - 1)} \quad (58)$$

So the government will accept any (weakly) positive contribution. Therefore the government will continue doing deals (and taking the associated contributions) until it reaches $K^T = 0.5 \int_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \pi_i di$. The eventual size of the contribution, $B_i^* = \pi_i$ is determined by a competition argument. If one interest group were paying less than π_i , then some other group would be able to offer more, and the government would prefer this. \square

F.3 Government: non-fungible capital

Here, the model is identical to Section 1 with the following exception: political capital spending has no opportunity cost, so

$$u'_G = \int_i [(1 - \alpha)(1 - p_i)\pi_i - L_i] di. \quad (3.c)$$

We can think of this use-it-or-lose-it political capital as a secretary of state's time (under an assumption that a secretary of state can only spend her time contesting laws).³³

This adjustment has a small impact on the results. The condition $\alpha > 2$ in Proposition 1 becomes $\alpha > 2(1 - Z^{0.5})$, where $Z \equiv K^T / \int_i \pi_i di$, and all other aspects of the result remain unchanged. The intuition is extremely straightforward. The absence of an opportunity cost reduces the overall cost of spending political capital, so the bar the spending it is now lower.³⁴ There is still some cost to spending political capital – the lobbying it induces from special interest groups. This is why the threshold value of α falls as $K^T / \int_i \pi_i di$ rises – engaging in contests induces less wasteful lobbying.

Proposition 1.c. *Fix $B_i = \mathbb{O}$ for all i .*

- *If $\alpha < 2(1 - Z^{0.5})$, there is a unique equilibrium: $K_i^* = \mathbb{O}$ and $L_i^* = 0$ for all i .*
- *If $\alpha > 2(1 - Z^{0.5})$ and $K^T < \int_i \pi_i di$, there is a unique equilibrium:*

$$K_i^* = \pi_i Z \quad , \quad L_i^* = \pi_i (Z^{0.5} - Z) \quad \text{for all } i, \quad \text{where } Z \equiv \frac{K^T}{\int_i \pi_i di} \quad (59)$$

- *Otherwise, in all equilibria: $K_i^* \geq \pi_i$, $L_i^* = 0$ for all i .*

The impact on Proposition 2 is somewhat more nuanced. When $2(1 - Z^{0.5}) < \alpha < 2$, the government will take no bribes, and will spend its political capital in exactly the same way as the exogenous bribes setting (with no opportunity cost of political capital). When $\alpha > 2$, the outcome is exactly as in Proposition 2.

This happens because the government's initial endowment of political capital, K^G , has no opportunity cost. However, any political capital gained from bribe-taking *does* come with an opportunity cost. The government always has the outside option of not taking the bribes, and leaving the resources in the hands of the special interest group. For the purposes of deciding whether or not to take bribes, the whether or not the initial endowment of political capital has an opportunity cost does not matter.

Proposition 2.c. *If $\alpha < 2$, there is a unique equilibrium: $B_i = \mathbb{O}$ for all i , and K_i, L_i as described in Proposition 1.c. If $\alpha > 2$, then the equilibrium is as described in Proposition 2*

Proofs

Proof of Proposition 1.c. Consider the government's utility function. First suppose that $K_i < \pi_i$. Substituting in the optimal lobbying rule from Lemma 2, and then taking the partial derivative with respect to K_i yields:

$$u'_G = \int_i [(\alpha - 2)(K_i \pi_i)^{0.5} - (\alpha - 1)\pi_i + K_i] di \quad (60)$$

$$\frac{du'_G}{dK_i} = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - 2) \left(\frac{\pi_i}{K_i} \right)^{0.5} + 1 \quad \text{for all } i, \quad (61)$$

³³We use secretary of state in the British sense of the term. In the US, the equivalent would be a presidential appointee.

³⁴The careful reader will notice that when $K^T > \int_i \pi_i di$, the equilibrium is no longer unique. In fact, any feasible allocation such that $K_i \geq \pi_i$, $L_i = 0$ is an equilibrium. However, precisely because there is no opportunity cost to spending political capital, this equilibrium multiplicity is uninteresting. They are effectively all the same.

which is strictly positive if and only if $\alpha > 2(1 - (K_i/\pi_i)^{0.5})$. Equating partial derivatives across contests and rearranging yields the standard result that:

$$K_i^* = \frac{\pi_i}{\int_j \pi_j dj} K^T \quad (62)$$

This process is identical to Proposition 1 and so we omit it here for brevity. L_i^* also follows straightforwardly from Lemma 2. When $K_i \geq \pi_i$ then it is clear that $\frac{du_G}{dK_i} = 0$. Therefore the government is indifferent between all allocations where $K_i \geq \pi_i$ for all i . \square

Proof of Proposition 2.c. This result follows from the observation that when the government does not take any bribes, its utility function is described by Equation (3.c): $u'_G = \int_i [(1 - \alpha)(1 - p_i)\pi_i - L_i] di$, but when it does take bribes, its utility function is described by Equation (4). This is because when the government takes bribes, political capital *at the margin* has an opportunity cost.

Hence, when $\alpha > 2$ this is clearly identical to Proposition 2. When $0 < \alpha < 2$, bribe-taking is clearly non-optimal under Equation (4). Without bribe-taking, we are back to the setting of Equation (3.c), so the result follows from there. \square

F.4 Government: populism

Here, the model is identical to Section 1 with the following exception: the government does not care about the benefits that accrue to special interest groups, or about the costs these groups incur, so:

$$u''_G = \int_i [-\alpha(1 - p_i)\pi_i - K_i] di. \quad (3d)$$

Again, special interest groups' optimal response rules are unchanged, and the government accounts for how its choices affect lobbying decisions. The direct benefit of winning a contest is larger than in the main model, because government does not care about the benefits interest groups receive from closed laws (which partially offset the welfare gains from winning in the main model). All else equal, this pushes down the value of α required to induce spending and bribe-taking by the government. However, the government also ignores the “deterrence effect” as it puts no weight on resources spent on lobbying. In the main model, this “deterrence effect” partially offsets the marginal cost of spending political capital in a contest.

The net effect is modest. $\alpha > 2$ remains a sufficient condition for the marginal utility of political capital spending to be positive in all contests.³⁵ Therefore, Proposition 1 remains unaffected in this range. However, it is no longer a necessary condition for political capital spending. In fact, the government will choose to spend at least some capital whenever $\alpha > 0$.

The thresholds are less clean than in the main text, but the key insight holds. When the set of bribes is exogenous, the government adopts a “scattergun” approach, spreading itself across all remaining contests.

Proposition 1d. *Fix $B_i = \mathbb{O}$ for all i .*

- *If $0 < \alpha < 2Z^{0.5}$, there is a unique equilibrium: $K_i^* = \frac{1}{4}\pi_i\alpha^2$ and $L_i^* = \frac{1}{2}\pi_i\alpha(1 - \frac{1}{2}\alpha)$ for all i .*

³⁵At least when $K_i < \pi_i$, and some lobbying still takes place. When lobbying is completely deterred at the point $K_i = \pi_i$ then obvious the marginal return to further capital is zero.

- If $\alpha > 2Z^{0.5}$ and $K^T < \int_i \pi_i di$, there is a unique equilibrium:

$$K_i^* = \pi_i Z \quad , \quad L_i^* = \pi_i (Z^{0.5} - Z) \quad \text{for all } i, \quad \text{where } Z \equiv \frac{K^T}{\int_i \pi_i di} \quad (63)$$

- Otherwise, there is a unique equilibrium: $K_i^* = \pi_i$, $L_i^* = 0$ for all i .

The same is *not* true for the endogenous bribes setting. The alternative utility function changes optimal behaviour by the government. While closed-form solutions are unavailable, simulations show that the government takes *fewer* bribes. We can build intuition for this by looking at the government's utility function after substituting the optimal lobbying rule from Lemma 2.

In the main model, we have:

$$u_G = \int_i [(\alpha - 2)(K_i \pi_i)^{0.5} - (\alpha - 1)\pi_i] di, \quad (\text{main model})$$

and when the government does not care about the payoffs to the special interest groups we have:

$$u_G = \int_i [\alpha(K_i \pi_i)^{0.5} - \alpha\pi_i - K_i] di. \quad (\text{populist})$$

The derivations for these equations are provided in the proofs to Proposition 1 and Proposition 1d respectively. In the first utility function, the government's spending on contests only enters positively. The Force that prevents the government from spending without limit (up to the point where $K_i = \pi_i$) is the fact that additional spending is only possible by taking bribes. The bribe-taking is costly because it prevents the government from spending in the affected contests. In the second utility function, the government's spending on contests directly enters negatively. This provides an additional disincentive to spend political capital – and so reduces the quantity of bribes that the government takes.

Proofs

Proof of Proposition 1d. Consider the government's utility function. First suppose that $K_i < \pi_i$. Substituting in the optimal lobbying rule from Lemma 2, and then taking the partial derivative with respect to K_i yields:

$$u_G'' = \int_i [\alpha(K_i \pi_i)^{0.5} - \alpha\pi_i - K_i] di \quad (64)$$

$$\frac{du_G''}{dK_i} = \frac{1}{2}\alpha \left(\frac{\pi_i}{K_i} \right)^{0.5} - 1 \quad \text{for all } i, \quad (65)$$

which is strictly positive if and only if $\alpha > 2(K_i/\pi_i)^{0.5}$. If this condition is met, then we calculate equilibrium actions in the standard way: by equating partial derivatives across contests and rearranging. This yields the standard result that:

$$K_i^* = \frac{\pi_i}{\int_j \pi_j dj} K^T \quad (66)$$

This process is identical to Proposition 1 and so we omit it here for brevity. L_i^* also follows straightforwardly from Lemma 2. Therefore, the threshold on α amounts to $\alpha > 2Z^{0.5}$, where $Z = K^T / \int_i \pi_i di$. This gives the threshold in the result.

When this “standard” allocation process yields a value of K_i^* that would result in a negative marginal utility of spending political capital in a contest i , then the equilibrium value of K_i is pinned down by the First Order Condition. This is because it is clear that the marginal utility of spending political capital in a contest i is monotonically decreasing in K_i . So the government spends up to the point where the marginal utility is zero. In this case,

$$\frac{du_G''}{dK_i} = \frac{1}{2}\alpha \left(\frac{\pi_i}{K_i}\right)^{0.5} - 1 = 0 \quad (67)$$

$$\implies K_i^* = \frac{1}{4}\pi_i\alpha^2 \quad (68)$$

Finally, when $K_i \geq \pi_i$ then it is clear that $\frac{du_G}{dK_i} = 0$. Therefore the government is indifferent between all allocations where $K_i \geq \pi_i$ for all i . \square

F.5 Interest Groups: imperfect legislation

Here, the model is identical to Section 1 with the following exception: if a law i is open, then the benefits to the interest group are $(1 - z_i)\pi_i$ and the costs to society are $\alpha(1 - z_i)\pi_i$, with $z_i \in [0, 1]$.

Intuitively, this is a setting where the government is only able to mitigate, rather than completely remove, the harm a special interest group can impose on society. Further, its ability to mitigate differs across laws. The parameter z_i captures the effectiveness of legislation, with $z_i = 1$ being the special case corresponding to the main model in Section 1. This is an intuitively appealing extension, as in many real-world settings legislation and regulation will only be partially effective. Preferences are then:

$$u_i = (1 - p_i)\pi_i + p_i(1 - z_i)\pi_i - (L_i + B_i) \quad (2f)$$

$$u_G = \int_i [(1 - \alpha)(1 - p_i)\pi_i + (1 - \alpha)p_i(1 - z_i)\pi_i - L_i - K_i] di. \quad (3f)$$

However, this change has no impact on the analytic results. We can merely replace the interest groups’ benefits, π , with a weighted equivalent, where the weights capture the extent to which the government can mitigate harms regarding the relevant law. Define a weighted benefit $\pi'_i \equiv z_i\pi_i$ and rearrange these utility functions to get:

$$u_i = (1 - p_i)\pi'_i - (L_i + B_i) + C_i \quad (2f')$$

$$u_G = \int_i [(1 - \alpha)(1 - p_i)\pi'_i - L_i - K_i + C_i] di \quad (3f')$$

where $C = \pi_i(1 - z_i)$. Since C is a (law specific) constant term and is unaffected by any agents’ decisions, this problem is identical to that in the main model. This only difference is that we replace π with π' . Therefore all results in Section 2 will be unaffected, save for the replacement of π_i with π'_i .

G Heterogeneous Contest Functions

G.1 Contest function: heterogeneous home field advantage

Here, the model is identical to Section 1 with the following exception:

$$p'_i = \begin{cases} \frac{\phi_i K_i}{\phi_i K_i + (1 - \phi_i) L_i} & \text{if } K_i + L_i > 0 \\ 0.5 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1b)$$

with $\phi_i \in [0, 1]$ for all i .

Intuitively, this gives the government a relative (dis)advantage in the contest. In the main model, the contest function is symmetric in the sense that changing round the quantities each of the two agents in a contest chooses also changes round the probability the agents win the contest. Formally, this means $p_i(x_1, x_2) = 1 - p_i(x_2, x_1)$ for any $x_1, x_2 \geq 0$ for all i . The altered contest function in Equation (1b) no longer has this symmetry.

We can interpret this as simply one of many possible variations on the contest function, albeit one that is widely used in existing literature concerning contests [Konrad et al., 2009]. Note however that the heterogeneity in the contest function is *not* common in existing literature.

Alternatively, we can use the micro-foundations provided in Appendix C and interpret it as adding heterogeneity in the efficiency of evidence production. The evidence production functions $V_G = \ln(\phi_i K_i)$ and $V_i = \ln((1 - \phi_i) L_i)$ yield the contest function we use in this section.³⁶ This captures a range of institutional and idiosyncratic factors that make it easier for the government/interest groups to produce convincing evidence in some contests than others. For example, it could capture prevailing public opinion, geopolitical conditions, or some reduced form measure of past contests between the government and interest group i . For clarity of notation, it is convenient to define $\chi_i \equiv \phi_i / (1 - \phi_i) \in [0, \infty)$ and to work with this variable instead.

The impact of adding this heterogeneity to the contest function is wide-ranging and interesting in its own right (not merely as a robustness check to the main model). Therefore some of the results in this section have no direct analogue in Section 2.

Interest group behaviour. First, the impact on the interest group’s optimal lobbying decision is relatively straightforward.

Lemma 4. *If $K_i \leq \pi_i / \chi_i$ then $L_i^* = (\pi_i \chi_i K_i)^{0.5} - \chi_i K_i$. Otherwise $K_i = 0$.*

Proof. We omit this for brevity. It is substantively identical to the proof of Lemma 2, with the addition of χ_i . \square

The parameter χ_i “stretches” the interest group’s best response function (i.e. the optimal lobbying rule), but does not change the maximum amount of lobbying that the interest group would ever choose to do. However, it does shift the point at which the interest group is completely deterred from lobbying. It is easiest to see graphically.

The government’s overarching strategy is the same as in the main model when bribes are exogenous (as in Section 2.2). It adopts a “scattergun” approach, spreading itself across all contests.

³⁶An identical formulation would be to scale the government’s political capital by $\chi_i \equiv \phi_i / (1 - \phi_i) \in [0, \infty)$, and to not scale the interest group’s lobbying.




Figure 4: Optimal lobbying choice of interest group i as a function of K_i , for different values of χ_i . $\pi_i = 1$.

The logic is the same. To the extent possible, it aims to equalise the marginal return to capital across contests.

In the main model this equalisation is possible because the point at which hits the “corner” is the same in each contest. By “corner”, we mean the point where the political capital spent is just sufficient to completely deter lobbying by the special interest group. This occurs at $K_i = \pi_i$ in the main model. Before this point, the marginal utility of K_i is strictly monotonically decreasing. At this point, it is exactly equal to $0.5(\alpha - 2)$ (see the proof to Proposition 1, and substitute $K_i = \pi_i$ into the final equation there). After this point, it is zero.

In contrast, with the heterogeneous contest function here, the marginal utility of political capital at the “corner” is $0.5\alpha\chi_i - 1$. The “corner” is reached at $K_i = \pi_i/\chi_i$. The marginal utility of K_i is strictly decreasing before this point, and is always zero after this point. Further, notice that if $\chi_i < 2/\alpha$, then the marginal utility at the “corner” (where lobbying by the interest group is completely deterred) is negative. In these contests, the government would choose to stop before it reached the “corner”. It would instead stop at the point where the marginal utility of political capital hits zero (since we know it is strictly decreasing in this interval).³⁷

Overall, the picture is far more complex. Nevertheless, the overarching procedure remains the same. Spend political capital where it has the highest marginal return, never spend where the return is negative. Hence, the government has a unique optimal strategy, although closed-form solutions are not available.

Proposition 1e. *Fix $B_i = \mathbb{O}$ for all i . There is a unique feasible allocation $\{K_i^*\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ that maximises u_G subject to (i) $\int_i K_i di \leq K^T$ and (ii) $K_i \geq 0$ for all i .*

While we are unable to provide an exact characterisation of the solution, it is still possible to make a few observations. The first is that the optimal choice of political capital spending in a contest i is linear in the benefits interest group i receives from a closed law.

Remark 1. K_i^* is linear in π_i .

³⁷This occurs at $K_i = 0.25\pi_i\chi_i(\alpha - 2)^2/(1 - \chi_i)^2$.




Figure 5: A qualitative image of the optimal political capital choice, K_i^* , as a function of the efficiency of lobbying, χ_i . Actual choice of K_i^* is the lower of the unconstrained and constrained solutions. Solid line shows where each case applies.

Proof. There are three possible cases to consider: (i) the “corner” case, where $K_i = \pi_i/\chi_i$, (ii) the case where the marginal utility falls to zero before reaching the “corner”, where $K_i = 0.25\pi_i\chi_i(\alpha - 2)^2/(1 - \chi_i)^2$, and (iii) the interior case, where $\frac{du_G}{dK_i} = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - 2) \left(\frac{\pi_i\chi_i}{K_i} \right)^{0.5} + (\chi_i - 1) - \mu = 0$. It is clear from the expressions that K_i is linear in π_i in all three cases. \square

In contrast, the optimal choice of political capital spending in a contest i is non-monotonic in the parameter χ_i . First suppose that there is an interior solution (i.e. $K_i^* < \pi_i/\chi_i$) for some contest i . As χ_i initially increases, the government responds by allocating more political capital to the contest. This is because, all else equal, higher χ_i increases the marginal return of capital in contest i . We can think of this as a consequence of the government becoming more productive at converting political capital into “evidence”. This makes contest i relatively more attractive to the government, attracting more capital up to the point where the marginal return is once again equalised across contests.

However, at some point this process of higher χ_i attracting more political capital will cause the government to reach the “corner” case of $K_i^* = \pi_i/\chi_i$, where complete deterrence is achieved (i.e. when $L_i^* = 0$). After this point, further increases in χ_i have the reverse effect. They cause the government to reduce its spending on contest i , because these further increases in χ_i allow it to spend less while still guaranteeing victory.

Remark 2. K_i^* is non-monotonic in χ_i

Figure 5 gives a graphical flavour of this result. The technical details associated with calculating K_i^* in the “unconstrained” case are provided after the proof to Proposition 1.b.

Proofs

Proof of Proposition 1e. For existence and uniqueness, it suffices to show that the objective function is strictly concave and the set of inputs is compact.

First notice that $K_i > \pi_i/\chi_i$ can never be optimal – it would always be better to choose $K_i = \pi_i/\chi_i$ and do nothing with the leftover capital (this is likely not optimal, but is an improvement). Therefore, an optimal solution cannot involve $K_i > \pi_i/\chi_i$, so we can impose the appropriate constraint without loss. This step then allows us to substitute in a simpler version of interest groups' optimal lobbying rule: $L_i = (\pi_i\chi_i K_i)^{0.5} - \chi_i K_i$ (rather than $L_i = \max\{(\pi_i\chi_i K_i)^{0.5} - \chi_i K_i, 0\}$ – which avoids the difficulties of the max function). The government's utility function is then:

$$u_G = \int_i [(1 - \alpha)\pi_i + (\alpha - 2)(K_i\pi_i\chi_i)^{0.5} + (\chi_i - 1)K_i] di. \quad (69)$$

Hence the government's problem is:

$$\max u_G : \{K_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad \text{subject to} \quad \int_i K_i di \leq K^T \quad \text{and} \quad K_i \in \left[0, \frac{\pi_i}{\chi_i}\right] \quad \text{for all } i. \quad (70)$$

It is obvious that the set $\{K_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ that satisfies the constraints is compact. Strict concavity of u_G follows from the second derivatives.

$$\frac{d^2 u_G}{dK_i^2} = -0.25(\alpha - 2)(\pi_i\chi_i)^{0.5} K_i^{-1.5} \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } i \quad (71)$$

$$\frac{d^2 u_G}{dK_i dK_j} = 0 \quad \text{for all } i, j. \quad (72)$$

□

Technical details for Figure 5. The proof to Proposition 1.b sets out the government's problem. We can re-express this as a Lagrangian as follows: We can set out

$$u_G = \int_i [(1 - \alpha)\pi_i + (\alpha - 2)(K_i\pi_i\chi_i)^{0.5} + (\chi_i - 1)K_i] di - \mu \left[\int_i K_i di - K^T \right] - \int_i \lambda_i \left(K_i - \frac{\pi_i}{\chi_i} \right) di \quad (73)$$

where μ and λ_i are Lagrange multipliers. As usual, we then differentiate with respect to K_i :

$$\frac{du_G}{dK_i} = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - 2) \left(\frac{\pi_i\chi_i}{K_i} \right)^{0.5} + (\chi_i - 1) - \mu - \lambda_i = 0. \quad (74)$$

Recall that this partial always equals zero, because the Lagrange multipliers adjust as necessary. Rearranging:

$$\frac{\pi_i\chi_i}{K_i} = 4 \left(\frac{1 - \chi_i + \mu + \lambda_i}{\alpha - 2} \right)^2 \quad (75)$$

$$K_i = \frac{1}{4} \pi_i\chi_i \left(\frac{\alpha - 2}{1 - \chi_i + \mu + \lambda_i} \right)^2. \quad (76)$$

Note that by definition, $\lambda_i > 0$ if and only if $K_i = \pi_i/\chi_i$. Additionally, if $\mu > 0$ then: $\int_i K_i \, di = K^T$.

$$\implies \frac{1}{4} \int_i \pi_i \chi_i \left(\frac{\alpha - 2}{1 - \chi_i + \mu + \lambda_i} \right)^2 \, di = K^T. \quad (77)$$

This provides a unique characterisation of K_i^* , although we do not have an explicit solution for μ .

$$K_i^* = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4} \pi_i \chi_i \left(\frac{\alpha - 2}{1 - \chi_i + \mu} \right)^2, \frac{\pi_i}{\chi_i} \right\} \quad (78)$$

where μ solves Equation (77) if $\mu > 0$. Notice the λ_i is not present in the left-hand part of the min function in Equation (78). This is because the relevant constraint does not bind there by definition, so $\lambda_i = 0$. A pair of observations follow easily from this characterisation. First, an obvious relationship between K_i^* and π_i carries through from the main model.

G.2 Heterogeneous cost of lobbying

Here, the model is identical to Section 1 with the following exception: interest groups face a general, and heterogeneous, marginal cost of lobbying. An interest group's preferences are now:

$$u'_i = (1 - p_i)\pi_i - (E_i L_i + B_i)$$

with $E_i > 0$ for all i .

Interestingly, this is exactly the same as adding heterogeneous home field (dis)advantage, as we did in Appendix G.1. This is easy to see by redefining terms. Let \tilde{L}_i be the *spending* on lobbying. Then $L_i \equiv \tilde{L}_i/E_i$. Making this substitution yields:

$$u'_i = (1 - p_i)\pi_i - (\tilde{L}_i + B_i) \quad \text{and} \quad p_i = \frac{K_i}{K_i + \frac{\tilde{L}_i}{E_i}} \equiv \frac{E_i K_i}{E_i K_i + \tilde{L}_i}. \quad (79)$$

Finally, note that in Appendix G.1 the marginal cost of lobbying is one by definition. So the quantity of lobbying and the spending on lobbying are equivalent there. From this it is clear that the problems are the same.

This equivalence result is also obvious once we consider the evidence production functions shown in Appendix C. Having $V_G = \ln(\chi_i K_i)$ and $V_I = \ln(L_i)$ yields a contests function $p_i = \chi_i K_i / (\chi_i K_i + L_i)$. And similarly, having $V_G = \ln(K_i)$ and $V_I = \ln(L_i/E_i)$ yields a contests function $p_i = E_i K_i / (E_i K_i + L_i)$. Therefore all results and analysis presented above carry over here. For completeness, we state the following result.

Proposition 5. *Consider any function $x : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, and let $x(i) \equiv x_i$. Then the following two settings are equivalent:*

1. $\chi_i = x_i$ and $E = 1$ for all i ,
2. $\chi_i = 1$ for all i and $E = x_i$

Proof. This follows from the argument immediately above. □

H Supplementary Results

This section sets out formal statements and proofs for claims made in the main text. The results are set out to match the order of appearance in the main text. The aim here is simply to convince the sceptical reader that the claims in the main text are in fact true. Therefore we provide no further discussion here.

Remark 3. Fix $B_i = \mathbb{O}$ for all i . Equilibrium welfare is:

- (i) strictly monotonically decreasing in each π_i ,
- (ii) strictly decreasing in α , if $\alpha < 2$ or $K^T < \int_i \pi_i di$, and is invariant in α otherwise,
- (iii) strictly increasing in K^T when $K^G < \int_i \pi_i di$ and $\alpha > 2$, and invariant in K^T otherwise.

Proof. This proof has two simple steps. First, we take the government's utility function (eq. (4)) – which is identical to social welfare by construction – and substitute in the optimal behaviour from Proposition 1. This is done for each of the three cases identified in Proposition 1. **Case 1.** If $\alpha < 2$ then:

$$u_G = (1 - \alpha) \int_i \pi_i di.$$

Hence, (i) $\frac{du_G}{d\pi_i} = (1 - \alpha) < 0$. Recall that we assume $\alpha > 1$ in the setup in Section 1. (ii) $\frac{du_G}{d\alpha} = - \int_i \pi_i di < 0$. (iii) $\frac{du_G}{dK^T} = 0$. **Case 2.** If $\alpha > 2$ and $K^T \geq \int_i \pi_i di$ then:

$$u_G = - \int_i \pi_i di.$$

Hence, (i) $\frac{du_G}{d\pi_i} = -1$. (ii) $\frac{du_G}{d\alpha} = 0$. (iii) $\frac{du_G}{dK^T} = 0$. For cases 1 and 2, the resulting utility functions follow immediately from substituting in the results from Proposition 1 into the government's utility function (eq. (4)). **Case 3.** is somewhat more involved, so we show the derivation of equilibrium welfare. If $\alpha > 2$ and $K^T < \int_i \pi_i di$, then:

$$u_G = \int_i [(1 - p_i)(1 - \alpha)\pi_i - L_i - K_i] di \tag{80}$$

$$u_G = \int_i \left[\frac{L_i}{K_i + L_i} (1 - \alpha)\pi_i - L_i - K_i \right] di \tag{81}$$

$$u_G = \int_i \left[\frac{\pi_i Z^{0.5} - \pi_i Z}{\pi_i Z + \pi_i Z^{0.5} - \pi_i Z} (1 - \alpha) \pi_i - (\pi_i Z^{0.5} - \pi_i Z) - \pi_i Z \right] di \quad (82)$$

$$u_G = \int_i [(1 - \alpha)(\pi_i - \pi_i Z^{0.5}) - \pi_i Z^{0.5}] di \quad (83)$$

$$u_G = \int_i [(\alpha - 2)\pi_i Z^{0.5} + (1 - \alpha)\pi_i] di \quad (84)$$

$$u_G = (\alpha - 2) \int_i \pi_i Z^{0.5} di + (1 - \alpha) \int_i \pi_i di \quad (85)$$

$$u_G = (\alpha - 2) \int_i \pi_i \left(\frac{K^T}{\int_i \pi_i di} \right)^{0.5} + (1 - \alpha) \int_i \pi_i di \quad (86)$$

$$u_G = (\alpha - 2)(K^T)^{0.5} \left(\int_i \pi_i \right)^{0.5} di + (1 - \alpha) \int_i \pi_i di \quad (87)$$

$$(88)$$

Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{du_G}{d\pi_i} &= \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - 2) \left(\frac{K^T}{\int_i \pi_i} \right)^{0.5} + (1 - \alpha) \\ &= (1 - \alpha) - Z(1 - 0.5\alpha) < 0 \quad \text{since } Z < 1 \end{aligned} \quad (i)$$

$$\frac{du_G}{d\alpha} = (K^T)^{0.5} \left(\int_i \pi_i \right)^{0.5} - \int_i \pi_i di < 0 \quad \text{since } K^T < \int_i \pi_i di \quad (ii)$$

$$\frac{du_G}{dK^T} = 0.5(\alpha - 2)(K^T)^{-0.5} \left(\int_i \pi_i \right)^{0.5} > 0 \quad (iii)$$

□