

Democracy, Flaws and Antidotes, The Toxic Case of Iraq War.

Santos José.

Cita:

Santos José (2010). *Democracy, Flaws and Antidotes, The Toxic Case of Iraq War*. V Congreso Latinoamericano de Ciencia Política. Asociación Latinoamericana de Ciencia Política, Buenos Aires.

Dirección estable: <https://www.aacademica.org/000-036/773>

Democracy, Flaws and Antidotes

The Toxic Case of Iraq War

José Carlos C. Santos

Josecs99@gmail.com

PhD candidate in Political Science

Researcher at the Instituto do Oriente

Instituto Superior de Ciências Sociais e Políticas

Universidade Técnica de Lisboa, Portugal

Area Tematica: Teoria Política

Subarea Tematica: Desarrollos recientes en Teoria Política

Trabajo preparado para su presentación en el V Congreso Latinoamericano de Ciencia Política,
organizado por la Asociación Latinoamericana de Ciencia Política (ALACIP)

Buenos Aires, 28 a 30 de julio de 2010

Resume

This paper constitutes an approach to the improper waving of the Democracy flag and the use of instrumental techniques as the marketing and more specifically the political marketing as a way to implement policies that are doubtful in democratic terms.

The astute use of media channels to produce a propaganda that ultimately had served only the goals of an entrenched group constituted a dramatic event whose consequences are still and for long hardly felt.

To defuse these wrong actions targeting to impose an alien top-down democracy a new concept is rising and committing democracy followers, the monitory democracy.

1. Democracy

Democracy is an overloaded concept, the most valued and also perhaps the vaguest of political concepts in the modern world. Historically it has meant different things to different people. It has been applied to many different formations, and in interaction with different socio-cultural traditions and practices has produced diverse forms of government-some more representative, participatory and stable than others.¹ Political systems as diverse as the U.S.A., various one-party states in Africa and communist states all describe themselves as democracies. Indeed, it is distinctive of this vagueness that when a UNESCO conference on democracy was held in the 50's, more than 50 nations representing a wide scope of political systems, each insisted that they were a democracy.

Even in Western democracies, there is no consensus as to precisely what the concepts means and how best to express it as an ideal. There is not even widespread agreement among theorists and practitioners as to whether democracy is a form of government, a method of picking a government, or a term applied to a whole society, as portrayed in Alexis de Tocqueville's magnum opus *Democracy in America*,² which is essentially about American society.

The word "democracy" is derived from two ancient Greek words: *demos* ("the people") and *kratos* ("strength", "rule").³ It means more than that, in a way that political power is ultimately in the hands of the whole adult population, and that no smaller group has the right to rule. In a broad sense is a process of public participation whereby power and authority can be transferred in an orderly and peaceful fashion from one popularly mandated leader or party to the next, without the upheaval and mayhem that very often typify such a transfer in non-democratic systems. The processes to achieve this goal vary accordingly with the institutional mechanisms and from country to country, and they can be electoral or non electoral, although is broadly recognized that the best mean is through universal suffrage.

One of the difficulties one must face at the outset is that there is no democratic theory, there are only democratic theories, as Robert A.Dahl, the seminal scholar of democracy and democratization

¹ Amin Saikal, *Islam and the West, Conflict or Cooperation*, London, Palgrave MacMillan, 2003, p. 111.

² Tocqueville, Alexis, *De la Democratie en Amérique*, Paris, Flammarion, 1999.

³ Bernard Crick, *Democracy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002, p.11.

says,⁴ considering that in existing many approaches to democratic theory, is partly, although not wholly, a result of the fact that there are several approaches to any social theory, and concerning democracy a good case can be made out for almost all of these possibilities. But at a minimum, democratic theory is concerned with processes by which ordinary citizens exert a relatively high degree of control over leaders.

In the Democracy Theory we can consider three historic traditions. The contemporary theory of democracy is the result of three great traditions of political thinking. The first one is the classical theory, inherited as the Aristotle theory of the three forms of government, where the democracy as the people's government, of all citizens, or all those in use of citizenship rights, is distinct from monarchy, as the government rule of an individual, and from the aristocracy as the government of a few. The second is the medieval theory, derived from the roman people sovereignty, based on an ascendancy concept clashes with a descendancy concept of sovereignty, where the representative supreme power derives from the people or derives from the prince being transmitted by delegation from a superior to an inferior sphere. The third is the modern also known as the Machiavelli one, born with the emergence of the modern state, in the form of the great monarchies, where the historic forms of government are essentially two, the monarchy and the republic, where the old form of democracy is not anything more than a form of republic (the other is the aristocracy), so that originates the characteristic change of pre revolutionary period from democratic ideals to republican ideals, and the genuinely popular government is named instead of democracy, republic.

The problem of democracy, of its characteristics and of its merit (or the merit missing) is as we can see so old as the same reflection over the matters of politics, and at each time has been reposed and reformulated.

Defining democracy is very difficult, but amongst the meanings that have been connected to the word "democracy", and according with Andrew Heywood, are the following⁵:

- a system of rule by the poor and disadvantaged;
- a form of government in which the people rule themselves directly, without the need for professional politicians or public officials;
- a society based on equal opportunity and individual merit, rather than hierarchy and privilege;
- a system of welfare and redistribution aimed at narrowing social inequalities
- a system of decision-making based on the principle of majority rule;
- a system of rule that secures the rights and interests of minorities by placing checks upon the power of the majority;
- a means of filling public offices through a competitive struggle for the popular vote;
- a system of government that serves the interests of the people regardless of their participation in political life.

⁴ Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, *Electing to Fight, Why Emerging Democracies Go to War*, Cambridge, Massachussets, MIT Press, 2005, p. 8.

⁵ Andrew Heywood, *Politics*, London, McMillan Press, 1997, p. 66.

Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, delivered in 1864 at the height of the American Civil War, where he lauded the virtues of what he called "government of the people, by the people, and for the people", constitutes the starting point of the nature of democracy.⁶

2. Marketing

In the political sphere, each time, more and more the marketing techniques are subtly applied to attain the desired goals, which have been precisely planned.

There are several definitions of marketing as several concepts to the same word. However, there is a general acceptance of the definition of marketing, as the process of planning and executing the conception, pricing, promotion, and distribution of ideas, goods, services, organizations, and events to create and maintain relationships that will satisfy individual and organizational objectives.⁷

Conceptually marketing is a function whose goal consists in obtaining the maximum profit. Can be described as a fundamental activity in the domain of a commercial policy definition, oriented for a selection and development of product selling, the promotion and distribution of these same products in a way that will enable an optimum return of investment. As the optimum rate of return is normally obtained through huge quantities of production, the biggest amount of units produced, the better the prospect of profit. This means to produce the product that probably will most please the majority of the population. This allows also the freedom of choice for the consumer, as the little firms will concentrate their efforts in the hollows let by the most powerful companies. Many times, the biggest company will appeal to a vast group, producing a basic product and several optional extras that will please extreme groups. As the panoply of choice may be limited, the variety is always maintained according to the demand. In this way the market always decides the choice.

The growing of marketing techniques in our century has been determined by the parallel development of the international means of communication. Voyaging abroad, world tourism and the speed that people can travel have shrunk the globe dimension, globalization being a fact. Social, cultural and national barriers have been eliminated.

3. Political Marketing

Political marketing⁸ is the overall of techniques and tools aimed at optimize the available political resources aimed at attaining the desired political targets.

The existing principles of political marketing are relatively recent, as only now the complete marketing intervention techniques are rationalized through the generic term Marketing. Meanwhile, the history of political marketing is the history of politics. In fact, political action, imply intervention over the social environment and consequently entails communication and persuasion. In an empirical way all political agents do or apply rules of political marketing.

Meanwhile, the real big development that has been systemized by the name political marketing started with the massive politico-social phenomenon as the industrialization, the widening of the

⁶ *Idem.*

⁷ Louis Boone and David Kurtz, *Contemporary Marketing Wired*, London, Thomson Learning, 1998.

⁸ Denis Lindon, *Le Marketing Politique*, Paris, 1976.

suffrage, the creation of mass media, etc.⁹ So it was mainly in the twentieth century that the techniques of political persuasion have developed in several ways with diversified intentions. From the American democracy parades to the military soviet parades, passing by the nazi youth festivals until the political election advertising, all are examples of political marketing methods.¹⁰

There is though a divergence among authors over the political marketing exact meaning and more accurately over its validity. In fact, if for some there is a conceptual autonomy of political marketing, that finally express a real autonomy of the selling in the political market, for others what exists is only marketing applied to politics as to any other reality. To this conception, technicians, without any *parti pris* or value reference, must do the “sale” of political products in order to obtain the maximum possible results. It is so, a marketing neutral vision that has an understated technocratic vision that destroys the autonomy of the political actor.

It looks more correct in the theory domain (and more efficient in the framework of practical political consequences), the thesis that supports the political marketing conceptual specificity, through the idea that it has as goal, to transform the influence in authority, optimizing the intervention processes over the political reality, to change in a favorable way the distribution of the political actions and resources.

The Political marketing, is used by all participants in the political activity, in any society (parties, lobbies, political personalities, etc.) and its composed by a vast and heteroclite means, from the qualitative to the quantitative ones, from the psycho- sociological to the fund collecting, and pamphlet distribution, from the brain-storming to the electoral consultancy.¹¹

With the development of the political life, we are witnessing a complex sophistication of the political struggle methodology.

In the stabilized and post-industrial societies, the political and electoral decision occur often due to marginal factors, that prompt the marginal electors to decide the political challenge. We can not have any doubts over the increasing importance of the Political marketing, with its technical accuracy in the modern and post-modern developed societies.

4. *The Public Opinion and the Media*

One important matter to the American establishment is to pass their message to the public opinion, through mechanisms that can favor the success of the policies they favor.

The challenging task of shaping the public opinion has several stages that request not only ideological but also technical and financial commitment.

⁹ D.David, J.M. Quirincourt, H. Ch. Schroeder, *Le marketing politique*, Paris, 1978.

¹⁰ *Idem*.

¹¹ Jean Marie Domenach, *La propagande politique*, Paris, PUF, 1992.

The foundations and policy planning networks are in the most of the cases interlocked through their members and staff with the opinion-shaping process with the ever present and tentacular public relations firms and public affairs departments.¹²

The dissemination network one of the most relevant of the chain, comprise local and state advertising agencies, corporate-financed advertising councils, special or ad-hoc committees to promote specific issues and the supportive mass media.¹³

The Public Relations companies easily maneuver through the mass media due to their staff of qualified former journalists, using and abusing of their well-positioned contacts. They monitor the dissent opinions and critics, taking preventive action in questioning and damaging their credibility. Most corporations have their own Public relations departments.¹⁴

A more positive feature is reserved to the corporations Public Affairs departments engaged in polishing their company actions. Any deviated opinion is usually countered with a favorable story trying to configure the public opinion with the goals of the institution or department.

Another important instrument of policy shaping is the opinion polls, done through expert companies, allowing to read the “public feeling” concerning certain affairs, constituting a diagnosis for the following therapeutics administered very often by highly specialized *spin doctors*.¹⁵

Sidney Blumenthal a well known journalist, assistant and senior adviser to President Bill Clinton, denounced the control of politics by the polls, and the absorption of the elected by the “permanent campaign”, underlining the rise of the communication consultants with a “permanent” status, contrasting with that of the elected that are just “ephemeral”.¹⁶

Concerning the shaping of opinion on foreign affairs, the Foreign Policy Association (FPA) based in New York draws attention, not only because one third of its governing council are also members of the Council on Foreign Relations but also among its major contributors are conservative biased private and corporate foundations like the Luce Foundation, funded by Henry Luce the founder of the Time-Life empire, the Exxon Mobil Foundation and the Morgan Chase Foundation.¹⁷

It is in the sensitive mass media field that particularly the neocons deployed all their energies in order to get the biggest share of power control to publicize their message.

For a long period the conservatives complained that their message was particularly difficult to be seen on television. The main reason was that the control and ownership of the mass media – newspapers, magazines, books, radio, movies and television- are increasingly concentrated; the owners have several relationships with other corporations. Also, the media to be profitable must

¹² William Domhoff, *Who Rules America, Power Politics & Social Change*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 2006, p. 111.

¹³ *Idem*.

¹⁴ *Idem*.

¹⁵ *Idem*.

¹⁶ Sidney Blumenthal, *The Permanent Campaign*, New York, Simon & Shuster, 1980.

¹⁷ *Idem* supra 12, p. 119.

rely, aside the consumers, on the corporate advertising, that makes it highly dependent from interlocked corporations¹⁸.

Anyway since the Reagan presidency a subtle change begins to take place, due in part to the reemerging importance of the “military–industrial complex” strongly favored by the conservative policies, and a grip that it starts to hold in the “mass-media industrial complex”, through a strategic penetration in the stock-market.¹⁹

The NBC channel (associated to the powerful Microsoft became the MSNBC) that is owned by the conspicuous General Electric, which started making light bulbs and electrical appliances and is one of the most important from the stellar corporations that supply the avid U.S. military –industrial complex. Also associated with this media group is Newsweek, the portal Bravo, Telemundo and the Universal Pictures studios.

Viacom that owns the CBS channel, and MTV, VH-1, Nickelodeon, Showtime, the Movie Channel, Blockbuster Video and the Paramount Pictures studios, is largely participated by Westinghouse, which apart making fridges, supplies refrigeration systems to NASA, and cooling equipment for the supersonic bomber reactors, part of the deterrent military apparatus of the U.S.A.

The innocent Walt Disney studios, a U.S. cultural vehicle that started with cartoons characters now owns the anchor channel ABC, ESPN, A&E, Miramax Pictures studios, 30 radio stations and 17 magazines²⁰.

The mega fusion of conservative Time Warner publisher of Time and Fortune and liberal Ted Turner’s CNN, created a conglomerate that includes HBO, Warner Brothers Studios, America Online, Book –of-the Month Club, the book publisher Little Brown and several magazines. This constitutes a multimillion consumer market that appeals to an eager advertising economy of scale²¹.

The Australia press tycoon Rupert Murdoch _ the citizen Kane of our days- owns the galactic News Corporation with major interests all over the world. In the U.S owns the conservative populist Fox

¹⁸ *Idem*, pp. 124-5.

¹⁹ In coining the term “military-industrial complex” in his farewell address to the nation in 1961, President Dwight D. Eisenhower-retired four-star general and war hero Eisenhower- warned of the incestuous ties that had formed between the Defense Dept. and the “permanent armaments industry” birthed by World War II. Eisenhower worried that the Pentagon’s pursuit of its bureaucratic imperatives could combine with arms maker’s pursuit of profit to thrust the U.S. into a war the country did not need and perhaps could not win. BW. Sept 15, 2003 p. 49.

²⁰ *Idem* supra 12, p. 125.

²¹ *Idem*.

TV, Direct TV, the *New York Post* and the celebrated Twentieth Century Fox Studios.²² In Britain he owns several newspapers from the popular mass circulation *The Sun* to the more “serious” *The Times* and the profitable TV channels Sky News and Sky Sports. He owns several book publishers, a number of broadcast channels and newspapers in Canada, Australia and Asia as well. In the two last government elections, his “conservative” will was translated through pamphlet editorials in his well grasped papers, in endorsing the “third way socialist” candidate Tony Blair, former prime minister of U.K.

Rupert Murdoch, a feline businessman, who keeps dating ardently the vast Chinese market, is a conservative with a permanent invitation card to the White House receptions, entertaining a friendly relationship with the incumbent President George Bush.

Other “shaping” newspapers are the iconic *New York Times* that owns the *Boston Globe* and the elite *International Herald Tribune*, the *Washington Post* that owns the *Newsweek* and the online magazine *Slate* and the Dow Jones Wall Street Journal.

The NYT one of the best newspapers in the world was founded by a Jewish journalist and through owner parenthood has kept its liberal editorial line. The *Washington Post* group is also owned by the heirs of the Jewish Katharine Graham an exponent in serious journalism.

Two outstanding facts, so far, concerning the infamous Iraq War coverage is how two major players with an enviable audience in the media field stand out.

The first is the coming out of Murdoch’s Fox News, replacing the CNN (Clinton News Network as it is dubbed by the conservatives) as the most popular news channel with a propaganda style coverage. In addition to the suspicious exclusiveness of his “embedded”-in what some critics say, “is to be in the bed with the military”- reporters in the advancing military convoys, it normally portrays the “official” version, through “breaking news” scoops, spreading complicity and gullibly the “establishment” ideas that were conducive to the war.

Another fact was the *mea culpa* that the conspicuous *New York Times* had to make in the complacent way that it dealt with Iraq invasion and to the intoxicating propaganda that lead to it. In

²² By Mr. Rupert Murdoch “proposal” the News Corporation has nominated José Maria Aznar- former prime minister of Spain- in London on the 20th June 2006, as a new member of its council of administration. Mr Aznar will be the 14th member of the council, that until now was integrated by 13 members. He will be the third councilor that will not represent affiliated organizations or financial institutions like J.P.Morgan. The other two members are Viet Dinh, Law Professor in the Georgetown University in Washington D.C., and John L.Thornton, former president and CEO of Goldman Sachs Group and now director for the Global Leadership program at the University of Tsing-hua in Peking. Mr Aznar is a member of the Spanish State Council, a sensitive post that can conflict with his private activity. In El País, Madrid, 22th of June 2006.

Mr José Maria Aznar while Spanish government president in the Cortes de Madrid (Spanish Parliament) on the 5th of February 2003 stated:“We all know that Saddam Hussein is in possession of weapons of mass destruction.(...) We know also that he possesses chemical weapons.” In El País, Madrid, 4th June 2003.

Mr Aznar on the 30th January 2003, with Mr. Blair, Vaclav Havel, Berlusconi among others subscribed the “Letter of the Eight” in support of the U.S.A. where it was sustained that :“ The Iraqi regime and their weapons of mass destruction constitute a threat to the world security.”

Mr Aznar attended the Azores Summit with President Bush, Mr. Blair and Mr.Durão Barroso (playing the host as Prime minister of Portugal and since July 2004 president of the European Commission) on 16th March 2003, three days before the war started, where they declared categorically that “ Saddam’s refusal in getting rid of his nuclear, chemical and biologic capabilities, as well of the long range missiles”, would trigger a military attack.

In *Público*,Lisbon, 17th March 2003.

an editorial *The Times and The Iraq* on May 2004 it addressed its readers in a way that constitutes a serious piece of independent journalism, and an anatomy of a well calculated obfuscation:

“Over the last year this newspaper has shone the bright light of hindsight on decisions that led the United States into Iraq. We have examined the failings of American and allied intelligence, especially on the issue of Iraq's weapons and possible Iraqi connections to international terrorists. We have studied the allegations of official gullibility and hype. It is past time we turned the same light on ourselves. In doing so — reviewing hundreds of articles written during the prelude to war and into the early stages of the occupation — we found an enormous amount of journalism that we are proud of. In most cases, what we reported was an accurate reflection of the state of our knowledge at the time, much of it painstakingly extracted from intelligence agencies that were themselves dependent on sketchy information. And where those articles included incomplete information or pointed in a wrong direction, they were later overtaken by more and stronger information. That is how news coverage normally unfolds. But we have found a number of instances of coverage that was not as rigorous as it should have been. In some cases, information that was controversial then, and seems questionable now, was insufficiently qualified or allowed to stand unchallenged. Looking back, we wish we had been more aggressive in re-examining the claims as new evidence emerged — or failed to emerge. The problematic articles varied in authorship and subject matter, but many shared a common feature. They depended at least in part on information from a circle of Iraqi informants, defectors and exiles bent on “regime change” in Iraq, people whose credibility has come under increasing public debate in recent weeks. (The most prominent of the anti-Saddam campaigners, Ahmad Chalabi, has been named as an occasional source in Times articles since at least 1991, and has introduced reporters to other exiles. He became a favorite of hard-liners within the Bush administration and a paid broker of information from Iraqi exiles, until his payments were cut off last week.) Complicating matters for journalists, the accounts of these exiles were often eagerly confirmed by United States officials convinced of the need to intervene in Iraq”.

This media distortion can explain how after the September 11 contributed to the war popular support. According to a poll held by the University of Michigan in October 2003, 60% of the Americans and an incredible 80% of those that watch Fox News believed in at least in one of this non truths: 1. That weapons of mass destruction (WMD) have been discovered in Iraq; 2. There is an irrefutable proof in the existence of an alliance between Iraq and Al-Qaida; 3. That the world public opinion, supports the American military intervention in Iraq. The more the TV viewers watched the news network, the more they believed in these allegations. This, as a result, legitimized George Bush policy by the American public opinion.²³

The retired General Anthony Zinni, a distinguished military career U.S. Marine, former Commander in Chief of U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM), (predecessor of General Tommy Franks), and a sharp critic of the planning for the 2003 invasion of Iraq, gives an idea of the biased media coverage: *“Our whole public relations effort out there has been a disaster. I read the newspapers from the region every night online, and if you watch al-Jazeera, al –Arabya, or even some of the more moderate stations out there, and you read the editorials in the newspaper, there is a different war being portrayed in that region. A different conflict than we’re getting from Fox,*

²³ Eric Klinenberg, *Manière de Voir* 77, *Le Monde Diplomatique*, Octobre-Novembre 2004 , p. 70.

CNN, CBS, et cetera. And we better get the two jibed somehow, because that has been a massive failure. And there again, we could use advice from the region as to how to go about it."²⁴

Another relevant event that was taking place was the media deregulation, consenting that the newspapers could possess radio and television stations in the same town and allowing the big media corporations to buy more local and national networks.

Heading the Federal Communications Company (FCC), that was accelerating the deregulation process was Mr Michael Powell (for many in the media industry, the "most important" Powell in the Administration), that gave an important boost to the notorious networks market enlargement.²⁵

5. Monitoring Democracy

Recently due to the stated Democracy flaws a new wave is undulating not belonging to the featured Samuel Huntington, but to prominent scholars whose academic activity has been deployed in building a new theoretical pattern of Democracy, work that can be instrumental in removing the erroneous performances that present day Democracy presents. Professors Michael Schudson, John Keane and Gerardo Munck are among those most feverish in trying to elaborate the matching therapies.

For Munck, since Democracy is a universal value, "monitoring can help to attain values and 'instill substance into wondrous phrases,' because monitoring is ultimately about generating measurements, or data, and neither rulers can formulate policies on the basis of solid knowledge nor citizens can hold their rulers accountable without systematic and reliable information about the state of democracy."

The mutation of democracy in environments drastically distinctive from the ancestor democracies of Western Europe, Spanish America and the United States on the other hand had an important consequence. More and more the meaning and practice of democracy became implicated in community permanent sentiments, languages, institutions and shifting and contested forms of power.²⁶

The "warning" effect of monitory democracy will exert a pressure on idle or corrupt politicians and governments making them accountable for their failures. The humble tax payer is becoming more alert and demanding urgent forms of correcting their faulty elected representatives.

²⁴ Remarks of Gen. Anthony Zinni in the address to the Centre for Defense Information (CDI), an independent Think tank dealing with security affairs, based in Washington D.C., on the 22th May 2004, available at: www.cdi.org/program/document.cfm?DocumentID=2208, (accessed on June 15, 2006).

²⁵ Michael Powell is the son of Colin Powell, the former Secretary of State. Before joining the FCC, Powell served as chief of staff of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, and as a policy adviser to Vice President Dick Cheney, when Cheney served as Secretary of Defense during the administration of President George H.Bush. He resigned in January 2005.

²⁶ Keane, John, *Life and Death of Democracy*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 2009, p. 687.

Elections, political parties and legislatures neither disappear, nor decline in importance states John Keane.²⁷

The age of monitory democracy that began after the World War II, delivered some one hundred types of power scrutinizing institutions that the “orthodox” democrats ignored. This resulted from the lack of trust in the political class and the abuse by the governments that outrageously reverse their commitments during their electoral campaigns.

So the worship of numbers so much associated with representative democracy and with the Tocquevillian “Tyranny of the Majority” are being ruptured by the power- scrutinizing innovations, that give a say to minorities and disillusioned electors that have been centrifuged by the official politics.²⁸

A new array of terms and expressions are defining this power-monitoring environment, such as “empowerment”, “high energy democracy” “deliberative democracy”, “participatory governance” etc. Monitory democracy contemplates updating surveys, focus groups, deliberative polling, online petitions and audience and customer voting. The watchful Human Rights organisations are among those more active in deploying their monitor scope.²⁹

Under monitory democracy we are witnessing the change of the former rule of “one person, one vote, one representative” characteristic of the representative democracy to the new one of “one person, many interests, many voices, multiple votes, multiple representatives”.³⁰

Diverse actors are pursuing democracy advancement, like global intergovernmental organizations and a myriad NGOs, regularly addressing political and civil rights in non hospitable areas, risking their security in the field of puppet governments and monitoring rigged elections.

A successful event in the Human Rights field has been the end of sovereignty as an absolute principle, when through monitory democracy practices, crimes against humanity have been uncovered and investigated and an unprecedented consensual, coercive and corrective action has been taken in behalf of democracy code.

Conclusion

From the stated above we shall conclude that the quality of the institution Democracy must be continuously improved through engineered mechanisms capable to produce solutions that would be acceptable by a sustainable, wide and varied majority.

Those mechanisms would assume an active monitoring effect, proficient enough to create well tuned alternatives to biased solutions that normally reflect the lobbied interests of the powerful.

²⁷ Idem p. 689.

²⁸ Idem p. 690.

²⁹ Idem p. 691.

³⁰ Idem

The involvement of civic associations, with a strong academic valence is most welcome in scrutinizing the functioning of the traditional democratic political institutions and vehemently report the systemic inconsistencies.

Bibliography

Books

- Aron, Raymond, *Les Etapes de la Pensee Sociologique*, Paris, Gallimard, 1976.
- Beetham, David, *Democracy and Human Rights*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1999.
- Birch, Anthony H., *The Concepts and Theories of Modern Democracy*, London, Routledge, 1993.
- Boone, Louis and Kurtz, David *Contemporary Marketing Wired*, London, Thomson Learning, 1998.
- Crick, Bernard, *Democracy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Dahl, Robert, *A Preface to Democratic Theory*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1956.
- David, D., Quirincourt, J.M. H., Scroeder, Ch., *Le marketing politique*, Paris, 1978.
- De Feyter, Koen, *Human Rights, Social Justice in the Age of the Market*, London, Zed Books, 2005.
- Domenach, Jean Marie, *La propagande politique*, Paris, Puf 1992
- Domhoff, William G., *Who Rules America, Power, Politics, & Social Change*, New York, McGraw Hill, 2006.
- Fukuyama, Francis, *After the Neocons, America at the Crossroads*, London, Profile Books, 2006.
- Heywood, Andrew, *Politics*, London, Mac Millan Press, 1997.
- Huntington, Samuel P., *O Choque das Civilizações e a Mudança na Ordem Mundial*, Lisboa, Gradiva, 1999.
- Huntington, Samuel P., *The Third Wave, Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*, Norman, Oklahoma, University of Oklahoma Press, 1993.
- Ingram, Attracta, *A Political Theory of Rights*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Keane, John, *The Life and Death of Democracy*, London, Simon & Schuster, , 2009.
- Kingdon, John, *America, The Unusual*, Wadsworth Publishing, 1998.
- Lindon, Denis, *Le Marketing Politique*, Paris, 1976.
- Miller, David, *Political Philosophy*, London, O.U.P. 2003.
- Mills, C. Wright, *Power Elite*, London, Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Nowak, Manfred, *Introduction to the International Human Rights Regime*, London, Brill Academic Publishers, 2004.
- Potter, David, Goldblatt, David, Kiloh, Margareth, Lewis, Paul, *Democratization*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1997.
- Ramonet, Ignacio, *Irak, L'Histoire d'un Desastre*, Paris, Galilee, 2003
- Saikal, Amin, *Islam and the West, Conflict or Cooperation*, London, Palgrave MacMillan, 2003.
- Shute, Stephen, and Surley, Susan, *On Human Rights: The Oxford Amnesty Lectures 1993*, Oxford, Basic Books, 1994
- Shute, Stephen, Surley, Susan, *Perilous Times: Free Speech in Wartime; from the Sedition Act of 1798 to the War on Terrorism*, New York, W.W. Norton & Company, 2005.

Sourdel, Dominique, *Histoire des Arabes*, Paris, PUF. 2002.
Tocqueville, Alexis, *De la Democratie en Amerique*, Paris, Flammarion, 1999.
Woodward, Bob, *Plan of Attack*, Washington, Simon & Shuster, 2004.

Articles

Daniel Byman, *Constructing a Democratic Iraq: Challenges and Opportunities*, International Security, MIT, Vol. 28, N. 1, Summer 2003. /18034, (accessed on June 17, 2006).

Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz Interview with Sam Tannenhau, Vanity Fair, May 9, 2003, available at <http://www.defense.gov/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=2594> (accessed on June 15, 2010).

Ignacio Ramonet, *State Sponsored Lies* Le Monde diplomatique, English edition, July 2003, available at www.mondediplo.com/2003/07/01ramonet (accessed in June 14, 2006).

Gerardo L. Munck, *Monitoring Democracy: Deepening an Emerging Consensus*, January 2006.

John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* Published in London Review of Books, vol.28, n° 6 in March 23, 2006, in www.lrb.co.uk/v28/n06/mear01_.html in June 1, 2010.

John Keane, *Is Democracy A Universal Ideal? On the Need for New Thinking about an Aging Ideal*, Que Valores para este tempo? Conferência Gulbenkian-Lisboa, Outubro 2006.

Mark Danner, *The Secret Way to War*, in The New York Review of Books, Volume 52, Number 10, June 9, 2005, available at www.nybooks.com/articles

Philip S. Golub, *Les néoconservateurs et le culte de la guerre*, Manière de voir, 77, Le Monde diplomatique, Octobre-Novembre 2004, p.30.

Robert W. Tucker and David C. Hendrickson, *The Sources of American Legitimacy*, in Foreign Affairs, November/December 2004, available at www.foreignaffairs.org/20041101faessay83603/robert-w-tucker-david-c-hendrickson/the-sources-of-american-legitimacy.html, (accessed on June 25, 2006)

Serge Halimi, *Manière de voir* 77, Le Monde diplomatique, Octobre-Novembre 2004, p 40

Seymour Hersh in New Yorker, Annals of National Security, *The Debate Within*, March 11, 2003, available at www.newyorker.com/fact/content/?020311fa_FACT, (accessed on June 14, 2006)

The Observer, Sunday, February 29, 2004 *Army chiefs feared Iraq war illegal just days before start*, by Martin Bright, Antony Barnett and Gaby Hinsliff.

Websites

BBC News www.news.bbc.co.uk
CBS News www.cbsnews.com
Cornell University www.library.cornell.edu
Foreign Affairs Magazine www.foreignaffairs.org
Human Rights Watch www.hrweb.org
M.I.T. University www.web.mit.edu
New Review of Books www.nybooks.com/articles

New Yorker Magazine www.newyorker.com/

News Week Magazine and NBC www.msnbc.msn.com

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights <http://www.ohchr.org>

The Guardian Newspaper www.guardian.co.uk

US Constitution www.usconstitution.net/

US White House www.whitehouse.gov/