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The history and institutions of American democracy are a source of national pride to Americans. For most people, the trip to Washington is a rite of passage, a moment of homage beneath the vaulting dome of Congress or of silent awe at the simple, stately elegance of the White House. The monument to George Washington towers above the city, a symbol of un-wavering strength. Thomas Jefferson, tall and far-seeing, gazes out across the Potomac River. Abraham Lincoln, thoughtful and compassionate, looks down on us, his wisdom inscribed on his memorial.

And yet today, Americans are profoundly dissatisfied with the performance of our national government. Opinion polls show that public trust in the leaders and institutions of government has been declining for several decades. One survey in May 1994 found that 75 percent of those polled thought that “major changes” were needed in “the way the federal government works.”

Popular discontent was dramatically expressed in the 1994 election, when voters swept Democrats out of control in the House of Representatives for the first time in 40 years. Just two years earlier, 19 percent of the voters rejected the presidential candidates of the two major political parties to support a political neophyte, Ross Perot, in what was the most massive repudiation of the political establishment in an American election.

Voter participation has been declining, because many Americans feel powerless and think that Washington does not care about them and their problems. “The nation as a whole is losing all respect for the political process,” asserted an automotive worker from Michigan. “There’s a sense that the system is broken,” said a medical marketing manager from California. A bank officer from Georgia was critical of elected officials: “They’re on an ego trip. They sit around playing power games with each other.”

People are frustrated but they do not understand why. They focus on personalities though the obstacles to better government may lie deeper—in the system itself.

The Constitution provides a system of separated and shared powers—the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government. But few people understand that constitutional checks and balances have been accentuated—some say aggravated—by the political divisions of government during the last six presidencies. For 22 out of the last 28 years, the White House and the Congress (or part of Congress) have been controlled by the opposite political parties—sometimes Republican presidents facing Democratic majorities in Congress, or vice versa under President Clinton.

Such partisan divisions have contributed to some of the policy deadlocks over the federal budget, the war in Central America in the 1980s or American intervention in Bosnia in the 1990s, the level of military spending, and debates about the proper size and role of the federal government. With partisan divisions, no one is in full control of government. The voters do not know whom to blame when the government is not working well.

Another important influence on how government operates and on how the public views Washington is “the shadow government” of the media and the organized lobbies. They are not mentioned in the Constitution, but they exercise great power in the name of the people. In the 1990s, the size of the government has actually shrunk, but the growth of the “shadow government” has been explosive. Some scholars believe that the media and special interest lobbying have helped undermine public confidence in government and made it harder for Congress and the President to do their jobs.

Still another important influence on how Washington works is the way our election campaigns are financed. Throughout much of our history, political parties organized and financed most election campaigns. But since World War II, and especially in the 1980s and 1990s, individual politicians have taken an increasing role in organizing and funding their own campaigns. This has given them much greater independence from their party leaders.
As a result, many go their own way rather than working together, but it is only in working together that they can achieve results.

Our documentary and discussion series, *The People and the Power Game*, examines these trends to show how our political system actually works and to help explain public discontent with government. From extensive research and interviews with virtually all the important political participants, we have put together stories and case studies that take voters and students inside government to see the President, Vice President, House Speaker, Senate Majority Leader, members of Congress, top lobbyists and major network anchors in action. Then we talk to them about what they do and why they do it. Our approach is to use real life stories and interesting people and events to show how the constitutional system of checks and balances has been changed by the techniques and technology of modern politics.

Finally, we bring together a representative sample of American voters from all over the country to talk with experts and political professionals about how we can make American democracy work better. Their discussion generated ideas for reform, which are a model for classroom discussions and for debate among voters and civic groups all across America. The goal is to go beyond the personalities of campaign politics to think about the strengths, the weaknesses, and the future of American democracy and how we can all make it fairer and more effective.

### Instructional Objectives

Through viewing *The People and the Power Game* and using this teaching guide, the student will:

- develop an appreciation of the *art of politics*—how power shapes the workings of our government;
- understand the necessity of compromise and coalition building in politics;
- become more aware of the forces that shape legislation;
- develop a lifelong curiosity about government, politics and the citizen’s role;
- concentrate attention on creating solutions that move government forward;
- be challenged to take a knowledgeable, participating role in political life;
- assess the impact of the media on politics and government;
- interpret how the public agenda is shaped by interest groups, the media and political parties.

### Instructional Elements

- Instructional Objectives
- Program Summary, *The Elected: The Presidency and Congress*
- Suggested Activities
- Program Summary, *The Unelected: Lobbies and the Media*
- Suggested Activities
- Extended Activities
- The People in the Programs
- Referenced Information
- Citizen Involvement
- Suggested Readings
- Sources on the Internet

---

Left to right: Republican leaders Senator Robert Dole, Senator Trent Lott, Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich and Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Congressman Bob Livingston.
*The Elected: The Presidency and Congress* takes the viewer into the world of legislative politics. The United States government was created to decentralize power, to protect the American public from a tyrannical leader as envisioned by our founding fathers, having recently fought to overthrow such tyrannical leadership. Perhaps they did much too good a job.

The federal government is divided into three branches—the executive, the legislative and the judicial. Each branch has powers granted to it by the Constitution, and each branch is able to impose checks and balances on the other two. This system led political scientist Richard Neustadt to describe “a government of separated institutions sharing powers.” Perhaps nowhere more than in the legislative process do we see those “separated institutions” struggling to retain their portion of those shared powers. *The Elected* specifically takes up the executive and the legislative branches and how the deliberative process envisioned by the founding fathers may have turned into gridlock.

Without compromise the newly formed United States of America would not have had the Constitution that we so value today. Complex areas of disagreement separated the framers. Initially, the questions of ending the slave trade, numerical representation, and how the legislative bodies would represent their small and large constituencies were solved by such proposals as the Three-Fifths Compromise and the Great Compromise. Their names say it all. One final argument threatened to split the new nation, the argument over governmental rights versus individual rights. The Bill of Rights solved that controversy.

Is compromise a concession, yielding or pragmatism, a practical way of solving problems? One is seen as defeat, the other practical, realistic. Look again at the words of James Madison, in *The Federalist*, No. 10: “...refine and enlarge the public views, by passing them through the medium of a chosen body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern the true interest of their country, and whose patriotism and love of justice will be least likely to sacrifice it to temporary or partial considerations.” Madison expected our elected representatives to look toward compromise to achieve the best response one can hope to achieve given the many viewpoints about how best to govern.

Many Americans are becoming cynical over what they see as gridlock in our government, the inability to accomplish the most basic of legislative actions. Many had hoped in 1992, with the advent of the first Democratic president in 12 years and a Democratic Congress in place, we would see an end to gridlock and ineffectual government. But as the first segment in *The Elected* shows us, being of the same political party does not guarantee cooperation between the executive branch and Congress.

As a newly elected president, Bill Clinton fell into the arrogance-of-power trap. Perhaps Tom Mann of the Brookings Institute said it best, “I think most presidents, most new presidents, overestimate the power of the office they have just won.” This overestimation of power cost President Clinton the support of conservative and more moderate Democrats in Congress. The President cannot order others to follow. He must lead by persuasion. If that persuasion is lost on Congress, he can turn to the American public as Franklin Roosevelt did, but ultimately it is the Congress that will or will not pass the legislative package a president puts forth.

Bill Clinton won some and lost some, most notably, health care reform, in his earliest attempts at legislative leadership. In the process he drove the Blue Dog Democrats into the arms of the Republicans. The language of another time gave us the name, yellow dog democrat. This was someone who would vote for a Democrat even if it were a yellow dog. The Blue Dogs were born when prominent
Louisiana artist George Rodrigue, famous for his blue dog art inspired by his dog Tiffany, created a painting for his friend, Democrat-now-turned-Republican Jimmy Hayes (R, LA). Hayes was denounced for voting against the Democratic-inspired budget. Rodrigue painted an oil which he titled *The Washington Blue Dog* and wrote a caption saying, “Jimmy Hayes, the Blue Dog Democrat.” Hayes supplied blue dog pins for other conservative Democrats. The *Wall Street Journal* picked up on the pins and the designation stuck.

The Republicans, led by Newt Gingrich (R, GA), saw Clinton’s mistakes as fatal blunders and set out not only to gain control of Congress but also to shift the center of power. It was this course of action that led to the downfall of Newt Gingrich and the Republican revolution.

Seventy-four freshmen Republican congressmen, inspired by the *Contract with America* and orchestrated by the new Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, moved like a blitzkrieg. They passed all but one component, term limits, of the *Contract with America*. But their never-say-die attitude made them more willing to fight than to compromise, and the public backlash against them and Speaker Gingrich stopped the revolution at the doors of the Senate and the Oval Office.

Compromise is not surrender; it is a pragmatic course of action envisioned by the Constitution’s framers to make government operate in a slow and deliberate manner, creating consensus rather than bowing to the capriciousness of any one faction.

---

**The Elected: The Presidency and Congress** has the following segments presented in this order:

**The Democrats:**
- Bill Clinton is elected and faces legislative obstacles.
- Senator David Boren (D, OK) defects over the economic package.
- Democrats attempt to police their party after the revolt of the Blue Dogs.
- Health care reform fails.

**The Republicans:**
- Newt Gingrich directs the 1994 Republican election landslide in the House.
- Gingrich is picked as Speaker by newly elected Republican House members. Republican program introduced.
- House freshmen revolt over purging of one of their own. Senate moderates also revolt against discipline.
- The farm subsidy proposal is modified by constituency politics.
- The budget impasse leads to shutdown of the federal government, while Republicans divide. President Clinton wins a round in the budget war.
1. Assign each student to write a letter from the perspective of a person who is visiting the United States and has observed first hand any of the events depicted in one of the case studies from *The People and the Power Game*.
   - The student should write in first person to a friend who is an American citizen.
   - The student should communicate feelings as well as objective opinions.
   - Have students exchange letters and reply to the issues raised.

2. Use the most recent party platforms of the Democratic, Republican, and any other parties.
   - Give each group different parts of the platforms.
   - They are to create short statements that summarize positions on a variety of issues.
   - The teacher will need to compile the statements into a questionnaire to which students can answer agree or disagree. (Note this exercise is a classroom simulation and of necessity generalizations must be made.)
   - Together with the class, classify the answers as most likely liberal or most likely conservative.
   - Students score their sheets with one point for the most likely liberal answer and two points for the most likely conservative answer.
   - Generate a discussion on why a liberal or a conservative might agree or disagree with each statement.
   - By generalizing, the lowest scores would be the most liberal; the highest scores the most conservative.
   - Use the scores to introduce and generate (1) a human political spectrum, and (2) a graphical one. (Remember, this is just one class and the spectrum only fits its range of beliefs. You may have a class of very liberal or very conservative students, but on the spectrum someone will be the farthest left and someone will be the farthest right.)
   - As students stand in the human political spectrum, ask them to look around and note if there are any surprises as to where they or their classmates are standing.
   - Ask them to speculate on why that might be.

3. Let students form two homogeneous groups according to their places on the political spectrum as determined by the earlier activity, or help them form two consensus groups through agreement on select issues.
   - Using copies of party platforms from various political parties have each group create a 5 to 10 plank platform upon which they can reach agreement using a one vote per person, majority rule.
   - No minority reports are allowed; they must compromise to reach an agreement.
   - Have the groups present their platforms to the class.
   - Each student should write a paper explaining how he or she feels about the platform. Papers should include the areas the students completely, or for the most part, agree with in the platform and those they would have preferred to see changed.
   - Let each group tell the class how it reached consensus. Discuss: What were the hardest issues upon which to find agreement, the easiest? Why do they think it happened that way? Continue to debrief the students following the direction of their experiences.

4. Give students copies of all or parts of *The Federalist*, No. 10 and *Washington’s Farewell Address*. Ask students individually or in groups to find and list the admonitions of Madison and Washington against factions. Discuss why they think Madison, Washington and others felt so strongly. Did any of their predictions come true? Are any of their arguments viable today?

5. Acquaint students with the classifications of governments based upon the type of executive and the relationship of the executive to the legislature—presidential, parliamentary or dictatorial. Introduce the basic characteristics of each type. A chart or frame is useful for this.
   - Divide the class into three groups. Each group is assigned a government type and must formulate a government based on that type.
   - Introduce one scenario from the following list to each group:
     - Your group must organize on a deserted island.
     - Inflation is growing to alarming levels.
Your group is under attack. You must decide how to respond.

A controversial piece of legislation needs to be addressed.

Citizens feel pressured and complain that their life, liberty and property are under attack.

- Discuss what problems the government type creates for the group. Why?
- Which government type might be best suited to handle the immediate problem? Why?

Having looked at various government formats and their capacity and competency to handle problems, ask students to write a paper describing under which type of government they would prefer to live.

6. Have students complete a chart detailing the three branches of government and the Separation of Powers and Checks and Balances as designated by the Constitution (see page 18).

- Where do we see these elements at play in The People and the Power Game?
- Given the layout of the branches, what breed of politician is most likely to generate the best outcomes?
- Are there events currently in the news that portray these elements?

7. Assign the class to create and take a poll, write a paper, or initiate a class discussion on the following topics.

- What are the inherent weaknesses/strengths of the presidency?
- Congress?
- Where should America look for policy leadership—the President, Congress, both, neither?

8. Have students use a graphic depiction of How a Bill Becomes Law to trace the path of a bill through both houses of Congress and on to the President. Completely label the chart. Label all the points where a bill can be blocked from passage.

9. Ask the class to brainstorm suggestions for reform in the legislative process. Ask the class to critically examine the list.

- Which suggested reforms seem to make the most sense? Why?
- If major reforms were passed in Congress and the legislative process speeded up, would this be desirable or not? Explain.

10. Hedrick Smith comments on the presidential leadership of Franklin Roosevelt during the Depression. FDR’s activism changed the face of the Presidency forever.

- Assign the class to research and prepare a paper on how Roosevelt changed the presidency.
- Investigate the leadership of a modern president. How does the presidential legacy left by your choice compare with Roosevelt’s?

11. Discussion: From The People and the Power Game, compare the Democratic caucus’ attempt to bring the Blue Dog Democrats in line on Clinton’s economic package and the Republican leadership’s attempt to punish Mark Neumann and Mark Hatfield’s defections.

- What were the immediate results in each case?
- Speculate on the long-term results.
- What do these case studies say about party loyalty vs. personal conviction or constituent responsibility?
- Research historical cases of this same dilemma.

12. Ask a student to explain Congressman Parker’s statement, “If you take a yellow dog Democrat and you put your hands around his neck and you squeeze hard enough and he can’t breathe, he becomes a blue dog. And if you keep squeezing, he becomes a Republican.”

13. Review with the class the historical compromises that give form to the Constitution of the United States—the Three-Fifths Compromise, the Great or Connecticut Compromise, the addition of the Bill of Rights.

- Analyze the words of James Madison in The Federalist, No. 10 as he clarified the intentions of the framers of the Constitution:

  The effect of the first difference is, on the one hand, to refine and enlarge the public views, by passing them through the medium of a chosen body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern the true interest of their country, and whose patriotism and love of justice will be least likely to sacrifice it to temporary or partial considerations.

- Discuss the spirit of compromise intrinsic to our decentralized three-branch government.
- What forces are causing this spirit to break down in the legislative process?
- Is this a recent phenomenon or have we seen it at other times in our nation’s history?
- What sacrifices must politicians make to renew this spirit of compromise?
- What sacrifices are necessary on the part of the media? Interest groups? Citizens?

14. Have students research the Blue Dog Democrats who switched to the Republican Party after Republicans won control of Congress in 1994—Mike Parker (MS), Greg Laughlin (TX), Billy Tauzin (LA), Jimmy Hayes (LA) and Nathan Deal (GA).
- Of those who have stood for re-election, how have they fared?
- Let the class develop questions to ask (via e-mail or letter) someone on the national, state or local political level who has switched political parties.

15. Have the class examine the Clinton approval graphs on this page and answer the following:
- What trends can you discern from 1993 to the end of 1995?
- Pinpoint various incidents in The People and the Power Game:
  - Clinton’s first 100 days (Jan.-May 1993);
  - Debate and passage of the Clinton economic package (Aug. 1993);
  - NAFTA debate and passage (Nov. 1993);
  - The health care reform debate (Aug. 1994);
  - The 1995 budget battle, the veto of the Republicans’ Balanced Budget Bill and anticipated subsequent federal government shutdown (Sep.-Oct. 1995).
- What happened to Clinton’s approval rating? Is this what you expected? Why or why not?
- Obtain the same data for other U.S. presidents.

Gallup data is available beginning with Truman (http://www.gallup.com).
- How do Clinton’s approval ratings compare?
- Which presidents have had the lowest overall approval ratings? The highest?
- Chart other presidents’ approval ratings with various incidents in history.

16. For discussion: Congressman Orton said that both the Republican and Democratic parties are controlled by the extreme factions on the political spectrum, but most Americans are centrists. Do you agree or disagree?

17. Have students write papers or present arguments on the following. Suggestions to end demosclerosis included electing the president and both houses of Congress for the same term, electing Congress after the presidential election or putting one party in control of Congress and the presidency. Do you agree with these proposals? What would you suggest?

18. Do you think political parties are a good thing, a necessary part of bringing cohesion and direction to our government?

19. Ask the class: Of primaries, conventions and party caucuses, which do you feel has the tendency to foster more public participation? Record students’ answers. Have students ask their families and community members. Record the replies. Is there a consensus? Post the question to a listserv on the Internet.

20. Do you support term limits for Congress? Why or why not? What time frame would you choose if there were a limit?

21. Senator Cohen asked the question, “... how do we restore confidence in our institutions...?” Ask the class to discuss that issue. Have students ask the question outside the class and post it on an Internet listserv. Do the answers reveal any geographical or socioeconomic trends?
Program Summary
The Unelected: Lobbies and the Media

The Unelected: Lobbies and the Media takes the viewer inside the “shadow government”—the lobbies and the media, who exercise power in the name of the American people and whose performance affects whether the public feels well served by American democracy.

Under the Constitution, formal power is granted to elected officials and those appointed to the executive branch by the president. People complain that this official bureaucracy has become bloated, but actually, the federal government has shrunk during the 1990s by 200,000 employees.

What has been growing rapidly is the unelected power centers of the media and the lobbies. Writer Kevin Philips estimates that the armies of professionals working to influence government policy is far larger than ever and now numbers 60,000 lawyers, 90,000 lobbyists, hundreds of trade associations, labor unions, citizens groups—all pushing their special agendas.

The media, too, is exploding. In the 1930s, the entire White House press corps could fit around the desk of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Today, there are 1,800 reporters, photographers, television producers and other media personnel who are accredited to the White House. In all, 12,000 journalists work in the nation’s capital.

The Media: Its explosive growth has left the mainstream media—the national television networks and the major newspapers—vulnerable to new competition from cable television, talk radio, supermarket tabloids and infotainment shows like “Hard Copy” or “Inside Edition,” which play up entertainment and scandal over factual political news and issue coverage.

The daily challenge is to choose what news to report and how to treat it. Television finds it far easier to cover personalities, scandals and snafus than to explain the complexities of policy, economics, or the inner workings of Congress. Graphic pictures or extremist accusations dominate the newscasts. Sensationalism pushes aside news about the substance of government.

In the relentless race for audience ratings and readership, the mainstream media stands charged with lowering its news standards, with blurring the line between fact and opinion. In this program, news anchors Dan Rather of CBS News and Peter Jennings of ABC News acknowledge their uneasiness at recent episodes and trends, such as the supermarket tabloid allegations against presidential candidate Bill Clinton in 1992. The networks, Dan Rather says, are “right at the brink of being totally overwhelmed and consumed by entertainment values as opposed to news values.”

Conflict is another favorite theme of the press. The conflict between the White House press corps and the presidency epitomizes today’s combative style of journalism and the distrust that has developed between the media and the government since the Vietnam War in the 1960s and the Watergate break-in during the 1972 presidential campaign and the subsequent coverup by President Nixon.

Today, reporters make their careers by exposing official wrongdoing. That has led to a culture of “gotcha” journalism. Exposes and conflicts are more enticing stories to report than the necessary but less dramatic give-and-take of political compromise.

With apathy rampant among American voters, critics blame the press for feeding public cynicism.
about government. People say that the media, by its increasingly negative tone, by turning tabloid, and by treating government as a world of underhanded deals and power plays, has distorted the public agenda and provoked public mistrust—both toward politicians and toward journalists.

**The Lobbies:** Citizen participation is the essence of democracy. Going to Washington to see your member of Congress is putting the First Amendment into action. It is exercising the constitutional rights of free expression and free assembly. It is petitioning the government—to protect the environment, preserve favorite programs, or rescue the public from higher taxes. Our democracy cannot function without the citizen effort to influence policy debates, what is called lobbying.

But today, lobbying has become a highly sophisticated industry. It is not just folks coming from California, Texas or Pennsylvania to see their senators. It is the professional influence peddlers—lawyers, lobbyists, ad men, telemarketers, public relations firms and grass roots organizers—who often overpower and push aside ordinary citizens.

Great power and influence are exercised by the PACs—Political Action Committees, or the financial arms of special interest groups that put up much of the money for our political campaigns. In fact, lobbying and funding campaigns have become the Siamese twins of American politics, because professional lobbyists have learned that one of the best ways to gain access to politicians is to provide the money that helps them get elected. After the election, the PAC lobbyists have a better chance than most ordinary people to sit down with members of Congress to push their pet legislation. The feeling that Washington is dominated by this “inside money game” has fueled public disillusionment with government and has left many ordinary citizens feeling that they cannot compete with special interests.

The newest wrinkle in lobbying is “the outside game.” This means going over the head of Congress to the country at large with an issue, the way a president does from what President Theodore Roosevelt called “the bully pulpit” of the White House, and then mobilizing public opinion to switch votes in Congress.

In one instance, the insurance industry fought against President Clinton’s proposed reform of the American health care system with a series of television advertisements targeted at the home districts of important members of Congress. These were the “Harry and Louise” ads, showing a man and his wife criticizing the President’s program at their kitchen table.

Another tactic is to spend millions on hiring telemarketers to phone hundreds, even thousands of people. When the people agree with the position of the lobbyist, the telemarketers put their phone calls through to members of Congress to influence their vote. Advocates of this practice defend it as democracy in action. Critics say this is not grass roots opinion but “Astroturf,” artificially generated opinion. They contend this method distorts democracy because it exaggerates public support of lobbyists’ causes and because it favors people and organizations rich enough to pay for this high-priced lobbying.

---

**The Unelected: Lobbies and the Media** contains the following segments:

**The Media:**
- CBS in “the competitive pit.”
- Tabloids turn the mainstream media.
- Newt Gingrich’s rise and fall in the media.
- The rush to judgment—instant analysis.
- The people vs. the media: issues vs. inside baseball.
- CBS: Getting back in touch.

**The Lobbies:**
- The money game: bucks and beliefs.
- Tom DeLay and U.P.S. vs. OSHA.
- Stealing the bully pulpit: Harry and Louise.
- The First Amendment in action.
- Tobacco and the money game.
- Smokescreen lobbying.
- “Astroturf”—artificial grassroots.
Suggested Activities for 
*The Unelected: Lobbies and the Media*

1. Discuss with the class:
   - Do the actions of political parties differ from what interest groups do?
   - Would stronger political parties decrease the need for interest groups (lobbyists)?
   - Why would a Democrat want to “convert” to a Republican?
   - How do government agencies act as interest groups? Why would they need to?

2. Use the following questions for class or group discussions or ask students to research and present papers on the topic.
   - What do you believe is the relationship between active government involvement and interest group formation? Why?
   - Find data to support or repudiate your suppositions. Create a graph to demonstrate your findings.
   - Identify the interest groups as either membership (supported by contributions of individuals) or institutional (supported by business, labor, institutions, foundations, etc.).
   - Is there a numerical or chronological difference between institutional and membership interest group formation? Can you tie any group formations to specific historical, legislative or executive activities?

3. To initiate classroom discussion: What social trends and changes in contemporary America have the potential to stimulate interest group formation?

4. How can interest groups help facilitate the legislative process? The class can consider this question in general or with specific reference to the graphic How a Bill Becomes Law (below).

5. Ask students to graphically depict the symbiotic relationship between interest groups and Congress discussed by Tony Motley in *The People and the Power Game*.

6. Brainstorm a list of tactics interest groups can use to influence Congress.
   - Which would be most/least effective? Why?
   - What, if any, restrictions would you place on interest groups? Why?

---

**How a Bill Becomes Law**

*(With obstacles to passage in red)*

- **Bill is introduced in one chamber** *(House or Senate)*
  - Presiding officer may assign bill to a favorable or unfavorable committee.

- **Committee Hearings**
  - Public hearings held and amendments made.
  - Committee chair can delay or speed up the process.
  - Bill can be pigeonholed (killed) or reported out to the floor.

- **Floor Action**
  - Party leaders seek to influence vote on party lines.
  - Presiding officer controls bill’s progress.

  - If passed, sent to other chamber.

- **Other Chamber**
  - Committee hearings and floor action repeated.

  - If passed with amendments.

  - If no changes made.

  - If original chamber concurs with changes.

- **Bill goes to President**
  - President can veto entire bill or can veto line items.

- **Returned to original chamber**
  - Party ideology can vary in each chamber and can reduce chances for compromise.

---
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• Research to see if any of your ideas have been enacted. Any proposed in the recent past? What happened to them in Congress?

7. Begin a class discussion. It has been suggested the media is most effective in affecting how politics are conducted.
• Do you agree or disagree? Explain. Cite examples to support your position from the programs and from current events.

8. Have students, working in pairs, choose different topics currently in the media.
• Have each pair check television, radio, newspaper, periodical and, if available, online services’ reports on the topic.
• Compare the reports’ language, slant, place in the overall news and amount of coverage.
• What generalizations can be drawn from the information?
• Let each pair report its findings to the class. Do any overall patterns emerge? What conclusions can the class infer from this exercise?
• If there is enough data, have the class rate the various media sources as to bias in reporting or political leanings.

9. Begin with a discussion on the following. Programming choices made by the electronic media unduly influence the public agenda. Agree or disagree? Explain your position.
• Have the class ask this question of others in the school, home and community.
• Chart the results by age, sex and race.
• What trends, if any, can be discerned from the answers?

10. Review with the class the basic provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974 (see page 16). How has this law impacted on the power of political parties?

11. Paper topic: Based on the discussion in The People and the Power Game, why is “towing the party line” not as powerful a mandate now as in earlier sessions of Congress?

12. Divide the class into groups. Ask each group to research a Political Action Committee (PAC).
• Which members of Congress received funds from the PAC?
• Did students find any pattern of legislative voting that correlated with the PAC’s cause?
• How much influence do they think a PAC has over a member of Congress?
• How can creating a PAC be beneficial to small businesses and associations?

13. For class discussion or papers: Forum participants proposed various methods for funding elections. With which proposals do you agree? Why? Have students expand on those proposals to improve them or devise their own.

14. Ellen Miller of the Center for Responsive Politics gave some interesting statistics: $724 million was given in the 1994 election and it is estimated that $1.5 billion will be spent on the 1996 election. Find statistics on giving and spending from earlier elections. How do these compare? What are the percents of increase (or decrease)? To gain some point of reference, use budget figures from your school, town, state or another area to compare with the $724 million and $1.5 billion figures. Create a graph to show these comparisons.

15. Ms. Miller cites additional interesting figures: Less than 1/10 of 1 percent of the population gives $200 or more to a candidate; business interests give seven times more than labor; and energy interests outspend environmental concerns by 10 to 1. A forum member responded with the question, “How can you get democracy to work in that context?” Answer Ms. Garriga’s question. What would you propose to change these statistics?

16. Senator Bradley said the Supreme Court ruled [Buckley v. Valeo (1976)] that a wealthy man’s pocketbook (money) can obtain public exposure for him in the same manner public exposure can be obtained freely by a poor man on a “soapbox.” Do you agree?


18. Take a class poll and then a larger one in your school and community. Ask participants to name the Three Stooges and three Supreme Court justices. How do your respondents stack up? Do Americans have responsibilities as well as rights? Make a list of some of those responsibilities.

19. What is civic journalism? Could the practice of civic journalism attack public cynicism? What other tactics might reduce cynicism?

20. Hedrick Smith said, “American democracy will not work better unless all of us get engaged and try to make it work better ourselves.” Ask students what they can do, at this point in their lives, to begin to make American democracy work better.
Extended Activities

1. Gathering data on an issue:
   • Have student groups choose an issue, brainstorm interview questions and conduct interviews with at least 10 people. The people interviewed should represent a cross section—of age, race, sex, occupations and political parties.
   • Have each group gather data and create a statistical representation (in graph or chart form).
   • Each group uses the class’ information to draw conclusions or formulate a hypothesis.
   • Each group presents its data and conclusions to the entire class.

2. Timeline for each segment of The People and the Power Game: To help students understand the order of events and to see the timespan involved in the legislative process, have them create a detailed timeline.

3. Class discussion topics:
   • What kinds of power do you have available for action in the political arena?
   • What kinds of power would you like to see citizens acquire?
   • What do you want from government?
   • What is government capable of delivering?

4. Research: Identify the major leadership positions in the House and Senate.

5. Activity: Have students rank the values below in order of importance to them. Have them compare answers with others in the class.
   ___ Individual freedom
   ___ Property ownership
   ___ Law and order
   ___ Freedom of religion
   ___ Freedom of speech
   ___ Freedom of the press
   ___ Equal opportunity
   ___ Financial security
   ___ Personal security
   ___ Love of country
   ___ Rooting for the underdog
   ___ Tolerance
   ___ Justice
   ___ Majority rule
   ___ Protection of minority rights

After students have gone through the exercise, ask them as a class to rank the values as they believe the majority of Americans would rank them. Have them compare their rankings with those of their parents or other classes in their school.

The People in the Programs

(Identified by their status as of May 1996)

The Elected: The Presidency and Congress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White House Officials</th>
<th>House and Senate Democratic Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leon Panetta</td>
<td>Richard Gephardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White House Chief of Staff,</td>
<td>Congressman, Missouri 3rd District,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Administration</td>
<td>Minority Leader, <a href="mailto:gephardt@hr.house.gov">gephardt@hr.house.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Stephanopoulos</td>
<td>David Bonior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior White House Advisor,</td>
<td>Congressman, Michigan, 10th District,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Administration</td>
<td>Minority Whip, <a href="mailto:tom_daschle@daschle.senate.gov">tom_daschle@daschle.senate.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Dee Myers</td>
<td>Thomas A. Daschle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former White House Press Secretary,</td>
<td>Senator, South Dakota, Minority Leader,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Administration</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tom_daschle@daschle.senate.gov">tom_daschle@daschle.senate.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Gergen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former White House Counselor,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Administration and Republican Presidents Nixon, Ford and Reagan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Paster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former White House Congressional Liaison, Clinton Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| House Democrats/Party Loyalists     |                                        |
| George Miller                      |                                        |
| Congressman, California 7th District, gmiller@hr.house.gov |                                        |
| David Obey                         |                                        |
| Congressman, Wisconsin, 7th District |                                        |
House Republican Members

HENRY HYDE
Congressman, Illinois 6th District, Chairman, Judiciary Committee

BOB LIVINGSTON
Congressman, Louisiana 1st District, Chairman Appropriations Committee

PAT ROBERTS
Congressman, Kansas 1st District, Chairman, Agriculture Committee, emailpat@hr.house.gov

GERALD SOLOMON
Congressman, New York 22nd District, Chairman, Rules Committee

MARGE ROUKEMA
Congresswoman, New Jersey 5th District

VIN WEBER
Former Congressman, Minnesota

Senate Republicans

ROBERT DOLE
Senator, Kansas, Majority Leader

WILLIAM COHEN
Senator, Maine, billcohen@cohen.senate.gov

MARK HATFIELD
Senator, Oregon, Chairman Appropriations Committee

ARLEN SPECTER
Senator, Pennsylvania, senator_specter@specter.senate.gov

RICK SANTORUM
Senator, Pennsylvania, senator@santorum.senate.gov

Democrats/Party Rebels: Blue Dogs and Lone Rangers

MIKE PARKER
Congressman, Democrat who switched to Republican, Mississippi 4th District

CHARLES STENHOLM
Congressman, Texas 17th District

GARY CONDIT
Congressman, California 18th District

DAVID BOREN
Former Senator, Oklahoma

JIM COOPER
Former Congressman, Tennessee, introduced Cooper Health Care Plan

House Republican Leadership

NEWT GINGRICH
Congressman, Georgia, 6th District, Speaker of the House, georgia6@hr.house.gov

JOHN BOEHNER
Congressman, Ohio 8th District, Republican Conference Chairman

House Republican Freshmen

DAVID McINTOSH
Congressman, Indiana 2nd District, mcintosh@hr.house.gov

MARK NEUMANN
Congressman, Wisconsin 1st District, mneumann@hr.house.gov

MARK SOUDER
Congressman, Indiana 4th District

Broadcast Media

DAN RATHER
Anchor, Managing Editor, CBS Evening News

ANDREW HEYWARD
President, CBS News

JEFF FAGER
Executive Producer, CBS Evening News

ERIC ENGBERG
Correspondent, CBS News

JERRY NACHMAN
Vice President, News, WCBS-TV, CBS Affiliate in New York City

PETER JENNINGS
Anchor, ABC World News Tonight

JEFF GREENFIELD
Correspondent, ABC News

BRIT HUME
White House Correspondent, ABC News

GAIL BENDING
WJZ News Director, Baltimore

Print Media

PAUL STAROBIN
Reporter, National Journal

DAN MORAIN
Reporter, Los Angeles Times

The Unelected: Lobbies and the Media

PAUL TAYLOR
Former Reporter, Washington Post

JEFFERY BIRNBAUM
Time Magazine Correspondent

Media Commentators

MANDY GRUNWALD
Former Clinton Media Advisor

THOMAS PATTERSON
Professor, Syracuse University

TOM ROSENSTIEL
Media critic, Newsweek

MARVIN KALB
Media Analyst

Lobbyists and Industry Spokespeople

ROBERT RUSBULDT
Vice President, Federal Affairs for Independent Insurance Agents of America

JOHN MOTLEY
Lobbyist, National Retail Federation

NEYSA SOMPLe
Lobbyist, Ohio, anti-smoking interest group

JANET STUDER
Lobbyist, Ohio, anti-smoking interest group
Michael Pertschuk  Co-director, Advocacy Institute, an organization supporting other non-profits’ advocacy efforts
Lisa Frenicks  Lobbyist, Ohio, anti-smoking interest group
David Rehr  Lobbyist, National Beer Wholesalers Assn.
Bruce Gates  Lobbyist, Wholesale Grocers Assn.
Willis Gradson  Health Insurance Assn. President
Jack Bonner  President, Bonner and Associates
Mike Malik  President, Triad Communications
Ben Goddard  Media consultant to lobbyists, responsible for the “Harry and Louise” advertising campaign
Charles Blixt  Senior Vice President, R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company
Laurie Baulig  American Trucking Assn.

Congresspeople
Tom DeLay  Congressman, Republican, Texas 22nd District, Majority Whip
Henry Waxman  Congressman, Democrat, California 29th District

Linda Smith  Congresswoman, Republican, Washington 3rd District, asklinda@hr.house.gov
John Boehner  Congressman, Ohio 8th District, Republican Conference
Steve Largent  Congressman, Republican, Oklahoma 1st District

Executive Branch Officials
Joseph Dear  Assistant Secretary, Occupational Safety & Health Administration
Mike McCurry  White House Press Secretary, Clinton Administration
George Stephanopoulos  Senior White House Advisor, Clinton Administration

Commentators
Ellen Miller  Executive Director, Center for Responsive Politics
Charles Lewis  Executive Director, Center for Public Integrity, a nonprofit watchdog organization
Kevin Phillips  Author, political analyst

Government Officials and Former Officials
Senator Bill Bradley  Democrat of New Jersey, senator@bradley.senate.gov
Senator William Cohen  Republican of Maine, billcohen@cohen.senate.gov
Lloyd Cutler  Former White House Counsel to Presidents Carter and Clinton
Rep. William Orton  Democrat of Utah, ortonut2@hr.house.gov
Rep. Christopher Shays  Republican of Connecticut, cshays@hr.house.gov

Academic Specialists
Professor Kathleen Hall Jamieson  Dean, Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania
Professor Barbara Sinclair  University of California at Riverside, sinclair@wizard.ucr.edu

Media and Media Reformers
Chris Bury  ABC News Nightline
Ed Fouhy  Director, Pew Center for Civic Journalism
Kenneth T. Walsh  White House correspondent, U.S. News & World Report

Lobbyists and Specialists on Campaign Finance
Aaron Belk  Executive Asst. to President of Teamsters Union
Ellen Miller  Director, Center for Responsive Politics
David Rehr  Vice President, National Beer Wholesalers Assn.

ABC News Nightline’s Chris Bury (first row left) with citizen participants in the Voters’ Forum.
**Blue Dogs:** A yellow dog Democrat was someone who would vote for a Democrat even if it were a yellow dog. The Blue Dogs were born when prominent Louisiana artist George Rodrique, famous for his blue paintings of his dog Tiffany, created a painting for his friend, Democrat-now-turned-Republican Jimmy Hayes (R, LA). Hayes was denounced for voting against the Democratic inspired budget. Rodrique painted an oil which he titled *The Washington Blue Dog,* with a caption that read, “Jimmy Hayes, the Blue Dog Democrat.” Hayes had blue dog pins made for other conservative Democrats. The *Wall Street Journal* picked up on the pins and the designation stuck.

**Bully Pulpit:** President Teddy Roosevelt said the presidency was a bully pulpit, describing it as an excellent medium for the communication of ideas.

**California Proposition 188**  
**Statewide Smoking/Tobacco Regulation**
- Repeal and preempt local smoking and tobacco regulations.
- Repeal and replace existing statewide smoking and tobacco regulations.
- Permit amendment of tobacco regulations by two-thirds vote of Legislature.
- Ban public smoking with significant exceptions.
- Permit smoking sections in restaurants and employee cafeterias with conditions.
- Bars not regulated.
- Permit smoking in private offices and business conference rooms with occupants’ consent.
- Exempt from smoking regulations gaming clubs, bingo establishments, racetracks, sports facility private boxes and smoking lounges.
- Regulate location of tobacco vending machines and billboards.
- Increase penalties for tobacco purchases by minors.

**Democratic Leadership Council:** The DLC is an organization of centrist and conservative Democrats formed in 1985. The founders, mostly Southern Democrats, wanted to counter the policies of the more liberal wing of the Democratic party and Republican presidential victories. A primary goal of the DLC was to reclaim the center of the political spectrum, thereby making Democratic presidential candidates more viable contenders. David Boren, Jim Cooper and many political *Blue Dogs* have been members. Bill Clinton is a former chairman.

**Demo-sclerosis:** Term coined to describe the sluggish behavior of politics in democracy. The term is a play on arterial-sclerosis or hardening of the arteries, as Hedrick Smith noted.

**Freedom to Farm Act of 1995:** Among other provisions, this bill established annual and aggregate limits on commodity credits for farm and export expenditures through the crop year 2002 and created the Commission on 21st Century Production Agriculture to assess the current and future condition of U.S. agriculture, including the appropriate agricultural role of the government. President Clinton signed this bill into law in April 1996.

**Health Security Act:** This plan from the Clinton administration to achieve universal health insurance coverage through improved access to standardized and affordable health plans failed to pass Congress.

**Managed Competition Act of 1993:** The general objective of this bill, also known as the Cooper Health Care Plan, was to reform the health care marketplace to provide universal access to care through competitive health plans. Another specific objective of this bill was to lower the rate of increase in health care costs by the year 2000 to equal the rate of increase in costs in the economy as a whole. This bill failed to pass.
Governing by a few.

Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993: Clinton’s 1993 economic plan, which passed by one vote in the Senate and was signed into law in August 1993. Three key elements of the act were an economic stimulus to create jobs; long-term public investments to increase productivity; and a deficit-reduction plan. The plan’s goal was to reduce the deficit by close to $500 billion over five years. The blueprint involved spending cuts, particularly in the areas of defense and Medicare, and tax increases.

Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996: Signed in April 1996, this act finished financing scores of federal agencies for the remainder of the 1996 fiscal year, ending a 16-month impasse. The budget was cut by $20 billion from 1995 levels, but the reductions came strictly from annually approved domestic programs and not from the Medicare and Medicaid programs originally targeted.

Seven-Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995: Passed by Congress in November 1995 and vetoed by President Clinton, this package aimed to balance the federal budget by the year 2002—by cutting $245 billion in taxes over seven years; reducing spending on Medicare, welfare and Medicaid benefits; reducing subsidies to farmers; and cutting back or eliminating hundreds of federal programs.

Symbiotic relationship: Two or more entities existing in a close, usually beneficial relationship.

**1974 Federal Election Campaign Act—CONTRIBUTION LIMITS**

Candidates for Congress can spend as much money as they can raise, whether from their own pockets or from those of contributors. No spending limits apply. Contributors to federal campaigns, on the other hand, do face limits in what they can give to a federal candidate or a national political party.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gifts</th>
<th>To any candidate or Candidate Committee</th>
<th>To any National Party Committee Political</th>
<th>To any PAC or Other Committee</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td>Per Election</td>
<td>Per Calendar Year</td>
<td>Per Calendar Year</td>
<td>Per Calendar Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-candidate Committee</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Political Committee</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Federal Election Commission

The Supreme Court ruled, in *Federal Election Comm’n v. National Conservatives PAC* (1985), that PACs can spend unlimited amounts on behalf of a candidate or an issue. Also, contributions channeled to a state party committee or state-registered PAC are not regulated by federal law.
These 10 bills were the legislative centerpiece of political actions and legislation proposed by Republican candidates running for Congress in 1994. Items followed by an asterisk (*) had been signed into law as of May 1996.

1. **Fiscal Responsibility Act**
   - Amend the Constitution to require a balanced budget
   - Give president a line item veto*

2. **Taking Back Our Streets Act**
   - Require restitution to victims
   - Increase grants for prison construction
   - Speed deportation of criminal aliens
   - Create community, anti-crime block grants
   - Limit death row appeals

3. **Personal Responsibility Act**
   - Create state welfare block grants
   - End automatic welfare eligibility
   - Cap welfare spending
   - Establish lifetime, five-year benefits cap
   - Require work after two years of benefits

4. **Family Reinforcement Act**
   - Require parental consent to survey children
   - Provide tax credits for adoption and elderly home care
   - Increase penalties for sex crimes against children
   - Strengthen child support order enforcement

5. **American Dream Restoration Act**
   - Institute a $500 per child tax credit
   - Ease jointly-filed tax return *marriage penalty*
   - Expand IRA savings account plans

6. **National Security Restoration Act**
   - Prohibit US troops in UN missions under foreign command
   - Prohibit defense cuts to finance social programs
   - Develop a missile defense system
   - Cut funding for UN peacekeeping missions

7. **Senior Citizens’ Equity Act**
   - Repeal 1993 increase in taxable Social Security benefits
   - Permit $30,000 of earned income without loss of Social Security benefits
   - Provide a tax credit for long-term care insurance purchase

8. **Job Creation and Wage Enhancement Act**
   - Cut capital gains tax rate and accelerate depreciation
   - Reduce unfunded mandates*
   - Reduce paperwork*
   - Require federal agencies to assess risks, use cost-benefit analysis, reduce paperwork and reimburse property owners for value loss due to regulations

9. **Common Sense Legal Reforms Act**
   - Enact national product liability law with punitive damage limits
   - Make investor lawsuits more difficult
   - Apply *loser pays* rule to certain federal cases

10. **Citizen Legislature Act**
    - Congressional term limit amendment

Congressman Christopher Shays (R, CT, center front) at Voters’ Forum.
Separation of Powers and Checks and Balances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Branch</th>
<th>Legislative Branch</th>
<th>Judicial Branch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>President</strong></td>
<td><strong>Congress</strong></td>
<td><strong>Courts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Powers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Powers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Powers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enforce, propose and veto laws</td>
<td>• Make laws</td>
<td>• Judicial review of laws and executive actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare U.S. budget</td>
<td>• Can override a veto</td>
<td>• Interpret treaties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct foreign policy and make treaties</td>
<td>• Control appropriations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Command armed forces</td>
<td>• Approve treaties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appoint federal judges, Cabinet members, ambassadors and other federal officials</td>
<td>• Declare war</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May grant pardons and reprieves</td>
<td>• Raise and support armed forces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impeach and judge federal officials</td>
<td>• Approve appointments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Checks</strong></th>
<th><strong>Checks</strong></th>
<th><strong>Checks</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Judicial</strong></td>
<td><strong>Executive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Veto laws</td>
<td>• Appoint judges</td>
<td>• Override veto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Call special sessions</td>
<td>• Grant pardons and reprieves</td>
<td>• Impeach federal officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Control money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Confirm treaties and appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive</strong></td>
<td><strong>Judicial</strong></td>
<td><strong>Executive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Legislative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impeach judges</td>
<td>• Interpret laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approve appointments</td>
<td>• Decide constitutionality of laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Propose amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish lower courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Change size of court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hedrick Smith leads Voters’ Forum discussion.*
1. The constitutional disbursement of power offers numerous opportunities for citizens to get involved in the political system.

- Form groups to influence politics and strengthen political parties.
- Volunteer in a political campaign.

2. We will have more effective legislators when we become more effective citizens. Become a more effective citizen by keeping informed on local issues and investigating records of officeholders. Records of Congressional votes can be obtained from many sources. On the Internet, try:

Rate Your Rep - [http://voter96.cqalert.com/cq_rate.htm](http://voter96.cqalert.com/cq_rate.htm)
Vote Watch - [http://pathfinder.com/cq](http://pathfinder.com/cq)
Project Vote Smart - [http://www.oclc.org/VoteSmart/lwv/lwvsmrt1.htm](http://www.oclc.org/VoteSmart/lwv/lwvsmrt1.htm)
also reached by phone at (800) 622-7627.

3. Call and leave messages for members of Congress concerning pending legislation or Congressional action. The number is (202) 224-3121.

4. Promote a voter registration campaign.

5. Join an interest group.


7. Involve yourself in election reform. Contact:

   **League of Women Voters of the United States**
   1730 M Street, NW
   Suite 1000
   Washington, DC 20036
   (202) 429-1965

   **Center for Responsive Politics**
   1320 19th Street, NW
   Suite M-1
   Washington, DC 20036
   (202) 857-0044

   **Honest Ballot Assn.**
   272-30 Grand Central Parkway
   Floral Park, NY 11005
   (516) 466-4100

8. Broaden your horizons, test your opinions: Read periodicals from various political persuasions.

9. Suggest policies public officials could adopt to increase the notion of political effectiveness.

10. What’s in it for me? Identify elements of political participation that can help one achieve personal goals: i.e., safety from crime and hazardous products, economic security, a clean environment, healthy economy, good education.

11. Outline actions to increase your civic participation and reach your personal goals.

12. Keep up with and stay informed about issues. The House Document Room distributes House bills, resolutions, reports, documents and public laws for the 104th Congress. House reports, documents, and public laws for the 103rd Congress are also maintained. To order copies, call the Document Room at (202) 225-3456, Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Include your telephone number and mailing address.

To write for copies, the address is:

- House Document Room, Rm. B18
- Ford House Office Building
- Washington, DC 20515

The e-mail address is:

- [hdocs@hr.house.gov](mailto:hdocs@hr.house.gov)

Send an e-mail to

- [househelp@hr.house.gov](mailto:househelp@hr.house.gov) for help in getting electronic information.

13. Let the parties that run Congress know your feelings or ask them a question.

   **Democratic Policy Committee**
   (automated server):
   [info@dpc.senate.gov](mailto:info@dpc.senate.gov)
   (Subject = “Help”)

   **postmaster@dpc.senate.gov**
   comments and questions

   **Republican Policy Committee**
   [webmaster@rpc.senate.gov](mailto:webmaster@rpc.senate.gov)

Suggested Readings


Senator William Cohen (R, ME, center front) with Voters’ Forum participants.
Sources on the Internet

Thomas (legislative information):  http://thomas.loc.gov
White House:  http://www.whitehouse.gov
Publications from the White House:  http://www1.ai.mit.edu/publications.html
U.S. Senate:  http://www.senate.gov
The Jefferson Project:  http://www.voxpop.org/jefferson
Project Vote Smart:  http://www.oclc.org/VoteSmart

The People and the Power Game http://www.pbs.org/powergame

To purchase copies of The People and the Power Game videocassettes, contact:

PBS Video Sales
(800) 328-PBS1 or
PBS Video
1320 Braddock Place
Alexandria, VA 22314