

## CONTROL OF PROPAGANDA AS A PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEM<sup>1</sup>

By Professor EDWARD K. STRONG, JR.

CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

**A**N interesting phenomenon of the last few years has been the unanimity with which millions of men and women have conformed in their thinking and in their actions to what certain leaders wanted. Vast sums of money have been raised for liberty and victory loans, for the Red Cross and for many other agencies. Citizens of the United States consented to universal conscription, cut down their daily use of sugar, closed down their factories on certain days, and went without gasoline for their autos voluntarily and enthusiastically. To an extraordinary degree men and women in nearly all the countries of the world have cooperated in carrying out programs necessitating radical changes in their every-day life; and they have done so not because they were ordered to do so, and so were forced to it, but because they freely responded to suggestions presented in skillfully conducted propaganda.

Because of the surprising success of all this propaganda, the innumerable times it has been employed and the ease with which it has been carried out, people generally have become conscious of propaganda as a great tool or method for influencing others. Propaganda has, of course, existed for ages. But it has not been comprehended so clearly by the mass of people as it is to-day. And certainly it has never before been employed on such great numbers of men and women. To-day it is a clearly recognized method of social control.

If propaganda were a means of influencing others along lines only of benefit to society, it could be hailed with great acclaim. But unfortunately it can also be employed for dishonest and socially vicious programs, just as well as for honest and worthwhile movements. At the present time the advertising of patent medicines that can not possibly cure, and of stock in companies formed for no other purpose than to defraud the public, appears

<sup>1</sup> Retiring vice-presidential address before Section I, Psychology, American Association for the Advancement of Science, at Toronto, December 30, 1921.

in altogether too many of our publications. Federal authorities estimated that in five years, 1910-15, the 2,861 swindlers that were arrested had defrauded the public of \$351,000,000, averaging a dishonest gain of \$123,000. All authorities are agreed that such swindling increased very greatly during the war, and possibly reached its climax some time after the armistice. If so, it is now on the decline. Let us hope so!

The drive, a new form of propaganda, has now become a regular business. According to James H. Collins, somewhere between a billion and a billion-and-a-half dollars have been raised in one year for various causes other than governmental. Many of these have been worthwhile, but unfortunately many have been the reverse. A bureau that makes a business of investigating national and interstate money-raising activities, reported that by April, 1920, the number of drives had risen to 1,021, of which the bureau approved only 124. The district attorney of New York County investigated 534 money-raising activities in 1918 and put 384 of them out of business. One gang of ex-convicts had obtained \$500,000 in eight months.

But we are less concerned here with swindling propaganda than with those forms not so palpably dishonest. It is important that our citizens be protected from pecuniary loss, but it is far more important that the United States, for example, deals with Russia, Mexico and the Irish question in the right way. And it is just such problems that furnish us with propaganda very difficult to handle.

As a case in point, consider the Russian situation. Those opposed to the Bolsheviki have attempted to destroy the movement by linking it up in our minds with the fact that the Bolsheviki were under German influence, that they were anarchists, that they were guilty of murder and atrocities, that they persecuted the Church, that they had nationalized women and were deliberately corrupting the morals of children, and now, recently, that their government is so unstable that we can not do business with them. The friends of this political and social revolution have told us entirely different stories. And so-called unbiased persons have often made statements which do not agree with what any one else has set forth.

Consequently to-day the average citizen confesses he really does not know what the facts are in this and many other important issues. He has been deluged with facts, near-facts and falsifications put forth by interested parties, so that he has a mass of undigested and conflicting ideas on these subjects, or else has become frankly partisan to one view.

President Butler, of Columbia University, recently called attention to the dangers to society of this sort of thing. "Liberty," he said, "which once was endangered by monarchs and by ruling classes, has long since ceased to fear either of these; it is now chiefly endangered by tyrannous and fanatical minorities which seize control for a longer or shorter time of the agencies and instruments of government through ability and skill in playing upon the fears, the credulity and the selfishness of men."

The question naturally arises, is there no way of controlling propaganda? Certainly there are ways and they are enforced more or less in the case of certain types of propaganda. But there are other types which are not so easily evaluated and consequently not so easily handled.

A perusal of literature on this subject gives one the impression that very few to-day are sincerely interested in the matter, except those apparently who desire to control or eliminate propaganda directed at their own. It is still viewed as highly ethical for us to sort and reject and trim in the name of our own view of truth, justice, democracy and loyalty to our group. But it is anti-social for the other fellow to do so. If we are Republicans we want the editor of our newspaper to give us good Republican views and to damn the Democrats. If we are Democrats, we want the reverse. We really want "facts" that support our views. It is too uncomfortable to be confronted with many counter "facts."

Naturally as a psychologist, I view this matter as an interesting psychological problem. It is my purpose in this place to discuss certain psychological aspects of the subject and to point out some of the ways in which propaganda may be controlled. It is also my purpose to call attention to certain types of propaganda which at present I see no way of controlling, in the hope that others may become interested in the subject and labor to work out some adequate methods.

First of all let us clarify the use of certain terms which are employed in discussing the subject and at the same time come to an understanding of the psychological elements which are involved.

The word "propaganda" means essentially the spread of a particular doctrine or a system of principles, especially when there is an organization or general plan back of the movement. Propaganda differs from "education" with which it is purposely confused, in that in the case of the former the aim is to spread one doctrine, whereas in the case of the latter the aim is to extend a knowledge of the facts as far as known. Advertising men have never been able to agree on a definition of "advertising" and I should not want to attempt here what they have failed to do. But

I think we can distinguish between advertising and propaganda by saying that advertising is usually concerned with making known and desirable a definite commodity or service with the definite aim of leading many individuals, as such, to acquire the commodity or service. Propaganda includes many types of advertising, but it is mainly concerned with the subtle presentation to the public of information so chosen and so focussed that among many individuals there develops a general "point of view" which is favorable to the aim of the propagandist and leads to action in that general direction. A further distinction between these two methods of influencing people pertains to the *methods* employed rather than the *object*. The advertiser buys space upon which appears his message, and the reader knows it a paid advertisement. The propagandist may advertise, but he especially aims to employ space he did not buy, at least directly, and not to permit the reader to know that the material is propaganda. He believes his material will have greater effect when its source is unknown.

It is clear that both advertising and propaganda make use of argument and suggestion. And much has been written and said as to these two methods of influencing others. We have no quarrel in this paper with argumentative or "reason-why" appeals to the public. But we are very much concerned with appeals involving suggestion.

The term "suggestion" has been employed in a great variety of ways, sometimes in a narrow sense, but usually in a rather broad and indefinite way. Frequently it is used to cover all the means of imparting information and exerting influence other than through reasoning. Without going into the subject here, let us recognize three phases of non-rational influencing of others. In the simplest form one or more ideas are presented which are known to be associated in the minds of the audience with another idea not mentioned. The audience thinks the non-mentioned idea because of their established habits of thought. In this way a speaker may denounce most viciously and unfairly a prominent man without giving his name, by skillfully referring to one or more of his known characteristics. The desired effect is accomplished and without making it possible for the prominent man to reply. Then there is the more complicated phase of suggestion where an *action* is brought into the mind of the audience—the action being a familiar one and also one that will be desired as soon as mentioned. Thus a school boy at recess says, "Let's get a drink." The other boys might not have gotten a drink if they had not been reminded of the action. But as soon as it is called to mind, they feel the desire and so go. So also a nation like Ger-

many, all primed for war, as in 1914—I don't refer here to her military preparations, but to the state of mind of her citizens—was ready to act immediately when her leaders said "Let's fight." It was the absence of just such a mental state in the United States that kept us out of war. Later on the attitude was developed—almost over-developed before it had a chance to function—and we were eager to act when the word was given.

In both these phases of suggestion the effect is produced because there exists within the mind of the person being influenced certain habits of thinking and action and when the proper stimulus or cue is given the associated thinking and acting immediately follow. There is still a third phase of suggestion, which I prefer to call motivation, in which a person is led to do something which is unfamiliar or which he would not do if it were merely mentioned. It is because of this third method of influencing others that the control of propaganda is so difficult. Let us see what this process of motivation is.

Consider an example: An electric light and power company launched a newspaper campaign some time ago in order to sell vacuum cleaners. The appeals were made to women to buy the cleaners in order to save labor and to make their homes cleaner and healthier. Many cleaners were sold. But the stock on hand was far from exhausted. Some time later the company launched another campaign, in which they directed their appeals to husbands, not wives. In these advertisements they depicted, for example, a successful business man in his office surrounded with filing cases, typewriters, dictaphones, and the like, and in another cut, showed the wife at home with a dust-cap on her head, sweeping the dining room, with the dust flying all about. The caption underneath read something like this: "Why not equip your wife's office like your own?" This second campaign sold more vacuum cleaners than the first one. Why? Because the man's love for his wife was aroused and this strong force was coupled to the idea of vacuum cleaners. Buying a vacuum cleaner then became a most satisfactory manner of expressing love. In advertising to the wives, on the other hand, no such fundamental motive was aroused. The vacuum cleaner would save labor, it is true, but it would not give to the wife as much satisfaction for the money as a new rug to be seen by every one coming into the home, or as new clothes for the children.

In this case we have men led into doing something they had no intention of doing, of buying something that little concerned them, and that they probably knew very little about. They were so led because love for their wives was aroused and they were

shown how this love could be very adequately expressed. With minor changes, the advertisement could have sold them an electric washing machine, or any useful household device. They were not sold, then vacuum cleaners so much as they were the satisfaction of pleasing their wives.

Motivation involves two elements—first, the arousal of a strong desire, and, second, the presentation of a certain action which appears to be a satisfactory way of expressing the aroused desire. Moreover the action in such cases is not one that the individual would perform if it were merely suggested.

The question has often been discussed: Could the United States have declared war in 1914? I think there is no doubt that there was insufficient war sentiment at that time to have permitted mere suggestions from the President to be effective. But I think there is also equally no doubt that proper propaganda would have motivated the country into war. The years 1914 to 1917 may be looked upon as a period in which such sentiment developed and was finally put into action in a calmer and far less emotional manner than usually prevails at such a time.

Recent work in psychology has emphasized the distinction between an "idea" and a "sentiment." The sentiment, according to Rivers, is an idea emotionally toned. "House" is thus an idea, whereas "home" is a sentiment, for home always includes an emotional consciousness of mother and father, brothers and sisters, old familiar associations and the like. When the sentiment becomes suppressed and lost to consciousness it is called a "complex." Sentiments and complexes, we are coming to see more and more are extremely important in explaining behavior; much of abnormal conduct being traceable to the existence of complexes.

Motivation is thus the process of deliberately developing a sentiment, of deliberately associating an idea with an emotion, of tying together in the mind of another the love for wife and the idea of buying a vacuum cleaner, or of sympathy for the Belgians and hatred of the Germans, and the idea of war.

The aim of propaganda is to develop sentiment and then precipitate action through mere suggestion. Let us consider some implications which are involved in all this.

First of all let us note that theoretically any emotional element can be associated with any specific line of action. Practically, certain combinations are difficult to accomplish, but theoretically they are possible. Thus, the correspondence school arouses the boy's love for his mother and challenges him to make her proud of him and "funnels" the aroused emotional desire into taking a correspondence course. The same appeal could be utilized to get



young men to go to church, to quit gambling, to work harder for their employer, to enlist when war is declared, to do anything the boy could be made to believe his mother would approve of.

In the last political campaign for President of the United States, the maternal instinct was appealed to by both sides. A Democratic editorial appealed as follows:

"Mother of America! Mother of Pennsylvania! Mother of Pittsburgh! Do you want your boy to go to war? Is the roll of battle drums sweeter in your ears than the song of his voice in the home? Would you rather have his hands in fierce grip on gun in battle's rack than have his arms in love about your neck? That is the question you must answer to your God and your fellow-man when you go into the voting booth on November 2. Do not let demagogues confuse you. The issue is plain: A vote for the league is a vote for peace; a vote against the league is a vote for war. . . . Mother of an American boy! The munition makers of the world are arrayed against American participation in the League of Nations. They are snatching at your vote, because with it they may claim the body of your first-born. Mother of a Pittsburgh boy! The question comes home to you! Your boy was not born to be food for guns."

A Republican advertisement stated in part:

"Women! For your own good vote the Republican ticket. . . . The American woman asks of her country: That it be a secure place for her home and for her children and that it be security with honor. That it give her children opportunity to lead their lives even better than she and her husband led theirs. That it be just in its relations with other nations, and merit the pride which the best of its citizens have in it, in its history and its ideals. A policy which has these purposes will have the support of American womanhood and American motherhood. That is the Republican policy and has been Republican policy from the days of Abraham Lincoln. The Republican policy is to protect the security of the United States by preserving its right to make decisions regarding its actions in the future as events in the future demand. The Republican party is unwilling to pledge now that it will protect European boundary lines and to deprive Congress of the power to say in each case what the action of the United States will be. . . ."

Here we have the same instinctive emotional element aroused and then associated with two diametrically opposite lines of action. Both of these articles are intended to arouse a mother's love for her boy and consequent horror of war, and then show that her desire could be best obtained by voting the Democratic ticket in one case and the Republican ticket in the other.

A second fact can be considered regarding motivation. It is that no logical connection needs to exist between the emotion which is aroused and the program which is outlined. And further still, there need be no logical establishment of the fact that the program is really the best one to be pursued or even that it is honestly conceived.

Consider the propaganda for the Red Cross, an organization for which we are all enthusiastic. The Red Cross has rendered inestimable service. And because its work has touched our hearts a real sentiment has been built up about its name. So strong is this sentiment that one now finds himself unable to resist the request for annual dues. But my friends—I have asked several—and I do not know whether all the money that is now raised is really needed, nor how it is spent, nor whether the organization is efficiently administered or not. I am not saying this in the way of criticism: I am only pointing out that when one's emotions have been properly aroused one acts as directed and without intellectually considering the matter.

Take the recent "Clean-up and paint-up" campaign as another illustration of what most would call a worthy propaganda. A trade journal, *The American Paint and Oil Dealer*, started it off with an editorial in May, 1912, in which it was pointed out that for many years there had been special campaigns inciting people to clean-up their towns and their neighborhoods for some specific gala occasion. It was now time "to back the idea that you clean up and paint up and keep cleaned and painted up, not just once a year, but the whole year through." "The idea was to inculcate into the minds of people pride in home and city, and in thrift and cleanliness, and to appeal to that pride to the end that it might be organized and wisely directed for the benefit not only of the paint industry, but of the whole United States of America. Enlisted in this campaign were various types of people. Material was prepared that appealed to every one of these types in a most specific manner."

R. F. Soule writing in *Associated Advertising* tells us how Chambers of Commerce were the principal bodies that helped put the campaign over. He describes how fire departments were aroused to the need to prevent fires as well as to put them out; how police departments became much more interested in enforcing sanitary ordinances along with the street-cleaning departments; how women's clubs helped the good work along; etc. In 1920 there were 7,000 towns and cities engaged in this campaign. And illustrative of the work accomplished it is reported that in Cincinnati 384 buildings were torn down that were a fire menace and



the city so cleaned up as to lessen the annual premiums for fire protection by \$850,000.

According to Soule not over \$25,000 was spent in any one year by the organization back of this campaign, although a great deal of publicity was given in newspaper editorials and in the advertising of many companies in connection with their own products.

Now note: This campaign is characterized as having been unselfish. The big idea was not to sell merchandise, it is claimed, but "to sell the people of this country citizenship, pride of home and ownership, and a desire to be of greater service to the community of which they were a part."

These were the motives, desires or wants that were aroused and then hundreds of business men saw to it that they were expressed by way of buying their goods, whether it was paint, oil, lawn mowers, flower seeds, or even safety razors. Clearly any emotional desire can be coupled up with any line of action and there needs to be no real logical connection between them.

Propaganda depends upon this psychological process of motivation for its success. And motivation, as we have seen, is the deliberate process of arousing one's emotions and desires and then suggesting a line of action by which these desires may be expressed. And we have seen further that any emotional element can be associated with any specific action; and that when one is well motivated he ignores intellectual considerations touching upon the honesty of the statements or the efficacy of the program.

So much for our analysis of motivation—the principal psychological process in propaganda. Now let us consider how propaganda may be controlled by society so that dishonest and pernicious campaigns may be prevented without interference to worth while propaganda.

The most convenient method of considering the many angles of the subject will be through discussing propaganda in terms of the following three aspects: First, propaganda considered with regard to the truth or falsity of the statements in which it is presented; second, with regard to the action suggested as the means of satisfying the aroused desire; and third, with regard to the emotional element, the desire that is aroused. The matter of control can accordingly be discussed in terms of these three questions: First, how far can propaganda be controlled in terms of the validity of the statements which are made? Second, to what extent can propaganda be controlled in terms of the action which is proposed? And third, to what extent can propaganda be controlled in terms of the emotional elements that are involved?

First of all, then, how far can propaganda be controlled in terms of the validity of the statements which are made?

Society has long dealt with false statements and already has postal regulations, laws against slander, libel and the like. To protect politicians the English law provides a fine not to exceed £100 if the name and address of the printer and publisher is omitted from a poster relating to the candidature of any person for Parliament and other offices. The Association of Advertising Clubs of the World carries on a steady campaign against dishonest advertising and has accomplished a great deal of good against this type of propaganda. At this time, thirty-six states have passed the Printers' Ink Statute or a modification of it, thereby facilitating convictions in such cases. And the Association of Advertising Clubs of the World is spending money and effort in enforcing it. Control of propaganda publicly making dishonest statements can clearly be taken care of.

But unfortunately many undesirable propaganda will not fall under the class of propaganda publicly making dishonest statements. One very undesirable sort is spread by word of mouth. No one knows from whence it comes, and exactly what is back of it. We had many stories thus circulated against the Germans during the war, and we have the same sort of thing carried on against prominent men almost all the time. Stories of Roosevelt's excessive drinking were thus circulated. And it was not until they were publicly expressed that he had an opportunity of disposing of them through law suit. Such word of mouth propaganda is fostered in times of emotional stress and particularly wherever people believe they are not being told all the facts. The best possible cure for it is publicity of the sort that makes people *believe* they are getting all sides to the question.

But in addition to this sneaking underhand propaganda there are all sorts of campaigns which are very undesirable, but which adhere technically to the truth. They cannot accordingly be prosecuted for dishonesty. Some of them, however, give false impressions just the same. This is so because the human brain does not necessarily think in a logical manner. For example, the statement, "No watchman here between 6 P. M. and 6 A. M." means just that and no more, but actually the effect is as though the statement had gone on to say that a watchman was on duty in the day time. For a distributor of a food product to advertise that his goods contain no arsenic is to give the impression that the goods of at least one of his competitors do contain that poison. And the lurid page description of two successful gushers between which the advertising company's property is located gives the impression one is surely buying stock in a gusher-to-be, even though the company's property may be several miles from either of the described oil wells.

Then there are other kinds of propaganda which deal with this subject in such a general way that no one can challenge their statement. One of the packing companies ran an advertisement some time ago which came no nearer to stating facts than this: "Possibly, we are partially to blame for the lack of understanding which exists in regard to our business. In the past, knowing that attacks upon us have been based on tissues of half-truths, adroitly handled inuendo and misinformation, we may have forgotten that the public were not in full possession of the facts." The statement is a very clever one, undermining criticism without giving a single fact in reply except the company's own belief that all attacks have been based on half-truths.

To require that propaganda contain truths and not falsehoods is a desirable regulation, but it will not stop undesirable campaigns.

Let us consider second to what extent propaganda can be controlled in terms of the action which is proposed.

If the proposed action is that of buying, it is not difficult to evaluate the propaganda, or advertising as it would usually be in this case, upon the grounds that the individual did or did not get value received. But if the proposed action is that of giving money for some cause or charity, justification upon such grounds is far more difficult. If a woman, very fond of cats, wants to endow a hospital for them, run by thoroughly incompetent people whom she likes, isn't that sufficient to justify her action and the propaganda, as far as she is concerned? It is hard to attack such action in terms of the rights of individuals, but it is being more and more attacked upon the grounds of social welfare. Business men through their Chambers of Commerce in sheer defense are increasingly investigating such propositions and in many places list the charities that they will countenance. Out of the war has come the Community Chest movement whereby all social agencies in a district make up their budgets in advance and after they have been gone over by both disinterested and interested parties, a single united effort is made to raise the total amount in one campaign for the year. Such plans help the worthy cause and interfere with the unworthy one. But they do not eliminate the unworthy campaigns.

The establishment of bureaus, whose business it is to investigate all organizations asking for funds—organizations like the National Information Bureau—renders it easier to determine whether any organization is desirable or not. Can society go farther here? Can society not only positively help the worthy cause, but put the unworthy, inefficient or unnecessarily duplicating agency out of

business? There is no question but that many individuals are being fooled every year and much money squandered through such non-worthwhile causes. But at the same time, we must remember that most new uplift movements have encountered great opposition at the start, and to increase this opposition still more through the establishment of legal regulations may do society in the long run more harm than good.

In addition to campaigns to sell a commodity or service or to obtain gifts, there are other campaigns devoted to accomplishing specific actions of a sort much more difficult to estimate fairly. Political campaigns aim to secure votes for certain men; propaganda appears from time to time to influence citizens to vote for or against certain measures; propaganda appeared in many forms a short time ago, appealing to citizens of the United States to intervene in Mexico; lobbies are familiar accompaniments to our legislatures, each one aiming to accomplish a specific program; unions appeal to public opinion to aid them in winning a strike and companies appeal to the same public to help them prevent or break the strike, etc. We are so accustomed to our political machinery that we do not often stop and ask ourselves whether it is geared up so as to serve society in the best way. Only when some enthusiastic social uplifter boasts that she and four others alone put a measure through a state legislature by the use of skillful lobbying, or a secretary of a business man's organization calmly announces months in advance that Congress will do away with a bureau because his organization is demanding such action, and his prophecy comes true, does one wonder whether some sort of control of propaganda would not be worthwhile even here. And one waxes quite indignant, as did a former Secretary of War, when he comes to realize that much of the propaganda for bringing back the bodies of our dead soldiers was instigated by the journal of the undertakers and casket makers.

To control such propaganda we must have facts and we must have a body to review the facts. This we do not have in many cases. A political campaign on a clean-cut issue is supposed to be a trial as to the merits of the two sides before all the citizens who through their votes decide the issue. This is the theory of democracy. It works pretty well in many cases, surprisingly well in some. But in most campaigns the issue is not clean-cut and in nearly all campaigns the political strategist endeavors to confuse the issue, so that many a time a citizen votes against what he really wants. And then there are many measures coming up in our fearfully complex life of to-day upon which the average man is not at all competent to pass judgment. Except in a few instances, so-

ciety has not yet organized itself so as properly to handle such matters. In the case of struggles between capital and labor, we are steadily advancing toward the insistence upon both sides that they shall present the facts as they see them and also toward the establishment of tribunals which shall weigh all the facts and decide the issue. The impartial chairmanship program maintained by the clothing industry in Chicago and other cities has worked very satisfactorily and seems to be the ideal machinery for controlling propaganda in that field. Its greatest merit lies, it seems to me, in the fact that complaints are studied and evaluated very shortly after they arise, thus eliminating the getting under headway of extensive propaganda with all the arousal of emotions that propaganda assures.

But there are many issues to-day, strongly supported by a minority, regarding which it is difficult to obtain facts. And as long as one side is insistent and the other side largely indifferent, society cannot expect that the minority will present facts regarding their claims. For it is not facts that will sell the program, but emotion and the emotion which is aroused needs not be logically connected with the issue. So a few harrowing tales of deserted mothers and their poverty stricken children bring us a mother's pension program because a few people believe this is the best solution. Possibly it is. I am not here arguing the case. But how much real thinking has entered into the matter by disinterested parties before a legislature has voted!

We have briefly considered the possibilities of controlling propaganda in terms of the action which is proposed—when the action is that of buying, giving money, or gaining support for *definite* political or other issues. But there is an entirely different type of response which some propaganda aims to accomplish. It is that where no definite act is suggested, at least directly, but where public opinion is to be changed. Pro-German propaganda before and during the war, or pro-Irish propaganda to-day, or the New Era Movement of the Presbyterian Church, or the International Typographical Union advertising in the newspapers do not aim at getting any one to do a specific act. What is aimed at is the development of a broad sentiment with the perfectly clear understanding that when this sentiment is established the individual will do something to forward the cause. To evaluate the propaganda in such cases, the entire program must be considered. And as individual members of a big movement emphasize different aspects it is very difficult to determine just what the movement stands for. For example, legal action was instigated some time ago against a union because in its constitution, if I remember correct-



ly, it stood for a soviet type of government. But no progress could be made because no specific action had been taken by the union, openly against the laws of the United States. Now possibly the constitution as far as this point was concerned was and had always been a dead letter. But possibly the point was the very heart and center of the union's life. Still, how can its propaganda be limited until it has resulted in definite action? But if it cannot be controlled until anti-legal action commences, then there can be no control of such situations until most of the harm (or good) has been accomplished. For if the propaganda has accomplished the establishment of a certain sentiment without interference and then specific action has been suddenly advocated, no legal machinery in existence can stop the action. The existence of a sentiment in Great Britain, that treaties to which they were a party must be observed, was one of the factors that forced that nation into war with Germany when the latter violated the neutrality of Belgium. As Sir Edward Gray said, "My God, what else could we do!"

There is another very vexatious phase of this point. When a sentiment has been established the individual may do almost anything which he feels will advance the cause in which he is interested. Can a propagandist be held responsible for the actions of his followers because he stirred them up originally. A newspaper publisher's propaganda against McKinley may have caused that president's assassination, as some have felt. But is the publisher responsible for an act he did not specifically advocate, even though, for the sake of argument here let us say, he did stir the assassin emotionally and against the President? The newspapers report the non-cooperation propaganda of Mahatma Gandhi of India and how this leader is fasting one day a week in protest against the rioting which his followers are indulging in. To maintain that the Publicist is responsible for what his followers do seems very unfair: to hold that he is entirely unaccountable opens the way for most subtle and dangerous attacks on society.

This leads us squarely up to the issue: shall propaganda be evaluated only on the basis of the actions that result or on the basis of the motives back of the propaganda?

Our law basically concerns itself with man's behavior and takes little account of motives. But a distinction is made between wilful murder and unintentional manslaughter. And a man can be convicted of murder if a person's death results within a year from his shooting at a chicken with intent to steal it. The intention to steal makes the accidental death murder. Here man is held responsible for the final results of his criminal intention in just about as far reaching a manner as if he had inflamed another who



then went out and murdered a complete stranger. Responsibility for the actions of another under certain circumstances, has been established. The Court of Appeals of New York State has recently awarded damages to an employee who when reprimanded by his foreman for negligence called the foreman a liar, and was struck and knocked down by the foreman. His glasses were shattered and vision in one eye destroyed. It was held that the employer should be held responsible for an excitable and violent foreman in the prosecution of his duties as such, at least until there is sufficient interruption in the performance of such duties as to justify the conclusion that the foreman had abandoned his employment and that the assault was an independent and individual act, as distinguished from acts within the terms of his employment.

In connection with the Espionage Act the Attorney General's Department opposed the proviso that "anti-war utterances or propaganda would not be punishable if made with good motives and for justifiable ends" on the grounds that it would make it difficult to prosecute and convict. Regulation according to this view must be in terms of actions, and motives can not be considered. Twenty-two states have adopted the Printers' Ink Statute regulating dishonest advertising in which no reference to motive or intention is made. Sixteen other states have, however, inserted the word "knowingly" or its equivalent, thus making it necessary to prove that the dishonest advertising was intentional. Legal action in these sixteen states is based primarily then upon the motive, not the act.

The 1918 Report of the Attorney General states the policy of that department regarding the enforcement of the Espionage Act. It is of significance here. One paragraph reads as follows:

"The Department throughout the war has proceeded upon the general principle that the constitutional rights of free speech, free assembly and petition exist in war time or in peace time, and that the right of discussion of governmental policy and the right of political agitation are most fundamental rights in a democracy. It has endeavored to adhere to the principle that neither the Government nor any group or class of citizens should be permitted to take advantage of the war situation to suppress discussion and agitation of domestic problems, whether political, social, economic, or moral. At the same time, however, it has held to the view that neither under the guise of political theory, social conviction, or religious creed should any man or group of men be permitted to indulge in propaganda which has the deliberate purpose of disintegrating our strength in the war or which is of an essential nature necessarily producing that effect."

In other words, the policy outlined here maintains that the welfare of the nation is paramount and that any propaganda which can be classified as injuring the national war program will be condemned regardless as to how this propaganda could be classified in terms of rights of free speech, free assembly and the like. And further that motive is of little consideration in comparison with an overt act.

So far we have considered the possibilities of controlling propaganda from the two aspects: first, as to whether the statements in it were true or false; and second, as to whether the proposed action was socially worth while or not. This discussion has seemingly emphasized the necessity of taking motives into account. Now let us consider the third aspect of the subject—the element of aroused desire, the emotional background and psychologically true cause of the action.

We have seen that theoretically any emotion may be aroused as the basis for stirring one to act and that there needs be little or no rational connection between the two. The detailed suffering of a little girl and her kitten can motivate our hatred against the Germans, arouse our sympathy for the Armenians, make us enthusiastic for the Red Cross, or lead us to give money for support of a home for cats. The story may be true or concocted for the purpose; the inferences against the Germans or for the home for cats may be also true or false; the organization carrying on the propaganda may be efficiently administered or not—all these considerations little concern us. We feel the emotion, we want to do something because by acting we will feel better, and away we go regardless of mere intellectual considerations.

Here is the real psychological problem concerning propaganda. Take away the emotional element and society need have no fear of propaganda. For man is always very slow to act in terms of ideas alone. Witness his indifference when he really knows the political organization in control of his municipality is flagrantly dishonest. He does nothing until his emotions are aroused by a whirlwind speaker, or by personal injury. So long as a radical writes or speaks in a philosophical manner society can rightly be indifferent. But when he discards the intellectual aspects of his views, seizes upon some slogan and fills his writings or speeches with concrete tales of human suffering and the arrogance of the rich, society rightly becomes alarmed. For now the radical is setting fire to dynamite and neither he nor any one else can tell what may result.

At the present time the prospects do not appear over bright of controlling propaganda through regulation. There is, however,

a method of weakening its influence, and that is by fighting one propaganda by another, or by general publicity. The trouble, however, with fighting bad propaganda by good propaganda, aside from the very practical consideration that the former is usually better equipped financially, is that seldom is the public supplied with facts upon which a real conclusion can be thought out. Instead it is inflamed to take sides and a deadlock results, or the matter is settled by some sort of resort to force. Just in this way arose the turmoil about the League of Nations program. Instead of thinking it through and arriving rationally at a real conclusion, Wilsonites and anti-Wilsonites became emotionally aroused and it was voted down because the latter group had the greater force measured in votes. Both sides know the real issue is not dead, and the Republicans who defeated Wilson's program are now attempting at Washington to find the conclusions we should have reached months ago. Fighting propaganda with propaganda is not likely, then, to give us satisfactory results.

Can propaganda be controlled through publicity? Yes, if we had perfect publicity. But that, apparently, we cannot have. Hence, we can only hope to have partial control by this means.

It has been suggested that propaganda could be controlled by national control of all publicity. Would such regulated and censored publicity help here?

The two extremes of publicity are no freedom of speech and complete freedom to say whatever one wants to. The Anglo-Saxons have decided that freedom is better than no freedom. The French lean quite strongly to centralized control of all publicity. Observers both from within and without that country testify that such censorship deadens public interest in the news of the world. And it certainly makes possible all manner of mouth-to-mouth whisperings—the most insidious and undermining of all propaganda. An editorial in the New York Times only the other day called attention to the marked difference in behavior of radicals in this country and abroad concerning Sacco and Vanzetti, who have been condemned to the electric chair for murder. Abroad the Reds have inspired the rank and file of their group with rage over the so-called persecution by the American Government of those radical leaders and several assassinations have been attempted as a result. In this country no such disturbance has resulted because, as the Times points out, everyone is familiar with all the facts of the case and so even the Reds can not be stirred up over the affair.

Possibly publicity is the one best cure we have to-day for handling those forms of propaganda which are not readily con-

trolled by other means. But if this is the case it means that more of our newspapers and magazines will have to convince the public that what they print is not controlled by certain interests. At the present time I should judge that great numbers of citizens believe most newspapers, if not their own, distort the facts to fit their purposes. And again, if publicity is to cure the evils of propaganda, it means that society must work out some more satisfactory method than now exists of providing the groups of poor people with adequate publicity to offset the enormous advantage that groups composed of wealthy people have in commanding the printed page. Too few newspapers print to-day, and too few can ever afford to print, the detailed testimony in a labor controversy, yet unless the laboring man feels his side is presented, he will have supplied to him and will read wild denunciations of capital instead of the sworn testimony of his leaders as given before a board of arbitration.

Another means of controlling propaganda lies in educating the public to an understanding of the methods employed in propaganda. It is thought that man likes to feel he is being appealed to on logical grounds: that he resents being "soft-soaped." And that he does not want to be "worked," or to have something "put over on him." Possibly, it is contended, articles such as have appeared recently in our magazines recounting the methods by which propagandists have fooled men and women may educate the public to see through a publicity campaign. Personally, I do not believe that very much can be accomplished in this way, for, as Barnum claimed, the public likes to be fooled; and secondly, clever appeals to the emotions will nearly always win when pitted against intellectually held convictions.

In closing, I want to emphasize one point. It is possible to-day for a group to carry on a very subtle propaganda with the immediate aim of developing some sentiment. There is no machinery to stop them, whether the sentiment is socially good or bad. For sentiment is an emotional state of mind and as long as no action results, society to-day has no way to handle it. So France mourned at the Strasbourg statue in Paris each year and kept alive the sentiment to retake Alsace-Lorraine. Of course, we completely sympathize with her. But it made Germany prepare all the more for war. And the world sat back and looked on while Germany established the sentiment in the minds and hearts of her citizens that they lived only for the fatherland and that war was the truest expression of their country's life. The Grand Army of the Republic and the Confederate Veterans have perpetuated northern and southern antipathies and the American Legion must of neces-

sity keep us antagonistic toward Germany. For these organizations are surcharged with emotion. General O'Ryan is quoted in the papers as follows:

"Ten years from now the battlefields of Europe will not look as they appear to-day. They will bear monuments of men on horseback and the young men will grow up thinking of war in terms of medals, glory and men on horseback rather than in terms used by the young men of to-day who were in the war. Delay in solving this problem will mean that those who profit by war will get control of the kids and that's what they want. The youngsters will be hypnotized to believe anything in the name of patriotism and they will want to get medals and glory of their own."

If war is to be eliminated, it will be necessary to control the sentiments that are developed in each and every country. Similarly if peace is to be attained between capital and labor, the right sentiment will have to be developed. Many an employer has been smarting under conditions now past when labor had the whip hand. He is now getting even, as he says. He is reacting to a sentiment of revenge and at the same time building up a similar one in the minds of his employees. This is the sure road to worse conditions.

As far as I can see, society has reached the point in its development when it must take motives into account, because man has now learned how to arouse motives to action in an economical and wholesale way. And in regulating motives society must come to evaluate the sentiments that propaganda is aimed to create, and to regulate in some way the use of phrases arousing emotions, as distinguished from phrases appealing to rational consideration. Without control in some way of the emotional element in propaganda, legal action will never stop the most dangerous of propaganda which arouses a sentiment first of all and then at the proper moment in one fell swoop precipitates that sentiment into action.