

**The Public Problems of Business
—Crucial Test of the Seventies**

Hale Nelson

**Foundation for
Public Relations Research and Education**

The Public Problems of Business —Crucial Test of the Seventies

The Corporation hide is as thick as an elephant's; kick it in the tail and it will feel it in the head six months later." That statement was attributed to a former chairman of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. The fact that he didn't say it takes nothing from it as a text for this essay.

In 1972, the American corporation once more is suffering a decline in public support. This one a precipitous and startling rejection that has been building for some seven years and seems to be accelerating.

One must conclude that business has been insensitive to forces it did not see, did not feel, or which, if recognized, were not fully understood. Nor was business organized to respond properly when it did feel and try to react.

This appraisal will be denied as too sweeping. And by some as not true. The reactions will range widely and sound like this:

"That applies to only a few industries."

"The attacks on business stem from the assault on private property that spearheads the conspiracy to kill capitalism"

"We are well aware of our social responsibilities and are fulfilling them."

"We *have* a way of knowing what's in the minds of people—the marketplace."

"It's politics in an election year."

"We have a strong public relations department which has the situation well in hand."

A few will say truthfully, "We just don't know how to cope with these forces." A handful can say, "We see our mistakes and are organizing to correct them."

But the indictment will stand; otherwise how do you explain these findings:*

- 46% of the American people agree with the statement: "Big Business is dangerous to our way of life," up from 28% five years ago.
- 68% believe new Federal laws are needed to protect the consumer, up from 55% four years ago.
- In the 1969-71 period, of 39 businesses measured, 33 declined in favorable public standing, none improved.
- Not just a few, but *all* types of business lost sharply in this wave of public reaction.
- Until 1970 a comfortable majority gave business credit for "achieving a good balance between profits and service." In that year public support abruptly faded, with an astounding drop from 58% to 29% in a single year.

In summary, beginning about 1965 and especially in 1970 and 1971, there has been a massive shift in public sentiment. Where once two-thirds of the public approved of the American business establishment, now some two-thirds disapprove. New surveys only corroborate these trends, the latest being a Lou Harris study in February, 1972, for *Life* magazine which notes, "The image of industry continues to deteriorate."

Note the word "image." I will use it again as a valuable term meaning how any institution is viewed through the eyes and mental filters of the beholder. Whether business is guilty on

* Sources are Social Research, Inc., Opinion Research Corporation, Louis Harris, Inc., Daniel Yankelovich, Inc. These selected data tell only part of the plunge.

all counts is immaterial to our thesis. The facts are that most Americans think so.

In the consumer field and in advertising the realization is spreading that a crisis is here, and there is frantic activity. At least five years too late, the Better Business Bureaus are impelled to move and create their arbitration panel—a bold and interesting venture. The advertising business tries self-regulation, but not before the Federal Trade Commission starts to demand proof of advertising claims, and not before confidence in advertising leadership has dropped to 13%, the lowest of all institutions studied by Lou Harris, and just below organized labor.

The damage to business in the aggregate has been done. The guilty and the innocent are tarred by the same brush, and *The Wall Street Journal* writes, "It's a whole new ball game."

No single individual can document all the blots on the business escutcheon which have served to catalyze and aggravate the social ferment, but I will remind you of a few and you will remember others.

Item: Ralph Nader, the automobile companies and the safety uproar;

Item: The conglomerates, merrily merging away in the late 60's, greedily spawning the notion that a \$400 million company can swallow a \$9 billion bank; Congress rebels;

Items: The Penn Central debacle, the Lockheed episode, and most recently the unbelievable IT&T affair.

From a variety of sources, then, enormous forces have assembled, crystalizing in a neo-populist political movement, to buffet business. A "free enterprise" system is already a misnomer for what we have. The timely question is: Just how "unfree" can it be and still be enterprising?

A further question is: How does this dramatic deterioration of the corporate image affect the future of our country? Can we reverse the trend in time, and restore the

corporation to its former status of popular support?

Most significant, where in the decline was the public relations function? And finally, can public relations qualify for a key role in the restoration—if it is to be?

Empirical evidence suggests that public relations either was not positioned to warn and advise countermeasures, was not capable, or—sadly—was quite ignored in top management strategy councils.

Public relations growth is a post-World War II phenomenon. It has flourished during prosperous times when business was generally well regarded. Now, if ever, its competency beyond communications and its capacity to help steer the enterprise will be tested—and its own future charted. A fair question is whether it can withstand the shock of having its chief client put into the national doghouse?

I have no oracular answers to these tough questions. But I shall comment on what I believe to be some principal elements in them—after we have reviewed a bit of business history.

World War II Success

Business emerged from the Second World War with the envy of the world for its record as the “arsenal of democracy.” That well-earned praise offers some ground for present hope, for it had been only a few years previous that American industrialists had been roundly denounced as “merchants of death” for their role as munitions manufacturers.

Defying the prophets of a post-war depression, business turned out more than a quarter century of almost uninterrupted prosperity. It raised the standard of living and reduced the numbers at the poverty level to an identifiable and an attackable problem.

Preoccupied with profit and expansion, and focusing on its primary mission, business continued to produce prosperity

and a cornucopia of bright new products through the fifties, and the sixties.

From this prosperity there emerged, ironically, a strain of discontent with material progress. It pricked at a few consciences, stimulated a few intellectuals, and activated some opportunists.

The denunciatory voices of the prophets were heard as early as 1957 with Vance Packard and “The Hidden Persuaders.” Then came John K. Galbraith and “The Affluent Society,” and into the sixties Rachel Carson, “Silent Spring,” Ralph Nader and “Unsafe at Any Speed.” Herbert Marcuse, a neo-Marxist, could, in the changing mood of the sixties, attract a surprisingly large and strident student following.

In 1969, Lou Harris confirmed the coalescing of the new forces in a survey for *Newsweek* and the National Industrial Conference Board. At that time *Newsweek* wrote, “A storm is brewing in the minds of millions of Americans. It is small now, a cloud no bigger than a vague dissatisfaction. But it may swirl up angrily on the horizon for American business management.” The cloud no bigger than a “man’s hand” has grown until, as the Scripture reads, “The heaven is black with clouds and the rains pour down.”

The rampaging individual, intent on his quest for a place in the sun and disillusioned by a dubious war, has lost confidence in the leadership of all major segments of our society. Big Government, Big Education, Big Labor, Big Journalism (press and TV), even Big Church—face their challenges and problems of credibility. But Big Business, believed by many to be the source of real power, (“It’s stronger than many governments”), takes the brunt of the attacks.

Public Backs Protests

The protest groups firing at business proliferate from coast to coast, some 2,500 on environmental concerns alone! *Fortune* magazine says the number of active consumer groups is

500. (One for each of *Fortune's* 500 top businesses?) Not to be pooh-poohed, they are growing on a solid base of public support, as the surveys show. The best of them use "businesslike" methods and are studded with bright young lawyers who know how to use the courts, the politicians, and our lawmakers.

They also know how to use the media which has helped contribute to the fast growth of that new element affecting public attitudes—the character and social behavior of the corporation. A new quarterly, *Business and Society Review*, even lists the "good guys and the bad guys." In the court of public opinion, the judge and jury suddenly want to know if you "come into court with clean hands." Are you guilty of:

Tricky guarantees, shoddy service and difficult repairs?
Misleading or fatuous advertising?
Doing business with South Africa?
Not promoting enough blacks or Latins—enough women?
Not using minority business as suppliers?
Unsafe plants, bad housing for employees?
Lead in paint and unsafe toys creating child hazards?
Too much planned obsolescence?
Etc., etc.

And who has next year's list? And the year after!

The erosion of public support is being well reported by the major research organizations. But the unremitting flow of legislation and resulting controls building a web of red tape around business is less well documented. Public attitudes translate quickly into law when, as in the consumer area, seven out of ten people support more action. Government regulation becomes a fact of business life, and corporate management prerogatives continue to shrink.

Some results are:

More bills "to protect the consumer" pile up in Congress.
The power industry is driven to an energy crisis.
The auto industry is in a panic race to solve the emissions problem.

The "excremental" industries are expending vast sums to try to clean up the landscape—and getting little or no credit for it.

When Opinion Research Corporation in 1971 asked what big companies were doing to control pollution, 53% of the public said "very little." They have actually lost ground during three years of effort. Only one in ten today gives them credit for "a great deal" of effort, a ratio which has been practically stationary since 1968.

As you must have observed, the anti-business activists present a weird coalition: doctrinaire liberals of the Nader type, young idealists and political opportunists—mostly Democratic. They join forces with pragmatic consumers and official agencies in the Republican administration, and with state officials of both parties who are busily filing environmental suits against the country's biggest businesses. Finally, in this amalgam of right, left and middle-road ideologies, we are quite likely to see our wives or our children marching along with those who believe there is something drastically wrong with the way business is being run.

History Repeats

This atmosphere is not without precedent. Around the turn of the century, Upton Sinclair was the leading muckraker. His attacks on the meat packers resulted in inspection and grading laws. Samuel Hopkins Adams was slashing at the patent medicine rackets and helping to bring on the Food and Drug Act. The creation of the Federal Trade Commission appeased those aroused by the attacks of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson on "monopolists" and "malefactors of great wealth." In the early days of the Great Depression, the word "banker" was an epithet.

Lest we assume too readily that the present storm will eventually leave the landscape similarly intact, let us take further note of what has been added. We observe the astonishing popularity of a politician whose key appeal is a

promise to redistribute the national wealth through taxation. If we need more evidence that socialism has become respectable, we see a Republican administration being very polite to a Communist government.

That government has demonstrated that it can survive, improve the material well-being of its people, and can win world prestige and power. Communism improves by borrowing aspects of capitalism. Our two systems move closer together as here at home, business shortcomings have encouraged experiments with governmental business operations. These departures from private enterprise have succeeded well enough to gain public support, as for example the existence of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Comsat and Amtrak will attest.

But among the things for which there is no precedent is the flowering of individualism organized for change—and especially the number, the militancy and the influence of the young and the causes they dominate.

The alienation spreads, the alarm sounds and is heard—by some. Whereas the finely adjusted ear of the politician receives the signal, the business ear does not seem to be well tuned.

Weakness of 'Facts'

When almost any problem arises the first reaction always seems to be a call for better communications. Businessmen habitually moan, "If only the public understood the role of profits—let's tell the story!" "Communication" is regularly asked to be a panacea for the confrontations between nations, between races, and to heal all miscellaneous woes, ills and differences.

Alas, as one uniquely positioned for forty years to observe the technical and the creative explosion in communications skills, I have noted little permanent improvement in local, regional or world relationships from more and more, and better and better tele-communications. (We do have to differentiate

between distant and face-to-face talk.) The eyes and ears of millions on millions are assailed daily by words, words, words. They reach to Tel Aviv, to the Bedouin camel driver in Arabian deserts with his transistor radio, into the no-longer-dark continent of Africa, around the world, and to Park Avenue and Nob Hill suites with their color television and *New York Times*. Precious little progress in solving our problems has come of it.

The fallacy in this worship of communication is that it takes two to tango. It's one thing to send, and quite another to receive. The transmitter proposes, the recipient disposes.

The disregarded trap in communication is that man is basically not a rational animal. His attitudes are composed of several parts emotion for every one part reason. The "facts" too often don't persuade. The logic of a Plato extolling the glories of Greece will not deter the Persian enemy.

There are at least five questions to ask whenever communication is proposed: (1) How sound is *our position* and should it be modified? (2) To *whom* do we communicate? (3) *When*? (4) Exactly *what* do we communicate? (5) *How* do we communicate? and finally, *whether*. If we communicate, will it help, hurt, or just be wasted? Judgement and experience are required to find good answers to those questions. And when, indeed, the decision *is* to communicate, there is no substitute for the professional ability of the skilled practitioner.

The key point in communicating is what you already know: that always shaping the acceptance or rejection of what we *say* is who we are and what and how we *do*. Or if you prefer, our reputation.

Actions vs Words

The present reputation of business as an institution, we have seen, is in no shape to gain credibility through communicating the story of profits or anything else. Suspicion will turn off the human receiving set as surely as a yanked power cord turns off your TV set.

No, what we need now are better decisions from corporate executives that will in themselves communicate and make fertile the soil where understanding grows.

I emphasize that the slow climb back up the ladder of public approval for the corporation—and incidentally the hope of public relations—depends on putting our emphasis on responsible corporate performance.

It is my conviction that the corporation in America is in its serious trouble because the decision-making mix of the executive consistently excludes vital data. He is fully prepared with production records, personnel reports, financial records, sales charts and profit figures. What he doesn't get is adequate *socio-political* data.

I have great admiration for the process that produces a top executive, and for the product. He can usually make the right decision if he receives the proper selection of facts. His personal computer, however, is no different from its electronic counterpart. GIGO works for both—garbage in, garbage out.

Intuition Takes Over

In the absence of a system to produce the needed sociological and political information (which he wishes he had) he simply substitutes his personal experience and feelings.

Not feeling as comfortable in the gray areas of human behavior—he's number oriented—he shies away from them. Consequently when he makes any basic decision affecting the corporation's performance he has too little reliable information as to how that decision will impinge on the public's sensitive areas.

Ay, there's a rub! *What are* the sensitive areas? More important and much more difficult, what will be the sensitive areas one, three and five years ahead? And what will it take to find out?

Fundamentally we will have a realization by the businessman that since the consuming public is also the voting public, its opinions, beliefs, and attitudes on *any subject* are germane to the continuity of good profit years; i.e., to successful survival.

The reason is clear. The corporation's constituency can no longer be limited to its customers, investors, employees, suppliers, and immediate community. The corporation public has been universalized. It is everybody.

The man who wants to fish a stream in Wisconsin and is frustrated by industrial pollution becomes a vote against the business system—and hence against your business. (No man is an island, and no business.)

This lumping together may be another case of guilt by association but is nonetheless real. Long ago, the advertising executive and author, Bruce Barton, wrote, "No business has the right to poison the pond in which we all must fish." But the pond is indeed poisoned. Somehow it must be cleaned up fast, for all of us must perforce continue to fish from it.

I quote: "The creation of a responsive and responsible corporation becomes an indispensable step in the creation of a responsive and responsible state." Economist and critic Robert L. Heilbroner said that. I agree, and I hope you do too.

If responsive and responsible are the key characteristics of the road back, these attributes will be displayed in behavior of the corporation which mollifies the consumer, soothes the environmentalist and fends off more government regulatory tentacles. (Inevitable in this process are costs which will shock the consumer and surely moderate, but not stop, his push for reform.)

A word is necessary on what is meant by responsive and responsible. Responsive means knowing what the customer wants, and, within a reasonable time span, supplying him,

whether with consumer goods, airplanes or cranes, clean air, water, and an undeveloped land—all at an equitable price.

Responsible means dealing fairly and with integrity, offering quality products, and assuming a share of society's burdens and problem solving.

If the way back to public esteem is to improve corporate decision making so as to be both responsive and responsible, then the problem calls for an organization form which includes:

- (1) A set-up to gather and deliver the socio-political data to the proper spot in the organization;
- (2) A senior officer to process this input and to use it to advise the corporation's executive level on all basic decisions of whatever nature.

In 1735, Alexander Pope gave a succinct boost for our first point. You remember—"The proper study of mankind is man." The time has come for business to study social trends as thoroughly as it now analyzes sales, expenses, taxes or other areas affecting profit and survival.

This information is often deceptively commonplace and must be handled by sophisticated people who can protect its fragility and recognize its significance. Also, it may not always be "good news." Special short-cut channels from the corporation-public interface to headquarters are absolutely necessary for the simple reason that this kind of information will never get through the many layers of the regular organization where, as we all know, each relay point screens and cleans for the next higher level.

Decentralization of authority and the profit center concept add to the problems of intelligence flow to the corporate head. Today's typical conglomerate set-up is especially susceptible to this weakness.

Some have a method of public pulse-taking and point to

opinion surveys taken regularly to measure the corporation's standing. They may also point to a Washington office where the political scene is being watched. I would merely comment that while alertness and aggressiveness in Washington are desperately needed, conditions there reflect the public of two years ago and three years too late. Corporate strategy should be focused on *preventing* the political denouement, so frequently final and fatal.

New Methods Needed

Quantitative public opinion surveys, valuable as they are, do not profess to measure the stirrings deep in society's cells. They do not often detect the emotions in the hearts of men which eventually evolve into the enormous forces for change. It is these that we must learn to recognize and find ways to live with harmoniously, before they turn on us and, without intending it, destroy us.

Some businesses already have a rudimentary system to cover the almost infinite variety of societal manifestations which go into this mix: information from their salesmen, from the many community meeting halls, from the grass-roots organizations, from the ethnic, race, liberal, right wing, and underground publications; from the whispers and shouts at City Hall and the State House; from all the many fronts of social change.

Personal participation is an important ingredient in intelligence gathering. Middle and upper echelon management will belong to community organizations of all types—intellectual, race relations, ad hoc improvement committees, even political groups. The standard practice of sitting on the board of the old established charities where you meet your other business friends will no longer suffice.

It would make for safer piloting into the future and set a fine example if our *top* executives would get out and belong to groups where they will *not* meet their own kind. The habit of well-feathered birds flocking together is normal, but of little

help to the executive seeking to discern the course of society and a safe track for his enterprise.

Thomas Benham of Opinion Research Corporation warns against being misled by our associates by pointing to these characteristics of the American public: eight in ten don't own any stock; three-quarters of them have never been outside the country; and over 80 per cent don't fly—at least have not been in a plane during the last year; more than half have not been 200 miles away from home in the last 12 months. That is the public. On the other hand, it is a public better educated than ever before, more perceptive, clearly more sensitive. It gets most of its news in superficial high spotting from television, and it holds the voting power to elect our public leaders.

Profit Talk Risky

Allow me one more observation on chief executives. The unconscious seeking for the approval of his peers may be the executive's stumbling block and an obstacle to better organizing for corporate responsibility. The peer group has rigid unwritten rules. One of them is that success is judged primarily on a scoreboard of short-term profit. No one can fault profit objectives. What can be deplored is the habit of talking about profit as the prime objective of business. The public will accept the profit concept for what it is—a stimulus to production, a means to an end. But they tune out and turn cold when they hear the executive say, "My company is in business to make profits."

It is also significant that so few plaudits are tendered inside the peer group when responsible social performance has been demonstrated by a corporate leader and his institution. With peer pressure added to shareholder pressure, profit considerations naturally dominate the dynamics and the supply of money within the corporation.* (To say nothing of the

* Between 1965 and 1970, GNP went up 42%, wages and salaries rose 51%, but corporate after-tax profits went down 11.4%. Profit as a per cent of sales for manufacturing industry in 1971 was 4.2, while the public, asked to estimate, said 28%!

incentives to executives on their way up.) In any belt tightening, which comes periodically, it's not easy to convince pragmatic management of the wisdom of investing sizeable sums in socially responsible behavior designed to shore up profits five years off!

Arthur W. Page stated what I believe to be the number one rule for protecting the corporate reputation: "It is necessary for one to *foresee* situations so that no innocent act may be misinterpreted by anybody." This puts the emphasis where it belongs—the future—and brings us to the fascinating subject of forecasting the future of social change and behavior.

The Stanford Research Institute believes that the art of forecasting social change will accelerate faster than its predecessor social disciplines, e.g. economics, because tools are already developed; the computer is at hand; and the money and effort will flow from intense national interest in the subject. But, as a science, it is a few years away. Business can't wait. The sociological data we need concerns present conditions, as well as future trends. The corporation will have to begin now the serious business of analyzing social and political moods, and do its best with trends.

There are auspicious beginnings in the development of techniques. Albert H. Cantril and Charles W. Roll, Jr., describe one approach in a Potomac Associates book entitled *Hopes and Fears of the American People*. Using the Gallup organization, they have experimented with a new type of introspective human research. They throw out a caution in these words: "Nothing is so elusive to the analyst of contemporary America as the mood of the people. It is fluid, yet stable. It is inconsistent, yet logical. It both leads and is led."

We come now to the second needed element in our set-up for the seventies, which is the officer designated to advise on the norms and vagaries of society's behavior. This executive we will call Vice President—Public. Not Public as an

adjective, but Public as a noun, taking its place alongside Vice President—Finance, Vice President—Law, Vice President—Personnel. The unmodified and unmodifying word suggesting its scope and authority.

The Vice President—Public domain will extend to all the areas represented by the corporation's many interfaces with society. They include those responsibilities now under "public relations," under "corporate relations," "communications," and that popular newer title, "public affairs" which sometimes means government relations and at other times means a broad spectrum of activities *including* public relations. His influence must be felt on the advertising and on *all* communication to the end that it be cast in the mode of understatement and honesty—even confession if need be.

Let's dispose of any nonsense that the public function can, by itself, save the day. The course of the corporation is set by a small management group, sometimes dominated by an authoritarian chief executive, sometimes led by a moderator type. The participating mode is becoming more and more prevalent and therein lies hope for the public officer. Can our man make the team—the first team that outlines policy by advising the chief executive? He can, with luck and ability, if he goes beyond his communications role and becomes a qualified business executive too.

Business Exec Can Qualify

It can also work the other way round. But whether he be a public relations professional who became a businessman or a businessman turned public officer, he should have earned acceptance by the business troops through solid service in the ranks. This is so that no one can ever say with validity, "You public relations people wouldn't know about that."

Not too late for today's youth is the corollary that if the public department aspirant of the *future* is to qualify for corporate success, his educational background had best include some business subjects.

It will be harder for the businessman to turn public officer, but possible, given the personal bent, the latter point being vital. He will have to spend enough time learning the rudiments as a member of the public department, invest concentrated effort in apprenticeship news training, and ideally spend a year or two in Washington in government service.

As part and parcel of the required emphasis in the new age, the chief executive would be well advised to route his young hopefuls through his Public department for at least a year as valuable conditioning for upper executive posts.

In shutting off this description of a comprehensive Public unit in the corporation hierarchy, I find AT&T Chairman John deButts' 1967 words and attitude a fitting inspiration to build on:

"The head of a business looks to his public relations officer for criticism, regular and rigorous, of business customs, habits and attitudes. He expects an understanding of the environment that will help him define goals that include the company's responsibilities. He expects recommendations for action that will put his company squarely in the position of doing what it ought to do."

Can't Businesses Cooperate?

Before I wrap this up, I have to urge business leaders to another type of action. The business establishment must find a proper way around the anti-trust laws in order to engage in *cooperative* activities to save itself. For a starter, the National Business Council for Consumer Affairs, created by President Nixon, could name a small ad hoc group, (with labor representation?) to approach the Department of Justice with the objective of obtaining a safe-course map for benign activities through the mine fields of the anti-trust laws. For example:

- (1) Cooperative sociological research into the churning and ferment of society;
- (2) An all-new Washington research and lobby facility to focus on business facts;

(3) Beyond that, to seek the latitude for industry-wide activities to clean up the air, water and land.

Ever since the automobile companies were stopped from getting together to solve the emission problem, business has hung back, afraid to act in concert. Both sides have to exhibit the common sense and the courage to keep these ambiguous laws from restraining—not just trade, but also—activities for the public good.

None of this harangue is to say that the alert chief executive is not well ahead of all these recommendations for accommodating to the vast public disenchantment. To him I send my congratulations. For those who haven't yet moved in these directions, I quote the devastating curse of Isaiah:

“Make the heart of this people fat,
make their ears heavy,
and shut their eyes.”

The consequences, we will not belabor.

The tortuous march of man to individual freedom and dignity has taken thousands of years and still goes on. Sometimes bright, sometimes weak and almost quenched, the flame has flickered through the centuries: Magna Carta, the Reformation, the French Revolution, the American Revolution and Bill of Rights; two world wars against overt authoritarianism.

With closer focus we see the post-war rise of union power; the stirrings among the masses and the quickening tempo: the Supreme Court decisions on civil rights, the revolt of the consumer, the student uprising, the discovery of the deterioration of our environment, Martin Luther King and the black revolution, riots in the ghetto and on the campus, fire in the streets.

The flame of expectation in the human heart now burns bright not only in America but all over the world where the black, the yellow, the red, the old, and especially the young are

saying—“We are important”... “I am somebody”... “Everybody is somebody.” To recognize that truth and to act accordingly is the essence of my message.

Summary of Essentials

In closing, I'll pass up the temptation to further peroration and summarize:

American business faces a crisis of mounting government control brought on by an unawareness which must never be repeated.

The penalties can be mitigated by a better record of responsible performance, made possible by business dedication to deeper knowledge of public hopes and fears. This in turn is the product of a better organization to cope with public problems.

A department, captained by a Vice President—Public, or similar generic title, heads up a corporate intelligence system which obtains and applies political and sociological information—processed for the business mind—to all important phases of business operations. That same input will mold the communications output, which in the new age must be marked by candor, integrity and helpful information.

The Vice President—Public has just one job. That is to help the executive team reach its profit objectives and at the same time live in harmony with society. He minimizes the hazards and maximizes public understanding. He does this by sensitizing the corporate nervous system from head to foot. When, despite its warning system, the corporate body receives a kick in the rear, it now feels it the same day!

It may respond with quiet dignity and statesmanship. Or circumstances may well occur in which the “better decision” will be to return the kick.

Whatever the route and however hard, private enterprise

must work its way back to public favor.

The new game is being played for keeps—and its name is Survival.

PREVIOUS FOUNDATION LECTURES

HISTORICAL SERIES

- The First Public War, 1861-1865* — Dr. Frank E. Vandiver (1961)
- The Constitution Makers and the Public, 1785-1790* — Dr. Allan Nevins (1962)
- Words That Won the West, 1830-1850* — Dr. Ray A. Billington (1963)
- The Man Who Made Canada, 1865-1867* — Dr. George F. G. Stanley (1964)
- Public Relations and the Progressive Surge, 1898-1917* — Dr. Eric F. Goldman (1965)
- After the Fall — Opportunity, 1918-1945* — Dr. Joe B. Frantz (1966)

CONTEMPORARY SERIES

- Public Relations and the Open Society* — Glen Perry (1967)
- Time's Arrow and the Fifth Estate* — Dr. G. Edward Pendray (1968)
- By Any Other Name* — W. Howard Chase (1969)
- Knowing Two Worlds, Thinking Two Things* — Benjamin DeMott (1970)

Copyright, 1972 by Foundation for Public Relations Research and Education