Naval War College Review

Volume 14
Number 9 *December*

Article 1

1961

December 1961 Full Issue

The U.S. Naval War College

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

VOL. XIV, NO. 4 DECEMBER, 1961

CONTENTS

SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE READER

The material contained herein is for the professional education of officers of the naval service. The frank remarks and personal opinions are presented with the understanding that they will not be quoted. Under no circumstances will this material be released to individuals or organizations other than active members of the officer corps of the armed services. It shall not be republished or quoted publicly, as a whole or in part, without specific clearance in each instance with both the author and the Naval War College.

Naval War College Review was established in 1948 by the Chief of Naval Personnel in order that officers of the service might receive some of the educational benefits of the resident students at the Naval War College. Distribution is in accordance with BUPERS Instruction 1552.5A of 23 July 1958. It must be kept in the possession of the subscriber, or other commissioned officer and should be destroyed by burning when no longer required.

The thoughts and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the author, and are not necessarily those of the Navy Department or of the Naval War College.

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE

REVIEW

Issued Monthly
U.S. Naval War College
Newport, R. I.

LOGIC AND PROPAGANDA

A lecture delivered
at the Naval War College
1 September 1961

by

Professor T.K. Noss

My purpose is to emphasize that propaganda is not something we should avoid, but something we should understand. We should know when we are using it and when it is being used on us.

Logic is rational behavior, the drawing of conclusions from facts. It is systematic thinking that is independent of the conclusions or opinions of others. Propaganda is the various forms of persuasion or explanations designed to influence opinions and feelings. It is very difficult in modern America to live exclusively by our own logic. Our lives are so interlocking that we must rely on others. I never examine every bridge I cross; I cross it on faith.

Colonel McBrayer, who was here last year, said that logical behavior can be illustrated by every man sitting down and actually estimating how much insurance he needs and of what kind, without being influenced at all by others. He wondered how many of us actually do that. That may be logical, but I am afraid I am so trusting that I even trust my insurance agent. I go over the policy, and then I hope for the best. You may recall the saying from Amos and Andy: "They give it to you in the large print and then take it away from you in the small print."

We critically, and uncritically, rely on the conclusions and opinions of others. We even tend to

accept authority rather than trust our own judgments. Some of this, of course, is necessary because our modern lives are so complex.

Propaganda rises out of ideologies, which are logical constructions. Perhaps some of you read in the newspapers of the "New Moslem" cult developing in Harlem, New York City, and elsewhere, supposed to be at least 100,000 strong, and composed entirely of American Negroes. As most American Negroes know, they are a people, a composite people drawn largely from Africa, but also from the American Indians and from nearly every nation in Europe. They may have only the barest trace of Arabian blood, but the "New Moslem" leaders tell their members that they are not African at all, nor are they American; they are actually Arabs. "New Moslems" assume Arab names and say that the true future of the world is a colored future. They say that God is not white but black, that the proper role of the white man is that of the slave of the black man. They are reported to have arsenals of weapons in Harlem, and they drill every week. Ostensibly, their platform is to have four or five states of the Union turned over to them; to move all the Whites out and all the Negroes in, so that they can set up their own republic and become a sovereign nation. The Whites, they say, are their enemies. This set of doctrines, I am told, is immune to penetration from white men. If you treat them roughly, they say, "See, that's the way the Whites are." If you ignore them, they go their own way; you go yours. If you attempt to be courteous, they call you a dangerous hypocrite. Already they are sending missionaries to other lands to propagate their beliefs and to try to unite all black men in Africa and elsewhere in a war against the Whites. One of my students, who has contacts in Harlem, interviewed a member of this movement and commented, "This man could readily answer any question I could ask." This is an ideology.

An ideology is a body of knowledge or beliefs that make up the point of view of a group within a society or the society as a whole. An American banker, who explains a philosophy of life centered around banking as the key function of the American economy, may not be conscious of having an ideology; but he does. An American lawyer, who puts law in the central place in the American scene, and has constructed his philosophy based on law, may not be conscious of having an ideology; but he does.

When we present a point of view to others, we must bear in mind the logical constructions, the ideologies, of the people with whom we deal, and we must adjust our ideas so that a common ground can be found. It is well known, for example, that the best of arguments are often based on ambiguity of the term used. When I was a moderator in the National War College, my discussion group developed an argument over the nature of truth. Five points of view were presented so vigorously that the contestants paid little attention to their poor moderator. That sometimes happens. I went to a corner of the room, found a Webster's International Dictionary, and looked up the word *truth* in it. Then I raised my voice to be heard: "Gentlemen," I said, "each one of you is correct. Among the eleven definitions of *truth* in this dictionary, each one of you is represented exactly." I read the appropriate meanings of the word, and the argument was ended.

When we are presenting an idea or plan, we must be sure that the words we use mean the same to ourselves and to the person to whom we speak. If there is a difference in meaning, we must be sure to understand and use the listener's meaning of the word.

Semantic confusions in our dealings with the communists, for example, have led to some tragic consequences, in Korea, Germany, and elsewhere. To us peaceful coexistence means that the ninety-odd

nations of the world live together in peace. To the communists, peaceful coexistence is possible only among peace-loving, that is, communist nations. They believe all others are war-mongering nations with whom it's impossible to have peace. When Khrushchev speaks of peaceful coexistence, we must bear in mind his meaning and contrast it with ours.

To us *capitalism* has made the modern Western industrial system possible and created the highest living standards in history. To the communists, who read Karl Marx, capitalism is personalized as capitalists. It is the capitalists, the money-bag holders, who manipulate the entire economy for their private profit, who exploit everyone else, who stir up wars because wars bring profits to them. So this word *capitalism* should be avoided when dealing with communists or peoples exposed to communist propaganda, for we could hardly use it in the sense the communists understand.

Democracy means to us an election of representative officers by voters. We limit our democracy. We rule out members of mental hospitals, most inmates of penitentiaries, all aliens, most illiterates, and most persons who are under the age of twenty-one. These people, we say, are not entitled to law-making in a democracy. The communists are much more restrictive. They say that only communists are entitled to vote; they are the only ones who are qualified to establish a government. To them democracy means that the communists rule the country; anything else is not a democracy.

When you present your research to others, remember that there is no excuse for being misunderstood when you know the values of the person to whom you are speaking, for a really intelligent person is rarely misunderstood when he speaks to people he understands. Naiveté is to express your own point of view to someone whose values are unknown and expect your listener to understand you. This is leading with your chin.

Let's assume that your research here in the War College has been finished. Let's assume that it is not a second-rate accomplishment in which you began with a conviction and ransacked the library for arguments to support your point of view, ignoring all else. Instead, you have produced first-rate research based on all available facts, from which you have drawn your conclusions objectively and impersonally, a fine piece of work. Let's assume that from this excellent research you have found some improvement in the Navy that you think the Navy should adopt. Are you going to be a cold fish? Are you going to think that the facts speak for themselves, that anything personal in your presentation is illogical, a fallacy, a method of propaganda that is unworthy of you? If so, you may proceed through your naval career in splendid isolation.

Each ideology depends on propaganda to preserve its unity and expand its program. Internally there are addresses, writings, conversations. Externally there is propagation. Dedicated participants are frequently impervious to propaganda based on a differing ideology; and, if you try to talk with dedicated communists, you will see how true that is.

An Army general in the Pentagon and I, once considered this interesting speculation: Suppose we selected six well-informed Americans and locked them in a room with six dedicated communists with instructions to discuss their differences jury fashion until they came to agreement. One can imagine what would happen. If I were a prisoner of war in China, I like to believe that I would preserve my memories and knowledge of the United States so firmly as to be impervious to brainwashing so far as it is physically possible. Each American and each communist in that room could feel that way, and the argument could go on endlessly. If each were sufficiently strong-minded and intellectual, this could last for years in that little room; six Americans and six communists, each

impervious to the arguments of the other side. I suppose eventually the strongest-minded would win, and the losing side, whichever it was, would claim it had been brainwashed.

Here, in America, we generally think of propaganda in unfavorable terms, as something undesirable. In this we differ quite sharply from the late Joseph Goebbels, who was, as you recall, Minister of Propaganda and Public Enlightenment under Adolf Hitler. But the word propaganda is neither good or bad. It is an essential part of any concerted movement.

For aspects of propaganda we Americans prefer other words. We strongly believe in *education* for the young, and advertisers for new products speak of conducting educational campaigns. When we take recruits into the Armed Services, we *indoctrinate* them, teach them the traditions and discipline of which they are a part. If it is necessary to have someone take a course of action that is desirable or inevitable, we *persuade*. I suppose that if anyone of you in this room unexpectedly should receive orders from here to some remote and, perhaps, undesirable station, you would contact your wife at once and start the persuasion; that is, if you are intelligent. *Advertising* or *promotion* increases sales; *public relations* enhance good will. *Propaganda* is all of these things.

In the late 1930's an Institute for Propaganda Analysis was founded in New York City for the purpose of analyzing and developing defenses against the rising tide of propaganda that was flooding the world. At this time the Nazis thoroughly controlled the Germans; Mussolini seemed to have the Italians well in hand; in Japan there was something called "thought control"; and the communists appeared to determine what the Russians thought. It was believed that the only way all of us could maintain our freedom, before we lost it, was to increase our ability to detect propaganda, and from this knowledge, to build up

defenses against it. The Institute prepared a list called *Keys to Propaganda* to alert us to detection devices: (1) *Name Calling*, appeals to prejudices, fears, hates, snarl words. Because Tom Dewey was youthful in appearance, he is said to have been unable politically to overcome Harold Ickes' caustic remark, "Dewey has decided to throw his diaper into the ring." (2) *Glittering Generality*, association with virtue words of religion, patriotism, goodness, justice, pride, hope, and courage. There is the old political cliché that if you are a political boss, and you have a strong candidate and a strong platform, emphasize the platform, for the candidate can speak for himself; if you have a strong candidate and a weak platform, talk about the candidate; if both candidate and platform are weak, wave the American flag. (3) *Transfer Association*, people with prestige use the idea, beautiful women surround it. A new model of an automobile parked before a palatial residence suggests that the owner drives this car or that the car fits here. A flashy convertible in the front of the salesroom lingers in our minds, so that even if we go past it to buy our humdrum sedan, some of the convertible rubs off on our sedan. (4) *Testimonial*, public statements supporting the idea or product. (5) *Plain folks appeal*. When Winston Churchill spoke before Congress he mentioned his American forebears through his American mother, and suggested that if his father instead of his mother had been American, "I would be no stranger here." (6) *Card-stacking*, selecting only favorable, or unfavorable, evidence for a position or idea. (7) *The Band Wagon*. If the candidate is really going to win, many people vote for him to get on the band wagon. Khrushchev's insistence on "communist inevitability" may be an effort to create a band wagon psychology. This list is not used very much, because we realize how inadequate it is, but these individual terms today are useful tools.

The chief media of propaganda are speeches, meetings, organizations, conversations, whispering and

smear campaigns, and use of the mass methods of communication: the press, radio, television, motion pictures, magazines, and books.

We, here, in the United States, have a free press, and most of us think our newspaper services are among the finest in the world. Many nations have a controlled press because their governments believe that people should know only what is good for them. Some apologists for Soviet Russia assert that the controlled press of Soviet Russia is on a higher level than the free press of the United States, but we certainly have more interesting and varied newspapers.

As a matter of fact, nearly all the news we get is slanted, a process as inevitable as human nature. In an American newspaper the owners, editorial writers, and reporters select the news they want to present, and sometimes fail to include news that does not interest them. That's slanting the news. Sometimes they present only what they want their readers to know, in which case they are really dictators at heart. When they do this, you don't have to buy the newspaper if you don't want to. Advertisers and financial backers also can influence the news. There was a time when a manufacturer might advertise only in what he called "friendly newspapers," that is, in newspapers that never ran news critical of him, no matter what he did. In this way he forced a favorable press, with heavy advertising the incentive. This practice increasingly is considered unethical in recent years. There are, however, still some "purple cows," persons or organizations that the newspaperman must praise or let alone if he wants to keep his own job.

Government pressures and national necessities also slant the news, particularly during war, but most of the slanting is done by none of these, but rather, by the newspaper readers. Those who read American newspapers will read only what they want to read and

when and where they want to read it. They really slant the news.

Let us suppose, for example, that you are a city editor, or his make-up editor, on Friday evening, August 11, 1961. You have before you a great mass of teletype messages that have come in from the press services. You have telegrams, night messages, handwritten and roughly typed stories from your correspondents. You have carefully prepared public relations releases from organizations that have stories that must be told, or that want the publicity, and you have photographs, piles of them. From all this material you must construct a newspaper that your readers will continue to buy. You know that if you have a dead front page your circulation will die. What do you do?

Let us look at *The New York Times*, the *Herald Tribune*, the *Daily News*, and the *New York Mirror* for Saturday, August 12, 1961. Out of the mass of information they had received, this is what these editors presented to their publics. It is what they selected as being most likely to keep the interest of their own readers.

Many items appear on the front page of *The New York Times*. There's a flattering picture of Senator Goldwater, with a less flattering one of Senator Byrd, and they are conversing about a foreign aid bill which Senator Byrd opposed. Next to the picture is the headline "President Wins Key Senate Test on Long-term Aid." In the head lead, a two-column spread: "Khrushchev Says Prestige Compels a German Treaty." In the right-hand column, the favored position, because most people are right-handed and tend to look to the right first: "Rusk Forecasts Long, Hard Talks on German Issue." In the left lead column is "Allen to Propose Albany Session on City Schools." They are keeping the school scandal alive. Further down the page appears a story headed, "Argentine Coup Claimed; Frondizi Denies It," and many other items.

The *Herald Tribune* has fewer stories on the front page; it is slightly less sophisticated than *The New York Times* under its present management. At the top is a picture of a crying refugee child in West Berlin, with a six-column heading, "Freedom Gate Shutting—East Germans Set to Act." Then in the left two columns is a local story on the school scandal, and below it, "K Says Hundreds of Millions Die if Reds Cut Loose"; "K—Bombs not Choosy—All Would Be Hit"; "Rusk—We'll Talk but Berlin May Be Hard Nut to Crack," and other stories.

The *New York Daily News* has only two stories on the front page, "Army Revolt in Argentina," and beneath it, a picture of a man who has just discovered that four of his relatives have been swept away into a sewer. Finally, the *New York Mirror* devotes the whole front page to "Dad, 3 Kin Die in B'klyn Sewer," with a picture of how the man looks when he discovers this.

Note the degrees of sophistication. It is interesting that the *Times* carried the sewer incident on the second to the last page, with television, the weather, "Lost and Found," and other items. Presumably people who look up TV programs are also interested in the sewer accident, and here is where they find it. Presumably, also, this family tragedy bores the more sophisticated.

Many of the readers of the *New York Mirror* are developing a newspaper habit by reading the *Mirror*. Some of them through repetition of these stories tire of them, increase their sophistication, and change to papers with wider coverage. Many stay with the *Mirror*.

One of the questions that has never been settled in American journalism is, Should a newspaper simply present the news or should it attempt to influence public opinion, carry on reforms, and fight for causes? I am sure that every TV addict knows that all good newspaper editors fight for causes because they

do on TV: The battling city editors against the gangsters; how they scream in banner headlines about the bad gangsters, and how the gangsters shoot them up; but the editors always win, alive or dead.

The *Long Island Press* for Monday, August 21, 1961, is fighting for a cause in a story headed: "Mitchel 'Civic Center' Plan Unveiled." This banner headline covers all eight columns of the front page with an eight-column story beneath it. All the news of the day is pushed down the page while this big issue is on top. The two Long Island newspapers have been campaigning for years to close Mitchel Air Force Base, and use the land for other purposes. Over and over, they have portrayed military airplane crashes and damaged houses in the area, and sometimes included civilian crashes too, to make it look more convincing. After the Air Force moved out, the Civil Aeronautic Authority wanted to set up a civilian airport there, and the two newspapers attacked that just as hard. Should or should not a newspaper run a campaign?

What about cartoons on the front page? People who live in Chicago and buy the *Chicago Daily Tribune* tend to look at the cartoon first. It is always there, in the middle of the front page. On September 20, 1952, the cartoon showed King Harry Truman sitting on a throne with Crown Prince Adlai Stevenson standing beside him wearing a dunce cap, and behind them both is Dean Acheson, holding a chain attached to President Truman; he is jerking the puppets. Was the *Chicago Tribune* neutral, or would you call it Republican? Many think a front page cartoon is permissible because it is labeled a cartoon. It is the presenting of opinions under a news label that is considered reprehensible.

Cartoons and cartoon comic strips can be an effective means of presenting issues. The Buzz Sawyer comic strip currently presents a vivid portrayal of complex issues of the cold war that are difficult to

describe in prose. Sawyer is a crop duster in South Vietnam at the moment, as an intelligence officer of the Navy, and is attempting to help resist a communist guerrilla attack on his South Vietnam friends. In these simple tales and clear pictures, he is really sending a message. Criticism of this theme, both spontaneous and deliberate, may rise as the months continue. The cartoon may be called too bloody, too sordid, and unsuited for newspapers. I hope the syndicate that produces Buzz Sawyer has aggressive salesmen, for this is news, told in story form.

The placing of the story, where it appears on the page, and with what, affects objectivity. This can be illustrated by the *Long Island Daily Press* and *The New York Times* on the morning the Titov story broke. The *Press* carried an eight-banner head, "Soviet Space Ship Lands Safely," with five columns carrying news related to this. The central three columns are headed "U.S. Still Confident of Matching Reds." On both sides there is more about Titov in two single columns. This newspaper frankly favors the American position. *The New York Times* carried a five-column heading, "Soviet Puts Up a Second Astronaut; He Eats, Naps and Radios Data in Continuous Orbits of Earth," with four columns on the right, the favorable position, furnishing details. On the left, the unfavorable place, and tied in with the main heading, is the subhead "U.S. Goal is 1962." From a propaganda point of view this makes us look very second-rate. It is true that the news is about Titov, and that editors must crash these headlines through in a hurry, often without time to consider carefully the total effect, but perhaps the United States could have been treated a little better without bias in our favor.

The New York Times may appeal to the intellectual reformer who gets angry when he reads such news stories. He wonders: Why did we let the Russians get so far ahead of us? How did we get into this mess? Why aren't we doing more about South Vietnam? Look at

the confusion the Congo is in! Why doesn't our government do more than it does? Every day he wants more news. He wants things to be happening fast so that he can sit in his armchair and read about them. *The New York Times* appeals to him, so he keeps on buying it.

The American public is a scandal-loving public, much more ready to read about what is going wrong than what is right. The newspapers tell us how the United States is losing its popularity and prestige throughout the world. After Vice-President Lyndon Johnson toured Southeast Asia, he said that wherever he went he met great crowds of people friendly to the United States, and that he did not meet a single unfriendly person in all his travels. Was this entirely a response to his hearty, outgoing, Texas personality, or has our press misled us into thinking we have hardly any friends anywhere? Which is true?

Saying that something is not going well is more likely to get into the average newspaper than a dull "everything fine, nothing to report." You'll rarely find *that* on the front page.

Overseas correspondents tend to stay in the same hotels; sometimes they form clubs; and generally they keep in touch with each other. Occasionally one wonders if they get their news from each other. How would you like to be in a complex situation like the Congo and ordered to send back so many hundred words to your paper? With all the many events happening around you, what would you pick? Wouldn't you like to know what the others are sending, so that you are not out in left field, having sent in a unique story that doesn't cover any of the important events the others have reported? You could be very lonely and not very honored; but a common effort of the correspondents does not mean complete coverage or objective reporting.

A biased editor can be vicious. Any time he wants to smear someone he can run a big story that the person denies something reprehensible, denies being a bigamist, being an embezzler, using shady means to get money, denies having unworthy and inappropriate friends, denies being an influence peddler. These suggestions surround the poor victim. There are more subtle ways, such as running stories about a man next to the crime news in the hope that proximity to crime will smear him. There are the repetitions, stories that are rewritten with no new information coming in; or the suppressions, the headlines that don't appear because the editor, for reasons of his own, decided not to print them. The editor is running the newspaper for profit, and puts on his front page what he thinks will sell his newspaper; and always bear in mind that most of our news is slanted because we, the readers, slant it by reading only what interests us.

The radio, television, and motion pictures are controlled by moral codes that prescribe what can or cannot appear. These codes are largely voluntary, and some think they are necessary, but they tend to stifle range and depth. I wish we could find a way to increase the information that reaches us through these means. The New York theater handles all kinds of problems that never come over the air. There is a general commercialism prevalent. I used to think it degrading to see prominent actors participate in commercials on television, but I no longer do. Undoubtedly some of these actors think, "Bless our sponsor for keeping this program going," and they push the sponsor's product from sheer gratitude.

The "disk jockeys" have taken over the radio. What a wonderful vehicle it could be and how poor it actually is! I get so tired of listening to silly popular records as I wait for the news. Sometimes, however, the news is rewarding because often the radio broadcasts raw material that comes over the Associated Press and United Press wires, and occasionally one

hears news that does not appear in tomorrow's papers. This may not mean that the press deliberately suppresses it; this news may be considered not important enough to print, may be crowded out by other news, or withheld, pending verification. But the radio broadcaster does not have much time to consider; he simply takes it and puts it on the air.

Communist propaganda is in a class by itself, based on a particularly isolated ideology. It epitomizes ruthlessness, which is something that most Americans really cannot understand. We react with wishful thinking; we try to pretend that we could talk with Khrushchev and find a reasonable solution. We are constantly vulnerable to communist propaganda because many of us underestimate it, and cannot recognize it. But we must train ourselves to see it for what it is, and to deal with it realistically.

Behind all the complexities of information, misinformation, slanted news, and conflicting reports, reality does exist. We must constantly seek it. When we analyze propaganda, we should forego the comforting security of ideologies, and seek only the truth.

The Japanese painter of the old school portrayed only a part of a building, leaving it to the viewer to construct the rest. What I have said is only fragmentary, and you must complete your own understanding of the nature and uses of propaganda. Know when propaganda is being used on you; and, in turn, use it only when you choose to do so, and then to bring others closer to reality.

BIOGRAPHIC SKETCH

Dr. Theodore K. Noss

Present Position:

Professor of Sociology and Chairman, Division of the Social Sciences, C.W. Post College, Long Island University.

Schools:

Princeton University, A.B., Honors, 1925
Union Theological Seminary, B.D., 1929
University of Chicago, M.A., 1934; Ph.D., 1940

Career Highlights:

1935-42 Faculty, Purdue University
1942-46 U.S. Navy, Personnel and Military Government, Hawaii, U.S., Guam, Tokyo. Commander, USNR.
1946-47 Occupation of Japan, civilian economic specialist and personnel.
1948- Visiting Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Texas; also since the war, on the faculties of Hunter College, Adelphi College, and C.W. Post College.
1953-56 Education Specialist, U.S. Air Force.
1960- Group leader, National Defense Seminar, National War College.

THE ROLE AND INFLUENCE OF INTEREST GROUPS IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

A lecture delivered
at the Naval War College
9 October 1961

by

Professor C.A. Jellison

As you are well aware, the subject of today's lecture is a very broad and complex one, and it occurred to me that it might best be approached by resorting to a series of questions and answers, or at least attempted answers, which in my estimation pertain significantly to the character and impact of pressure groups in a democratic society. In this way perhaps we shall be able to develop our thinking on this subject into some sort of meaningful focus. First, however, in deference to the political scientists in the audience, let me apologize in advance for a conscious transgression. I understand that it is the fashion today among professionals in the field to make some subtle distinctions between the "interest group" and the "pressure group." For our broad and hurried purposes today, however, I see no compelling reason not to use the two terms interchangeably. Forgive me if I have sinned.

Obviously, the first question concerning this topic that comes to mind is: What is an interest group? And my answer to this would be that an interest group is a number of individuals who hold in common certain values, ideas, or aspirations which they endeavor to promote. There are, of course, many different sorts, shapes, and sizes of interest groups. Some are organized to a greater or lesser degree; some are not. Political scientists sometimes refer to

the American public as a great unorganized interest group, although it's not always clear to me what properties or goals its members have in common. Some pressure groups are broadly based, either in the nature of the interests they wish to promote or in the composition of their membership, or both. The Americans for Democratic Action, for example, is an organization that is motivated, to a large extent, by long-range, abiding ideological interests, and includes in its membership representatives of all classes, parties, and religions. At the other end of the spectrum are those groups, such as the Anti-Saloon League, whose aims and attitudes are so narrow that they seem trivial to many people, and whose membership could hardly be called cosmopolitan. Some pressure groups are doggedly aggressive in their attempts to bring about change. Such a group is the National Education Association, which is reported to have spent nearly a quarter of a million dollars in support of President Kennedy's public education bill. Other interest groups, such as the American Medical Association, are just as doggedly engaged in attempting to prevent the government from effecting certain changes. Some interest groups, certainly most of them, are composed largely of American elements. Some, however, clearly receive their inspiration and much of their money from abroad. The China Lobby, for example, could hardly be considered a native growth.

Bearing in mind, then, that these groups vary widely in a number of respects, and that consequently there are bound to be at least a few exceptions to practically any general statement we make about them, let's consider for a moment the second question on our list: What place does an interest group occupy in our democratic way of life? To this I would say—apparently a very secure and fundamental place. In fact, the pressure group complex has been called the warp and woof of our political system. It was, of course, clearly envisaged by the founding fathers, or at least by some of them. As you know, James Madison

wrote at some length and with great penetration on this matter in the Federalist Papers, especially in Federalist #10. As seen by Madison the type of political pluralism inherent in the pressure group approach to governmental process would prove to be the people's best guarantee against the emergence of despotism. What he saw in the future was a balanced clash of interests, a many-sided battle in which pressure groups would act and react upon one another, often in coalition, to prevent the unchallenged ascendancy of any one element. On the whole, things have worked out pretty much as Madison predicted they would, and tyranny has, as a result, been thwarted. We would, in fact, probably be justified in stating that the interaction of interest groups has constituted a central theme in the development of our political apparatus. By performing the twofold function of providing a vehicle for political aspirations and achievement and of safeguarding our liberties, the pressure-group system has served democracy well in this country. The fact should not be overlooked, however, that we in America have often had to pay a large price to support and maintain this "tug-of-war" approach to government, for the pressure group system by its very character is anything but a model of efficiency and thrift. I am reminded here of a remark made by Fisher Ames, one of the old New England aristocrats, who as a Senator saw service in the nation's first Congress. Himself temperamentally hostile to popular government, Ames likened monarchy to a fine, sleek sailing ship on which passengers and crew ride in comfort and beauty until suddenly the ship hits a rock and goes down. Democracy, on the other hand, Ames pointed out rather perceptively, is like a raft—sturdy, solid, and safe. "You may not sink, but damn it, your feet are always wet."

The third question is this: What is the relationship of democracy's basic unit, the individual, to the interest group? Well, it would seem safe to say that every individual who is at all politically alive is an

active member of at least one pressure group. Perhaps he supports it with money; perhaps he writes letters to promote its cause; or perhaps he just talks about it to his neighbors. Actually, the individual is much more a member of a pressure group than he is of a political party, and when he goes to the polls he votes principally, whether he realizes it or not, in accord with what he believes to be his own interests when he votes for one party or another. It is, therefore, through the interest group that the voice of the citizen is heard. He may not have thought of the situation in this way, but our political parties are nothing more or less than coalitions of pressure groups. And this has always been true in this country, with the exception, of course, of the mid-nineteenth century when political parties ceased temporarily to be aligned according to interest and became aligned instead according to geography, thereby making sectional war all but inevitable.

So, generally speaking, political parties have represented, and still do, combinations of pressure groups banded together, sometimes rather tenuously, for purposes of strength and strategy. The combination that we call today the Republican Party generally speaks for those interests in our society that tend to support the status quo. The Democratic Party generally speaks for those who, to a greater or lesser degree, would attempt to bring about change. But, of course, there is in our society a wide twilight zone. There are many groups who under one set of conditions and at one given time prefer one course of action, whereas under different conditions or at a different time they prefer another. As a consequence, the composition of our parties is far from constant, and there is a considerable amount of party hedge-hopping by pressure groups. In fact, what a great deal of the wheeling and dealing of our party contests amounts to, when you come right down to it, is an attempt on the part of one party to detach some of those more unstable or vacillating interest groups

from the other party. The Negro vote, for instance, and the Jewish vote, were considered by both Nixon and Kennedy in the 1960 campaign as being within the twilight zone—detachable.

So the great contest goes on between our parties—to court, to woo successfully these more vacillating interest groups. Of course, some of these elements are so irrevocably committed to one side or the other that it is folly even to think about detaching them. Big business, for instance, is not about to be detached during the foreseeable future from the Republican Party, and I think it's pretty safe to say that unskilled labor is going to remain pretty loyal to the Democratic Party, barring some major political aberration. Astute politicians are, of course, very much aware of the presence and importance of detachable elements in our political spectrum. They really have to be; their political lives depend upon it.

The next question is this: What is the aim of the interest group? Well, obviously the primary, overriding aim is to promote the general and specific interests of the group, either directly or indirectly. This usually means the strengthening of the position of one's own group, or, as is frequently the case, the weakening of a rival group. You are all aware of the long, historic tug-of-war that has gone on, and is still going on, between business and labor. In this struggle it has often been true that what conduces to the advantage of one group, conduces to the disadvantage of the other, or at least so the situation is viewed by the forces involved. In assessing the aims of pressure groups it would be naivé of us to suppose that many of these groups are, or could be, self-sacrificing enough to subordinate their own interests over the long haul to the interests of the nation except, of course, in cases of national emergency, and not always even then. Essentially the interest group is egocentric and selfish. It usually pays lip service to the idea of the national welfare, and I think that

many members are actually quite successful in persuading themselves that the interests of their own special group and the best interests of the country are one and the same; hence, the expression: "What's good for General Motors is good for the country"; or, "What's good for the AFofL, etc." But a realistic assessment reveals that the pressure group is constructed upon a hard core of self-interest, in most instances transcendent self-interest. That our political system recognizes this fact and has erected effective safeguards against the ultimate triumph of rampant self-interest is, in my estimation, one of the greatest achievements of our society. Madison read the situation wisely and well when he stated in his Federalist #10 that free institutions can be preserved only by counterbalancing the selfishness of one group with the selfishness of another, thereby reducing the sum total of these group pressures to a sort of resultant vector, which might well be labeled "democratic compromise." And herein is found the essence of democratic process—decision or resolution by compromise, an arrangement which, although seldom geared to the total satisfaction of any single group, nevertheless has the great merit of providing a general acceptability or "livability."

On occasion, of course, the system gets out of balance, as it did in the late 19th century when one complex of interests (big business in this case) reached a dominant position and was actually able to oppress other interest groups. Now, this is very dangerous, indeed, for democracy. When this sort of thing happens, democracy is not well served, and measures must be taken to restore the balance. That we have done precisely this in the past is not the least important reason for the continued survival of our free institutions. Recall, for instance, those depression days of the early 1930's, when the organized labor interests of this country were very hard put, badly demoralized, and generally unable to help themselves. One wonders what might have happened to

the character of our society if the government had not stepped forward to alleviate this dangerous imbalance in our system by legislating labor into a position of greater strength. Briefly stated, our political system is based upon a conflict of appetites, most of them quite voracious, and if we treasure our institutions it behooves us, I think, to see to it that a balance is maintained among these appetites. If we fail to maintain the balance, then we fail to maintain democracy, and we enter instead into some sort of class or clique despotism.

The next question is this: From what sources do pressure groups attempt to receive gratification? In other words, what are the targets that the pressure groups customarily aim at? Well, the source of gratification is determined to a great extent, of course, by the aspirations of the group involved. In the great majority of cases interest groups aim ultimately at the constituted policy-making machinery of the government in order to gain the support of the legitimate forces of control, authority, and coercion in our society. Now, the United States political system is particularly vulnerable to pressure group activity. It's true that in many other countries—England, for instance—there are as many interest groups, or nearly as many, as we have here. But we have in this country what political scientists refer to as a multiple access for interest groups, and if you ponder the matter for a moment you'll realize that in our decentralized society there are, indeed, opportunities galore for the interest group to insinuate pressure or influence of one sort or another. The city council, the country board of supervisors, the state legislature, Congress, the courts, governmental agencies and committees at all levels—all of these can provide satisfaction for the interest group. In England, on the other hand, the sources of authority and decision are less scattered and therefore offer a more limited access for pressure groups to take advantage of.

The United States, then, is particularly vulnerable to interest groups because of the many targets it offers, and the eternal struggle among groups is correspondingly chaotic. Actually, the end of the line for this sort of political tug-of-war—the ultimate triumph for pressure-groupism—would be a complete welfare state, in which every pressure group would get everything it wanted from the government. This is a point that is often overlooked, especially by those who cry out in anguish against big government. Many elements of the business community moan and groan about big government, about increased government spending, etc., but at the same time support the idea of tariff protection, of government subsidies to business, government contracts to private manufacturing concerns, tax write-offs, etc. Actually, it would appear that they are not really opposed to either government interference or government spending. They are merely opposed to activities of this sort that do not conduce to the advantage of the particular interests they represent. And much the same may be said about big labor, or the farmer, or for that matter the military. For the government to throw its weight around, to spend money like the proverbial drunken Indian, is very, very bad indeed, unless one's own group happens to be a principal beneficiary.

The next question is: What are the instruments used by these interest groups? Well, as you know, they are of various shapes and sizes, but they are all instruments designed primarily for exerting pressure in the right place at the right time. This pressure might be applied by an after-dinner speech, a letter, a newspaper campaign, a bonus march on Washington, or a lobbyist in the statehouse. All of these instruments and techniques, however, have as an ultimate target the influencing of governmental policy, and in our society this means the influencing of our elective and appointive public officers.

Since decisions pertaining to foreign policy, the area that we're particularly interested in today, are made almost without exception on the national level rather than the state or local, the pressures involved in helping to shape these decisions are eventually focused on Washington. By far the most effective instrument for applying these pressures on the Washington scene is the paid lobbyist. There are over five thousand of these fellows at work today in Washington, engaged in a billion dollar enterprise with one single purpose in mind, and this is the purpose of influencing decisions. Although the other branches of our government receive attention in good measure from the lobbyists, it is Congress which receives the brunt of the lobbyists' attacks—Congress, which, even in foreign policy matters, is still the great master-cylinder of our decision-making process, and which, because of its size, its function, and its heterogeneous character, is especially vulnerable to the insinuations of pressure.

And now, getting to the meat and marrow of today's lecture—To what extent and in what way do interest groups influence the course of American foreign policy? To this question I must answer that I simply don't know. We are dealing here with abstractions and intangibles that really don't lend themselves to either qualitative or quantitative assessment. We don't know, for instance, even with the advantage of hindsight, how influential the so-called yellow press of the 1890's was in bringing about our war with Spain. We can't know the *ifs* or the *might-have-beens* of any given situation, past or present. It's certainly possible that this nation might have gone to war with Spain in 1898 if there had been no Joseph Pulitzer or William Randolph Hearst. On matters such as this, we can only guess at the results. We can, however, identify with some degree of assurance, the nature and aspirations of the groups that promote and direct many of the major pressures that are brought to bear upon the formulation and implementation of United States foreign policy.

The first of these groups—not necessarily in order of importance—is big business. Let me insert here parenthetically that there is always danger of distortion in gathering together people or groups, especially in this country, pinning labels on them, such as "Liberal," "Methodist," or "Big Business," and then proceeding to treat them as monolithic entities. The fact of the matter is that in the United States most of us are, to a large extent, pluralistic in our attitudes and behavior. Few of us are all conservative, or all liberal, or all Negro. Few of us are all big business or all big labor. We are beset by a multitude of pressures acting upon us, and we react in diverse ways to diverse situations. We shall, then, be guilty this morning of some degree of distortion when for the sake of emphasis and simplicity we shall resort to an overly neat categorization and homogenization of the various pressure elements we'll be dealing with. For example, big business does not always act as a single-purposed entity. Not infrequently merchants and manufacturers differ widely on matters of public policy, and occasionally bankers find themselves opposed to both. Thus, when we treat big business as a monolithic influence in our society we are certainly presenting a somewhat distorted picture. And what we have said here of big business could be applied with greater or lesser validity to big labor, religious groups, the military, etc. On the whole, however, by ignoring the exceptions and aberrations, and by judging each group by its norm, we'll not, I believe, be straying too dangerously far from the truth in most cases.

Again concerning big business, here is an interest group or coalition of groups that throughout our history has been most emphatic in its attempts to shape American foreign policy. To what extent these attempts have been responsible for the formulation and implementation of policies favorable to big business we can only guess, but in some instances, at least, it would, in my estimation, be exceedingly safe to

assume that our national policy in the world arena has, to a large degree, resulted from pressures brought to bear, directly or indirectly, upon the government by business interests. Our tariff policy since the Civil War offers a good example of this. Beginning midway through the Civil War, American tariff rates began to rise. By the last decade of the century they had reached a point of rapid and substantial increase. By the late 1920's, thanks largely, we may assume, to agitation by business interests, American tariff rates had reached a ridiculous high. This high degree of tariff protection naturally had a significant influence upon our relations with foreign countries, and was in no small way responsible for much of the antagonism felt toward "Uncle Shylock" by many foreign nations during the decade following the end of World War I. Indeed, the fact that high American tariff rates made it practically impossible for European nations to carry on trade with the United States during the 1920's, at a time when Europe was desperately in need of American markets, might well be considered a major cause of the world depression of the 1930's, and the consequent political upheavals abroad—events which would subsequently have a profound effect upon the direction of United States foreign policy.

Other examples of business influence could be cited. The list is certainly a long one: The role of the American banking community and munitions-makers in bringing about our entry into World War I; the influence of manufacturing and shipping interests in shaping our trade policy with Japan during the 1930's; and, of course, the part played by business elements in this country in persuading our government to recognize the Soviet Union in 1934. As I've said, the list is long, and it is becoming longer every day. We are now on the threshold of a major political debate on our tariff policy; it will be interesting to see how big business handles itself in this matter.

Labor, organized and unorganized, certainly deserves mention as an interest group that has had, and continues to have, influence on American foreign policy. We need only consider the pressures applied by labor in behalf of immigration restriction to conclude that labor has, on occasion, made its voice clearly heard by those involved in directing our foreign policy. The Chinese Exclusion Act of the 1880's; the Gentlemen's Agreement with Japan in 1907-08; and the Johnson Act of 1924 which cut immigration to a trickle—all of these reflect a very firm and historic determination on the part of American labor to cut down the influx of foreign workmen into this country, and it is probably not too far-fetched to assume that without the incessant protests of this increasingly powerful interest group, our immigration legislation would have been slower in arriving upon the scene. Currently, the voice of labor is rather mute insofar as major foreign policy decisions are concerned, but let the right issue arise and it will certainly be heard again.

Ethnic groups also constitute sources of pressure, and here, of course, the situation is a very heterogeneous one. There are more ethnic groups in this country than you can shake a stick at, and many of them are quite active and noisy. The so-called "hyphenated Americans"—Italian-Americans, Irish-Americans, Jewish-Americans, etc.—along with our Negroes and American Indians, have frequently loomed large in the arena of American foreign policy, and still do. In 1919, for example, some of the most dogged opposition to this country's entry into the League of Nations stemmed from the Irish-Americans. Senator Hiram Johnson of California (no friend of the League) reminded the Irish in this country that under Article 10 of the League covenant, the British Empire could demand American blood to subdue Ireland, and you can well imagine how kindly our Irish citizens took to that idea. "Truckling to the shamrock" has, in fact, long been common practice among our politicians

in matters pertaining to American foreign policy—and why not? After all, we have more than twelve million Americans of Irish descent, and that figure can represent a lot of democracy in action when the occasion so demands.

Of a more transcendent and heterogeneous nature (by transcendent I mean transcending party, class, and religion) are the so-called citizens' organizations. The William Allen White Committee, officially known as the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, offers an excellent example of the effect that a citizens' committee can have in marshaling public opinion behind a cause. In this case, of course, the cause being promoted was a closer relationship between this country and the Allied nations then fighting the Axis. I would say that it's pretty safe to assume that without the work done by the White Committee in bringing pressure to bear on our decision-makers, the very important Lend-Lease Act of 1941 would have been longer in coming. At the same time, the America First Committee was acting as spokesman for those conservative isolationist elements in the United States that wanted nothing to do with internationalism. The Citizens' Committee for the Marshall Plan offers a more recent example of an effective citizens' pressure group. On the whole these bi-partisan citizens' groups, organized usually for promoting a single cause or program of a specific nature, are probably the finest and most conspicuous representatives of those rare pressure groups which place the good of the country, or at least what they consider to be such, above their own self-centered desires for personal gain or aggrandizement.

And now, gentlemen, the military! Theoretically, of course, the military shouldn't even be included in a list of pressure groups, because the function of the military in a free society is to serve as an instrument of foreign policy rather than a formulator. And historically, I might add, the record of our

military has been a very good one. Nevertheless, it is perhaps understandable that many Americans have traditionally tended to view the military with suspicion and some distrust. After all, the military has the power to destroy our institutions, and might conceivably do so. Such things have happened before in other countries.

Between 1789 and 1917 the United States government spent a total of less than thirty billion dollars for all of its operations and services. During this single year (1961) the military alone will spend almost twice that amount, over fifty billion dollars. In 1913 the per capita cost of maintaining our military establishment was $2.25. Today, with twice as many people in this country, the per capita cost stands at more than $250. Now, the presence of a greatly enlarged military complex, plus the concomitant growth of military influence upon the nation's economy, can pose serious dangers for a free society, some of which President Eisenhower was careful to warn us about before he left office last winter. Increasingly alert to these dangers, many Americans have become particularly sensitive in recent years to "the military menace," and they customarily point in horror to the expanded size of our armed forces as positive proof that the military is well on its way to taking over the country. These fears have been fed from time to time by certain regrettable incidents which would seem to indicate that there are at least some segments of our military leadership that have apparently forgotten or chosen to disregard Woodrow Wilson's famous admonition that in a free society the military should speak only when spoken to.

Despite an occasioned aberration, however, on the whole the military has behaved well in our society. There have been few major attempts to cross over into the area of civilian authority, and in general, even these attempts have been eminently ineffectual and have, in most cases, actually been repudiated by the military itself.

Even in the face of frustration and great provocation, such as in Korea, the military, over a period of nearly two hundred years of service to our democratic institutions, has kept its record free of major blemish. It has never thrown its weight around in a serious attempt to direct or interfere with the regular processes of government, and the mere fact that the military is getting larger and richer is no reason to suspect that it will be any more inclined to deviate from its traditional policy of obedience to the constituted civil authorities of the state. It is true, of course, that our military complex today exerts a significant influence upon the course of policy, especially in the arena of international affairs, but it should be noted that this influence has, with very few exceptions, been exerted by advising, which is a legitimate and valuable function of the military, rather than by pressuring, which is not. All things considered, I see no reason to join those who fear that the military, because of its expanding dimensions, is destined to play an increasingly active role in American pressure politics. I doubt seriously that this will, or could, happen in our society as it is now constituted. If it does, then clearly our free institutions will be in grave danger.

These, then, are a few of the interest groups that, for better or for worse, have been and, in most cases, still are involved, in varying degrees, in attempting to shape our foreign policy. There are, of course, dozens of others, applying pressure here and there, sporadically or continuously, and representing a wide assortment of attitudes and aspirations. Of the pressure groups operating in our society today, especially those that are active in the foreign policy area, we know a great deal, thanks in part to some excellent studies done recently on this subject by a number of professional scholars. We know now the general configuration and character of the membership of most of the major interest groups actively engaged at the present time in attempting to influence

decision-making. We know also about many of the tools they use and the special targets and areas of sensitivity that they seek to penetrate. What we don't know, however, at least in most instances, is how effective these groups are in their attempts to influence policy, be it domestic or foreign, and until that unlikely day when it is given us to understand the *ifs* and *might-have-beens*, our knowledge in this area must of necessity remain limited in nature and amount.

BIOGRAPHIC SKETCH

Professor Charles A. Jellison

Present Position:

Ernest J. King Chair of Maritime History, Naval War College; on leave from position of Professor of American History, University of New Hampshire.

Schools:

Stanford University, B.A. degree, 1947.
University of Wisconsin, M.A. degree, 1948.
University of Virginia, Ph.D. degree, 1956.

Career Highlights:

1956-58 Instructor in History, University of New Hampshire.
1958- Assistant Professor in History, University of New Hampshire.

Military Experience:

1943-46 U.S. Army

Publications:

A Biography of William Pitt

Fessenden (Lincoln's Secretary of the Treasury and Longtime Senator from Maine - (about ready for publication)).

As well as several articles and book reviews in scholarly publications.

RECOMMENDED READING

The evaluation of books listed below include those recommended to resident students of the Naval War College. Officers in the fleet and elsewhere may find them of interest.

The inclusion of a book or article in this list does not necessarily constitute an endorsement by the Naval War College of the facts, opinions or concepts contained therein. They are indicated only on the basis of interesting, timely, and possibly useful reading matter.

Many of these publications may be found in ship and station libraries. Certain of the books on the list which are not available from these sources may be available from one of the Navy's Auxiliary Library Service Collections. These collections of books are obtainable on loan. Requests from individual officers to borrow books from an Auxiliary Library Service Collection should be addressed to the nearest of the following special loan collections:

Chief of Naval Personnel,
(G14)
Department of the Navy
Washington 25, D.C.

Commanding Officer
U.S. Naval Station
(Attn: Station Library
San Diego 36, California

Commandant FOURTEENTH Naval
District (Code 141)
Navy No. 128
Fleet Post Office
San Francisco, California

Commander Naval Forces,
Marianas
Nimitz Hill Library, Box 17
Fleet Post Office
San Francisco, California

U.S. Naval Station Library
Attn: Auxiliary Service Collection
Building C-9
U.S. Naval Base
Norfolk, Virginia

BOOKS

Lukacs, John A. *A History of the Cold War.* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961. 288 p.

This book, while manifestly only an outline of the history of the Cold War, traces the thread of its development with care and great clarity. A flash-back technique from the confrontation of United States and Russian troops in April 1945 traces briefly the history of the two countries up to the beginning of the Second World War. Subsequently, the author leads the reader down the twisting, turning corridor which represents the course of the 15 years following the close of World War II. He very artfully weaves into the pattern all the side issues, and with masterful self-restraint, gives the reader an appreciation of these subsidiary issues without slowing down the pace of the story.

Glazer, Nathan. *The Social Basis of American Communism.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961. 244 p.

This brief but excellent study of the membership of the American Communist Party deals with two major questions. First, from what social, political, economic and ethnic strata did the Communist Party recruit its membership? Second, why did persons from these groups join the Party? In answering these questions, Dr. Glazer discusses three other related problems: Why was the Party desirous of attracting certain types of membership? What arguments were used to appeal to these various audiences? And, implicit in the foregoing, why was the Party able to draw a membership of only 100,000 or so even during its heyday?

Drummond, Roscoe and Coblentz, Gaston. *Duel at the Brink.* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1960. 240 p.

This work is a collection of the impressions of 14 present and former government heads and 42 senior

diplomats concerning the record of John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State. These impressions are intricately woven into a very readable account of the six momentous years during which Secretary Dulles was the very embodiment of United States foreign policy. By relying throughout upon the opinions of responsible United States and foreign officials, the authors have produced an intimate picture of their subject as seen by his most important associates, and they go far to explain the basis of his immense personal stature in world affairs.

Beer, Kenneth E., ed. *The U.S.A. Answers; a Guide to Understanding.* New York: U.S. and World Publications, 1961. 248 p.

This is a compilation of some 1800 questions, with answers, that are representative of the fields of inquiry about the United States by foreign nationals at the American Exhibition in Moscow, 1959, and at the Italia '61 Exhibition in Turin. At both of these exhibitions an IBM RAMAC 305 computor was set up as a "giant encyclopedia." By merely pushing a button the questioner could ask his question and within a few seconds get the answer in his own language.