

POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS AND DEMOCRACY: The problem of the media and the return of the citizen

Stephen Stockwell

Abstract

In the flourishing literature on political campaigns two schools may be discerned. On the one hand there are the proponents of political marketing and on the other hand there are the cultural critics concerned that marketing debases democracy. Neither school seeks to place the political campaign within the context of democratic theory and its accommodation of representative and participative views in recent work on the deliberative nature of democracy. In applying the deliberative paradigm to political campaigns the problem of the media, first identified by JS Mill, becomes apparent: the commercial media can never be the forum for debate that democracy requires. Against this pessimistic view, this paper suggests the theoretical possibility that the recreation of citizenship within the media/campaign paradigm provides the opportunity for new forms of democratic deliberation to emerge.

Political Campaigns

Over the last two hundred years, the representative democracies of the United States, Canada, Western Europe, Australia and New Zealand underwent significant changes. Where once only wealthy men were qualified to be citizens, by the early twentieth century citizenship was extended to all adults, male and female, wealthy and poor. As those democracies became mass societies the old networks of personal contact no longer held sway and prospective representatives had to find new ways to gather the votes they needed to win election. The advent of new media such as off-set printing, radio and television allowed persuasion techniques such as advertising and public relations to take commercial messages to potential consumers and politicians were quick to recognise the usefulness of these media for their own persuasive messages to citizens. Academics began to probe the role of the media in opinion formation and voting determination (Lazarsfeld, Berelson and Gaudet 1944).

But it was John F. Kennedy's 1960 presidential campaign that showed how a mixture of opinion research and media management could swing close contests and the craft of political campaigning was born. Kennedy's campaign and the three succeeding US presidential campaigns were closely documented in *The Making of the President* series by Theodore White (1961, 1966, 1969, 1974) who documented the inner-workings of the campaigns. Joe McGinniss carried White's work further during the 1968 US presidential election when he focussed on the marketing techniques employed by the successful Nixon campaign in *The Selling of the President* (1970). The 1972 US presidential campaign produced three important books that revealed much about the operations of campaigns. First there was *The Boys on the Bus* by Tim Crouse (1972) which showed how the press corps covering the election was manipulated by the party campaigns and each other to produce a sanitised and side-tracked account of what actually happened, a

theme theorised by Melvyn Bloom (1973) in *Public Relations and Presidential Campaigns*. Also Hunter S Thompson's (1973) *Fear and Loathing on the Campaign Trail* captured the temporary and expedient nature of campaigns marked by strategic game-playing and ready compromise.

A number of authors have since documented the rise of the political consultancy industry that developed to prosecute this new form of political campaigning in the United States (Blumenthal 1980; Dinken 1989; Napolitan 1994; Sabato 1981; Thurber and Nelson 1995), the United Kingdom (Butler 1992; Norris 1999; Rosenbaum 1997) and Australia (Mills 1986; Tiffen 1989). The industry journal *Campaigns and Elections* has documented developing campaign techniques and judged their application in practical conditions as selected articles show (Sabato 1989). The academic discipline of political marketing quickly "colonised" (Wring 1999) this new style of politics. There are now a number of texts that give a technical account of the campaign which, by and large, treats citizens as consumers and democracy as a competition (Kavanagh 1995; Lees-Marshment 2001; Maarek 1995; Mauser 1983; Newman and Sheth 1985; Newman 1994; Newman 1999; O'Shaughnessy 1990).

In response to the growth of political marketing, a strident critique emerged that exposed the hegemonic control of the mass media and the public relations apparatus of the party and state as propaganda designed to dupe the voter (Pratkanis and Aronson 1992; Spero 1980). In particular, this critique targets negative advertising (Ansolabehere and Iyengar 1995; Johnson-Cartee and Copeland 1991) and fund-raising excesses (West 2001) to explain the growing apathy and cynicism of citizens (Cappella and Jamieson 1997). Or as Lucaites and Charland argue "Postmodern mass politics... replaces the collective imaginary... with simulacra that remain specular and uninhabitable..." (1989: 33) In short, democracy has become a ghost and useless parody of its old self.

There is also the connected concern among critics that the spread of political marketing is producing the systematic "Americanization" of politics around the globe (Kavanagh 1996) even though some would argue that this effect is merely a by-product of the "modernization" of societies (Negrine and Papathanassopoulos 1996: 42). The Japanese Liberal Democratic party has taken a systematic approach to campaigning since 1948 (Curtis 1983), though at that stage it relied on a thorough-going organisation of grass-roots support rather than the polling and media management of American style campaigning.

It is reassuring that not all writers fit into these opposing camps. Some appreciate that campaigning is a craft which is something more than marketing (Shea 1996). Some bring the raw experience and urgent enthusiasm of the participant (Johnson 2001; Matthews 1989; Morris 1997). Many offer a do-it-yourself manual including Shaw and Holstein (1999) for the United States and Richards (2001) for the United Kingdom. There is also the on-going debate about the effect of political campaigns: whether they make a difference or not (Farrell and Schmitt-Beck 2002; Holbrook 1996). The growing number of late-deciding voters with no party attachment but an interest in media campaign coverage (McAllister, 2002) makes the question of campaign effects more than an

academic issue. Most significant is the growing sub-literature of those who start out to criticise political campaigns but come to appreciate that they are at the heart of our existing democracy and the formal opportunity for citizens to learn about and participate in political debate (Jamieson 1996; Norris 2000; Scammell 1995; Street 1996).

As campaign logic spreads from elections to government issues management, public education, interest group lobbying and activism, there is a particular need to understand what the campaign is and how it can be democratised to provide the debate, discussion and deliberation on which democracy depends. This project is complicated, but perhaps assisted, by the emerging global regime. The ubiquity and intimacy of emerging media suggest a return to a more personal, and even a more primal, relationship between citizens and their representation. In the immediacy of television and computer-driven opinion research, in the personal contact of direct mail to text messaging, in the centrality of image, in the psychological symphonies campaigns seek to create, there is a clear breach with rational choice theory. As expounded by Anthony Downs (1957), this theory expects citizens will decide their behaviour by making a rational calculation of their optimum economic outcome. Samuel Popkin (1991) was perhaps the first to point out that citizens do not have sufficient time, or certainly inclination, to know all about an issue and depend on competing campaigns to provide the information they need to make a choice. Emerging already are “viral” campaign strategies using fuzzy logic, ambush promotion and interactivity to infect host populations with arguments towards the debate that goes on during the campaign period (Painter and Wardle 2001). Others argue that greater interactivity, particularly via the internet, will produce a virtuous circle where the more citizens participate in democratic deliberation the better the democracy gets so more citizens are enticed to participate and so on (Norris 2000).

Democracy is held together by a fragile consensus of minds and the creation of that consensus without resort to force or coercion depends on the effective communication of persuasive ideas to a public that is not always interested. A political campaign is not merely the prelude to a snapshot of the “collective will” taken on election day. Rather politics is work that seeks to construct the “collective will” so citizens take particular decisions not just on election day but on a range of issues and in their everyday lives as well. The role of the participating citizen is to use all and any means of persuasion at hand to move the collective to actions the citizen considers is necessary. Providing effective persuasion is a glorious art, the very art by which democracy functions, survives and even prospers. This raises important questions about the nature of democracy.

Democracy

Paul Hirst argues that “Democracy is the dominant idiom” of our time and that “Everyone is a democrat” (1988: 190-193) but he is left wondering if what we have is really democracy. Hirst argues that the form of democracy that has been victorious limits and contains debate, fails to represent the diversity of interests and opinions in society and is dominated by the concerns of a few institutions. The emergence of disciplined party machines has acted to constrain the operations of democracy in various ways so that, Hirst would argue, it now merely “serves to legitimate modern big government and to restrain it hardly at all” (1988: 190).

Perhaps the gap between the simple promises of democracy and the complexity encountered in making it work may help explain why the near universal acceptance of democracy is accompanied by an high level of ambivalence, cynicism and disdain towards its political processes. While around eighty percent of citizens express an interest in politics (McAllister 1992: 34) no more than half the adult population follow political and social issues in the mass media (Dahl 1984: 96). and, in voluntary systems, even fewer vote (Chapman and Wood 1984: 57) There is a growing concern among the citizenry that politicians do not know what they are doing because they have lost touch with those they claim to represent (McAllister 1992: 46). This cynicism about politicians is producing a crisis of faith in democracy and adds urgency to the search for redefinition.

The challenge facing democratic theory is to find an approach to democracy that can confront this ambivalence and cynicism by returning the citizen to the centre of the democratic process. Perhaps the best place to start is with the dynamic potential within democracy itself. Unlike most other forms of government which seek to establish an enduring system, democracy actually creates change, adapts to new situations and remakes its own practice continually. The corollary of democracy's dynamic potential is that the search for a definition of democracy can never be concluded, the goal posts are always shifting. Democratic theory requires constant renewal as new conditions, social formations, technologies and complexities arise. Chantal Mouffe argues in her preface to *Dimensions of Radical Democracy* that: "democracy can only consist in the recognition of the multiplicity of social logics... [with] no hope of final reconciliation... the radical impossibility of a fully achieved democracy." (1992: 14)

The participatory model of democracy remains an important element of democratic theory today as a striking and tested alternative to the predominant representative model of democracy. In *Participation and Democratic Theory*, Carol Pateman (1970) argues that participation, both political and industrial, educates and empowers the participant and this is crucial to the health and strength of democracy. In a later work, *The Problem of Political Obligation*, Pateman (1985) suggests that a citizen's obligation to a political process can only develop in the context of a participatory democratic system. There is more to political obligation than the duty of occasionally casting a vote and then providing obedience to the system. There is also an obligation to make the system work by becoming involved in the debate which precedes decision-making. "Communicative action' is basic to political obligation over the whole of collective life" (1985: 178), as Pateman says borrowing from Jurgen Habermas (1987). In *Strong Democracy*, Benjamin Barber (1984: 117) continues the work of Pateman by contrasting "thin" representative democracy with "strong participatory democracy with" a self-governing community of citizens" who utilise participatory institutions to resolve conflict and decide on action. He accentuates the vital role of debate in participation: "At the heart of strong democracy is talk" (Barber 1984: 173) and points out that for talk to be effective there must also be listening, reflection and a willingness to persuade and be persuaded. Limitations inherent in participatory democracy include the problems of coordinating a large number of decisions from a large number of groups, the difficulties in keeping citizens engaged in

going to meetings or even responding to emails and the dangers of inter-personal coercion, psychological conformity and leadership cults that small groups may engender.

John Stuart Mill (1991: 244ff) provides perhaps the most straight-forward rationale for representative government: “since all cannot, in a community exceeding a single small town, participate personally in any but some very minor portions of the public business, it follows that the ideal type of perfect government must be representative... [where citizens] exercise through deputies periodically elected by themselves the ultimate controlling power.” In *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, Joseph Schumpeter (1976: 269) offers a minimalist, “empirical” definition of representative democracy as: “...that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people’s vote.” By giving no place in democracy to the citizens and their aspirations except for a numerically insignificant vote in a competition, Schumpeter accepts that democracy generally entails government by elites. Criticism of representative democracy falls into two categories: one, against Mill, points to logical problems in depending on representation to produce policies which reflect the actual aspirations of the electorate and the other, against Schumpeter, points out the propensity to elitism in political arrangements which ostensibly treat all citizens equally. Aristotle, as M.I. Finley (1973: 19) shows, was the first to point out that elections were predominantly aristocratic rather than democratic: the criteria by which the choice of the “best” candidate is made will always be influenced by those who already have power to define “best”. Robert Michels (1959: 377-392) developed this insight into a theory of organisations built around the principal of “the iron law of oligarchy”: real power always sits with some form of political elite. “Who says organisation, says oligarchy” (Michels 1959: 401). But he does not blame evil oligarches for the concentration of power but “the very nature of the mass as mass” (Michels 1959: 404).

While there are limitations in various theoretical accounts and practical programs of both participatory and representative democracy, none refute it as an on-going experiment constantly recreating itself by adapting to theoretical developments and changing circumstances. Therefore some theorists suggest that democracy could evolve to make it both more representative and more participatory (Arblaster 1987). Norberto Bobbio (1987: 53) argues that: “between pure representation and pure direct democracy there is not the qualitative leap... [but] a continuum ... [I]n a mature system of democracy both forms of democracy are necessary but they are not, taken on their own, self-sufficient.” In conceptualising new definitions of democracy it is important to respond to the critiques of democracy to hand. How can democracy defuse the power of elites while improving the quality of representation and participation it offers? To consider how the citizenry can better control the elite raises, in a mass society, the conduit between them, the media.

The Problem of the Media

It is intriguing that while John Stuart Mill revealed the problem of the media in his theorisation of representative democracy, its ramifications were never pursued. The problem may be stated simply. The representative system allows democracy to extend beyond the single city that characterised Athenian democracy. However to function

effectively, representative democracy must be complemented by processes which allow the dissemination of a broad range of views and the opportunity for debate similar to that provided by the Athenian Assembly of citizens. While Mill argued that the press filled this role, he had some unspecified dissatisfaction with its ability to do so comprehensively. He referred to the newspaper press as “the real equivalent, though not in all respects an adequate one, of the Pnyx and the Forum” (Mill 1991: 310). While Mill did not expound on his reservations about the role of the newspaper press, he appears to be pointing to the paradox at the heart of representative democracy: political information is predominantly communicated through the mass media but it is not an effective democratic forum for mass voices. Discussion is dominated by proprietors and advertisers, filtered by journalists and experts and fit into existing expectations.

A number of democratic theorists have made explicit their disquiet about the ability of the mass media to function as a forum. Barber (1984: 197) saw a danger that if deliberation is left in the hands of the media it “quickly degenerates into one more weapon in the armory of elite rule.” Similarly Anthony Giddens (1994: 132) holds that his model of dialogic democracy will only work where “differential resources aren’t used to prevent views being voiced or for a drastic skewing of the conditions of dialogic interchange.” The role of the mass media in providing the forum for deliberation in current representative democracies raises “fundamental questions” for democratic theory and it is easy to share John Keane’s concern that “almost nobody asks basic questions about the relationship between democratic ideals and institutions and the contemporary media” (1991: x). The relative absence of discussion of the mass media in democratic theory is remarkable given the way key thinkers such as Mill and Barber have flagged the problem. In his otherwise systematic *Models of Democracy*, Held (1987) makes only one reference to the media in quoting Herbert Marcuse and his dismissal of the media as a tool of coercion. In listing the main forms of political participation Birch (1993) does not mention activity in the mass media. Even when Giddens (1994) raises the issue of differential resources skewing dialogic interchange he pursues the question with reference to the welfare state rather than media access. In his discussion on the practicalities of citizenship, James Lynch (1992: 51) only mentions the mass media to note a survey that found “television and the mass media have an important and often negative effect on young peoples’ values”.

The resolution of Mill’s paradox relies on the restoration of citizen-to-citizen debate and various theorists have suggested ways to achieve that restoration via “deliberative democracy”: “open and uncoerced discussion of the issue at stake with the aim of arriving at an agreed judgement... whereby initial preferences are transformed to take account of the views of others.” (Miller 1993: 75) It is difficult to underestimate the importance of debate to the effectiveness of democracy. From Schumpeter’s minimal model of representative democracy requiring limited citizen involvement to the complex models of participatory democracy requiring a strong engagement from citizens, the one constant is not free elections or the rule of law but that upon which the whole enterprise depends: free political speech. Free speech is just as vital to Mill’s liberal democracy as it is to Mouffe’s radical democracy. It is the golden thread from the Athenian assembly to the experiments with new communication technologies. Even Schumpeter (1976: 270)

accepts that electoral competition requires opposing elites to put their cases after considering “genuine group-wise volitions”. The ubiquity of deliberation as an essential element of democratic practice at so many points along the continuum suggests the crucial role discussion and debate play in the prelude to democratic decision-making and thus in democracy itself.

John Dryzek (1990) offers a model of deliberative democracy. Rejecting the manipulation, domination, strategy and deception of current representative democracy, he returns to Aristotle to argue for a democracy of practical reason that is not based on complex theory but the common interests we have as a result of our communication with each other. We owe our existence to our ability to communicate with each other and, Dryzek argues, this provides the rational basis from which we can understand how democracy does and should work. Anthony Giddens (1994) follows a similar path to produce another model of deliberative democracy when he argues that in the “double dissolution of tradition and nature” there is the potential for a “utopian realism” which deals with the rapid pace of social change in a creative way. He points out that “Democratization processes today are driven by the expansion of social reflexivity and detraditionalization” so that while “well established debates pitting participation against representation offer little purchase... dialogic democratization” creates forms of social interchange that contribute to reconstructing social solidarity and further cultural cosmopolitanism by connecting autonomy and solidarity (Giddens 1994: 111-112). In short, while our representative institutions have difficulty dealing with a rapidly changing, globalising world, their decline gives citizens the freedom to create new ways of collective decision-making.

The deliberative view of democracy solves many of the problems of representative and participatory models discussed above by acknowledging the power inherent in the citizen’s active engagement in the political process (Cohen 1989). It is important to appreciate the way in which it is the full, free and frank debate that underpins the effective operation of democracy by allowing the reconciliation of individual preferences into a collective consensus and by putting leadership under constant scrutiny to make it transparent. In producing the peaceful movement from the disparate ideas and aspirations held by a group of individuals to a social decision by which those individuals consider themselves bound, deliberation requires the frank exchange of views that allows new ideas to arise. It requires that those views and ideas be intellectually tested with all the skills of reason and persuasion that those individuals have to offer; it allows opinions to mutate and transform until a decision is made to which most participants are happy to be bound - at least until next time - because they have said everything they could to convince their fellows.

How then might the deliberative model of democracy find application in currently existing systems of representative democracy? The answer is difficult because the mass nature of society means that much key deliberation in current representative democracy occurs in the organs of the mass media. This is not to dismiss the importance of interpersonal discussion and small group debate but merely to acknowledge the difficulties in producing authentic democratic deliberation in mass societies. The case of

the political campaign is instructive. The campaigns of major parties, government departments or corporations can tell citizens what they want to hear and then insist on their support. Campaigns of this ilk can be successful in the short term but leave unfulfilled expectations in the long term. By way of contrast, campaigns that use opinion research to understand the citizenry's frame of mind and employ the campaign machinery to conduct a two-way discussion with the citizenry based in even-handedness and an equality of power can have a remarkable and on-going effect, as did Jim Soorley's 1991 campaign for the Brisbane Lord Mayoralty.

Deliberation can legitimate democratic processes, but if and only if those processes can guarantee free speech and an equality of potential participation. These are major provisos and significant stumbling blocks to the achievement of effective democracy. While deliberative democracy seeks to confront the logical limitations of elitism and coercion inherent in representative and participatory models by ensuring an equality of access to debate and discussion in relatively small groups, the power that arises from the centralised role of broadcast media in mass society generally remains a problem that can only be solved when citizens reclaim their voices in the mass media and in other forums they create. The political campaign, as the pre-eminent form of political organisation in mass society, is the obvious means for citizens to utilise in their work on democracy.

The Role of the Citizen

To create greater deliberative participation in existing representative institutions and to recreate democracy itself, it would appear clear that in mass societies direct participation by all citizens in all decision-making is unrealistic but participation in campaigns, both during elections and in the pursuit of particular interests allows self-determined participation in deliberative processes. The election is the one moment when citizens have a clear and decisive power over government. Politicians dread the electoral backlash and frequently allow electoral considerations to dominate the political processes (Mayhew 1974). As the moment of mass decision making, elections provide the opportunity for direct participation, and election campaigns have the potential to open spaces where new and marginal ideas can be introduced and deployed against established interests. Green parties around the world have honed the art of media intervention into successful strategy in both short-term election campaigns and on-going issue campaigns. Greens have long appreciated the importance of co-opting the media machine to make their case clearly and succinctly in order to build a grassroots organisation and to take their arguments with the wider community.

But contemporary politics offers more opportunities for participation than just elections. The spread of campaign techniques from elections to government issues management, public education, interest group lobbying and activism provides citizens with constant opportunities to participate in the political process in a myriad of ways from engineering a global campaign environmental destruction or African hunger to being a mere book member of an organisation supporting a cause close to the citizen's heart. John Hartley (1996: 43) goes as far as suggesting that the couch potatoes could become "citizens of the media", using TV news as their forum, ambivalent about established politics but pursuing political ends by creating their own forms of participation from critical consumerism to

virtual republics of fans. The "McLibel Two" subverted a range of media management techniques to open new areas for deliberative consideration. Two vegetarians wrote and published a small pamphlet critical of the environmental, health, industrial relations and culinary practices of the McDonald hamburger chain. McDonald's responded by initiating a libel action against the authors who fought the case both in the courts and, more significantly, in the mass media and on their internet fan site where they used the opportunity to bring international deliberative consideration to the conduct of international corporations (<http://www.mcspotlight.org/>). After ten years, McDonald's won part of the court case but lost the public relations battle.

Critics are right to be sceptical about the ability of contemporary democracies to offer the space for debate and deliberation. Political campaigns involve the rapid construction and adaptation of complex and therefore creaky meta-narratives. To be effective campaigns must appeal to the popular consciousness and that process has always made democratic politics a relatively facile and banal activity. The advent of mass society with greater distance between citizens and their representatives, has only exacerbated this problem. But against the practice of propaganda which seeks to close debate and discussion, contending political campaigns, particularly where there is equality of opportunity to participate in and create one's own campaign, play a crucial role in allowing democratic institutions to come to decisions. Without the outright coercion evident in the 2002 Iraqi election, it is only political campaigns that can produce the majorities required for democracies to take decisive action or any action at all. Thus the political campaign is a necessary condition for democracy in mass societies.

Rather than lament democracy's shortcomings and its failure to adequately represent an alternative or critical or broad range of views, perhaps there is a strategy to understand the nature of modern democracy and work to ensure the representation of other views. At a very basic level the internet offers a range of low-cost organisational tools. See, for example, the use of the internet to distribute anti-publicity that calls corporations to account (<http://www.flamingfords.com/>). Consider also Belgrade Radio Station B92 which used the internet to thwart Milosevic's censorship and the rise and rise of the cell-based Indymedia project.

Then there is Irene, the lady who lives next door to me. She is a mum, a former postal worker and a sometime beautician who likes to take her own mum for a walk along the beach most mornings. The local municipality was planning to redevelop the beach area by cutting down a lot of trees and putting in a lot of concrete, so Irene started up an email group to oppose the development and, after a lot of work and a lot of poking around among municipal records on-line and at the council chambers and a lot of face-to-face local politics and some big meetings and stories in the local papers, she succeeded. So I would like to propose Irene as the prototype for the citizen of the future, creating her own political space in the gaps of media dominance, she might just save democracy from itself.

Thus citizens can harness the breaks and irregularities in power, use new forms of media and create new forms of association to foster democratic deliberation, at least until new

forms of control emerge. The deliberative potential of the mass media rests in the willingness and ability of people to claim media citizenship in order to pursue new debates designed to civilise national governments, international corporations and other forms of power that are not yet apparent. The challenge for citizens is to do what democrats have always done and grasp the levers of democracy to reform its methods in light of current conditions. Thus our attempt to place the political campaign in contemporary democratic theory leads us to consider how the political campaign is much more than marketing and how a multiplicity of contending campaigns provides the theoretical potential for a dispersed but nevertheless deliberative forum for mass voices.

References

- Ansolabehere, S. and Iyengar, S. 1995, *Going Negative*, Free Press, New York
- Arblaster, Anthony 1987, *Democracy*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes
- Barber, Benjamin 1984, *Strong Democracy*, University of California Press, Berkeley
- Bloom, Melvyn 1973, *Public Relations and Presidential Campaigns*, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York
- Blumenthal, Sidney 1980, *The Permanent Campaign*, Beacon Press, Boston
- Bobbio, Norberto 1987, *The Future of Democracy*, Polity Press, Cambridge
- Butler, David and Ranney, Austin (eds) 1992, *Electioneering – A Comparative Study of Continuity and Change*, Clarendon, Oxford
- Cappella, J. N. and Jamieson, K. H. 1997, *Spiral of cynicism: the press and the public good*, Oxford University Press, New York
- Chapman, RJK & Wood, Michael 1984, *Australian Local Government - The Federal Dimension* George Allen & Unwin Sydney
- Cohen, J. 1989 'Deliberation and democratic legitimacy' in *The Good Polity*, eds A. Hamlin and P. Pettit, Blackwell, Oxford
- Crouse, Tim 1972, *The Boys on the Bus*, Random House, New York
- Curtis, G. L. 1983, *Election Campaigning Japanese Style*, Kodansha, Tokyo
- Curtis, Michael 1965, *The Great Political Theories, Volume 1*, Avon, New York
- Dahl, R. A. 1984, *Modern Political Analysis*, 4th edition, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs
- Dinken, Robert J. 1989, *Campaigning in America – A History of Election Practices*, Greenwood Press, Connecticut
- Downs, Anthony 1957, *An Economic Theory of Democracy*, Harper, New York
- Dryzek, John S. 1990, *Discursive Democracy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Farrell, D. and Schmitt-Beck, R. 2002, *Do political campaigns matter?: campaign effects in elections and referendums*, Routledge, London
- Finley, M. I. 1973, *Democracy Ancient and Modern*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick
- Giddens, Anthony 1994, *Beyond Left and Right*, Polity Press, Cambridge
- Habermas, Jürgen 1987, *The Theory of Communicative Action II: Lifeworld and System*, Beacon, Boston
- Hartley, John 1996, *Popular Reality*, Arnold, London
- Held, David 1987, *Models of Democracy*, Stanford University Press, Stanford
- Hirst, Paul 1988, 'Representative democracy and its limits', *The Political Quarterly*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 190-205

- Holbrook, Thomas 1996, *Do Campaigns Matter?*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks
- Hyland, J. L. 1995, *Democratic Theory: The Philosophical Foundations*, Manchester University Press, Manchester
- Jamieson, Kathleen Hall 1996, *Packaging the Presidency*, Third edition, Oxford University Press, New York
- Johnson, Dennis W. 2001, *No Place for Amateurs*, Routledge, New York
- Johnson-Cartee, K. S. and Copeland, G. A. 1991, *Negative Political Advertising: coming of age*, N. J. L. Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale
- Kavanagh, Dennis 1995, *Election Campaigning: the New Marketing of Politics*, Blackwell, Oxford
- ____ 1996, 'New Campaign Communications: Consequences for British Political Parties', *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, vol. 1, issue 3, Summer, pp. 60-76
- Keane, John 1991, *The Media and Democracy*, Polity Press, Cambridge
- Lazarsfeld, P, Berelson, B & Gaudet, H 1944, *The People's Choice*, Columbia University Press, New York
- Lees-Marshment, Jennifer 2001, *Political Marketing and British Political Parties*, Manchester University Press, Manchester
- Lucaites, J. L. and Charland, M. 1989 'The legacy of Liberty: rhetoric, ideology and aesthetics in the postmodern condition', *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 31-48
- Lynch, James 1992, *Education for Citizenship in a Multi-cultural Society*, Cassell, London
- Maarek, Philippe J. 1995, *Political marketing and communication*, John Libbey, London
- MacIntyre, Alasdair 1985, *After Virtue*, Duckworth, London
- Matthews, Christopher 1989, *Hardball*, Perennial Harper & Row, New York
- Mausser, Gary A. 1983, *Political marketing: an approach to campaign strategy*, Praeger, New York
- Mayhew, D. 1974, *Congress: The Electoral Connection*, Yale University Press, New Haven
- McAllister, Ian 1992, *Political Behaviour*, Longman, Melbourne
- ____ 2002, 'Calculating or capricious? The new politics of late deciding voters', in *Do political campaigns matter?*, eds D. Farrell and R. Schmitt-Beck, Routledge, London
- McGinniss, Joe 1970, *Selling the President*, Andre Deutsch, London
- Michels, Robert 1959, *Political Parties*, Dover, New York
- Mill, John Stuart 1991, *On Liberty and Other Essays*, Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Miller, David 1993, 'Deliberative Democracy and Social Choice' in *Prospects for Democracy*, David Held, Polity Press, Cambridge
- Mills, Stephen 1986, *The New Machine Men*, Penguin, Ringwood
- Morris, Dick 1997, *Behind the Oval Office: winning the presidency in the nineties*, Random House, New York
- Mouffe, Chantal (ed) 1992, *Dimensions of Radical Democracy*, Verso, London
- Napolitan, Joe et al 1994, 'The political campaign industry', *Campaigns & Elections*, December/January, pp. 45-50

- Negrine, Ralph and Papathanassopoulos, Stylianos 1996, 'The "Americanization" of Political Communication: A Critique', *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, vol. 1, issue 2, Spring, pp. 45-62
- Newman, Bruce 1994 *The Marketing of the President: Political Marketing as Campaign Strategy*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks:
- Newman, Bruce 1999, *Handbook of Political Marketing*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks
- Newman, Bruce & Sheth, Jagdish 1985, 'A Model of Primary Voter Behaviour' in *Political Marketing*, eds Bruce Newman and Jagdish Sheth, American Marketing Association, Chicago
- Norris, Pippa 1999, *On message: communicating the campaign*, Sage Publications, London
- ____ 2000, *A virtuous circle: political communications in postindustrial societies*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- O'Shaughnessy, N. J. 1990, *The phenomenon of political marketing*, MacMillan, Houndmills
- Painter, A. and Wardle, B. 2001, *Viral Politics*, Politicos, London
- Pateman, Carol 1970, *Participation and Democratic Theory*, Cambridge University Press, London
- ____ 1985, *The Problem of Political Obligation*, Polity Press, Cambridge
- Popkin, S. 1991, *The Reasoning Voter: communication and persuasion in presidential campaigns*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- Pratkanis, A. R. and Aronson, E. 1992, *Age of propaganda: the everyday use and abuse of persuasion*, W. H. Freeman, New York
- Richards, Paul 2001, *How to Win an Election*, Politicos, London
- Rosenbaum, Martin 1997, *From Soapbox to Sundbite: Party Political Campaigning in Britain since 1945*, MacMillan, London
- Sabato, Larry J. 1981 *The Rise of Political Consultants*, Basic Books, New York
- ____ 1989, *Campaigns and Elections: A Reader*, Scott, Foresman Glenview
- Scammell, M. 1995, *Designer Politics: How Elections are Won*, MacMillan, London
- Schumpeter, Joseph 1976, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, Allen & Unwin, London
- Shaw, Catherine M & Holstein, Michael E. (1999) *The Campaign Manager : Running and Winning Local Elections* Boulder: Westview Press
- Shea, Daniel M. 1996, *Campaign Craft – The Strategies, Tactics and Art of Political Campaign Management*, Praeger, Westport
- Spero, R. 1980, *The duping of the American voter: dishonesty and deception in presidential television advertising*, Lippincott and Crowell, New York
- Street, John 1996, 'In Praise of Packaging?', *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, vol. 1, issue 2, Spring, pp. 126-133
- Thompson, Hunter S. 1973, *Fear and Loathing on the Campaign Trail*, Popular Library, New York
- Thurber, J. and Nelson, C. J. 1995, *Campaigns and Elections American Style*, Westview Press, Boulder
- Tiffen, Rodney 1989, *News and Power*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney
- West, D. 2001, *Checkbook Democracy*, Northeastern University Press, Boston

- White, T. H. 1961, *The making of the President 1960*, Atheneum, New York
____ 1966, *The making of the President 1964*, The New American Library, New York
____ 1969, *The making of the President 1968*, Atheneum, New York
____ 1974, *The making of the President 1972*, Jonathan Cape, London
Wring, D. 1999, 'The Marketing Colonization of Political Campaigning' in *Handbook of Political Marketing*, ed Bruce Newman, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks