

The War for the Public Mind

Molding Public Opinion

NUÑO RODRÍGUEZ, POLITICAL SCIENTIST AND ANALYST



The rise of mass society was a turning point in history. The need to redirect the population by the new parameters set by the ruling class, was a turning point in governance. In the modern world, Napoleon was the first to openly use propaganda for political purposes, with his creation of the office of public opinion. Napoleon saw public opinion as something mechanical that could be manipulated through psychology.¹ As a matter of fact, Napoleon thought that there were only two forces in the world: the sword and the spirit. He saw that throughout history, the spirit had always defeated the sword.² Therefore, he thought that the strength of a state resided in the opinion that the population had of the state itself. Napoleon summarized his belief in the power of public opinion when he said that “three hostile newspapers are more dangerous than a thousand bayonets”.³ The approval of the population was indispensable for the practice of government. Thus, the of the masses and their emergence in political affairs was one of the main reasons why the modern state needed propaganda.⁴ In mass soci-

ety, the population knows its leaders through the media, and in this system, the exercise of strong censorship is much more complex than in previous times. The French philosopher Jacques Ellul claimed that if political leaders want to follow their own agenda they must present a decoy to the masses; they must create a screen between them and the masses that projects shadows representing a type of policy, while the real policy is carried out on another stage.⁵ Thus, the emergence of mass society has caused the emergence of a bizarre symbolic communication, covered by the media, between the rulers and the governed.

In the twentieth century, American sociologist Daniel Bell criticized the dystopian vision of European authors against the new social reality. For Bell, these authors only saw that in Europe, technology had devoured social ties, authorities, and beliefs that had previously given meaning to lives; that society had become a market where individuals had become speculators of fluctuating values and roles.⁶ Daniel Bell saw, in European authors, that the denunciation of this new social situation, which had made individuals lose their sense of being and, thus, increased their level of anxiety. The general idea was that society had lost the concept of good and evil—had lost the Cartesian coordinates that allowed society to analyze itself and the environment.⁷ This situation led people to look for new beliefs, new messiahs—something that restored what mass society had destroyed.⁸ It was a dystopian vision which authors such as José Ortega y Gasset and Hanna Arendt shared. Clark MacPhail, professor emeritus at the University of Illinois, suggests that “the economic, social, and political confusion of the late nineteenth century turned the masses into a formidable problem for the political status quo, as well as for security in public places”⁹ and certainly history comes to us full of tumultuous events in almost the entire globe. The study of the psychology of the masses that emerged in Europe held that the assembled crowds generated all kinds of emotions among members, which transformed the “psychology of the individual into a collective psychology.”¹⁰ In the United States, there was a more positive vision of mass society, and the management of that society had been theorized.

American researchers saw this new mass society not as the sum of the individuals but rather the conversion of individuals into a single entity with unique characteristics not previously found in isolated individuals.¹¹ An individual that is part of a mass thinks, feels, and behaves differently than he or she does as an individual; one switches from having an individual psychology to being part of a social psychology.¹² Ellul was not indifferent to this. The French philosopher explained that an individualistic society must, by nature, be a mass society; one where the individual is reduced to a number. Mass society tears individuals out of their primary groups to throw them into the whole of society. Thus, uprooted individuals begin to live in an unstructured mass society where social groups such as

family or church have disappeared, where they must learn again to judge what is good and bad. Thus, the uprooted individual is exposed to the propaganda currents of the state and of the masses¹³ Propaganda creates myths that try to entrap the person in all aspects. For Ellul, the myth created by propaganda completely invades consciousness. The myth created by propaganda totally controls the person, who becomes immune to other types of influences.¹⁴ The ideal life internalized by modern populations is a product of the propaganda that the ruling class inject into the media. Mass society is made up of a multitude of atomized and unstructured individuals eager to fill their emotional and existential emptiness with currents of thought that link them with a psychological group that makes them feel part of a group. That group psychology is the “public mind”.

British political scientist Terence Qualter has a more pragmatic view of the new mass society. Qualter believes that the emergence of mass society forced the ruling class to take the masses into account and to conform their own actions to the popular will. This led to the development of sophisticated attempts at manipulating public opinion. He states that the growth of propaganda parallels the rise of democracy. According to Qualter, the traditional ruling class was forced to invest considerable time and energy in pretending to have social support.¹⁵ The struggle to manage the public mind, i.e., public opinion, is at the root of mass society and democracy. Qualter says that economic power reconciled with democracy once ruling class realized that the majority could not be detrimental to private property; trust came from new communication technologies and the manipulative knowledge of their uses.¹⁶

In this regard, Robert Entman, political scientist and professor at George Washington University, suggests that ruling class monitor public attitudes so that people would behave in ways that favor the ruling class. To influence the thinking and actions of the population, the ruling class must filter information and link it with knowledge already acquired by the population. Entman argues that to exercise power in a democracy, behavior must be influenced by telling people what to think and how to do it.¹⁷ For the government in mass societies to work, the thoughts and decisions of the population must always be in line with the filtered information; the public mind must be molded with published information. In this social scenario, the public mind is an influenced audience.

Many academics have studied the emergence of mass society, its nature, behavior, and influence in the social structure and people themselves. George Simmel analyzed the differences between rural and urban environments; Gustave Le Bon, the psychology of the masses; Gabriel Tarde, the relationship between mass and public media; and Robert Parks told us that sociology is the science of human behavior and shared the idea of differentiating crowds and audiences with Tarde.

Parks thought that when the public ceased to be critical, it became a crowd again.¹⁸ Walter Lippmann offered the first analysis on the proven malleability of public opinion, and Edward Bernays explained how to manipulate that opinion for its own purpose. It is an encyclopedic task to gather and analyze all theorists of the psychology of multitudes, mass society, and public opinion in an article. However, there are four authors who show the evolutionary linkage between the relationship of the masses with the media and with the elites: Le Bon, Tarde, Lippmann, and Bernays.

Gustave Le Bon

The author of the “Psychology of the Masses” tells us that a crowd is a transitory construct, composed of heterogeneous elements that come together momentarily to form a living being.¹⁹ Le Bon pointed out that for a group of individuals to form a crowd, with their own feelings and behavior, elements must displace individual consciousness, giving way to group unconsciousness. For him, the elements that made a race a unit were, among others, religion, politics, and morals. Le Bon maintained that, although individuals of the same race or society could be intellectually disparate, they were united by common feelings and passions.²⁰ For him, for the multitude to arise it is necessary that individual consciousness be displaced; thus, a few hundred individuals gathered in a square did not constitute a multitude in psychological terms, a common influence of other causes was needed.²¹ Individuals had to alienate their feelings and thoughts from the collective of the crowd.²²

According to Le Bon, there are three basic elements that form a crowd. The first is the feeling of *group strength*, the individual becomes an irresponsible anonymous being.²³ The second element according to the French author lies in *social contagion*, collective hypnosis; an individual can superimpose the interests of the collective over their interests. The third element, according to Le Bon, is *influence*.²⁴ With these characteristics mass psychology gives clear parameters of how the individual immersed in the mass lacks individual consciousness and alienates himself to a collective unconsciousness, in which influence and contagion makes them into irrational beings.²⁵ Le Bon thought that those who managed to excite the imagination of the masses would be able to control them. In fact, he thought that the masses were especially suggestible and gullible.²⁶ He wrote:

“The creation of the legends which so easily obtain circulation in crowds is not solely the consequence of their extreme credulity. It is also the result of the prodigious perversions that events undergo in the imagination of a throng... that is soon totally transformed.”²⁷

The abstract theory of Le Bon was clear: simplified narrative was the way to transmit ideas among the crowd. It remains the same today. One of Le Bon’s most interesting

reflections on the mentality of the masses refers to the way in which the masses manage their cognitive process:

“A crowd thinks in images, and the image itself immediately calls up a series of other images, having no logical connection with the first... Our reason shows us the incoherence there is in these images, but a crowd is almost blind to this truth.”²⁸

Le Bon delved deeper into the mentality of the crowds, suggesting that the projection of suggested ideas to crowds needs a simple form that can be translated into images. Ideas do not even have to be related to each other. For Le Bon, suggesting ideas to the crowd is like projecting slides from a magic lantern; the most contradictory ideas can be symbiotic in the minds of the crowd.²⁹

This idea of projecting ideas onto the masses seems to have been a prophecy about today’s current media. Le Bon’s ideas have been contested at various times and different academic venues, but today his thesis is still valid and verifiable. Just as before “crowds that only know how to think about images can only be impressed by images. Only images can terrorize or attract the masses. The feelings suggested by images is what can lead to motivate an act.”³⁰ Undoubtedly, Gustave Le Bon has been one of the authors who have influenced most political leaders of the twentieth century.

Gabriel Tarde

Gabriel Tarde obtained scientific recognition in academic circles, while Le Bon was considered vulgar.³¹ Together with Le Bon, Tarde stated that crowds were a product of industrial urban areas and that their disengagement from traditional institutions, together with exposure to various stimuli, resulted in their restlessness.³² However, Tarde suggested that both crowds and societies responded to similar dynamics.³³ The French author was key to understanding the transition from psychology to sociology and how communities transformed into societies.³⁴ Tarde suggested that the transformation of individual psychology to group psychology was achieved through imitation. He later stated, in his book “The Laws of Imitation” (1890), how society consisted of a huge network of imitations and how that imitation is sort of a sleepwalking.³⁵ What was “influence” for Le Bon, was “imitation” for Tarde. A similar concept will be basic in sociology in later decades, such as the cognitive psychology of Albert Bandura.

Tarde added a vision of the human group relationship that changed the way of looking at society. Tarde suggested that the congregation of the multitudes might not be physical but a psychic connection generated by the media. Therefore, Tarde thought that while a crowd could physically congregate, the psychic connection produced by the media was what created a new social entity: “the media created the public”. For Tarde, the public congregated around ideas reflected in the press—not through physical suggestion but by influence without contact.³⁶ Tarde had made the distinction between

crowds and audiences, which would be an advance for the study and analysis of modern societies: the theory on the connection node of the public's mind.

For Tarde, the written press was society's nervous system.³⁷ Physical space had ceased to be a determining variable for grouping individuals; mass media could do it mentally, not physically. It was the media that generated influence, that generated a contagion.³⁸ This made the media the necessary driving force for crowd mobility, as reflected by Le Bon.³⁹ Tarde's contributions to the knowledge of mass society marked the evolutionary step of the crowd into the masses themselves. However, his contributions to the academic knowledge of society have been obscured in history to the point of the apparent oblivion of such a great thinker.

Walter Lippmann

Walter Lippmann experienced World War I firsthand and the massive propaganda campaign that had been carried out by Woodrow Wilson's government. Lippmann understood then that democracy was moving through strings manipulated by propaganda. In 1922, he wrote his work "Public Opinion", in which he stated that stereotypes and prejudices expressed in propaganda campaigns governed public opinion.⁴⁰ Lippmann realized that people in the modern world did not know the world through direct experience but through the media.⁴¹ He was certain that the media suggested the masses to take one direction or another; but they did not distribute the concrete information, but rather specific visions about events. It was already a proven fact that Spain's war with the United States was promoted by different means of mass media; specifically it was a war promoted by the tabloid press of William Randolph Hearst, who dedicated himself to cultivating war psychosis in American public opinion.⁴² In fact, the war between Spain and the United States is known as "the Hearst War".

Lippmann, after analyzing the media's relationship with the audience, suggested that propaganda acted as a filter between reality and the audience's perception of reality itself. As he said, the media created "the images in our heads."⁴³ Lippmann revealed that in a few hours a short report could go around the world and be read by millions of people, and those words could draw an image in the public mind about what was happening in any other part of the world; and with that image propagandists could manipulate people's emotions in one direction or another.⁴⁴ Le Bon suggested that crowds think with images, disjointed and irrational. According to Lippmann, the audience of the media resembled Le Bon's thesis. The mechanism of inserting images into the minds of the audience resembled a trigger for Lippmann that, when pressed, produced a series of images that could come from a reading or a speech. Those images made emotions emerge. and when the images dissipated, only emotions remained, which could continue to be used by a name or a symbol.⁴⁵

Lippmann considered that symbols are socially binding elements that had the power to create coalitions and that these coalitions were more emotional than critical. Therefore, struggling factions fought for possession of those symbols. He pointed out that the public's opinion could be totally manipulated and controlled through the media. Lippmann's next work would further reflect the skepticism of the author in reference to public opinion, which may be the reason that his work "The Phantom Public" disappeared from circulation shortly after being published.⁴⁶ Few authors have been so precise in expressing themselves on how the media creates and influences public opinion.

Edward Bernays

Edward Bernays, Sigmund Freud's nephew, considered Lippmann the father of public relations. However, Lippmann was a theorist and not a practitioner. In the end, it was Bernays who was recognized as the father of public relations, even though there were other specialists in this field since the creation of social relations and its writings. Consistent with Bernays' vision, Lippmann had proposed the theory and had put it into practice.⁴⁷ However, Bernays' distortion of Lippmann has generated many theories on how public relations can be applied in the media to influence the consumer of ideas, products, or policies.

During World War I, Bernays was working for a propaganda organization created by President Wilson, the Committee on Public Information. Within this huge propaganda campaign, Bernays began to take seriously the field of advertising and its application.⁴⁸ Bernays suggested that the public relations (PR) advisor should know how to generate propaganda that colored the minds of the public in reference to the most disparate matters.⁴⁹ He held that the masses aspired to gain power and that the ruling class had found, in propaganda, the scientifically correct weapon to channel the mentality of the masses. He maintained that propaganda was the executive arm of the invisible government.⁵⁰ According to Bernays, the minority had again found a way to control the majority.

In 1923, Bernays wrote "Crystallizing Public Opinion", clearly inspired by Lippmann. However, Bernays focused more on the field of sales and marketing than on social theory.⁵¹ In his book, Bernays states that public opinion is the aggregate sum of individual opinions and that the PR counselor must approach the individual to know the group.⁵² Bernays said that public opinion is malleable if the PR advisor can influence the thinking bodies of the audience, mainly the media.⁵³ For Bernays, first, public opinion could be molded through social groups and institutions such as schools, churches, and academics and then, through the media (press, movie films, radio Bernays', and so forth).⁵⁴ Bernays' work extended between political and mercantile circles. In fact, he used his status as a newly published author to convince New York University to create a PR course for him to teach. Bernays only had a bachelor's degree in agriculture, but

he managed to compare PR studies with those of medicine or law.⁵⁵ Bernays knew that there was no exact science to manipulating public opinion, but he knew that experimental psychology had begun to mark the way, that psychology had taught the usefulness of emotions to manage individuals and audiences. He knew that sociology would benefit by analyzing the behavior of the groups.⁵⁶ He thought that, if the political power thoroughly understood what strings to pull to change public opinion, it would be as if a new instrument was added to an orchestra and the other instruments changed. Bernays thought that to change public opinion, authoritarianism and influence groups were needed. He hinted that ideas needed to be impressive and dramatic to change the inertia of traditions.⁵⁷

His book, “Propaganda”, published in 1928, has been described by many authors as a basic manual for political and commercial manipulation. The validity of its ideas is more than evident and has given rise to innumerable investigations in reference to psychological warfare, public relations, and propaganda. The book begins with the chapter “Organizing Chaos” in this blunt way:

The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country. We are governed, our minds are molded, our tastes formed, our ideas suggested, largely by men we have never heard of... in almost every act of our daily lives, whether in the sphere of politics or business, in our social conduct or our ethical thinking, we are dominated by the relatively small number of persons...who understand the mental processes and social patterns of the masses. It is they who pull the wires which control the public mind, who harness old social forces and contrive new ways to bind and guide the world.”⁵⁸

Summary

The emergence of mass society changed the relationship parameters between rulers and governed. The change from fragmented agrarian societies to concentrated industrial societies meant a change in the nature of the human being and of society. The need to readjust relations between rulers and governed implied the need for an agreement between both parties. Control could no longer be exercised through coercion; the era of control by influence was born. The elites had to convince the governed to follow the parameters set by the rulers, and the media opened a door to the mind of each individual, thus becoming a new social entity: the audience. The use of propaganda, persuasion, and protopsychology was decisive when it came to changing mass societies into easily manipulated democratic societies that did not jeopardize the power of the ruling class. Convincing was cheaper and more reliable than imposing.

Le Bon, Tarde, Lippmann, and Bernays marked the guidelines of the new relationship between rulers and governed: The psychology superior to the individual that is articulated in images and emotional contagion, proposed by Le Bon; the cohesion of the masses through the media and imitation as social learning, proposed by Tarde; media manipulation attracting individual psychologies to an artificial media psychology, suggested by Lippmann; and the use of psychology to govern the masses without them suspecting that they have been influenced, as Bernays proposes. All these constitute an action protocol for the molding of the public mind through media propaganda.

Bernays was already clear in expressing that the world of propaganda was linked to the academic knowledge of psychology and the manipulation of emotions to eliminate and not tear down the barriers of the individual's resistance to be bought.⁵⁹ Bernays, by way of working on the Committee on Public Information, knew that the basis of all social dynamism was propaganda and psychological warfare.⁶⁰ This became the basis of the media as propaganda became a science. The use of the manipulative elements applied to mass society required large investments of capital and human resources. World War I provided governments at war with the opportunity to invest in the research of the manipulation of the masses. From there, new academic fields in the application of psychology and sociology have emerged to achieve those ends in peacetime. □

Notes

1. MEERLOO, Abraham Maurits. Total war and the human mind: A psychologist's experience in occupied Holland. International Universities Press. 1945. P 39.
2. GELFI, Manuel H. La acción psicológica como arma de guerra (*Psychologic Action as a Weapon of War*). Revista ESG. Buenos Aires. 1955. P 168.
3. MCLUHAN, Marshall and Lewis H. Lapham. Understanding media: The extensions of man. MIT press, 1994. P 13.
4. ELLUL, Jacques. 1973. P 122.
5. ELLUL, Jacques. 1973. P 122.
6. LEACH, Eugene E. Mastering the crowd: Collective behaviour and mass society in American social thought, 1917-1939. American Studies, 1986. P 99.
7. SANJORGE, Gonzalo Hernández. "Reflexiones sobre la construcción del sujeto en la era post cartesiana." (Reflections on the creation of the individual in the post cartesian era) A Parte Rei: Philosophical Journal. 2003.
8. LEACH, Eugene E. 1986. P 99.
9. MCPHAIL, Clark. Blumer's theory of collective behaviour: The development of a non-symbolic interaction explanation. The Sociological Quarterly. Vol. 30, no 3. 1989. P 402.
10. LEACH, Eugene E. 1986. P 101.

11. GUTIÉRREZ, Eduardo Gutiérrez. El barbarismo de las masas visto desde la perspectiva de tres “pensadores de lo social”: Gustave Le Bon, Georg Simmel y José Ortega y Gasset. (The barbarity of the masses as seen from the perspective of three “social thinkers”: Gustave Le Bon, George Simmel and Jose Ortega y Gasset). *Agora: Philosophical papers*. 2017. P 103.
12. GUTIÉRREZ, Eduardo. 2017. P 104.
13. ELLUL, Jacques. 1973. P 90-94.
14. ELLUL, Jacques. 1973. P 11.
15. QUALTER, Terence H. *Advertising and democracy in the mass age*. Springer, 2016. P 5.
16. IBID P 10.
17. ENTMAN, Robert M. “Media framing biases and political power: Explaining slant in news of Campaign 2008.” *Journalism*. 2010. P 392.
18. MCPHAIL, Clark. 1989. P 407.
19. LE BON, Gustave. 1896. P 6.
20. GUTIÉRREZ, Eduardo 2017 P 105.
21. LE BON, Gustave. 1896. P 2.
22. IBID. P 2.
23. IBID. P 10.
24. IBID. P 10.
25. GUTIÉRREZ, Eduardo. 2017. P 108.
26. TAGLIAVIA, Francesca Martínez. “La imaginación de las masas: la eficacia de una falsa hipótesis.” (The imagination of the masses: The effectiveness of a false hypothesis). *Revisiones* 3. 2016. P 2.
27. LE BON, Gustave. 1896. P 23.
28. LE BON, Gustave. 1896. P 23.
29. IBID. P 49.
30. IBID 1896. P 57.
31. BORCH, Christian. *The Politics of Crowds: An Alternative History of Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2012. P 34.
32. LEACH, Eugene E. 1986. P 101.
33. BORCH, Christian. 2012. P 48.
34. LANG, Kurt; LANG, Gladys Engel. *Mass society, mass culture, and mass communication: The meanings of mass*. *International Journal of Communication*, 2009, vol. 3, p. 20. P 1005.
35. BORCH, Christian. 2012. P 54.
36. LEACH, Eugene E. 1986. P 102.
37. IBID P 108.
38. NOCERA, Pablo. *Masa, público y comunicación. La recepción de Gabriel Tarde en la primera sociología de Robert Park. (Mass, the public, and communication. The reception of Gabriel Tarde in Robert Parks’ first sociology)*. *Nómadas*. Vol. 19, no 3. 2008. P 151.
39. IBID P 152.
40. BORCH, Christian. 2012. P 151.
41. IBID P 151.
42. FELDMAN, Marc D. *The military/media clash and the new principle of war: Media spin*. Air University Press, Maxwell AFB AL, 1993. P 5.
43. BORCH, Christian. 2012. P 151.
44. LIPPMANN, Walter. *Public Opinion, with a new introduction by Michael Curtis*. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick. Second edition. 1998. P 37.

45. IBID. P 203.
46. LIPPMANN, Walter. *The Public Phantom*. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick. 1993. P XVII.
47. JANSEN, Sue Curry. Semantic tyranny: How Edward L. Bernays stole Walter Lippmann's mojo and got away with it and why it still matters. *International Journal of Communication*. 2013. P. 1094.
48. EWEN, Stuart. *PR! A social history of spin*. New York: Basic Books, 1996. P 162.
49. BORCH, Christian. 2012. P 153.
50. EWEN, Stuart. 1996. P 167.
51. BORCH, Christian. 2012. P 153.
52. BERNAYS, Edward. *Crystallizing the Public Opinion*. Liveright Publishing Corporation. New York. 1961. P 61.
53. IBID. P 76.
54. IBID. P 87.
55. JANSEN, Sue Curry. 2013. P 1095.
56. BERNAYS, Edward L. Manipulating public opinion: The why and the how. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1928, vol. 33, no 6, p.960. In this article Bernays explains which techniques were used through the media to change the opinion of the white population over the black population.
57. BERNAYS, Edward L. 1928. P. 958.
58. BERNAYS, Edward. *Propaganda*. Barcelona: Melusina, 2008. P 15.
59. BERNAYS, Edward. 2008. P 70.
60. EWEN, Stuart. 1996. P 162.

References

- BERNAYS, Edward L. Manipulating public opinion: The why and the how. *American Journal of Sociology*. vol. 33, no 6. 1928.
- BERNAYS, Edward. *Crystallizing the Public Opinion*. Liveright Publishing corporation. New York. 1961.
- BERNAYS, Edward. *Propaganda*. Barcelona: Melusina, 2008.
- BORCH, Christian. *The Politics of Crowds: An Alternative History of Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2012.
- ELLUL, Jacques. *Propaganda. the formation of men's attitudes*. Vintage Books New York. 1973.
- ENTMAN, Robert M. "Media framing biases and political power: Explaining slant in news of Campaign 2008." *Journalism* 11.4 .2010.
- EWEN, Stuart. *PR! a social history of spin*. Chapter 8 Unseen engineers: biography of an idea New York: Basic Books, 1996.
- FELDMAN, Marc D. *The military/media clash and the new principle of war: Media spin*. Air University Press, Maxwell AFB, Al. 1993.
- GELFI, Manuel H. La acción psicológica como arma de guerra (*Psychologic Action as a Weapon of War*). *Revista ESG*. Buenos aires. 1955.
- GUTIÉRREZ, Eduardo Gutiérrez. El barbarismo de las masas visto desde la perspectiva de tres "pensadores de lo social": Gustave Le Bon, Georg Simmel y José Ortega y Gasset (The barbarity of the masses as seen from the perspective of three "social thinkers": Gustave Le Bon, Geore Simmel and Jose Ortega y Gasset). *Agora: Phisophical Papers*. vol. 36, no 2. 2017.
- JANSEN, Sue Curry. Semantic tyranny: How Edward L. Bernays stole Walter Lippmann's mojo and got away with it and why it still matters. *International Journal of Communication*. vol. 7. 2013.

LANG, Kurt; LANG, Gladys Engel. Mass society, mass culture, and mass communication: The meanings of mass. *International Journal of Communication*. vol. 3. 2009.

LE BON, Gustave. *The Crowd; a study of popular mind*. Chapter I The Mind of the Crowd. The Macmillan co. New York. 1896.

LEACH, Eugene E. mastering the crowd: collective behaviour and mass society in American social thought, 1917-1939. *American Studies*. vol. 27, no 1. 1986.

LIPPMANN, Walter. *Public Opinion*, with a new introduction by Michael Curtis. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick. Segunda edición. 1998.

LIPPMANN, Walter. *The Public Phantom*. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick. 1993.

MCLUHAN, Marshall and Lewis H. Lapham. *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. MIT press, 1994.

MCPHAIL, Clark. Blumer's theory of collective behaviour: the development of a non-symbolic interaction explanation. *The Sociological Quarterly*. vol. 30, no 3. 1986.

MEERLOO, Abraham Maurits. *Total war and the human mind; a psychologist's experience in occupied Holland*. International Universities Press, 1945.

NOCERA, Pablo. Masa, público y comunicación. La recepción de Gabriel Tarde en la primera sociología de Robert Park (Mass, the public, and communication. The reception of Gabriel Tarde in Robert Parks' first sociology). *Nómadas*. vol. 19, no 3. 2008.

QUALTER, Terence H. *Advertising and democracy in the mass age*. Springer, 2016.

SANJORGE, Gonzalo Hernández. "Reflexiones sobre la construcción del sujeto en la era post cartesiana." (Reflections on the creation of the individual in the post cartesian era). *A Parte Rei: Philosophical journal* 26.6. 2003.

TAGLIAVIA, Francesca Martínez. "La imaginación de las masas: La eficacia de una falsa hipótesis." *Revisiones* 3 .2016.



Nuño J. Rodríguez, Political Scientist and Analyst

Director and analyst at Quixote Communications, a political, diplomatic, public relations, and strategy consulting firm. Rodríguez is a graduate political scientist from the Universidad Complutense de Madrid and specialized in Political Communication at the University of Amsterdam. He is an expert in intelligence and counterintelligence and has extensive knowledge in audiovisual language, narratives, and counternarratives. He has worked on research funded by the European Union on the influence of the media on society, for this reason he has developed analytical and critical capacities on the influence of the media system on the formation of patterns of behavior in society. He has also conducted research on psychological warfare, propaganda, and intelligence. Additionally, Rodríguez is a political analyst for different television programs with an international scope.