

PROPAGANDA-MANAGED DEMOCRACY: THE UK AND THE LESSONS OF IRAQ

DAVID MILLER

During the 2005 election campaign in the UK, the Conservative party adopted a strategy of describing Blair as a 'liar' over Iraq. Some critics regarded this as counterproductive.¹ It was seen as harming the Tories electorally, but there was also an implication that this was not quite the done thing, as if it breached the protocols of dignified politics. Blair himself has repeatedly stated that he doesn't mind people disagreeing with him just as long as they don't attack 'my conduct and integrity'.²

The extraordinary thing about these events is that it should be thought that lying was the worst thing that Blair had done. The degraded quality of political debate is such that the ultimate prize is to catch one's political opponents in a falsehood. Political success is reduced to the outcome of a linguistic battle. This illustrates a wider problem: the notion that words and deeds are separate, or at least separable things – that for political success one does not need to act consistently or honourably, one just has to ensure that what one says can be said to be consistent or honourable.

This divorce between words and deeds closely – and not accidentally – parallels a similar divorce at the core of the belief systems promoted by the powerful. The gap between words and deeds has widened in recent years, with Iraq merely providing the defining moment in which this is seen clearly by millions of people. But the lies go much deeper than the convenient rationale for an unpopular invasion. They are actually a key and necessary part of the neoliberal period.

In the real world, where most of the world's population still has to live, there is an inescapable connection between saying and doing. And in the real world the opprobrium of millions towards Blair (and Bush and the rest) is based on the fact that he lied for a purpose. That purpose was the pursuit of US imperial interests. In that purpose he broke international law and helped to kill tens of thousands of civilians in the process. This makes Blair

something worse than being a common or garden liar. The charge sheet also includes murder and war crimes.

LIVING IN THE MATRIX

The separation between words and deeds, or rhetoric and reality, is increasingly recognized in every sphere of public life, from the inappropriately-named 'reality TV' shows and the hyper-unreality of advertising, to election razzmatazz, corporate spin and government propaganda. We live in a period where we must recognize what John Kenneth Galbraith, in *The Economics of Innocent Fraud*, describes as a 'continuing divergence' between 'approved belief' and reality.³ We live in the age of the fake.⁴ For many, the lies around Iraq crossed a line and revealed concerted government lying which was seen as comparatively new. In my view it is new in the sense that we are in a new, neoliberal period which stands in marked contrast to the period of social democracy (roughly 1945-1979) when the gap between words and actions was of necessity narrower. The compromise between capital and labour forced the creation of a common language. This had its limits, but at least in key aspects of domestic policy the gap between rhetoric and reality was narrower. There was less need to lie, less need to attempt to align capitalist interests with general interests because there was some compromise and mediation of interests.

Under neoliberalism, the gap between the interests of the elite and the general interest widens dramatically, and is exacerbated by the gap in social experience created by increasing economic inequality. A whole new machinery of propaganda was called for and could be seen in the rise of the PR industry, and in the overhaul of state propaganda.⁵ After 9/11, the assault on Iraq involved a huge propaganda build up, both organizationally and ideologically.⁶ It is in the ideological campaign to sell the invasion that we can best see our rulers in action, both because this was a crucial period for them and because we now have access to some of the key documents which recorded their thinking.

'A CLEVER PLAN': IRAQ

The assault on Iraq was a long-term plan of the US right, but it was 9/11 that provided the opportunity to put it into action. In early 2001 Bush administration officials had been candid that Iraq was not a threat. 'He [Saddam Hussein] is unable to project conventional power against his neighbors', Colin Powell said in February 2001.⁷ 'The truth is', noted one of UK Foreign Secretary Jack Straw's advisers, that what had changed was 'not the pace' of Saddam Hussein's WMD programmes, 'but our tolerance of them post-11 September'.⁸ Between September 2001 and the spring of 2002 the plan to invade

Iraq was developed by the Bush administration and by March 2002 the Blair administration was fully on board. The message delivered to Condoleezza Rice in the second week of March by Blair's most senior foreign affairs adviser, Sir David Manning, was that Blair 'would not budge in [his] support for regime change'.⁹

The Americans pressed on with their policy, but recognized the need for a political strategy to deliver it. So as Richard Dearlove, the head of MI6, put it, 'the intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy'.¹⁰ British officials regarded this strategy, which included attempting to link Al Qaeda and Iraq, as 'frankly unconvincing'. They conveyed to the US administration the support of the UK government, but alerted it to the difficulties faced by the British. Manning told Rice that Blair 'had to manage a press, a Parliament and a public opinion that was very different than anything in the States'. As Christopher Meyer, the British Ambassador to the US, put it, the management of dissent required a 'plan' that 'had to be clever' and 'would be a tough sell for us domestically'.¹¹

According to a Whitehall briefing paper for the Prime Minister's meeting on 23 July 2002, the 'conditions necessary' for military action included 'justification/legal base; an international coalition; a quiescent Israel/Palestine; a positive risk/benefit assessment; and the preparation of domestic opinion'.¹² There were two key elements to the plan. The first was to use the United Nations to 'wrong foot' Saddam Hussein into delivering a *casus belli*.¹³ In other words, the UK government persuaded the US government that by manipulating the UN to provoke a war, they could gain greater legitimacy for the invasion.¹⁴ The second element was to play up the threat from Iraq. This was necessary to prepare 'domestic opinion'. According to the Cabinet Office this would involve the following:

Time will be required to prepare public opinion in the UK that it is necessary to take military action against Saddam Hussein. There would also need to be a substantial effort to secure the support of Parliament. An information campaign will be needed which has to be closely related to an overseas information campaign designed to influence Saddam Hussein, the Islamic World and the wider international community. This will need to give full coverage to the threat posed by Saddam Hussein, including his WMD, and the legal justification for action.¹⁵

The organizational apparatus to conduct this campaign was thoroughly overhauled by the US and UK governments after September 2001 and coordinated by the Office of Global Communications created by Bush in July

2002.¹⁶ Only the content of the campaign remained to be worked out. This was prepared and launched two months later involving the full weight of US and UK government resources and a wide range of government departments, PR consultancies, think tanks and intelligence agencies. The US government focused on the alleged (and quite false) connection between Iraq and 9/11 or at least 'terrorism' in general. This was so successful that by the end of 2002 two thirds of US citizens believed that Iraq was involved in September 11 attacks.¹⁷ By contrast, in the UK more weight was laid on the alleged threat posed by Iraq. 'To get public and Parliamentary support for military options', wrote Jack Straw's adviser, we have to be 'convincing' that 'the threat is so serious/imminent that it is worth sending our troops to die for'; and that 'it is qualitatively different from the threat posed by other proliferators who are closer to achieving nuclear capability (including Iran)'.¹⁸

In order to show this, the UK government launched a massive 'information' campaign, at the centre of which was the dossier on Weapons of Mass Destruction.¹⁹ This contained a litany of lies about Iraq's weapons capability. The most discussed claim, though by no means the only deception, was that WMD could be 'ready within 45 minutes of an order to use them'. The dossier claimed that 'much information about Iraqi weapons of mass destruction is already in the public domain from UN reports and from Iraqi defectors. This points clearly to Iraq's continuing possession, after 1991, of chemical and biological agents' and Iraq has 'continued to produce chemical and biological agents'. But the UN reports and information from the key defector, Hussein Kamel, showed that there was no evidence that the Iraqi government had engaged in new production, and that it had verifiably destroyed 90-95 per cent of its chemical and biological agent. Any that remained (including Anthrax and VX nerve agent - with the single exception of mustard gas) was in a form which would have degraded to 'useless sludge' (within the 10 years that had elapsed), to use the words of Scott Ritter, the former weapons inspector. So the evidence on which the dossier relied did not support its account. Therefore, the government knew that there was no threat.²⁰

On the possibility of using the weapons within 45 minutes the dossier claimed that Iraq 'can deliver chemical and biological agents using an extensive range of artillery shells, free-fall bombs, sprayers and ballistic missiles ... The Iraq military are able to deploy these weapons within 45 minutes of a decision to do so'.²¹ This neatly conflates the alleged 'intelligence' on 45 minutes with long range ballistic missiles. In fact, Iraq did not have any such missiles, and according to John Scarlett of the Joint Intelligence Committee the original intelligence assessment was only that 'battlefield mortar shells or small calibre weaponry' could be deployed in 45 minutes. Again, both Blair

and Campbell were in a position to know this since it was their own intelligence. In other words, the 45 minute claim involved at least three separate deceptions: on the existence of agents in weaponized form; on existence of the delivery mechanism; and on the application of the 45 minute claim to long-range delivery systems.

Peter Osborne, of the conservative *Spectator* magazine, declares that it is 'amazing' that there is a 'group of shameless habitual liars at the centre of power'.²² But it is not terribly surprising, nor is it terribly new, for the political elite to believe it is their right to lie in defence of their interests. What is perhaps novel is that elements of the elite now subscribe to a belief system that is unable to comprehend the difference between truth and lies. This collapse of the distinction between truth and interests is a characteristic of the neo-conservative movement in the US and has striking parallels in the development of New Labour in the UK.

THE RISE OF THE 'SHAMELESS HABITUAL LIAR'

Peter Osborne's book, *The Rise of Political Lying*, provides a good analysis of the trajectory of new labour deception. It focuses on the role of key operatives like Geoff Mulgan and Charlie Leadbetter and their use of relativist and post-structuralist conceptions of narrative to suggest that there are only versions of truth. Both Mulgan and Leadbetter were linked with the *Marxism Today* project around Stuart Hall and Martin Jacques which paved the way for New Labour ideology.²³ Osborne notes how this fits well with the neo-conservative analysis derived from Leo Strauss that democracy and truth were irreconcilable.²⁴ As the prominent neo-conservative, Irving Kristol, has put it: 'the notion that there should be one set of truths available to everyone is a modern democratic fallacy'.²⁵

But Osborne does not delve into the history of lies and propaganda and underestimates the historic depth of the contemporary pattern of deception. The weakest part of his analysis is his explanation of the reasons for the rise of spin. He describes a 'massive change in British political culture in the past few decades'. This, he believes, rather than 'internal or external pressures', has produced the 'catastrophic' decline in standards of 'truth telling'.²⁶ He mentions the contributory role of technological developments in mass communication and points to the application of advertising and marketing techniques; the 'hard sell' instead of 'humanity, complexity and truth'.²⁷ While his account is an accurate, if brief, description of the transformation of the culture, it fails to explain why the culture would change, except under the influence of technology. But the adoption of the techniques of marketing and advertising industry is not the inevitable result of neutral transfer of

knowledge from one part of society to another, but actually a key indicator of the rise of corporate power.

Osborne dates the malaise to the Major government and says it has accelerated under New Labour. Thatcher's propagandists by contrast, made 'the most' of her 'triumphs' and played down 'her mistakes and failures' but 'never departed' from the 'common sense' that they must present what they saw as the truth.²⁸ Osborne adds to this that some Labour ministers do not lie. It is as if the propensity to lie is partly related to questions of character.

In fact the neoliberal revolution and its promotion of corporate power is the key to the convergence of the parties (to 'factions of the business party'), the downgrading of parliament, the increase in inequality and the rise of PR and lobbying. Since the onset of the neoliberal revolution, initiated by the Thatcher and Reagan administrations, the sweep of privatization and neoliberal reform has occurred unevenly. The US has always been a more market oriented society and more advanced 'propaganda-managed' democracy than European countries, where the UK has been at the forefront of this process. The apparatus of lying has developed faster in the UK than in continental Europe, covering the gamut of communicative spheres (corporate PR, political communications, lobbying and civil society spin techniques).

The export of US (read neoliberal) techniques of electioneering has been rapid if also uneven.²⁹ The same is true of the growth of the PR industry. This has been particularly marked in the UK, whose PR industry has been the main economic engine for the expansion of techniques of propaganda control. The UK PR industry is the second largest in the world after the US, larger than that in Japan and twice the size of that in France and Germany (in 2002).³⁰ The PR industry had been lobbying for thirty years with some success for the increased use of PR consultancies by government, but it took the Phillis inquiry, which reported in 2004, to really open the floodgates to the use of private sector PR to sell government policy.³¹ In the US this process was much more advanced, and became a political scandal in 2004/5 with the revelation that fake 'news' had been constructed for US government departments by PR companies.³²

THE ORIGINS OF PROPAGANDA-MANAGED DEMOCRACY

However much the neoliberal period has involved a marked increase in the technology of propaganda control, the gap between words and deeds is not new. In this respect, it resembles the period in which modern democracy was born, when the threat from the masses led to a huge upsurge in the machinery of propaganda. The theory and practice of a propaganda-managed democracy were developed between 1880 and 1920.

In the UK, the threat of democracy was a keen concern of the business, political and intellectual elites. Graham Wallas, whose key contribution to the theory of propaganda-managed democracy is largely forgotten, was a one time member of the Fabian Society who grew sceptical of the ability of the people to rule. His book, *Human Nature in Politics*, first published in 1908, advanced the argument that 'human intellectual limitations' meant the possibility of the 'manipulation of the popular impulse' and therefore that the scope of popular democracy should be restricted so as to leave out 'those questions ... which cause the holders of wealth and industrial power to make full use of their opportunities'.³³ This could be achieved thanks to the fact that 'the art of using skill for the production of emotion and opinion has so advanced, that the whole condition of contests would be changed for the future'.³⁴ Wallas' contribution is largely forgotten. There is little awareness that there was a concerted movement in Britain to 'take the risk out of democracy' as Alex Carey has memorably put it.³⁵

After Wallas lectured in the US in 1910, his work was taken up enthusiastically by Walter Lippman, himself a former member of the Socialist Party USA, and widely recognized on the left as an important intellectual progenitor of the theory and justification of a propaganda-managed democracy. It was essential, he wrote, that 'the public be put in its place' so that 'each of us may live free of the trampling and the roar of a bewildered herd'.³⁶ Lippmann thought that the 'manufacture of consent' was both necessary and possible. 'Within the life of the generation now in control of affairs, persuasion has become a self conscious art and a regular organ of popular government'.³⁷

Back in the UK, the business classes were already organizing to buy insurance against democracy by the late 19th century. The Engineering Employers Federation was a key capitalist lobby group set up in 1896. By 1911 a hugely important and now largely forgotten activist for big business, going by the delightful name of Dudley Docker, was organizing corporate propaganda outfits known as 'Business leagues' under the slogan 'pro patria imperium in imperio' (for our country a government within a government) – in other words, business rule. 'If our League spreads', wrote Docker in 1911, 'politics would be done for. This is my object'.³⁸ In 1916 he was founding president of the Federation of British Industries. By 1918, when universal suffrage was (almost) fully instituted for the first time, corporate propaganda was in full swing – organized by a group of business activists (including Docker) around the British Commonwealth Union. Their intent can be understood by the names they gave themselves – the 'London imperialists' and the 'diehards'. Their project was business rule and in the 1918 election they fielded nearly 50 covert candidates, whose ostensible party loyalty was a cover for business loyalties.³⁹ In 1919 they launched a powerful new organization whose name

unblushingly revealed its purpose: 'National propaganda'. They went into action almost straight away during the 1919 Rail Strike in close collaboration with the Prime Minister, Lloyd George, who granted them access to all special branch and intelligence files on the left. They later played a pivotal role in the 1926 General Strike, by which time they had changed their name to the Economic League. Their principal role in this period was propaganda intended to undermine the democratic process and especially the labour movement.

This story has been almost entirely suppressed.⁴⁰ Since then, the power of business lobbyists has waxed and waned, and taken on new guises, such as Aims of Industry, set up in 1942 to counter Labour's nationalization plans. But there is an unmistakable continuity between these early business practitioners of propaganda-managed democracy, and today's.

TODAY'S SUCCESSORS OF WALLAS AND LIPPMAN

The concerns about the unleashed power of the masses which the rise of organized labour and the campaign for universal suffrage raised in the early 20th century are back again. The social democratic and liberal left, or rather the ex-liberal left, appears to be particularly exercised by this. In Britain the *Guardian* has featured a succession of commentators blaming the public for what they see as the malaise of the political system. Polly Toynbee epitomizes this when she writes: 'It is salutary to be reminded how much sheer pig-headed ignorance, nastiness, mean-spiritedness and rudeness politicians encounter every day. Trying to squeeze votes out of people who can't be bothered to inform themselves of the most basic facts is wearying work'.⁴¹ Elsewhere she denounces the media for attempting to 'Get the politicians, catch the government lying, denigrate, mock, kill. Never mind the substance of a policy'. This, she writes 'is political decadence', which 'is in danger of making the country nearly ungovernable'.⁴²

The same line could be heard from Blair aides such as Geoff Mulgan, who denounced 'the lack of a strong ethic of searching for the truth in much of the media'.⁴³ The most extended attack on the media in this vein has come from John Lloyd, a former *New Statesman* editor, who claimed the media were undermining democracy.⁴⁴ His point of departure was the BBC report by Andrew Gilligan which exposed the 'sexing up' of the dossier on Weapons of Mass Destruction. Lloyd asserted that the Gilligan story 'wasn't true'.⁴⁵ But this assertion was categorically wrong. The published evidence clearly shows that the story was true. Downing Street repeatedly intervened to 'sex up' the dossier – or to give 'presentational advice', as Alastair Campbell laughably put it – and was key to the strategy of selling the policy of regime change by lying about it. Whether or not all the evidence was available at the time

of Gilligan's report, his story was true, as the government's weapons expert, David Kelly, had intimated to him and other journalists. Lloyd and the rest exhibit the standards of journalism and evidence typical of the political elite in general. They are simply unable to write the truth about their political masters, being lost in the same matrix of deception and self-deception. They betray an abject supplication before our rulers.

As Marx and Engels put it in the German Ideology:

The division of labour,... manifests itself ... in the ruling class as the division of mental and material labour, so that inside this class one part appears as the thinkers of the class (its active, conceptive ideologists, who make the perfecting of the illusion of the class about itself their chief source of livelihood), while the others' attitude to these ideas and illusions is more passive and receptive, because they are in reality the active members of this class and have less time to make up illusions and ideas about themselves.⁴⁶

Lloyd fits this description well, as do so many other journalists and the staffers in Downing Street who helped their masters concoct the lies in question around Iraq. The outpourings of Lloyd and other apologists for neoliberalism in the UK bear a striking resemblance to those uttered by the neo-con followers of Leo Strauss. Irving Kristol notes that the truth must not be uttered in front of the masses in case 'the popularization ... of these truths might import unease, turmoil and the release of popular passions ... [with] mostly negative consequences'.⁴⁷

THE LESSON OF IRAQ

The lesson of Iraq is that the gap between elite belief systems and the truth has widened. This is a development grounded in material changes. Winning support for the idea that profits are legitimate and wages are fair is more difficult under neoliberal conditions than it was under social democracy, hence the need to lie and fabricate more than before in order to align dominant class interests with popular aspirations becomes a structural condition of the neoliberal period. In other words, the exponential growth of lying and of the apparatus for constructing lies is fundamentally connected to the freeing of capital from democratic control.

We should beware of those accounts which argue that our leaders have always lied or that there is nothing new in their contemporary lies. Such accounts fail to account for lying as an outcome of concrete material processes. Propaganda-managed democracy is hardly a matter of innocent fraud. The necessity for propaganda is created by the narrowing social basis of

neoliberal rule. This type of rule depends more on propaganda as the gap between class and general interests grows. But propaganda becomes ever more fragile as a mechanism of control as the divergence is experienced and understood by the people. The global justice and anti-war movements are both an expression of that fragility. Our rulers know this, and the fear it causes pushes them on to ever more extravagant lies.

NOTES

- 1 For example, Melanie Phillips: 'His repeated taunt that Mr. Blair was a liar rebounded badly; British voters don't like their politicians to trade insults, even if they agree with them'. 'Stuck in the Middle with You', *Wall Street Journal Europe*, 9 May 2005.
- 2 Philippe Naughton, 'Blair Dismisses Iraq Row as a Distraction', *Times Online*, 25 April 2005.
- 3 J.K. Galbraith, *The Economics of Innocent Fraud*, London: Penguin, 2005.
- 4 David Miller, 'The Age of the Fake', *Spinwatch*, 14 March 2005.
- 5 David Miller and William Dinan, 'The Rise of the PR Industry in Britain 1979-1998', *European Journal of Communication*, 15(1), 2000, pp. 5-35.
- 6 David Miller, 'The Propaganda Machine', in David Miller, ed., *Tell Me Lies: Propaganda and Media Distortion in the Attack on Iraq*, London: Pluto, 2004.
- 7 John Pilger, 'Pilger Film Reveals Colin Powell said Iraq was No Threat', *Daily Mirror*, 22 September 2003; and see Secretary Colin L. Powell, 'Press Remarks with Foreign Minister of Egypt Amre Moussa', Cairo, Egypt (Ittihadiya Palace), 24 February 2001, <http://www.thememory-hole.org/war/powell-cairo.htm>.
- 8 Memo from Peter Ricketts, Political Director, Foreign & Commonwealth Office, to the Foreign Secretary, Jack Straw, dated 22 March 2002, <http://www.david-morrison.org.uk/other-documents/ricketts020322.pdf>.
- 9 David Manning to Tony Blair, 'Your Trip to the US', 14 March 2002, <http://www.david-morrison.org.uk/other-documents/manning020314.pdf>.
- 10 Matthew Rycroft to David Manning, 'Iraq: Prime Minister's Meeting: 23 July' [The Downing Street Memo], published by the *Sunday Times*, 1 May 2005.
- 11 Christopher Meyer to David Manning, 'Iraq and Afghanistan: Conversation with Wolfowitz', 18 March 2002, <http://www.david-morrison.org.uk/other-documents/meyer020318.pdf>.

- 12 Cabinet Office paper, 'Conditions for Military Action', published in the *Sunday Times*, 12 June 2005.
- 13 Meyer's words in Meyer to Manning, 'Iraq and Afghanistan'.
- 14 For the documents in full and an analysis of them, see David Morrison, *Blair's Big Lie*, A Labour and Trade Union Review pamphlet, London: Bevin Books, April 2005; and 'More on Blair's Big Lie', May 2005, <http://www.david-morrison.org.uk/iraq/bn-blairs-big-lie-more.htm>.
- 15 Cabinet Office paper, 'Conditions'.
- 16 David Miller, 'The Propaganda Machine'.
- 17 Laura Miller, John Stauber and Sheldon Rampton, 'War is Sell', in David Miller, *Tell me Lies*.
- 18 Ricketts' memo to Jack Straw.
- 19 *Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction: The Assessment of the British Government*, 24 September 2003, <http://www.number-10.gov.uk/output/Page271.asp>.
- 20 See the forensic deconstruction of these claims on Glen Rangwala's site: <http://www.middleeastreference.org.uk>.
- 21 *Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction*, p. 17.
- 22 Peter Osborne, *The Rise of Political Lying*, London: Free Press, 2005, p. 244.
- 23 Greg Philo and David Miller, *Market Killing*, London: Longman, 2001.
- 24 Peter Osborne, *Rise of Political Lying*, p. 218.
- 25 Quoted in Ronald Bailey, 'Origin of the Specious: Why do Neoconservatives Doubt Darwin?', *Reason*, July 1997; See also Jim Lobe, 'Leo Strauss' Philosophy of Deception', *AlterNet*, posted 19 May 2003, <http://www.alternet.org/story/15935>.
- 26 Peter Osborne, *Rise of Political Lying*, p. 123.
- 27 *Ibid.*, p. 125.
- 28 *Ibid.*, p. 141.
- 29 In the rather 'tepid' debate on the 'professionalization' of political communications study after study demonstrates that US techniques of spin are being exported all round the world, although they meet greater resistance in some states than in others. See Gerry Sussman, *Global Electioneering: Campaign Consulting, Communications and Corporate Financing*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005; David Miller, 'System Failure: It's Not Just the Media – The Whole Political System has Failed', *Journal of Public Affairs*, 4(4), 2004, pp. 374–83.
- 30 Miller and Dinan, 'The Rise'.
- 31 David Miller, 'Phillis Report Signals End Of UK Public Service Information', *Spinwatch*, 2 February 2004; David Miller, 'Privatising Spin', *Spinwatch*, 18 May 2004, <http://www.spinwatch.org>.

- 32 Source Watch, 'Fake News', consulted 6 July 2005, <http://www.source-watch.org>.
- 33 Cited in Terence H. Qualter, *Graham Wallas and the Great Society*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979, p. 134.
- 34 Graham Wallas, *Human Nature in Politics*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1962, p. 29.
- 35 Alex Carey, *Taking the Risk Out of Democracy: Corporate Propaganda Versus Freedom and Liberty*, Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 1995.
- 36 Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion*, London: Allen and Unwin, 1921.
- 37 *Ibid.*, p. 158. 'The crowd is enthroned' PR pioneer Ivy Lee had written in 1914, calling for professional propagandists to act as modern 'courtiers' to 'flatter and caress' the crowd. See Ray Eldon Hiebert, *Courtier to the Crowd: The Story of Ivy Lee and the Development of Public Relations*, Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1966.
- 38 R.P.T. Davenport-Hines, *Dudley Docker: The Life and Times of a Trade Warrior*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 70, 74.
- 39 J.A. Turner, 'The British Commonwealth Union and the General Election of 1918', *English Historical Review*, 93, July 1978, pp. 528–59.
- 40 But see Mike Hughes, *Spies at Work*, Bradford: 1 in 12 Publications, 1994.
- 41 Polly Toynbee, 'Voting's Too Good for 'em: The Public Cavil Endlessly at Politicians while Wallowing in Wilful Ignorance and Bitter Prejudice', *The Guardian*, 4 June 2004.
- 42 Polly Toynbee, 'Breaking News', *The Guardian*, 5 September 2003.
- 43 Geoff Mulgan, 'The Media's Lies Poison Our System', *The Guardian*, 7 May 2004.
- 44 John Lloyd, *What the Media are Doing to Our Politics*, London: Constable Robinson, 2004.
- 45 John Lloyd, 'Dishonest? Take a Look at Your Own Deeds, Greg', *Observer*, 24 October 2004, p. 8.
- 46 Karl Marx, 'Ruling Class and Ruling Ideas', in *The German Ideology*, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1968, p. 64.
- 47 Quoted in Bailey, 'Origin of the Specious'.