



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Boekbespreking van: Campaigns and elections American style

Anker, H.

Citation

Anker, H. (1995). Boekbespreking van: Campaigns and elections American style. *Acta Politica*, 30: 1995(4), 479-481. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3450355>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3450355>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

point of the tree, could be interpreted as a particular 'history of the world'. That sounds all right to me as long as such a path does not contain lines that are exclusively related to some admissible GF. Indeed, if it does, the path will be more like a 'history of a hypothetical world'. It seems to me that the CGT setup can perfectly handle the one extreme of feasible, nonadmissible behavior but still needs the finishing touches as far as the other extreme of admissible, nonfeasible behavior is concerned.

Another aspect that puzzles me is the way the admissible GFs are supposed to come into being. The reason Van Hees assigns a separate admissible GF to every participant (or even every coalition of individuals) is that he wants to leave open the possibility that participants have contradictory permissions. For instance, individual A may have an admissible GF such that by choosing some particular strategy he can make sure that a certain state of affairs 'x' will arise, while at the same time another individual B may have an admissible GF in which some strategy choice guarantees that 'x' will not arise. It looks as if in the admissible GF of individual A the other participants have no say whatsoever about their 'own' strategy sets in that game form. Finally, there is the closely related question of how it is 'decided' which game form is actually to be played at any given point of the game tree and how that 'decision' is coordinated. That is, how can we be sure that all participants intend to play the same game form?

Whenever Van Hees turns to examples, he neatly succeeds in evading the above problems by looking at rather special cases only. To begin with, he mostly considers decision situations in which the whole gamut of admissible GFs is reduced to just one, i.e. situations in which all (coalitions of) participants face exactly the same admissible GF. In addition, he assumes that for each and every participant any admissible strategy is at the same time feasible but not necessarily vice versa. That is to say, the admissible GF is just a part of the feasible GF. Unfortunately, by so doing Van Hees also appears to lose track of one of his self-imposed tasks, namely, to devise a theory of rights in which there is a clear differentiation between devices of actual and of hypothetical control.

Unfortunately, this very evasion of the more intricate aspects of his own DLA also deprives Van Hees of the opportunity to add something really innovative to the analysis of the Liberal Paradoxes, the subject matter of Chapters 7 and 8. The first of these two chapters is devoted to what he calls conventional, the second to constitutional decision-making, the difference being that the latter centers upon the question how rights should be allocated while in the former this allocation is taken as given. For situations of conventional decision-making Van Hees shows that, in case the admissible GF is one and the same for all individuals, there may exist preference profiles such that either none of the Nash outcomes is Pareto optimal (Sen's Paradox) or there exist no Nash equilibria at all (Gibbard's Paradox). These results could have been derived – indeed, were previously derived by others – without the powerful apparatus of DLA.

One cannot but feel similar disappointment when reading the chapter on constitutional decision-making. As a matter of fact, in this part Van Hees seems to wander away almost completely from his original analytical framework. All of a sudden, con-

ditions of liberalism are now defined in terms of a newly introduced concept, the individual freedom relation, a binary relation over the set of possible outcomes. That is to say, any constitutional decision-making situation is not just characterized by some particular preference profile but also by a specific freedom profile. It seems almost self-evident that always some pair of preference and freedom profile may be found such that outcomes which are (Pareto) optimal under the one profile are definitely not so under the other. For Van Hees a case like this represents the analogue of Sen's Liberal Paradox in the constitutional decision-making context. I don't say he is wrong, I just cannot see what might be the use of proving again and again the ubiquity of these rather dull phenomena. To me, that has something of a paradox.

The above, more critical remarks about the last two chapters do not alter in any way my overall positive judgment on Van Hees' thesis. No doubt, he did a great job. Indeed, for anyone thinking about doing research into the subject matter of individual rights this book should be the natural point of departure. Of course, this is not to say that for others without such plans there are not as many good reasons to take note of it.

G.P. de Bruin

J.A. Thurber and C. Nelson (eds.), **Campaigns and Elections American Style**. Westview Press, Boulder 1995

Perhaps nowhere else in the study of political phenomena do we find such a big gap between practitioners and academics as in the area of political campaigning. Where academics have tended to regard political elections campaigns as fairly irrelevant for election outcomes, adding little, if anything, to the explanation of individual voting behavior or election outcomes, campaign professionals have found little use in the work of academics for bringing their missions to a successful end. It is this observation that lies at the heart of *Campaigns and Elections American Style*. The goal of this book is to explore to what extent academic and professional viewpoints nonetheless can be married.

The book attempts to do so by bringing together, for the very first time, academics and campaign practitioners and having them discuss a number of important aspects of modern election campaigns. The covered aspects are campaign planning, campaign strategy, fundraising, paid advertising, coverage by the press, field operations (such as get-out-to-vote drives), polling, and – sign of the times – campaign ethics. A final chapter, with the misleading title 'Do Campaigns Matter?', summarizes the most important findings.

Each of the topics is first addressed by a campaign professional and is subsequently discussed by an academic, thus granting the latter the privilege of having 'the final say'. At this point, however, it is worth noting that most of the academics actually do have some practical campaign experience. A second trait shared by the contributors is that they all served as lecturers at the well-known *Campaign Management Institute* affiliated with American University in Washington D.C.

The idea of pairing campaign professionals with academic scholars is, indeed, highly original and definitely worthy of further pursuit. For most topics, it has led to wonderfully thought-provoking exchanges of opinions. The discussions of campaign finance, paid advertising, and press coverage truly stand out in this respect. Some of these exchanges are complementary, as in the case of campaign reform, where the practitioner describes the process of fund-raising on the individual level (single candidates), while the academic describes how it all works out on the aggregate level (the political system). Other exchanges, such as that on press reform, are more polemic, leaving the reader wondering how the discussion would have continued if the practitioner were allowed the opportunity to reply to the academic.

In a few cases, the pairing idea does not work out as the editors undoubtedly had hoped for. This, however, is mostly due to the lack of work that has been done in certain fields. For example, academics have done relatively little in empirically evaluating the effects of fieldwork (voter contact, canvassing, etc.) on election outcomes. By implication, there is little reason to expect scholars to provide penetrating insights on this topic. In a similar vein, clearly defined frameworks for studying and evaluating campaign ethics are virtually non-existent. Here too, academics do not have much to add to the consultants' viewpoints.

The editors' emphasis on the differences between campaign professionals and academic researchers almost automatically begs the question of who did a better job. This question, however, is difficult to answer. It is probably most appropriate to conclude that both groups are tied. The biggest vice on the academics' part is a failure to be sufficiently to the point (quite stereotypical, indeed). Some of the practitioners, on the other hand, have a penchant for stating all sorts of 'truths', which either have not been tested adequately (as in the case of fieldwork), or, worse, have to be rejected on empirical grounds. The latter is for example the case in the thundering chapter on campaign strategy, which rests on the maxim that voters are either completely attached to a single party or completely unattached ('floating') – a gross over-simplification given the widespread knowledge that voters' ties to parties are more accurately described in terms of a gradual distinction rather than a dichotomy. Although most of the practitioners' chapters sound very definite, critical readers are more than once left wondering how much of this can be taken for true, and how much should be discarded as fluff. Proof is provided rarely, thus unnecessarily blurring the distinction between empirical fact and inference.

These criticisms, many of which are already addressed by the authors dealing with the same topic, should not allow us to overlook the great merits of *Campaigns and Elections American Style*. Together, the book's eighteen chapters give a highly informative view of what is going on in the U.S. as far as political campaigning is concerned. The major trend is a further professionalization of down-ballot races (state, county, district, etc.) due to the reduced costs of survey research. Still, the presidential races appear to be the ones to turn to for the introduction of new campaign technologies, such as dial meter focus groups (a small group of voters evaluating pictures shown to them by means of little hand-held switches), 'morphing' (a candidate's face changes to somebody else's, for example an unpopular (ex-)president), and the test-

ing of spots through interviews by phone. Without doubt, many of these technologies will be introduced to down-ballot races in the near future.

From a Dutch point of view, it is interesting to see how, in the last few years, Dutch political parties have managed to narrow the gap with their U.S. counterparts. Survey research (benchmark tests and tracking polls) and pre-tests of campaign messages were either introduced or assigned a more prominent role in the 1994-campaign. In addition, monitoring designs have been used that are characterized by a heavy emphasis on focus groups. In some ways, Dutch campaigners even seem to be ahead of the U.S. For example, the technology through which findings from a limited number of focus groups can be generalized to the entire electorate appears not to be known on the other side of the Atlantic.

Despite its little flaws, this book should be mandatory reading for any person who is to work on an election campaign, wherever that campaign takes place or whatever office is involved. During the campaign, one should keep this book within arm's reach, so that useful advice will be instantly available. Students in political science and communication studies, too, will benefit from this book, especially if teachers follow up on the discussions in the book through their lectures, class room discussions, practical assignments, or campaign simulation games. Finally, academics will find this book an important source that combines a host of practical, until now largely undocumented, knowledge with more common academic perspectives. As such, it contains the building blocks for theoretical frameworks that are so desperately needed in the study of modern election campaigns. Such building blocks are scarce and ought to be cherished.

Hans Anker