

1. Introduction

Lobbying in the modern sense can be defined in different ways, from lobbying as a communication between people or as techniques of public persuasion to the art of advocacy persuasion, and a series of actions intended to influence the decision makers. According to Webster's dictionary, lobbying is addressing to the members of parliament in an attempt to influence legislation. According to the lawyer T. Lefeburu, lobbying is not just to influence but primarily to analyze and understand the problem, to those who decide to explain the essence and effect.

2. Reasons for lobbying activities and interest groups

Interest groups, that is, a group of economic actors in a particular sector or with a common economic purpose have a strong incentive to lobby governments to implement specific inefficient policies that would have used them at the expense of the general public.

The largest number of voters will be in completely unaware of the situation due to the phenomenon of rational ignorance, and that is that the voters do not care for a number of small impacts on their income and life rather than focusing on areas where they gain or lose significant amounts. The attempts of the interest groups lobbying may be in different forms. The most obvious form definitely is corruption, where the representatives of interest groups directly bribed government officials or parliamentarians.

More hidden and benign forms are the following:

- Interest groups donate money to campaigns of political parties or individual candidates
- Government officials and parliamentarians find perspectives for a career in the private sector associations after they leave their job. From my own experience, the former officials are familiar with the policy process and are associated with networks of relevant information sources.
- Parliamentarians who make laws and governmental bodies which have regulatory and supervisory functions have a lack of information which can be provided by the interest groups and those are the data on the impact of proposed policy changes in the certain sectors of the economy.

Interest groups can provide these information in a strategic way which has affect on the result of the policy process, especially when the laws and regulations that deal with the complex and rapidly evolving technical issues (eg, approval of genetically modified organisms). Government officials and lawmakers tend to carefully listen the arguments of interest groups in those areas where they meet with the risk of being exposed to the absence of the complete information, or even to ignoring the issues.

Media coverage of the topic has a key role

There are many ways of lobbying, but in order to achieve the right effect it is necessary to bear in mind the basic principles of lobbying and the facts which should have been known before we embark on this venture, and only after that the different techniques and methods of lobbying can be applied.

The analysis, which need to be implemented, and that the antecedent of any lobbying activities can be divided into three key elements: fact-finding, legal procedures and impact analysis. But above all you have to clearly define who is to question (case-challenge) about whom you want to lobby. It is very important that the question is a real issue.

The word "issue" is of English origin and is difficult to find an adequate translation into our language. It is defined in various ways, mainly in relation to the area in which it is applied. In the context of project management, issue is the result of events occurring during the project and can have a positive or negative impact on the project, and it is necessary to analyze and properly respond to it. It may also mean the issue or subject matter about which consist a common concern of interested parties.

Perhaps it is best to say that issue is a question of general interest and of relevance to a particular community and that its solution delivers higher quality of functioning in the environment. For this aspect it should be well considered whether the issue that is important for you, is important for others and what is resolved by its actualization. Professor Larry Smith of the Harvard University JFK School of Government in his case, "Working with Congress" considers that the actualization of the issues that eventually becomes important for the society has become mystified in modern democratic systems because of the multitude of interests.

When we define what are the issues for which we fight, then we should find answers to many questions that are implementation of the antecedent of lobbying, but one should always bear in mind that each situation requires a special strategy.

If you want to establish the facts well, in regard to the position you are in, as the question that you want to lobby, you must have in mind some of the following questions:

What is your current position when it comes to the thing about which you should make the decision?

What is the current legal (procedural) position of subjects of lobbying? Where, in such factual findings, are those who are to make your lobby group, as well as those who are to make decision? Who is interested to gather around such a challenge? It should be noted that the question, which is important for you, will gather only those organizations, associations, individuals, and even part of the state if the matter concerns their interests or issues that are important to achieve common goals. The one who is lobbying in the process of an effective lobbying determines in which way will someone transmit a joint positions. Each will carry only those positions that fit into the system of values that are consistent with their interests. Professor Roger B. Potter lecturer at JFK Harvard University in Boston considers that good articulation and analysis of its packaging and selling is the essence of success in obtaining the necessary support.

It is important to establish the facts which will support the thing about which the lobbying is about and about which

you intend to gather a lobby group. The facts includes the justification for each member of lobby groups, as well as decision makers. The key question is why would someone excoigitate the solution and represent your interests if there are no good arguments for it.

Establishing legal procedures: laws, rules, procedures and key decision factors, should be thoroughly studied. Who makes the decision? What is the process of making decisions? In which way you can formally affect the approval of your proposal ?

Influences:

- Apart from the facts, it should well examine people who have the power of making decisions which is concerning your case lobbying, as well as the individuals and organizations that can influence decision makers.

- Subsequently, a plan should be made on how you can gain the decision-makers and how Individuals or organizations may become part of that lobby group which can influence decision makers. You should always bear in your mind that you, usually, can not lobby their way to a certain thing by yourself, especially if it does not fit in the positions of other individuals or organizations for the sake of achieving their individual interests.

- It should be analyzed who is for and who is against the decision that should be taken, if such a proposal is to be accepted. Duly analyze each argument of the opposing side, because that group has its own interests, and perhaps also trying to influence individuals or organizations to make a decision but the opposite or different from yours.

- It should, always, be analyzed what benefits that person, or the organization which is making the decisions will gather, as far as it accepts your proposal, and how it can positively use it for its progress.

In the Congress, for example, you can see who is lobbying for who when a new commandment is to be taken. So it was when, for example, a new law on games of chance was brought. This country is, regrettably, still under the pressure of certain financial groups and strongman.

Former rulers in Belgrade, convinced in the "moral superiority" of its policy, had never thought that lobbying is something that could benefit the country. Even in the later years of the former Yugoslavia in Washington, some national lobbies had started to sprout, first of all Croatian, Slovenian and Albanian sponsored by the founds of some emigrant circles. Albanian interests were represented mostly by the Congressman DioGuardi, but the major support was granted by the Republican Senator Robert Dole, for whom, today in Washington, there are rumors that it could be (or already is) the main lobbyists in charge for the project "an independent Montenegro" .

Actual Serbian lobby in the United States almost never had existed. At one point, before the collapse of Yugoslavia it had seemed that the work of organizing the Serbian lobby would be taken over by Helen Delic-Bentley, but she, quickly, abandoned it. Obrad Kesic points out that Milosevic and his regime completely underestimated the importance of the existence of an effective lobby in Washington. "Milan Panic once had found a company with public relations, but Milosevic simply refused to pay for it. Instead of a serious PR companies he chose to use the

"spokespersons" like Radmila Milentijevic. Also, as advised by Milan Milutinovic, he tied for the American of Greek origin Spirua Chris who was an official of the Democratic Party in the State of New Hampshire. He was not treated seriously in the Clinton administration, and tens of thousands of dollars spent in vain. "

That the money for lobbying could have been found (albeit in a way doubt), the recent news, about the state coffers of the federal ministry of foreign affairs, confirms it. Through the trot for half a year, all in a bag and hands, about 1.2 million DM was passed. The regulations otherwise say that the foreign currencies should be kept in the National Bank of Yugoslavia.

Most of the money was provided by Mihail Kertes over "his" resources, a part of this money was spent on the expenses of guests at the congress of the SPS, and then for the activities of Serbian Information Centre in London, for various flights, residence of the delegation of Alliance National Liberation War Veterans Association (SUBNOR-a) in Norway and for the arrival of the Chinese donors painters during the bombing.

How much foreign currencies were consumed during the war in former Yugoslavia for the stay of foreigners who have failed in their political, scientific and artistic careers bartered for support of Milosevic's regime, probably it will never be find out. Divers fighters "for the Serbian cause "from Siberia, Armenia, France and even from England and America, had paid, at the time, mostly, a one way ticket. When once appropriated of Belgrade, everything for them would become worthless, and they had, usually, lived in luxury hotels and were better welcomed than all of the important local politicians, with Milosevic at the head. They had promised to hosts the spreading of truth about Serbia, penetrating the international information blockade and bringing thousands of volunteers ready, immediately to take up positions on the frontline.

The documents registered in the Ministry of Justice and the U.S. shows that, at the same time, the other party in that war, was paying specialized teams do the work which for the Serbian side a various vagabond, tramp philosophers, or a retired Russian Generalas were working to. Persons with no significance in the countries from which they came. The Croatian government was paying each month to the Washington*s firm for public relations the "Ruder Finn Global Public Affairs" \$ 10 000 (plus all expenses) in order to give a "favorable image of Croatia" to the members of Congress, administration officials and media broadcast . The Bosnian government was paying to the same company for services which were including the placement of reviews, columns and associates letters to the editors.

Ruder and Finn on the behalf of the government in Sarajevo, from June to December in 1992. , had organized more than 30 interviews with the biggest news organizations in the U.S., sent 13 press releases, 17 unofficial letters, arranged meetings of Bosnian officials with Al Gore, Secretary of State Lawrence Iglbergom and tens of influential senators, including, at the time, the leader of the Senate majority George Michael and the leader of minority Bob Dole. The same company conducted 48 interviews with members of the House of

Representatives, 20 interviews with members of the Senate and more than 80 telephone calls to newspaper columnist, TV presenter and other journalists.

What were the effects of such work can be seen from the certain Steve Watt example, a voluntary worker at a humanitarian organization in Bosnia. Steve Watt said in a British radio station that Serbian snipers get 1000 marks for every Muslim child killed and argued that in this way it was killed 400 and wounded about 11 000 Bosnian children. The news quickly traveled the world and become "over the fact", especially as snipers from all over Sarajevo really worked hard. British journalist of the magazine *New Statesman and Society*. For Karl Voldron this claim is excessive. He found the very Watt, who admitted that he obtained the information which he has got from sources in Bosnia as he traveled to Sarajevo. Voldron continued research and eventually found that the news was made in the firm Ruder and Finn and then released many telex without checking the reliability of facts. During this time, Serbian propaganda awaiting for the Russian Cossacks and perambulating various Kennedy, the eternal "candidates for members of the English Parliament" in Belgrade and Pale.

Commenting on everything that had happened the previous year, Zivorad Kovacevic notes that the Milosevic regime, firstly, had underestimated the international factor and then did much of what has completely destroyed any positive image of what remained of the former Yugoslavia, especially Serbia. "Because of such understanding of this policies we were in every respect, and especially the media, in an extreme unequal position. Just imagine if the 'New Yourk Times' raises a significant name who was hired through the PR firms to lobby for one conflicted side, while 'the Serbian cause' was defending some anonymous priest who at the same foamed because of injured Serbian national interests. We were, unfortunately, in the situation in which we have been guided by the politics here, no lobby, even if we had it would not be able to help us. About the same today would be as when Saddam Hussein would tried to convince someone of the benefits of their policies."

Former Yugoslav ambassador in the United States in his interview for "Time" points out that the most convenient and most sought lobbyists are former senators or congressmen, who know the people and ways of realizing the interests of the boundary. In the United States for this kind of people there is a quite household term -revolving door (the door that turn). These are the people, who after they got out of the Senate or Congress, often, reenter into the governing boards of large companies and expensively charge their knowledge of the system from within. When they turn to someone else's phone in order to lobby for something or someone, on the other side they usually listen carefully. Publicist Hedrik Smith, in his book "The game of power", says that few people in Washington can not afford to refuse to meet or talk with someone ,who, until recently, had worked for the White House. The engagement and payment of such people as lobbyists do not buy an automatic win, but above all, the access to the centers of power and the decision-making points . All this, on the basis of a his own Washington experience confirms

Obrad Kesic, who argues that for the success of a lobbying is necessary ,above all ,to have clear objectives of what is desired to achieve, and then the money to pay it (the price varies from company which is engaged in issues and difficulties that needs to lobby), as from the level of interest in the specific topic of individuals in the U.S. Congress, the media or administration. The modern lobby includes a commitment of PR firms and at least one former member of the U.S. Senate or the lower House of Congress. All that ,often, you can find under one roof. Kesic, otherwise, is estimating that this is an auspicious moment for launching a Serbian lobby in Washington and that in this work Serbian diaspora could help, which after many years of energy dissipation in the last three years has done much on strengthening their own positions in the U.S..

"The most important thing is that politicians in Belgrade, above all, clearly define the goals and interests that would like to achieve in relation to U.S. policy toward Serbia and SPJ-in", says the "Time" interlocutor. "In mine opinion, it should not boldly go for more than three defined objectives because it is difficult to expect that any lobby company could succeed more than that in Washington. As many goals is less understanding of the actual demands of lobbyists. One goal might be, by chance, related to changes in the law that Congress passed last year, thereby depriving the Serbian financial and other assistance if it does not meet certain conditions. The second objective should be focused on increasing the budget for humanitarian and economic aid for Serbia for next year. And the third is to explain and defend the interests of the Serbian position on Kosovo, South Serbia and Montenegro.

In a country, where average wages are still not exceed \$ 50 per month, a story about spending hundreds of thousands of dollars of state money for the lubrication of decision-makers in Washington, or for the job that could be described as an "honest cat" , at first does not sound very convincing and socially disarable. With serious mathematics it could yet be proved that this sum is guaranteed less than that which the former regime until recently was paying to the users of Serbian accidents under the name of fighters for "Serbian truth" . One of these "fighters" once got a four room apartment in Knez Mihailova Street, and for that money they could, for example, rent a very decent lobby. Efficient Serbian lobby in Washington will be difficult, of course, ,quickly, to fill in the craters of the international image and position of this country, which has been left by the previous regime.

In a world where the most president of today countries,ere on "you", long since there are no good politicians and good policy without good connections. This, of course, costs, but far less than of not doing and letting courts omissions to others.

Conclusion

The influence of interest groups is focused on state government as a whole, mostly on the executive power, while the action of lobby is reduced on the legislature. In addition, lobbying is just a tool and expression of interest groups, and not the group itself.

Forms and methods of influencing the legislative body are different. Originally, they had met directly in the contact of lobby members with members of the legislature, but the expansion of suffrage and the rapid and enormous development of mass media led lobby to use indirect forms of influence on members of the legislative body, primarily

an adequate mobilization of public opinion. At one time the impact of such methods were bribery and other unethical means, but they were mostly eradicated today. Provided that there are Institutional forms of protection of general social interests, the existence of lobbies can not be taken a priori as a political evil.

References

1. Abedin Ferović, political systems and local government 2006
2. U.S., ban former members of the legislature to lobby state government after their mandate terminates
3. Law against lobbying (anty-lobbying act. U.S. § 18 1913) lobbying money from the budget
4. Ban of lobbying by the end of office.
5. .Andrej Grupacic, globalization, the World, Belgrade, 2003.