Occasional Papers—No. 3

The Problem of International Propaganda

A New Technique Necessary in Developing Understanding Between Nations

By IVY LEE

The Problem of International Propaganda

A New Technique Necessary in Developing Understanding Between Nations

An address by

IVY LEE

Delivered before a private group of persons concerned with international affairs, in London, July 3, 1934

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Problem of International Propaganda

HEALTHY contacts between nations are not promoted by the methods of war propaganda or those of any form of underground or indirect propaganda in time of peace. Something new is necessary in an era of progress.

I.

THE LONGING OF PEOPLES FOR UNDERSTANDING

IT WOULD seem that what every government and every people today are primarily seeking with reference to other peoples is not to change the methods of others, but to be themselves understood. The people of every nation have their ideals, their longings, their convictions. Some of them, especially since the war, labor under a sense of grievous injustice. Others are possessed with a sense of fear, wondering what may happen to them under imagined conditions. Again, there are nations not oppressed by a sense of injustice—those who are free from fear of attack, conscious of a larger purpose of their own, and earnestly seeking to cooperate with all nations in working out a higher human destiny. They often feel deeply that their own sincerity of purpose and earnestness of effort are neither appreciated nor understood by others.

Indeed, it can be said that the chief longing of nations, both great and small, as of individuals, is that their purposes

and aspirations shall be understood in their best sense by other peoples. As J. L. Garvin, the wise editor of the *London Observer*, has said, "Tragedy is the conflict not of right and wrong, but of right and right." And so the most tragic fact of our time is the failure of nations to understand one another's best sides. "The salt unplumbed estranging sea" of ignorance of one another keeps the souls of nations apart.

If, through some technique of beneficent international propaganda, a way can be found to bridge the psychological chasms between nations it will be like the vision of the rainbow after the flood. It will be grander than any golden dream of the mediæval alchemist.

II.

GUNS STILL SPEAK THE ONLY INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE

WHAT an incredible world we live in today! Were an inhabitant of Mars, through some process of television, to see this earth of ours, mirrored in his watch tower, what would be his outstanding impression? Would it not be that upon this planet, a tiny speck in the vastness of space, the inhabitants, separated into some 60 different nations, after all the years of human history, had been able to find only one language in which they could speak one to another and be *sure* they would be listened to, and that sole language was the thunder of guns?

We, the peoples of the different nations, seem to be inarticulate when in peace-time we present our faces one

to another. When a crisis arises and we are unable to resolve a fundamental conflict of purpose, and we insist that we must be heard, we appear to be unable to turn to any other interpreter of ourselves than the mouth of a gun. War in its essence is nothing but an admission of the fact that in the last analysis nations do not know how to talk to one another except with guns. The vast armaments which disfigure our civilization and oppress all peoples are indeed but an unholy confession of the poverty of the technique of international expression.

Who does not recall those feverish days of July, 1914? No people wanted war. No government wanted war. The chancelleries of Europe were desperately telegraphing one another, the sovereigns of the nations were pleading with one another in vain efforts to stay the tornado. Perhaps if they had merely had the present refinements of the telephone, the fatal crash might have been averted. But it is evident that the outstanding fact of that momentous month was the utter failure of the governments of Europe to use language that carried conviction. What one government said, another did not believe, and in default of any other technique of effective expression, the nations were flung back upon the dark, devastating dialect of guns.

And there are other kinds of guns than Big Berthas, 75's and machine guns, and other war weapons than torpedoes and airplane bombs. For "peace has her enmities no less profound than war," and since the great war, we have seen the amazing development of political and economic nationalism in a world endowed with untold wealth

of natural and industrial resources, needing only to be utilized to provide plenty for all. Is not this development of war in the midst of peace, imposing so many artificial barriers to the international interchange of the world's resources, a further admission of the inability of nations adequately to express themselves to one another except by means of economic and financial guns? High tariffs, embargoes, quotas, clearing offices and other similar manifestations are but the paraphernalia of war, and the havoc wrought to the peoples is almost as dire as bursting shells.

Against such procedures recall the experience of Elijah when

> (1 Kings 19): "A great and strong wind rent the mountains, and brake in pieces the rocks before the Lord; but the Lord was not in the wind: and after the wind an earthquake; but the Lord was not in the earthquake: and after the earthquake a fire; but the Lord was not in the fire: and after the fire a still small voice."

Our quest is even yet for that "still small voice" which shall still the tumult of international conflict.

What nations are seeking, too, is not merely to prevent war in the future, but at this very moment to effect some kind of moral cohesion which will enable them in a spirit of understanding to cooperate to the end that all the peoples may have their daily bread. The present economic breakdown of the world is probably due more than anything else to the fact that in the treaty-making at the end of the war there was so much politics and so little effective thought given to rebuilding the economic structure of this world

which the war had destroyed. And today the failure at Versailles still remains the cause of the fundamental disease which the restoration of peace on earth and good-will by men toward men alone can cure.

III.

THE BASIS OF MISTRUST BETWEEN NATIONS—LACK OF KNOWLEDGE

ONE of the disturbing facts of our time is the militarism of Japan. Why this particular phenomenon? Up to 1868, the year of the Japanese revolution, following the opening up of Japan, that country had known no foreign wars. But against the impact of the West, Japan was forced to look at Europe. The Japanese, a very mild people at heart, saw that the only method nations apparently practiced in order to impress themselves upon each other was the use of guns. So Japan began to arm, and it must be said that however much the West may talk about the virtues of listening to the voice of reason, there is but little in the conduct of Western nations toward one another to give Japan reason to believe that national ends can be achieved through reliance solely upon a righteous cause. The dictum of the first President Roosevelt: "Speak softly, but carry a big stick," is still, in very truth, the policy of the Western world.

Russia and Germany have suggested that the only solution to the disarmament problem is for all nations to disarm completely. Apparently the only reason why these proposals

do not fall upon receptive ears is because so many of the nations simply do not trust one another. Is not the reason they do not trust each other that they do not understand one another? Who was it who said you cannot hate a man you really know?

Travel the world over and meet peoples of every race, and you cannot but realize that human beings, whether Japanese, Indians, Persians or Turks, whether Germans, French or English, men everywhere are very much the same, and respond fundamentally to the same psychological stimuli. "He fashioneth their hearts alike," says the old psalmist. Every individual wishes to live a quiet, peaceful life with an opportunity to realize some of the comforts and joys of living. Why is it then that men in the mass find it difficult to make understood to other men in the mass their basic aspirations as members of the same human society? The chief purpose here is to submit certain suggestions which may throw light upon a solution to that problem.

IV.

THE REASON FOR INTERNATIONAL PROPAGANDA

WHAT is the larger purpose of legitimate international propaganda? Its purpose must primarily be the attainment of peace and the outlawing of war. Once that is attained the supreme aim must be to bring about such an interchange of goods, services and culture among all peoples as progressively to raise the standard of life for human beings everywhere. Viewed in this light, international propaganda has a beneficent mission.

The word propaganda, however, has an unfortunate connotation. Derivatively, the word has a precise meaning—the projection of ideas. But in practice the process of propaganda has been so often polluted, poisoned and prostituted that it is difficult to think of it in its strictly derivative sense. Consideration of the subject in its best sense at once rules out of consideration all secret, underground and indirect propaganda. If I am a salesman and approach a man in an effort to sell him a list of goods, my prospective customer knows precisely the purpose of my visit. He may listen to me in a receptive frame of mind prepared to hear of the qualities of my goods. Why, then, should not men in the mass, with ideas of which they wish other masses to hear, approach one another in the same direct manner?

Some years ago, President Coolidge, addressing the American Association of Newspaper Editors, said among other things:

> "Propaganda seeks to present a part of the facts, to distort their relations, and to force conclusions which could not be drawn from a complete and candid survey of all the facts."

Then Mr. Coolidge added:

> "Of real education and of real information we cannot get too much; but of propaganda . . . we cannot have too little."

Obviously, in these remarks, Mr. Coolidge was confusing terms, for, as a matter of fact, it is quite impossible to present any subject in the form of a "candid survey of all the facts."

Someone once stated that absolute truth could be ex-

pressed only in the form of a mathematical equation because that is abstract and the terms mean exactly the same thing to everyone. But if one makes a statement in words, each person who hears may interpret that statement differently because each of the words may have a different color and connotation to each listener. The effort to state an absolute fact is, then, an attempt to achieve the impossible. To state any fact, to give any sort of "candid survey of all the facts," leads one so far afield and compels one to include so many relative facts that a really comprehensive presentation of any single fact cannot be made—the best one can do is to give his own interpretation of the facts.

V.

THE ONE EVIL OF PROPAGANDA

WHAT one wishes to know, therefore, is this: Who is making the interpretation? What is his interest? What is his purpose? What is his objective? If one knows these things, one is able to judge for oneself of the sincerity and fidelity with which the interpretation of facts is presented. The essential evil of propaganda, and its only menace, therefore, is not in the effort itself to disseminate ideas. The evil is the *failure to disclose the source* of the information.

One can defend himself against the impact of ideas or emotions if one knows whence they come, but one needs to be protected from what Sir Norman Angell calls "the unseen assassins"—the "unseen assassins" which destroy the

mind's integrity. For "unseen assassins" are dangerous, whether they use stilettos of steel in the dark or seek to poison our minds with falsehood or half truths coming we know not whence and aimed at we know not what.

To be specific, what could have been more shocking than the vast expenditures which we know the Czarist government made to the French press in 1906 to seduce the French people into the purchase of Russian bonds? The French people believed that their own press was giving an opinion favorable to these bonds in the interests of the French investors. We now know that their own press was bought by the Czarist government and that the French people who in good faith invested their money in the bonds were swindled as effectively as if they had been offered counterfeit money. "Unseen assassins" were at work.

VI.

SOUND POLICY THE FIRST ESSENTIAL

NO PROPAGANDA is of real and authentic value as compared, first of all, with soundness and rightness of policy in itself, and, secondly, a frank, direct and intelligent effort to expound that policy, so that it may be understood by any and every one.

Extensive experience in assisting large corporations to adjust themselves to the demands of public opinion in making their purposes and policies understood and in creating for themselves a favorable position in the public mind has shown that no amount of propaganda is of any value unless the policy of the institution is, in the first place, sound and

honest, and is responsive to the high demands of enlightened public sentiment. Given a sound policy, it is often essential to explain that policy, and to make people realize its nature; but unless the policy is sound intrinsically no amount of propaganda will make it appear to be so. For governments, like institutions and individuals, are judged by what they do rather than by what they say. As Goethe makes Faust say:

"When you are in earnest, do you need
"A search for words?—
"If from the soul the language does not come
"By its own impulse,
"In vain you strive.
"Never hope to stir the hearts of men
"And mould the souls of many into one
"By words which come not native from the heart."

How superficial then to conceive of propaganda as though it were a mere umbrella to keep one dry against a very heavy downpour, or as a smoke screen to conceal what is going on behind, when what is there should not be. The truth of the reality is alone effective.

But let me illustrate what is meant by the importance of sound policy in developing good relations between peoples: The British government and the British people had for many years prior to the war sought the good-will of the American people. There was always a large section of American opinion very cordially inclined toward Great Britain. There was often talk of clasping "hands across the sea." But, broadly speaking, there was, prior to the war, no great cordiality on the part of the American people toward Great Britain. The American schoolboy was brought

up on lurid tales of the Boston tea party and "taxation without representation." Ireland was the modern prototype of the same form of oppression. George III was the picture in the American mind of an English king. Even when the United States entered the war, these prepossessions in the popular American attitude made the fullest cooperation with Great Britain difficult. Following the war, however, a profound change took place. This change was brought about, not by conscious propaganda, but by two major acts of British government policy. The first was the settlement of the Irish question. A source of incessant irritation between the two countries was eliminated. The other act was Great Britain's prompt dispatch of Stanley Baldwin to the United States to settle the question of the British war debt to America.

Whatever one may say about these debts, there can be no doubt whatever that the fact that Great Britain came forward so promptly and so manfully, and signed its name to a settlement of that debt, established Great Britain in the minds of the American people as a nation of character. The memory of that can never be effaced. Whatever may have been its temporary cost, that act of Mr. Baldwin's will, in the long run, amply recompense the British people in pounds, shillings, and pence, even if measured by no higher standard than can be expressed in the arithmetic of the ledger.

To compare the effect of indirect propaganda with so conspicuous an act of statesmanship is to compare the laying of the dust in the thoroughfares by Westminster Abbey with the inner glories of that magnificent edifice.

VII.

THE WEAKNESS OF MANY MODERN GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA EFFORTS

LET us assume that each nation adopts policies of state which the peoples of that nation believe to be reasonable. Let us further assume that each nation wishes to live in peace and concord with its neighbors. But no matter how passionately a nation may believe in the righteousness of its own attitude, and no matter how real its friendliness toward others may be, each nation has shaped its policies and purposes from the standpoint of national interest, in the light of national tradition, and all impregnated with that modicum of selfishness which is the inheritance alike of individuals and nations. It is, accordingly, difficult to make such policies understood among other peoples, to whom such interests and traditions are foreign. Just as efforts at propaganda by indirect method are so generally futile and ill-conceived, so is much of the conscious propaganda today attempted by various governments through their so-called "press departments." A great advance would be registered in the relationships of nations if in each country the governments realized that correspondents of foreign newspapers were there to ascertain facts and facts alone, and to ascertain them promptly and accurately. Modern news-gathering is a science, and implicit in any science is precise *knowledge*.

Any withholding of facts which the public is entitled to know always excites the professional antagonism of the responsible journalist. Journalists are usually thoroughly

responsible and exceptionally intelligent men. It is their business to collect news—not propaganda—and if governments everywhere obtain a clear conception of what news is, their relations with foreign journalists and with foreign peoples themselves will be perceptibly improved. News, in a word, is what the readers of the newspapers are interested to read. The reader is the essential factor to be considered, and not the man or the government who would like to tell the reader what he wants him to believe.

The wisest and most enlightened government is the one which, in its dealings with foreign journalists, effectively assists them to obtain quickly, accurately and authoritatively the information their newspapers seek to publish for their readers.

The most effective government propagandist of the past two decades was Lord Riddell who accomplished miracles for the British point of view, at Paris, at Genoa, at Washington, and always by the simple, straightforward process of assisting journalists to obtain the facts quickly. Lord Riddell was wise enough to know that any effort to color those facts would be bound to react unfavorably against the interests of his own country.

VIII.

THE BASIS FOR AN INFORMED WORLD OPINION

IT IS probably true that much of the international anarchy which prevails today arises from the inadequacy and futility of present-day methods of international communication which prevent effective healthy interplay between the

different views of nations and make impossible the development of such a thing as an intelligent world public opinion.

Influences set in motion by the use of new processes might result in a real organization of civilization. Ortega in his recent book, "The Revolt of the Masses," states:

> "Civilization is, before all, the will to live in common. A man is uncivilized, barbarian, in the degree in which he does not take others into account. . . . Liberalism is that principle of political rights which constitutes the supreme form of generosity. It is the right which the majority concedes to minorities. It announces the determination to share existence with the enemy; more than that, with an enemy which is weak."

Such is Ortega's philosophy. When, may I ask, will such a liberalism become the ruling principle among nations? Certainly not until peoples begin genuinely to understand one another. They will never understand one another until the philosophy of Burke becomes embodied in the attitude of mind of the peoples toward their sister nations. When the population of the American colonies was only some 3,000,000, and the colonials were being viciously attacked in England, Burke said, "I do not know how to frame an indictment against a people. I am not able to insult the feelings and impugn the motives of millions of my fellow-beings." But it is not unusual today for people in one country to indulge in the most violent attack upon the purposes of governments in other countries which enjoy the support of tens of millions of their own people. The philosopher Kant said more than a hundred years ago, "Man

cannot think too highly of mankind," and with reference to nations these words might now be applied:

> "There is so much bad in the best of us,
> There is so much good in the worst of us,
> That there is little ground for the rest of us
> To speak ill of any of us."

For between peoples as between individuals the French proverb is apt to be true: "Tout comprendre, c'est tout pardonner."

IX.

TRUTH ALONE CAN ENDURE

HOW, then, can each nation's interpretation of itself to other nations be made in a manner which will command a hearing, with some prospect that that which is good in its national policies will survive exposure to the blazing light of world opinion?

Of course, it must be assumed that, if nations are to undertake consciously to seek the good-will of other peoples, they will do so because they have in fact "a decent respect for the opinion of mankind." They will also realize that error when exposed to the light will not long survive. "Truth is mighty and will prevail," but only if it be truth. The hiding of error does not correct it.

Will Irwin said very truly in *Collier's Weekly* some years ago:

> "Nature has endowed the human mind with a curious sixth sense for truth. It is slow, this instinct; it burns dimly, but persistently. The famous epigram about fooling

the people, attributed to Lincoln, conveys a profound truth."

In his controversy some time ago with Governor Allen over freedom of the press in Kansas, William Allen White said, and also wisely, "If you allow unhampered discussion, much folly will be printed and spoken. But the truth will come out in the end."

If one stores, in a refrigerator, an ingot of steel and a cake of ice, each of the same size, the chances are that both will continue to be of the same size. But expose the same ingot of steel and the same ice to the noonday sun on a summer's day, and the ice will melt away. The ingot of steel will remain.

X.

THE PEOPLE NOW ASSERT THEIR SOVEREIGNTY

BEAR in mind, too, one of the most impressive facts of modern times. The masses of the people are in control. Even where there are dictators, the dictatorships are, in the last resort, but an expression of mass emotion and power. Even dictators know quite well that whom the masses have made, the masses can destroy. Even the Soviets realistically call their rule, "the dictatorship of the Proletariat." The intensive, internal mass propaganda in nations like Russia, Italy and Germany is but recognition of the sovereignty of the masses.

The governing classes of the past no longer rule. What Faguet calls "the cult of the incompetent" is accordingly the

greatest menace to efficient government or the exercise of high statesmanship. The ordinary man is restive if he is governed very much, or is required to submit to the authority of those much superior in quality to himself, and the rulers of any country disregard that fact at their peril.

To put the matter in another way, as Ortega has done in "The Revolt of the Masses":

> "European history reveals itself, for the first time, as handed over to the decisions of the ordinary man as such. The ordinary man, hitherto guided by others, has resolved to govern this world himself."

As an illustration of the truth that even a very popular government cannot do as it pleases, I venture to assert that there are many men in the government of the United States today who would be quite prepared to make a settlement of the war debts upon a basis very different from that upon which that government itself insists. But, as long as the American people as a whole remain in their present state of mind, no government of the United States could agree to any minimum figure for a settlement of the war debts which would not be far in excess of the maximum sum which the larger European debtors would regard as reasonable. The American people have a definite complex upon this subject, and the people are in control.

The present President of the United States also strongly favors adhesion to the World Court. Indeed, affiliation with that Court has been advocated by every President since the plan was first formulated, but up to now it has been impossible even under the strongest official pressure to secure

assent by the Senate of the United States to the World Court Protocol. The American people as a people are not yet persuaded that they dare trust their destinies to the determination of an international tribunal, and the Senate does not dare to act contrary to the popular will.

XI.

THE OUTWORN JARGON OF DIPLOMACY

THE technique of official communications between nations grew up under conditions very different from those ruling today. It used to be the fact that nearly all governments could act decisively in foreign affairs with assurance of support by their own citizens. That is not the case today —for now, in affairs both domestic and foreign, the people insist upon being consulted. In the presence of such a fact, is it not well for the foreign offices of all governments to consider the need for change in the technique of diplomatic correspondence? The ponderous Johnsonian language and the subtleties of phraseology so characteristic of diplomatic communications are utterly lost upon the masses of the people who read them in the newspapers.

These formalisms and pedantries in diplomatic documents are not wholly different from forms of language one comes upon sometimes when large business interests approach public opinion. Large corporations are apt to take themselves very solemnly in their public utterances, especially on questions of policy. In such matters they have usually been advised by lawyers, alert at once to safeguard against

lapses in phraseology which might open to attack an unnecessary amount of surface. Of course, as lawyers they are right, but lawyers too often are impressed with the necessity of making their statements in words of elevated dignity consonant with the magnitude of the interests they serve. But such words generally leave the public quite unmoved.

Edmund Burke, more than 150 years ago, used language about the lawyers of his time which might today be well applied to the gentlemen who draft the stately communications between governments. Burke wrote that lawyers had

> "bewildered the world and themselves in organizing forms and ceremonies, and perplexed the plainest matters with metaphysical jargon."

What we ourselves need to do in this latter day world is not so much to get rid of the lawyer or the diplomat. We need both, but we should get rid of the wig and gown spirit, and persuade foreign offices to talk to each other in language to be "understanded of the people."

If I may be permitted, I should like to commend the recent and latest British Note to the United States on the debt question. In a few paragraphs this Note dealt clearly with the problem of meeting international debts through payments in kind. If the multitudinous Notes which have been written by different governments on the subject of these debts had been phrased with the simplicity and clarity which characterized that particular Note much of the present confusion would not exist.

Nevertheless the practice as to communications between governments is still confined within set molds, and such

molds of formal and stilted phrase are remote from what we know to be the realities of modern life. Governments continue writing to each other in the old way and the people do not know what it is all about. Meanwhile, modern technique has opened new ways and new methods by which peoples may express themselves to peoples across all frontiers.

XII.

WHAT STUDIES OF MASS PSYCHOLOGY ARE REVEALING

THE development of a new technique of international communication has been coincident with the realization by the masses of their power and with their determination to exercise it. Indeed, mass psychology itself has been subjected to research which has revealed amazing possibilities as to effective methods of moving the hearts and reaching the minds of the collective man. These studies of mass psychology have so far tended to perfect methods by which the emotions of the collective man can be touched and stirred. While these methods can be used effectively within a nation, there are still great limitations upon even their use between peoples. The myriad banners, the endless marching and playing of bands, the reiteration of slogans which have had so much to do with creating and upholding the present régimes in Italy, Germany and Russia, methods which are not indeed dissimilar from those in an American presidential campaign, are clearly ineffective as between peoples of different nations. Within a nation, it is possible for orators and writers, by the mere suggestion of a word, the mention

of a place associated with a great event, or the reference to a revered national hero, to reach down into the hearts of the people and to arouse emotions due to subconscious reflexes. But beyond the frontiers of the nation itself such psychological power is lost.

Students of mass psychology recognize that even among any one particular people the devices and incantations of professional propagandists cease to have effect after a while. There comes a time when it is necessary even at home to appeal to reason. As men grow more sophisticated, better educated, more aware of the fact that their emotions are being subjected to vivisection and conscious stimulation, they insist more and more upon knowing the facts, and reaching conclusions of their own which do not flow from their emotions, and which are not made for them by others. There is no more general characteristic of modern youth than its ready disposition to challenge accepted conventions and to secure emancipation from the compulsions of tradition, whether political, social or religious, and to work out a rational basis for life rather than remain bound by chains of any kind.

This evolution merely indicates that a yet newer and better technique of appealing to mass psychology will afford opportunity for intelligent and reasonable intercourse between the peoples. Not that man in the mass will today or in the future pay attention to complicated argumentation. The tempo of modern life is too fast for that, and it is growing faster; the distractions are too intense, and every man's concentration upon his own immediate personal inter-

ests is so exclusive that anyone undertaking to get any idea before the public must surmount high psychological hurdles.

One of the great difficulties of obtaining intelligent conclusions from the people upon matters of moment is the fact that so many subjects which deeply affect the welfare of the people are in fact not sufficiently dramatic to be interesting to them. For example, in ordinary times it would probably be hard to persuade the average citizen of London to read a newspaper article about the immensely important subject of adequate water supply for this metropolis. It is only when there is a drought that one takes interest in the subject.

One of the chief reasons why it seems almost impossible to make real progress toward disarmament may be that the subject is so technical and so difficult of presentation to the people. For that reason, however important it is to every citizen of every country, people generally do not seem interested in it, and consequently do not become excited about it or place the weight of their influence behind enlightened efforts to deal with it.

XIII.

MODERN TECHNIQUE UNFOLDS THE WAY TO WHAT MAY BE A NEW WORLD

IN THE presence of this vast power of the multitude, bound as we are by so many shackles of custom and tradition in the intercommunication between nations, apparently thwarted by the interplay of conflicting interests and sinister ambitions, how can the peoples of the world make their

thoughts, aspirations and longings known to one another to the end that they will trust one another, believe in one another and be willing to cooperate in creating a new world really worth living in? Certainly no more vital question could be raised.

See what modern technique has provided for us as a means of solving this problem. And here, if I seem to speak in terms of fantasy, I may console myself with the fact that Leonardo da Vinci was considered a visionary when he sketched designs which were the earliest practical speculations upon mechanical flying, and that Jules Verne's story "Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea," written long before the coming of the actual submarine, was regarded, when published, as a mere dream to entertain schoolboys.

There are three media whose possible usefulness in building international understanding is without limit. Before we examine these media, it should be emphasized that if governments are to make use of them they should do so openly, vigorously and with regard for the psychological considerations which must be taken into account. Likewise, these media cannot be used effectively except at enormous expense, and to place such unusual expenses upon national budgets would profoundly shock most finance ministers.

The shock would be, in reality, however, only to tradition. But if, by such expenditures frankly made for international propaganda, results can be envisaged of the order we have described, how much more shocking it should be to place in national budgets the vast sums now willingly spent to build battleships or equip armies! Otherwise what do

we mean when we speak of the desirability of "Peace at Any Price"? The United States, for example, has spent $40,000,000 upon building two ships to carry naval battle planes. If $40,000,000 could be expended upon effective measures to make America better understood, how immeasurably greater might be the benefit! How strange that nations should be so prodigal in spending money to prepare for war, and so miserly in their payments for effective measures toward international understanding which might prevent war and foster international cooperation.

XIV.

NEW USES OF THE PRINTING PRESS

THE first of the media available for these beneficent purposes is the printing press. Today, in their dealings with each other, nations make practically no direct conscious use of their own printing press in telling their own story to other peoples. They rely almost entirely upon the printing presses of the other countries to do their job voluntarily for them. They do not openly print documents, books, pamphlets, posters or other material *designedly* to tell their story to other peoples.

The most irritating question, as a case in point, which today disturbs the cordial relations between the peoples of Great Britain and the United States is that of the war debts. The British people is sincerely convinced of the rectitude of its own position. Its method to date of stating that position to the American people has been through dip-

lomatic communications to the American government or speeches by members of the British government.

Believing in their case, as they do, convinced that if it was only thoroughly understood by fair-minded Americans it would appeal to them as just and reasonable, why shouldn't the British government print pamphlets in great quantities and circulate them freely among the American people as frankly and openly coming from the British government with the avowed purpose of appealing directly to the fair-mindedness of the American people? Some of the pamphlets would be for the so-called intelligentsia; others for the man in the street. They would, of necessity, be prepared with reference to the psychology of those to whom the appeal was intended. But remember Byron's lines:

> "Words are things, and a small drop of ink,
> Falling like dew upon a thought, produces
> That which makes thousands, perhaps millions, *think*."

And then what wonders can be accomplished with pictures. The art of visual presentation has been developed to a very high degree, and the value of pictures as a means to command attention is a basic precept in modern advertising. I have often thought that if the substance of Mr. Keynes' remarkable book, "The Economic Consequences of the Peace," had also been presented in the form of graphic illustration, and universally distributed, its influence upon the world would have been far greater even than it was. Points of view upon the war debts or arguments as to disarmament can easily be told by any country in the form of illustrated publications.

Take also the case of Japan in Manchuria. Japan is firmly convinced that its mission in the East is in the interests of civilization. If Japan were to tell in the form of pictures the story of what it has done for Manchuria and what Japanese rule means for sanitation, for preservation of civil law and order, for education, for economic development and for all those things which we mean by material civilization, and then if Japan were frankly and openly to distribute these pictures internationally, the nations might have far greater sympathy with Japan's influence upon Manchuria.

Just after Japan withdrew from the League of Nations, I remember meeting, in New York, Mr. Matsuoka, who had been head of the Japanese delegation in Geneva. I have seldom seen a more broken-hearted man, and the thought which obviously oppressed him most was that Japan had not been understood by the other nations. He was obsessed with the thought that, if the world could only understand, how different its verdict might be.

XV.

HOW NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING MIGHT WORK MIRACLES

IN THE distribution of books, pamphlets or even illustrated publications the chief problem is to get people to read them. But there is one method of using the printing press probably with more power to compel attention than any other, and that is the actual purchase of advertising space in the newspaper press. If this should be done by nations, foreign offices could not complain of the accuracy

of the news about them in the press of other countries. They would tell their own story in their own way, write their own headlines, get it all printed just as they want it told, and sign their names to it.

Gordon Selfridge, the great London merchant, said in his far-seeing advertising column in the *London Times* some two years ago: "We believe the day must come when the advertising of every civilized nation will be done frankly, thoroughly, professionally. At present it is being done only in a furtive and spasmodic manner." Surely the vision of a wondrous future!

Newspaper advertising, for instance, might effectively be used concerning one subject which probably more than any other today impedes normal commercial intercourse between Russia and the capitalist nations. It is a fact that Russia repudiated the Czarist debts and refuses to pay them. Discuss this subject with intelligent Russians, and you find that Russia has a case. It may not be a good case, but to the Soviet mind it is convincing. Soviet leaders claim that since the war no nation has more scrupulously paid its debts than Russia and that that fact should be all-sufficient proof that Russia believes in the sanctity of contract. Yet doubt upon this point prevents Russia getting normal commercial credits necessary to finance the trade which might easily develop with other countries, if such credits were available.

Why, then, should not Russia, in paid advertisements inserted in the press of all the important countries, set forth its attitude on the question of its debts? The advertisements might be signed by Stalin himself, for that would insure

attention. Such advertisements would be read; if the argument was appealing, it would gain support. The millions such an adventure would cost might mean the addition of billions to the Soviet national income.

The same technique can easily be applied to numerous problems which today agitate governments and estrange the sympathies of peoples. The printing press is here. Why not use it for such great purposes?

For breaking through the limitations which today circumvent the contacts of peoples, the printing press offers undreamed-of opportunities.

XVI.

THE MOTION PICTURE—THE EYE-GATE AND THE EAR-GATE TO THE HUMAN MIND

A SECOND medium which modern invention has placed at our disposal is the motion picture. Here is a medium by which almost any story can be told vividly. It is a medium which is virtually independent of the limitations of human language. It reaches the human mind through the Eye-Gate and the Ear-Gate, to use John Bunyan's quaint words. The same pictures can be understood whether shown in London, upon the heights of the Andes, or upon the banks of the Yangtze River.

In Hollywood recently I saw a very remarkable motion picture illustrating and undertaking to justify President Roosevelt's monetary policy. Whatever one may have

thought of the argument, the effectiveness of the technique was revealing. The habits and practices of social and commercial life are today being profoundly influenced by the motion picture. Why should not this medium be utilized by governments in telling abroad on behalf of their own people their own story and purposes?

How interesting and effective it might be if Italy should present its problems to the whole world in the form of a motion picture, or a series of motion pictures, and if at the very beginning of each picture Mussolini himself should sign a message saying, in effect: "I have caused this and other pictures to be made and offered to the world as Italy's own interpretation of itself." Such frankness would itself be refreshing.

If there was any special problem between Italy and, say, France, what more effective way than this for Mussolini to present his special case to the peoples of those countries?

This would be a startling innovation, but if Mussolini permitted the Italian motion picture houses to be opened likewise to France, the reciprocity thus established would itself create cordial feelings between the peoples. Before long the innovation might become accepted practice.

Think of what this medium would do for the League of Nations. It would appear that one weakness of the League arises chiefly from the fact that its meetings bring together so few individual statesmen representing their respective countries. The work of the League is not known,

and its processes are not understood by the rank and file of the peoples who send their representatives to Geneva. The expenses of the League are often criticized, but, if the League can be made an effective instrument of peace, its actual cost is trivial compared with the vast expenditures of the nations upon armaments and, potentially, upon war. If, however, there was a larger vision, the governments of the world could equip the League with funds to enable it to tell its story in its myriad ramifications, in the form of motion pictures so that the whole world might see and understand.

The extremely limited and almost casual contacts established between the few statesmen who gather at Geneva would then be projected into contacts between all peoples, and the whole world would gain a new vision of what it might in fact mean if the dream should come true that—

> "The war drum throbs no longer, and the battle flags
> are furled
> In the parliament of man, the federation of the world."

The motion picture is chiefly used today in places of entertainment, but its use is extending to the school, the church, even the home, and to all places where groups of people gather together. The technique of presenting with the film any kind of story, argument or scientific demonstration is being perfected with astonishing insight and originality. If the nations were consciously to adopt and incur the expense incident to a wide-scale use of this medium with which to reveal almost their very souls, as represented by their culture, purposes and aspirations, the beneficent results might be beyond all compare.

XVII.

THE RADIO AS A UNIVERSAL INTERPRETER

A THIRD medium which only awaits extensive and effective use by nations is the radio. It is already being used with effect even by governments, but up to now primarily for home purposes. In the United States it was formerly the accepted practice, for instance, for the President to give to the people an accounting of his stewardship chiefly in the form of messages to Congress, or through occasional speeches to important gatherings. The present President has broken through that tradition. He sends messages to Congress, to be sure, but every so often he announces to the country that he will speak to the people as a whole over the radio. Only the other night Mr. Roosevelt sat in his library in the White House and through a microphone addressed the whole population gathered in their homes. Even the Roman Catholic Church has installed a gigantic broadcasting station in Vatican City, and occasionally the Pope addresses simultaneously and directly the faithful in all lands. First they hear his own voice, and then his words are translated into the local vernaculars.

The possibilities of the radio for use in international affairs were clearly foreshadowed when the speech of King George in opening the London Economic Conference of last year was broadcast throughout the world.

We live upon a planet whose actual time-circumference is only a tenth of a second. When the first experimental wireless telephones were installed between Great Britain and the

United States, it was found that the voices could be heard across the Atlantic, but that a fraction of a second later there was an apparent echo of each sound. This was very puzzling, and careful research was required to ascertain the cause for the echo which so blurred the words as to make conversation impossible.

The problem was solved, however, when it was discovered that the echo was due to the fact that the electrical waves which carried the words, after registering them in New York, traveled around the world and returned to repeat the message a tenth of a second later.

In this tenth-of-a-second world, why should not the peoples through their governments frankly assume the cost of having their accepted leaders tell the story of their problems and relate their attitude on international matters by means of the radio?

Take again the three subjects in which the peoples of Great Britain and the United States have the greatest common interest: the general problem of disarmament and peace, commercial relations, and the debt question. Clearly these two peoples do not see eye to eye on these subjects upon which it is so important that they should agree. I make bold then to ask: Why should not the attitude of Great Britain be told to the people of the United States possibly by the voice of King George himself? If it were announced to the American people that King George was to talk to them about the debts or about the naval problem or about tariffs, quotas and international trade, the whole American people would listen not only with great interest, but respect.

They might not listen at all if a lesser figure were to undertake the task.

On the other hand, if the government of the United States should buy time on the radio that President Roosevelt might send his voice across the Atlantic Ocean and talk to the British people about the American attitude on this or other subjects, the British people would surely listen. With the cases on both sides thus presented, it should not be long before there was far greater reconciliation in the points of view of these two great peoples.

Of course, such procedure would do violence to the diplomatic protocol under which heads of nations are expected to speak only to one another. But if one is right in stating that it is the masses of the people who, in the last analysis, actually rule, and if the attainment of understanding between the peoples is the supreme objective, why should an outworn tradition prevent our making use of a direct and common sense procedure where other processes have clearly proved ineffective?

XVIII.

A NEW TECHNIQUE INDISPENSABLE

ALL THIS would call, of course, for a wholly new world point of view. If the leaders of nations are to speak to other nations with frankness, they cannot talk one way to the foreign people and say something quite different for home consumption. But once the larger conception has taken root, this very new procedure will tend to temper

national attitudes. Real national leaders will become world statesmen.

The dream of such possibilities may seem like an attempted leap into the millennium. But in fact: Is it not mere common sense? Is it not honest? Is it not worthy of the great ends to be served? If so, what reason is there for declaring that it cannot be done?

No one can imagine that such a picture as I have presented could come into being as though it were a trick flower blossoming almost instantly under a magician's wand. There must be gradual growth, fostered by a spirit of tolerance among the nations. Certainly nothing could be accomplished by such procedure, if attempted against resistance. A nation must have confidence in its cause if it is to submit it to the searching scrutiny of the world, and each nation must in the large interest want to know what its sister nations have to say.

Likewise, the concrete suggestions made would be utterly ineffective if adopted as merely sporadic measures to meet acute situations. There must be continuity of effort conceived in an entirely new spirit of international relations. What has been suggested as spectacular should become the usual, and it should no more be regarded as abnormal for President Roosevelt to talk directly to the British people, and to plead America's case to them, than for President Roosevelt to plead the case of his own administration to the American people.

The point is that the present methods by which nations seek to present their cases to another, with sovereign peoples

always the ultimate judge, are ineffective. Assuming the supreme importance of having the peoples themselves understand their sister peoples and nations, the procedures suggested constitute methods at least by which such understanding might be realized. Whether or not the exact details suggested are the best, the vital question which should be answered really is: How can the desired result be achieved?

Many, doubtless, will disagree with parts of this diagnosis. Others may question particulars as to the prescription. But details do not matter. I have been indulging in an adventure of ideas. The purpose is solely to suggest the importance of approaching this problem of the contact between peoples unfettered by traditional formulas, released from the tyranny of the diplomatic protocol, and enfranchised with liberty to explore possibilities wholly in the light of reality.

We live in a new world. Should we not then adopt new methods to make it a much better world?