

## 4. World War II comparative communications: the institutionalisation of ideology by policy scientists, émigré scholars and the military, 1940–1943

In war, men suffer pain, hunger, sorrow; the specific source of pain, the specific sensation of one's specific object of sorrow, may be very private. In contrast, the key symbol enters directly into the focus of all men and provides an element of common experience. (Lasswell 1949, pp.51–52)

This chapter picks up where Chapter 2 left off, with Lasswell, but it brings in new actors who were working with him during World War II on content analysis in order to study war propaganda. Lasswell was, from 1940 to 1943,<sup>1</sup> director of the Experimental Division for the Study of War Time (sometimes War-Time) Communications at the US Library of Congress (hereafter the Wartime Communications Project), funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, whose purpose was to conduct a 'World Attention Survey' through analysis of major newspapers (Berelson and Lazarsfeld 1948, pp.23–24; Lasswell 1941a; Lasswell and Goldsen 1947; Lasswell, Leites and Associates 1949). It did pioneering work on the methodological development of quantitative and qualitative content analysis, and most of it was done in pairs and groups. The chapter gives me an opportunity to analyse how policy science was conducted and to emphasise the role of non-academics and of émigré scholars from Europe who worked collectively during World War II to collect data and provide analysis that contributed to propaganda research. I argue that wartime comparative communications made its participants into a unified generation, where Insiders and Outsiders temporarily came together, leaving aside their non-shared utopias, united by the same ideology but separated by their status.

This chapter also problematises the concepts of ideology and utopia by questioning the concept of time (ideologies being about the past, utopias about the future). I explore how collective comparative communications was

---

### How to cite this book chapter:

Rantanen, Terhi (2024) *Dead Men's Propaganda: Ideology and Utopia in Comparative Communications Studies*, London: LSE Press, pp. 125–165.  
<https://doi.org/10.31389/lsepress.wmf.d>. License: CC BY-NC 4.0

carried out primarily within the Wartime Communications Project and in other government departments. I concentrate here especially on those émigré scholars whose names have been largely forgotten, specifically Nathan Leites (1912–1987) and Paul Kecskemeti (1901–1980), together with US researchers who themselves came from migrant families and many of whom were Lasswell's students or colleagues from the University of Chicago. The networks among the men who together analysed war propaganda often lasted their whole lifetimes. These men not only became colleagues who continued their work together at RAND Corporation after World War II but often also became friends, who, with their families, socialised outside of work. They became a generation that shared memories of fighting the propaganda war together. In this chapter, I analyse some of their projects, showing what kinds of theories they used, what kinds of methodological problems these researchers faced and how they solved them.

The chapter also touches on parallel work done in other government departments in the US at the same time or after the project was finished, since researchers often worked in pairs or in groups across institutions. There were other projects funded by private foundations, such as the Research Project on Totalitarian Communication under the direction of Ernst Kris and Hans Speier (Kris and Speier 1944) at the New School for Social Research in New York. The Office of Radio Research at Columbia University used content analysis. The Media Division of the Office of War Information (OWI) conducted content studies of war-related problems in newspapers, magazines, radio programmes, newsreels and comic strips. Another major application of content analysis was in the Analysis Division of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), which prepared weekly special reports on broadcasts to and within the US from foreign countries (see, for example, Berelson and de Grazia 1947, Berelson and Lazarsfeld 1948, pp.10–12). Yet another was the Organization and Propaganda Analysis Section of the Special War Policies Unit, Department of Justice, which employed content analysis techniques in its investigation of the propaganda output of various suspect organisations or individuals. This attempted to:

establish parallelisms between such propaganda and the propaganda of enemy countries and it took into court exhibits based upon content analysis and had them accepted as legal evidence requiring testimony of experts. (Berelson and Lazarsfeld 1948, p.24)

Other agencies included the Office of Strategic Services, the Board of Economic Warfare, and the War, Navy and State departments.<sup>2</sup> This chapter is divided into three parts. The first deals with Lasswell's role as director of the project at the US Library of Congress and the Rockefeller Foundation as a funder, while the second part moves on to émigré scholars and their US colleagues, and the final part considers the research and its evaluation.

## 4.1 The nature of research

The research done during World War II marks the beginning of a new period of group research, of collaboration between US and foreign researchers, and between academics, policy scientists and the military. This was also the period when future academics (many of whom were PhD or even undergraduate students when working for the project) became full-time policy scientists, for some paving the way for future careers at RAND Corporation (see, for example, Davison 2006; Chapter 5 in this book). Much of their research was published in reports of the Wartime Communications Project during World War II and was later in academic books, articles and chapters after the war. According to Smith (1943, p.2), research included:

‘semi-scientific literature’, meaning the writings of responsible newspaper men, radio commentators, public officials and others who have earned the respect of the scientific community not only for their accuracy, comprehensiveness and detachment in covering assignments but for their insight into the total social context.

Thus, World War II opened up new, unforeseen opportunities for individual men and research groups who achieved access to materials for their propaganda studies. The young Heinz Eulau (1915–2004), who had just received his PhD, remembered what happened when he joined Lasswell’s project as a research associate in 1943 (Eulau 1968, pp.9–10):

Moreover, the seemingly endless coding, all the pluses for strength and the minuses for weakness in the flow of symbols, and the poring over Lasswellian prose were richly rewarded by the company that Lasswell was keeping at the Library of Congress. He had assembled a research team of young men, including anthropologists, psychologists, sociologists and political scientists, almost all of whom were to influence the course of behavioral science after the war. Among the political scientists and political sociologists were David Truman, Ithiel Pool, Alexander George [1920–2006], Edward Shils, Nathan Leites, Bruce Lannes Smith, Morris Janowitz, Sebastian de Grazia and others. From Shils, walking me under an inevitable umbrella down Pennsylvania Avenue, I heard about Toennies, Simmel, Mannheim and other European sociologists I had never heard of. From Leites, giving a seminar in a language that combined Freud and Lasswell and was at first quite incomprehensible, I heard about the relevance of culture and personality for political science.

All the individuals recruited to Lasswell’s project as researchers (fellows) were men, while women worked only as research assistants. The telephone directory and letters in the archival materials reveal that many women were,

for example, carrying out the coding of content analysis in several government departments,<sup>3</sup> but their names never appeared in publications. They included Miss Brockett, Louise Baker, Elizabeth Beitz,<sup>4</sup> Phyllis Preston,<sup>5</sup> Clara J. Kretzinger, Sophia Ramm, Grace De Palma, Frances A. McCarter and M. Lubow Hansen.<sup>6</sup> Very little is known about them. Their names never appeared as authors, nor were they thanked in the acknowledgements in various works published during and after World War II. My findings support the existence of what Ashcraft and Simonson (2016, p.65) call a 'homosocial work practice', where 'works typically refer to published research or sometimes, by extension, to the investigative labor of an author whose name is affixed to a publication' (p.49). The Library of Congress project offered new opportunities for men, both US and non-US nationals, but not usually for women, except in this role of nameless research assistants.

Two academic publications were published under Lasswell's name alone (Lasswell 1941; 1942), although they were the result of collective work, and even work done in groups or in pairs is credited to Lasswell alone (see, for example, Levyatan 2009). The Wartime Communications Project, as collective research carried out by groups or pairs of academics, PhD students, consultants and civil servants, together with the army, was policy science in its purest form.<sup>7</sup> This pioneering work and served as an example for future comparative communications that would use research groups often consisting of researchers from different countries, funded by foundations, governments and international organisations. Some earlier studies have already concentrated on the ideological aspects of wartime psychological studies (Glander 1999; Simpson 1994; Sproule 1997) and their influence on the future of communications studies in the US in general. Simpson, for example, has shown that US psychological warfare studies carried out during World War II became part of an applied form of mass communication theory (Simpson 1994, p.115). As a consequence, according to Simpson,

Despite its claims, communication studies in the United States have not been typically neutral, objective, or even held at arm's length from the political and economic powers of the day. Instead, communication studies entwined themselves with the existing institutions of power, just as have, say, the mainstream study of economics or atomic physics, whose inbreeding with the political and military establishment are so extensive as to have become common knowledge. (p.116)

Simpson (1994) and Glander (1999) agree that World War II was a watershed, when communication studies in the US started to come of age. There is also research on the work carried out in wartime by individual academics, especially Lazarsfeld, and on how this has been used (see, for example, Morrison 1988, 2008, 2022), but not much research has focused on *how* wartime collective comparative communications on the content of propaganda was conducted. This is probably because academic research is often seen as an

individual achievement rather than as something done by a group, but also because so much of established scholarship on émigré scholars has concentrated on the Frankfurt School (Jay 1973/1996) with its different ideologies and utopias.

Further, history of the field of communication studies has often structured as being either 'administrative' or 'critical'. This distinction seems first to have been made by Lazarsfeld (1941), who famously defined administrative research as 'carried through the service of some kind of administrative agency of public or private character' and as being of a more 'practical character', while critical research:

develops a theory of the prevailing social trends of our times, general trends which yet require consideration in any concrete research problem; and it seems to imply ideas of basic human values according to which all actual or desired effects should be appraised. (pp.8–9)

Rogers (1981, p.25) writes that the empirical school in communication research has usually relied on empiricism, functionalism and positivism, while the critical school emphasises its philosophical approach, its connections with Marxism, the socio-structural contexts and the control systems of communication. Even if the administrative versus critical research division has been debated extensively (see, for example, 'Ferment in the Field' 1983; Katz and Katz 2016), the division has resulted in a bias in who is remembered in generational narratives. The émigré researchers at the Wartime Communications Project, Paul Kecskemeti and Nathan Leites, fell in the 'administrative category': they worked for an administrative agency, they were not Marxists, they were anti-communists, they worked with and for the military and for pragmatic and interested objectives rather than, disinterestedly, for knowledge's own sake. Still, they made a significant contribution to critical research, as did non-academics, another neglected group in the disciplinary histories of communication studies.

Before and after the beginning of World War II, there was suddenly a demand not only for propaganda analysis but also for researchers with language skills and experience of non-US political systems and cultures. In many ways this was a remarkable period, when substantial collective comparative communications was carried out for the first time, bringing together foreign- and native-born US academics and researchers. This was policy science that served the wartime goals of the US government. It was also a period when Outsiders received access to Insiders' information and themselves temporarily became Insiders, all united by the same ideology of the US versus the enemy. They shared a utopia: the end of World War II and possibly even the end of all wars. The difference between 'how it is' and 'how it ought to be' (Lasswell 1968, p.11) was immaterial as a goal of research: they came as one. There was no question about the deeply ideological aspect of the research; it was intended to benefit the propaganda war that needed to be won. However,

what in my view needs to be emphasised is the ways in which this research influenced future comparative communications in terms of its funding, the composition of research groups, its methodology and materials, using the criteria set out by Merton in Chapter 1.

## 4.2 The organisation and funding of the Wartime Communications Project

The organisation of propaganda research was somewhat chaotic. Sobel (1976, p.201) observes that 'Roosevelt delegated the same responsibilities to several offices and executives, often without informing one of the existence of the others, or the limits of authority'. Lasswell, as director of the Wartime Communications Project with the Reference Department of the Library of Congress (Library of Congress (no date), p.43), worked as a consultant funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, which paid his salary. He was one of four: other consultants included Hadley Cantril (1906–1969) (radio), Paul Lazarsfeld (radio), and Saul Padover (1905–1981) (history).<sup>8</sup> They all worked under Frank Stanton (1908–2006), first under the Bureau of Intelligence within the Office of Facts and Figures (OFF), then with the Office of War Information (OWI), the Office of Strategic Services, the Office of Censorship, the Foreign Broadcast Information Service, the Psychological Warfare Division of the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force, and other intelligence and morale offices within the military and the federal government (Farr, Hacker and Kazee 2006, p.580).

In this chapter I do not argue that Lasswell's project was the most important of all research projects conducted during World War II but I do argue that it is crucial to our understanding of how the content of propaganda was studied, as we try to understand how comparative communications research was done in groups, a feature that is now commonplace in international communication studies. Since much of the research so far has been about psychological warfare studies, this chapter concentrates on the content of propaganda rather than on its reception. Lasswell made this distinction by defining 'psychological warfare [as] concerned with influencing the attitudes and habits of nations and other groups', while propaganda is concerned with habits and skills.<sup>9</sup>

Since the project collaborated with individual researchers, both from the US and from abroad, under the auspices or different government offices, this chapter also considers some individuals who were not working in the Wartime Communications Project but who worked *with* it and whose work was covered in its publications. These included both émigré scholars and researchers from migrant families, both consultants and academics. As Chapter 2 recounted, Lasswell left Chicago in 1938 and worked outside academia until he received his chair at Yale in 1946. This was the period when he worked for the Wartime Communications Project and for the Hutchins Commission. Chapter 2 also emphasised Lasswell's networking skills, both inside and outside academia, with funders such as the Rockefeller Foundation and notably with John Marshall (1903–1980), director of the Rockefeller

Foundation Division of Humanities. Lasswell's project was funded by the foundation with a grant of \$85,400 from 1940 to 1943 (Rogers 1994, p.224) and was yet another example of how he was with the right people at the right time. As Buxton (2003, p.134) has shown, the Rockefeller Foundation was one of the largest funders of communication-related studies in the 1930s and 1940s, while Marshall had spent considerable time in Europe visiting several countries and cultural institutions (for example, the BBC) in the 1930s in his attempt to create 'international transatlantic community', especially between the UK and the US. His interest in Europe led later to the decision to bring émigré scholars from Europe to the US, working together with the Ford Foundation. Like Lasswell, he knew Europe better than many of his colleagues and also encountered there the rise of Nazism (Buxton 2003, p.147).

In 1939 Marshall organised an informal Communications Group, which had regular meetings (10 altogether). The academic members of the original Communications Group included Lasswell, Robert Stoughton Lynd (1892–1970), Paul Lazarsfeld, Hadley Cantril (1906–1969), Geoffrey Gorer (1905–1985), Donald Schlesinger, I.A. Richards (1893–1979) and Douglas Waples (1893–1978). Together they produced over 30 working papers (two of them written by Lasswell) and a final unpublished report entitled *Needed Research in Mass Communications* (Gary 1992, p.106). One of the papers was *Public Opinion and Emergency*<sup>10</sup> in 1939, published to turn attention to the role of communications in the emergency and mobilisation after the outbreak of war in Europe. The group emphasised the need to advance research methods including straw polling and short interviews, panel interviews, community studies, content analysis and source analysis (Simpson 1994, pp.22–23; Gary 1992, p.117). Lasswell was invited by the Rockefeller Foundation to submit a project. He received a two-year grant (later extended) to direct a programme that was to (1) develop the methods of 'content analysis' in communications research, as well as organisational analysis; (2) train technical personnel for agencies of the government that could be expected to become more actively involved in propaganda and intelligence activities; and (3) make Lasswell available in Washington so that he could serve as a consultant on developing the government's various propaganda and intelligence programmes<sup>11</sup> (Sproule 1997, pp.193–94). Gary (1996, p.142) writes that:

the Rockefeller Foundation generously financed defence research, supported promising American scholars and European refugee scholars in their collaborative efforts, and helped set in motion vitally important exchanges of information and personnel between allied intelligence and American ones.

The foundation funded: 'the Princeton Radio project, the Princeton Public Opinion Project, the Office of Radio Research at Columbia, the Princeton Shortwave Listening Center, the Graduate Library Reading Project at the University of Chicago, the Film Library of the Museum of Modern Art,



the Library of Congress Radio Project, the American Film Center, the Totalitarian Communications Research Center at the New School of Social Research and the Experimental Division for the Study of Wartime Communications' (Gary 1996, p.125).

Cmiel (1996, p.91) writes:

The war was the ultimate triumph of Lasswell's vision. Lasswell himself proved to be at the center of much of the government's extensive communication research during the war (Gary 1996; Simpson 1994, pp.26–27). Lasswell managed to push out the 'fact' crowd at the Office of War Information, arguing that propaganda had to have 'a large element of fake in it.' To use only 'truthful statements,' Lasswell argued, 'seems ... an impractical maxim.' (in Blum 1976, p.26)

Previous research emphasises Lasswell's role but now it is time to look at those who did much of the work, his collaborators, and especially those who came to the US as *émigré* scholars. It is not entirely clear how Lasswell recruited the people who worked for the project he directed, although there is some evidence that he ran the candidates past Marshall.<sup>12</sup> The realisation that there are some projects one person cannot carry out alone came with the wartime need for quick propaganda analysis focused not only on enemy countries such as Germany, Italy or Japan, but also on Allied countries such as the UK and the Soviet Union. The quest for language skills led to the recruitment not only of *émigré* scholars but also of researchers from migrant families, who, while perhaps lacking direct experience of the enemy countries in question, were nonetheless culturally familiar with them. As a result, the researchers had varied backgrounds and were of different ages. The oldest in my sample was born in 1901 and the youngest in 1920.

### **4.3 Nazi terror: European intellectuals run for their lives**

Thousands of European academics and intellectuals had to flee for their lives after Hitler became chancellor of Germany in 1933. A new 'Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service' was introduced in order to 're-establish a national and professional civil service,' and members of certain groups of tenured civil servants were dismissed (Cox 2021). By 1936, about 1,300 university teachers had been dismissed for reasons of racial origin or of suspected political sympathies (Dale 1936, p.1). During the 1930s about 60 per cent of the scholars who had been fired emigrated. As a consequence, the number of *émigré* scholars who arrived in the UK and the US approached 2,000 if other, younger academics and non-university research scientists are included (Lamberti 2006, p.159).



Five distinct sets of contributors established programmes to help émigré scholars leave their countries and to relocate them to the US. They included (1) individual academics and administrators; (2) aid and self-help organisations; (3) foundations; (4) colleges and universities; and (5) the Roosevelt Administration (Lässig 2017, p.779). For example, the Rockefeller Foundation Refugee Scholar Programs awarded aid amounting to almost \$1.4 million for 303 scholars and their families (Iacobelli 2021; Krohn 1996/2013, pp.15, 28). Most of those who went to the US stayed, and by 1947 around 77 per cent of them had obtained faculty positions (Lamberti 2006, p.158). According to Leff (2019, pp.3–4; emphasis in the original), in order to receive a US visa via these routes ‘immigrants had to establish that they *had been* professors in a higher education institution and that they *would be* professors in such an institution in the United States’. Émigré scholars therefore needed American universities to offer them jobs ‘in order to establish that their purpose in immigrating to the United States was to carry on the vocation of professor’ (Leff 2019, p.3). As a result, only ‘944 professors, 451 wives and 348 children received non-quota visas between 1933 and 1941, when most emigration from Europe ended’ (Leff 2019, p.4).

The records of the American Council for Émigrés in the Professions<sup>13</sup> show how difficult it was to secure a visa. US universities could pick and choose the ones they wanted. Among those they considered were Raymond Aron (1905–1983), Bertolt Brecht (1898–1956), Norbert Elias, Friedrich Hayek, Hermann Mannheim (1889–1974), Karl Mannheim, and Jean-Paul Sartre (1905–1980). Together with general information about the candidates, two recommendation letters from colleagues at US universities were required, and sometimes they were not all favourable. For example, Aron ‘should be saved at once and without fail’, Brecht was considered to be a communist or a ‘fellow traveller’, Elias a ‘convinced democrat’, Hayek had ‘no communist sympathies’, Hermann Mannheim ‘proved his capacity to adjust himself to a new situation’, Mannheim was ‘no communist’ but ‘tends to be extreme in order to be brilliant’, and there was some uncertainty about who Sartre was.<sup>14</sup> Mannheim, of course, did not migrate to the US but to the UK. Mannheim may well have been regarded as *persona non grata* by the US, not least for his association with Greta Kuckhoff (née Margareta Lorke, 1902–1981), who had studied at the University of Wisconsin. She worked as a scientific secretary (research assistant) at the Institute for Social Research, University of Frankfurt, and worked for Mannheim while pursuing her doctorate. When, in March 1933, Kuckhoff was doing doctoral research at LSE and in the British Library, the Nazis closed the institute and burned its books in public. She returned to Germany and helped with Mannheim’s move to LSE. Kuckhoff was a member of the resistance movement known as the Rote Kapelle and of the German Communist Party (KPD). She was imprisoned, sentenced to death and then reprieved, while her husband, Adam, was murdered by the Nazis. Subsequently, Kuckhoff became president of the post-war East German (DDR) state bank (Kuckhoff 1972; ‘Kuckhoff, Greta’ (no date); Nachlass Greta Kuckhoff (no date); Sayner 2013, p.4).

Those who started their new life in the US found that was not easy. According to Kurzweil (1996, p.140), the experiences of émigré scholars included: (1) becoming victims of a virulent, racially based anti-Semitism and so being forced to emigrate leaving their families and friends behind; (2) being delegitimated as human beings and starting a new life in a country whose political culture and system they were unfamiliar with and being forced to leave their former radical politics behind; (3) losing their professional, social and economic status and being forced to relegate themselves by adjusting to the American culture of research including writing in English; and (4) being expected to provide the intellectual tools to help defeat Hitler. Leff (2019, p.4) concludes:

Overall, to be hired by American universities, refugee scholars had to be world class and well connected and working in disciplines for which the American academy had a recognizable need. They could not be too old or too young, too right or too left, or, most important, too Jewish. Having money helped; being a woman did not.

Academically, émigré scholars' backgrounds differed from their American colleagues. As Neumann (1953, p.19) observes about German émigré scholars, they came from different intellectual traditions, namely German idealism, Marxism and historicism, and their way of thinking was primarily theoretical and historical, rarely empirical or pragmatic. He (Neumann 1953, p.19) sums up:

thus, on the whole, the German exile, bred in the veneration of theory and history, and contempt for empiricism and pragmatism, entered a diametrically opposed intellectual climate: optimistic, empirically oriented, ahistorical, but also self-righteous.

Before the outbreak of World War II their reception had not been entirely positive. Many US political scientists were not critical of all aspects of Nazism (Oren 2003, p.47) and émigré scholars had been arriving in the United States at a time when universities were struggling financially and student fees declining sharply (Lamberti 2006, p.159). While many émigré scholars eventually gained faculty positions, they struggled as new migrants in a country where they did not know the language, culture and educational system, far away from their families, often not understanding what had happened to them.

Among those whose names are often mentioned were Theodor Adorno, Franz Alexander (1891–1964), Hannah Arendt, Erich Fromm (1900–1980), Herta Herzog (1910–2010), Horkheimer, Marie Jahoda (1907–2001), Otto Kirchheimer (1905–1965), Wolfgang Kohler (1887–1967), Siegfried Kracauer (1889–1966), Ernst Kris (1900–1957), Paul Lazarsfeld (1901–1976), Kurt Lewin, Leo Löwenthal (1900–1993), Herbert Marcuse, Hans Morgenthau

(1904–1980), Franz Neumann (1900–1954), Hans Speier (1905–1990), Leo Strauss (1899–1973) and many others (see, for example, Lang 1979, p.89). As Lang (1979, p.88) writes, they played an important role in propaganda studies including the Research Project on Totalitarian Communication at the New School for Social Research, the Foreign Intelligence service at the US Office of War Information, and the Wartime Communications Research Project at the Library of Congress, directed by Lasswell. Among those who were not mentioned on this list were Paul Kecskemeti and Nathan Leites.

### European émigré intellectuals: Paul Kecskemeti and Nathan Leites

Paul Kecskemeti and Nathan Leites played an important part in World War II, carrying out research on propaganda, and both brought with them to the US their European intellectual traditions, especially their interest and expertise in psychoanalysis. Both were experts on totalitarian communication, and later especially on communism. Kecskemeti and Leites had academic qualifications, considered comparable to those of most of the US colleagues they worked with during World War II. I concentrate here only on some, most notably on those who were central in developing content analysis and/or who collaborated with Kecskemeti and Leites, namely Ithiel de Sola Pool, Alexander L. George, Joseph M. Goldsen and Jacob Goldstein. De Sola Pool and George were students at that time, Goldstein finished his PhD in 1942, and Goldsen was a man of experience. Their research, along with others who worked in different departments, was published in a series called 'Documents' from the Library of Congress (Experimental Division for the Study of Wartime Communications. Harold D. Lasswell: Chief).

Paul Kecskemeti (né Pál Kecskeméti; 1901–1980) was among the last of the émigré scholars to reach the US, although it is unclear how he got his visa (he came as a journalist). He was born in Makó, Hungary, the son of rabbi and scholar Dr Ármin Kecskeméti (1874–Strasshof, 1944), who died in a concentration camp (Ármin Kecskeméti 2008) and Irma (née Magyar) Kecskeméti (1884–circa 1944). Figure 4.1 is a photo of him taken in Hungary, as a boy. Kecskemeti had a twin brother, Dr György Kecskeméti, who also died in a concentration camp (1901–Auschwitz, 1944), who was an academic and journalist (György Kecskeméti 2008).<sup>15</sup> After Paul Kecskemeti had studied philosophy in Pecs and Budapest, he worked in Budapest as a journalist. In the 1920s, he joined the *Századunk* (Circle of Our Century) magazine.<sup>16</sup> Kecskemeti published his first article on Mannheim in 1926 (Kecskeméti 1926) and became Mannheim's literary executor after Mannheim's death (Meja and Kettler 1993, p. xi; Némedi 1992).

Kecskemeti moved in 1927 to Berlin, where he spent a decade reporting on the Third Reich and worked for the United Press (see Chapter 3), reporting news (Kecskemeti 1931), sometimes using the name Péter Schmidt (1933a; b; 1935), arguing that the main factor leading to the Nazi victory was the

**Figure 4.1: A young Paul Kecskemeti in Hungary**



Source: Image courtesy of Ilana Burgess.

Notes: Date unknown, though possibly his Bar Mitzvah photo.

division of the working-class movement (Némedi 1992, p.165). Kecskemeti had to leave Germany for France (the UP was seen by the Nazis as a Jewish agency).<sup>17</sup> In 1938 in Budapest,<sup>18</sup> he married Elisabeth (née Erzsébet) Láng (1889–1959), a concert artist who had been a piano student of Béla Bartók (1881–1945) and a harpsichord student of Alice Ehlers (née Ehlersné) (1887–1981) and was a sister of Dr Júlia Láng (who was married to Mannheim). They later emigrated to the US, where they arrived in August 1942, allegedly managing to take one of the last ships from Casablanca.<sup>19</sup> In the US during the war, he worked in various roles in the Office of War Information, notably with Leites on the psychological aspects of Nazi Germany. Kecskemeti was said to have predicted the break in US–Soviet relations, which did not make him popular among his colleagues at the OWI, who were ‘aglow with the heroics of the Red Army and wishfully fantasised away the essence of political realities,’<sup>20</sup> as one of his colleagues testified 20 years later.

Nathan Constantin Leites (1912–1987) was born in St Petersburg, Russia. His family was of Sephardic Jewish origin, his mother, Nichama Leites (1882–year of death unknown), was a medical doctor and his father, Kussiel (Constantin) Leites (1881–year of death unknown),<sup>21</sup> an economist and journalist associated with the Mensheviks (Marwick 1988, p.705). Both parents studied at German and Swiss universities. His father received a PhD from the University of Zurich and worked as a journalist and a publisher of social science books.<sup>22</sup> The family left Russia soon after the Bolsheviks took power, when Nathan Leites was three years old, for Denmark, where they lived until he was nine. Leites went to different schools, mainly in Germany, and then studied at the University of Berlin.<sup>23</sup> Like many other young socialists, he had come to attend the seminar of mathematician Ladislaus von Bortkiewicz (né Ladislaus Josephovich Bortkiewicz; 1868–1931) at the University of Berlin before going to Heidelberg (1929–1933), where he studied under Emil Lederer (1882–1939) (Krohn 1996/2013, p.172). The rise to power of the Nazis made it clear to him that there was no professional future for him in Germany (Marwick 1988, p.705). Leites then moved to the University of Lausanne (1933–1934), and the University of Fribourg (1934–1935), Switzerland, where he earned his doctorate<sup>24</sup> on monetary problems. After stopovers in other European countries, including the UK, Leites emigrated to the United States in 1935<sup>25</sup> to take up a fellowship at Cornell University (Marwick 1988, p.705).<sup>26</sup> He then went to the university of Chicago as a student and a researcher for Lasswell (Krohn 1996/2013, p.185).<sup>27</sup> Leites was married to Dr Martha Wolfenstein (1911–1976), who was a psychoanalyst and with whom he co-wrote a pioneering book on psychoanalytical film analysis (Wolfenstein and Leites 1947; 1950), but they later divorced.

In 1937 Leites joined the Department of Political Science at the University of Chicago as an instructor and was naturalised as a US citizen in 1941. He worked as an analyst in the Special War Policies Unit at the Department of Justice from 1941 to 1942. He then served, from 1942 to 1943, as chief of the French Section at the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service (FBIS). From 1943 to 1945 he was a regional specialist at the Office of War Information and he also served from 1943 to 1944 as a visiting lecturer during winter semesters at the New School for Social Research in New York. He spoke and wrote fluently in German, Russian, English and Italian and could read Danish, Swedish and Norwegian.<sup>28</sup>

Together, Kecskemeti and Leites wrote a report, *Some Psychological Hypotheses on Nazi Germany*,<sup>29</sup> in 1944, which was published by the Wartime Communications Project (Kecskemeti and Leites 1945) and was once described as the 'earliest major psychopolitical work and the first fully to reveal the method he [they] would employ in most of his [their] later prodigious and original contributions to this field' (Marwick 1988, p.705). This work was later published, in four parts, in the *Journal of Social Psychology* (Kecskemeti and Leites 1947; 1948a; 1948b; 1948c).

## Some of their US colleagues

Leites authored one of the earliest publications of the Wartime Communications Project on content analysis with Ithiel de Sola Pool (1917–1984)<sup>30</sup> and on communist propaganda and the Third International (1942), an analysis of Communist International congresses, of *International Press Correspondence* and of the *Daily Worker*.<sup>31</sup> De Sola Pool had been Leites' student at the University of Chicago and became his research assistant at the Wartime Communications Project between 1940 and 1942.<sup>32</sup> He was born in New York City in 1917. His father, David (Eleazer) de Sola Pool (1885–1970), was a rabbi with a PhD from Heidelberg and his mother, Tamar Hirschensohn (1890–1981), the Palestinian-born daughter of a rabbi, had degrees from Hunter College and the Sorbonne. De Sola Pool received a BA in 1938, MA in 1939 and PhD in 1952 from the University of Chicago, where he was known during his student days on campus as a student organiser and a Trotskyite (Frederick 1981; 'Guide to the Ithiel de Sola Pool Papers 1935–1948' 2011). During his time at the University of Chicago he went to Washington to work for the Wartime Communications Project. In 1949 he moved to Stanford's Hoover Institution under Daniel Lerner (1917–1980) (see Chapter 5) ('Ithiel de Sola Pool' 1997). In later life, de Sola Pool would become a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and an adviser to the United States government during the Cold War (Frederick 1981; 'Guide to the Ithiel de Sola Pool Papers 1935–1948' 2011).

The career of Alexander L. George (1920–2006) is another example of how difficult it is to define who actually worked for the Wartime Communications Project (Simpson 1993, p.321). His published CV lists him as working as a Rockefeller Fellow for the project in 1942, a research analyst for the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) from 1942 to 1944, and he served as a civil affairs officer and deputy chief, Research Branch, Information Control Division, OMGUS in post-war Germany from 1945 to 1948. George (né Alexander L. Givargis) was born in Chicago to impoverished Syrian Christian parents who had fled from pogroms in Persia (George 2008, p.477). He earned undergraduate and graduate degrees at the University of Chicago, where he received his doctorate in political science in 1958. In Figure 4.2 he is pictured as a student here (and member of the fencing team) in around 1938–1940. His doctoral dissertation (George 1959) was based on his work for the FCC, where his task was to analyse Nazi propaganda (Bennett 2008, p.491). He married Juliette L. George (1922–death year unknown), a graduate of the University of California at Berkeley and Columbia University who served during World War II as a propaganda analyst for the OWI in Washington and London, and later in Berlin and Munich, and edited political affairs reports for the Intelligence Branch of the Office of Military Government for Germany (US). She became a senior scholar at the Institute for International Studies at Stanford University from 1984 until her retirement in 1990 and they published together ('Alexander and Juliette George' no date). George started working for RAND in 1948 and worked there for 20 years until he became professor of political science at Stanford University in 1968 (Palmer 2006).



**Figure 4.2: Alexander George, photographed when a student at the University of Chicago, c. 1938–1940**



Source: University of Chicago Photographic Archive, apf5-00785, Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.  
<https://photoarchive.lib.uchicago.edu/db.xqy?one=apf5-00785.xml>

Notes: George is photographed as a member of the fencing team, around 1938–1940.

One of the early pioneers in content analysis was Bernard Reuben Berelson (1912–1979, pictured Figure 4.3), who published *The Analysis of Communication Content* together with Lazarsfeld in 1948 (Berelson and Lazarsfeld 1948) and as the only author in 1952 (Berelson 1952). He was born in Spokane, Washington, to Max (1875–1950) and Bessie (née Shapiro, 1877–1942) Berelson, both Jewish migrants from Russia. He studied library science at the University of Washington, received his PhD from the University of Chicago in 1941 and joined the Foreign Broadcast Service of the FCC. During the war Berelson worked in Washington as an analyst of German opinion and morale with the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service (FBIS) under the Office of War Information (OWI). In 1944 he became a project director at the Columbia University Bureau of Applied Social Research, then directed by its founder, Lazarsfeld. Shils writes that:

it is fair to say that Berelson learned how to categorize from Lasswell and how to cross-tabulate from Lazarsfeld, and he applied these skills with imagination and distinction during the rest of his working life. (Shils 1980, p.174)

Berelson co-authored the analysis of the famous Erie County panel study of the 1940 presidential election and was a co-author of *The People's Choice* (Lazarsfeld, Berelson and Gaudet 1944). Other projects in this phase of Berelson's career were a reader on public opinion and communication (edited with Morris Janowitz 1950) and a text on content analysis (Berelson and Lazarsfeld 1948; Sills 1980).



**Figure 4.3: Bernard R. Berelson**

Source: University of Chicago Photographic Archive, apf1-00626, Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.

<https://photoarchive.lib.uchicago.edu/db.xqy?one=apf1-00626.xml>

Notes: Date unknown.

Joseph (Joe) M. Goldsen (1916–1998) was born in Passaic, New Jersey, to a migrant from Russia, Herman (né Goldstein) and Tinie (née Pitzele) Goldsen, and educated at the City College of New York and the American University. Before the war he worked as research director for the Norman Bel Geddes Company from 1938 and joined the Wartime Communications Project in 1941 for two years as research director. He then worked in different consultancy, public relations and management counselling roles for bodies including the Commission on Freedom of the Press and the city of New York, before joining RAND Corporation as senior social scientist in the Social Science Division in 1948 (pictured during his time at RAND in Figure 4.4).<sup>33</sup> After joining RAND Corporation he married Lucille Gibbons, who worked as director for communications, stenographic filing and library services in the Social Science Division at RAND Corporation, but left her job after marrying Goldsen. He spent his early years at RAND Corporation as an administrator and researcher and then in Washington, where he worked as executive to Speier. He became a specialist in the politics and legal implications of activities in outer space and published *Outer Space in World Politics* in 1959 (Goldsen 1959).<sup>34</sup>

Jacob Goldstein (1914–2009) was born in Poland and later emigrated with his parents to the US. His PhD dissertation, 'Content Analysis: A Propaganda and Opinion Study',<sup>35</sup> carried out under the sponsorship of Max Wertheimer (1880–1943) and Hans Speier, was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

**Figure 4.4: Joseph M. Goldsen at RAND Corporation**



Source: Biographical file for Joseph M. Goldsen, RAND Corporation Archives, Santa Monica, CA.

Notes: Date unknown.

Political and Social Science at the New School for Social Research in 1942. It was based in part on material collected by the Research Project on Totalitarian Communication led by Speier and Ernst Kris. Goldstein's dissertation chapter, 'Some Methodological Problems in Content Analysis,' is probably one of the first attempts to address methodological problems of quantitative content analysis in propaganda analysis. After serving in the army, Goldstein joined the Wartime Communications Project and then became an analyst with the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service of the FCC.<sup>36</sup> One of the chapters of his thesis was later published as an article entitled 'An Exploratory Analysis of Opinion Trends with Special Reference to Conscription in the United States' (Goldstein 1943). Its materials had been made available by Lazarsfeld, whose cooperation 'at all stages of the study' was acknowledged (p.156). It analysed, using content analysis, 701 letters pertaining to conscription received by two Midwestern senators during the summer of 1940 (Goldstein 1943, p.157). Goldstein later became a psychologist and published mainly in academic journals of his field.

## **4.4 Quantitative and qualitative content analysis**

### **Attempts to quantify symbols**

Lasswell's earlier writings around content analysis had been influenced by Freud's concept of a symbol, focusing on its latent meaning. When Lasswell

started his work for the Wartime Communications Project his inspiration still came from psychoanalytic theory (see Chapter 2), although his thinking started to change even before the war. His article from 1938, 'A Provisional Classification of Symbol Data' (Lasswell 1938), is about psychoanalytic interviews with patients and establishing categories for the words they used, described in these interviews as 'symbolic events'. He wrote that 'references used in interviews may be quantified by counting the number of references which fall into each category during a selected period of time (or per thousand words uttered)' (p.198) but the main problem for Lasswell in this article was their classification. The quantification of symbols became one of the main objects of research for the Wartime Communications Project.

One of the early and most quoted research papers published on content analysis that still reflected the importance of symbols was one jointly written by Leites and de Sola Pool.<sup>37</sup> In this paper they state that there had been a considerable ambiguity in the meaning of content analysis. In their view, content analysis had to satisfy the following requirements:

- (1) It must refer either to syntactic characteristics (such as the presence of certain logical fallacy, e.g. *petitio principii*) or to semantic characteristics (such as the characteristic of having reference to material objects as against persons) of symbols.
- (2) It must indicate *frequencies* of occurrence of such characteristics with a high degree of precision. One could perhaps define it more narrowly: it must assign *numerical* values to such frequencies.
- (3) It must refer to these characteristics by terms which are general (i.e. the definitions of which do not place their referents within time-space regions or which are, by definition subsumable under such general terms). A general term-sequence in this sense would be 'predictions of success', whereas a term 'predictions of military victory in World War II' would be a term-sequence not general in itself but subsumable in the language adopted under a general term-sequence (i.e. the first mentioned one).
- (4) It must refer to these characteristics by terms that occur, or that it is intended to make occur, in universal propositions of social science.

They also added another requirement: a high degree of *precision* in the terms used to refer to the symbol characteristics studied. But according to them, this did not mean that 'objectivity' should be contrasted with 'subjectivity' or with 'impressionistic ways of talking about symbols'. Leites and de Sola Pool then combined symbols with propaganda, defining these as 'symbolic occurrences behind which there are certain manipulative intentions'. They distinguished among (1) the intentions of propagandists; (2) symbols that emitted themselves; (3) the responses of 'propagandees'.

As this early and much quoted paper by contemporaries shows, its authors were trying to combine the tradition from which Leites, at least, came with

the practical needs of the US government, which required them to quantify content analysis. Goals set for the new method were to 'anticipate the enemy' (Lasswell 1949, p.48), and to 'predict' the future (Lasswell 1949, pp.49–51). George (1956, p.334) describes their aims as follows:

the possibility of predicting an opponent's initiatives was generally regarded as requiring discovery of a regular pattern, or relationship, in the opponent's past behavior, which would serve as a rule of inference in new instances. Regular relationships were sought between the opponent's intention to initiate a certain line of action and (1) some type of *content characteristic* in his propaganda; or (2) some type of *propaganda strategy* pursued by him prior to the initiative.

There was a shift from latent to manifest content, and from qualitative to quantitative analysis. Krippendorff writes that the early work of the Wartime Communications Project 'addressed basic issues of sampling, measurement problems, and the reliability and validity of content categories, continuing the tradition of early quantitative analysis of mass communications' (Krippendorff 1980/2004, p.9). This included the training of staff when producing analyses on a tight schedule,<sup>38</sup> which made the team look for a new form of content analysis that could be taught. Lasswell later evaluated how he had trained more than 60 people in different departments during World War II.<sup>39</sup> The aim was to develop quantitative methods for studying the content of propaganda.

Goldsen seems to have played a key role in preparing content analysis and solving methodological issues. His many memoranda addressed to Lasswell tackle questions like coding efficiency (reliability, economy), symbol frequency, and how to prepare a detailed coding book. One of the main concerns was coders' application of the rules and their shared understanding of symbol expressions, referred to as 'unreliability'.<sup>40</sup> An early report used content analysis to study British and German newspapers at two-week intervals from the start of the war until March 1941. The researchers found that it was the factor of inactivity, rather than 'events', that in certain periods produced significant symbol fluctuations. By a symbol, they meant a 'word standing for some group, idea, or some other definable field of reference', and they were interested in 'those word-symbols of supreme importance which are characterised and joined by other words as subordinates'.<sup>41</sup> This was one of the first studies where they analysed retabulated data, but they ran into problems with the unreliability and inadequacies of the original coding procedures. They concluded that it was imperative to be just as analytical in planning the collection of the data as in studying the product.<sup>42</sup>

Goldsen was also responsible for developing a handbook of coding instructions. These were to 'provide a uniform, systematic scheme for the collection and presentation of politically significant symbols in the press'. Much of the work went into writing instructions and training the coders to code in

a uniform manner. Many members of the research team, including Leites and de Sola Pool (1959; 1969)<sup>43</sup> and George (1949),<sup>44</sup> wrote about the methodological aspects of content analysis; some also published their work after the war, most notably Berelson (Berelson 1952; Berelson and Lazarsfeld 1948) but also de Sola Pool (1959) and Morris Janowitz<sup>45</sup> (1968; 1969). Their research focused both on the US and on foreign countries, but not necessarily comparing these to one other, at least simultaneously. Some studies concentrated on one country only. They mainly concentrated on newspapers, although they also researched Hitler's speeches, posters and broadcasting. In short, most research was comparative in the sense that it compared two objects, that is, comparing, for example, the US to Germany.

Perhaps the most ambitious project was what was called the 'World Attention Survey: World Press', prepared by Goldsen and Goldstein. Its aim was to 'describe the frequency in the use of selected lists of political symbols in the world press considered as a whole', although several nations were not represented. For the survey, 47 newspapers were selected, one from each political entity, for the period from 28 August 1939 to June 1941, using eight-week periods. The study analysed the distribution of 100 symbols, including names of countries and their leaders, ideologies such as fascism, communism or democracy, and words such as 'war', 'nation' and 'people'. The data for each newspaper was obtained from headlines on the major world news pages and from editorials. The statistical treatment primarily involved an analysis of the distribution of arithmetic means, through the use of rank-order correlations. These correlations 'suggested that the use of ideological symbols in editorials is less dependent on the changes in the political environment than is the use of the same symbols in headlines'.<sup>46</sup>

Lasswell published the results of this collective work in 1941 as *The World Attention Survey* (Lasswell 1941), without any acknowledgement of Goldsen's and Goldstein's work. The article was based on the idea that 'we gain insight into the lives of others when we know what they read, see and hear' (p.456), and that it had been difficult to objectively discuss the connection between 'material and ideological' factors due to the lack of data on ideological changes through time (p.459). In the article, four newspapers were compared: *Pravda*, the official paper of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union, *Völkischer Beobachter*, the main Nazi newspaper in Germany, *Excelsior*, then published by a workers' cooperative in Mexico, and *Il Giornale d'Italia*, at the time a supporter of Mussolini's fascism in Italy, and particularly the attention these gave to foreign as compared with domestic politics, and to the United States as a symbol. The purpose of the technique was 'to describe the field of attention, to show the relative prominence of selected symbols like the names of the leaders, nations policies, institutions' by 'showing the percentage of words containing significant symbols' (pp.459–60). The article emphasised that objectivity was achieved by giving coders regular tests in order to 'verify the comparability of their results' (p.460). At the end of the article, Lasswell suggests that symbols may be either positive or negative.

Lasswell's article 'The Politically Significant Content of the Press: Coding Procedures' (1942) was published under the name Lasswell and Associates. In this article, Lasswell writes that there is no comprehensive list of political symbols that can be applied to all research, but he then lists symbols such as persons (for example, Roosevelt, Churchill, Hitler, Stalin), groups (for example, US, Germany, Great Britain, Russia), agencies (for example, Congress, Parliament, Fuhrer, Premier), policies (for example, war, peace, income tax), participations (for example, enlisting, bond-buying, food-saving) and ideas (for example, statements of aims, future expectations) (p.15) and suggests measuring their frequency of presentation. The article includes detailed coding instructions that also address the tone of the symbols (positive, negative, neutral).

Other articles were also published that concentrated on methodology, such as 'A Coefficient of Imbalance for Content Analysis', an article by Irving Janis (1918–1990) and Raymond H. Fadner (1917–1996) (Janis and Fadner 1943a) and 'The Reliability of Content Analysis Technique' by Janis, Fadner and Janowitz (1943b), both working at the time of these publications for the special policies unit at the Department of Justice. Janis and Fadner, after acknowledging the importance of psychoanalysis for studying content, suggested that:

Impressionistic judgments suffice for broad classification of symbol data and description of gross temporal changes in the content of mass communications. Thus, we may report reliably that a certain movie is manifestly anti-Nazi, or that the contents of a certain newspaper changed from pro-isolation to pro-intervention. But if we wish to develop precise hypotheses concerning mass communications, here is a need for quantitative analysis of symbols. (Janis and Fadner 1943, p.106)

The work that was done to develop content analysis in order to study propaganda during World War II was pioneering and was to have a long-term influence on so-called news flow studies, as shown in Chapter 5. There were several innovations that were developed in a relatively short period in the early 1940s, including focus on the source of news stories, their country of origin, tone (positive, negative, neutral), and topics of news stories. While the theories and concepts still came mainly from psychoanalysis and the study of symbols, the need to quantify the analysis meant that there was a gradual shift from studying latent content to studying manifest content. This shift took place in the period when governmental needs started increasingly to define what kind of research was required.

### Research using psychoanalysis

It would be wrong to conclude that all the work was about developing quantitative content analysis. Leites was described as being 'deeply com-

mitted to psychoanalysis<sup>47</sup> and he even published work together with leading psychoanalyst Ernst Kris (1900–1957), who had worked with Freud on an article. It was later considered a should-be classic (Lang 1979, p.88). Kecskemeti published an early article in Freud's journal *Imago* as early as 1933.<sup>48</sup> Leites and de Sola Pool's report on the Third International (Communist International, 1919–1935) and its propaganda was produced as early as 1942.<sup>49</sup> It was a study of the frustration and setbacks of the Communist International after several defeats. Leites and de Sola Pool were perplexed as to why, despite defeats, a loyal group of followers remained. They studied the Third International's propaganda and constructed a typology of modes of the symbolic treatment of setbacks consisting of approximately 1,000 statements. Their aim, again, was to illustrate the applicability of quantitative methods of content analysis to the study of communications.<sup>50</sup>

Leites also collaborated with Kecskemeti, for example in their already-mentioned study published by the Wartime Communications Project in 1945<sup>51</sup> on psychological hypotheses concerning Nazi Germany,<sup>52</sup> which was written in the second half of 1944 and published after the war in the *Journal of Social Psychology* as four articles (Kecskemeti and Leites 1947; 1948a; 1948b; 1948c). In this study they thank Kris and Lasswell for 'their researches applying psychoanalytic hypotheses to social phenomena' and 'the OWI for permission to use German press and radio material collected under its auspices' when they were on its staff (Kecskemeti and Leites 1947, p.141). Their aim was to study the Nazi variant of German culture, using the concept of compulsive character from psychoanalytic theory, and most of the references in their bibliography were about it. This was a completely *qualitative* study, where they analysed cultural products including films and speeches in order to find indicators of German culture. They write:

this study, then, contains many hypotheses about the role of certain 'indicators' (of a compulsive character structure) in German culture. But here two further points must be noted: (1) These hypotheses refer, by implication or explicitly, to frequencies—e.g., to frequencies of use of 'life-with-a-capital-*I*' terms in certain contexts in German culture. But we are at this point in the development of psycho-cultural analysis unable to be rather specific about the frequencies involved—hence we use ambiguous terms like 'very large,' etc. (2) Even if we were in a position to say '78.7 per cent' instead of 'very large,' there still would be the task of performing the appropriate 'counting' operations to correct 'impressionistic' errors. This the authors of the study have not done. (Kecskemeti and Leites 1947, p.143; emphasis in the original)

In this extract, the tension between quantitative and qualitative approaches is already out in the open. Kecskemeti and Leites felt that they needed to



justify their approach, probably after comments from their reviewers. What was in all likelihood acceptable before and during the war had now come under criticism.

### How useful was content analysis?

It would be easy to argue that for ideological reasons the research was forced to follow the needs of the military, and so be part of the war effort. However, the answer is not necessarily so simple. The usefulness of content analysis became a debated issue, not only among the military and civil servants but among the academics themselves, especially after World War II. The Wartime Communications Project ended by autumn 1943, and was not continued at the Library of Congress, although several members of the team continued to work for different government departments in different roles. Perhaps it was the military that was most disappointed with content analysis. Doob writes:

Many social scientists employed by the government or in the armed services during the war found their research and scientific wisdom was not eagerly accepted, wisely interpreted, or sensibly followed by policy-makers. Unlike some of the old-line departments, the war agencies had no established procedure for utilizing social science. Social scientists had a place on the ever-changing organization charts, sometimes merely because it was somewhat vaguely felt that all kinds of brains, even academic, were necessary to win a total war. Often they had to carve out for themselves the specific roles they wished to play. They functioned, not in accordance with the charts, but within what Mansfield and Marx call informal organizations of their own making. (Doob 1947, p.649)

Many of those identified in this quotation as social scientists evaluated the usefulness of the method of content analysis on several occasions (see, for example, Berelson 1952; Committee on International Communications Research 1952; Davis 1951; de Sola Pool 1959; 1969; Doob 1947; George 1949; 1956; Kaplan 1943; Kracauer 1952; Kris and Speier 1944), and the overall verdict could be described as lukewarm or even critical. According to George (1956, p.335), there was:

implicit recognition in the ... work that some modification would be necessary in the early assumption that the ability to predict Nazi initiatives rested upon the discovery of a single, regularly recurring relationship of intended action with propaganda strategy.

Berelson summarised the critique after World War II: 'Content analysis, as a method, has no magical qualities – you rarely get out of it more than you put in, and sometimes you get less' (Berelson 1952, p.198).

There was another, more philosophical, tension in the work of those who studied propaganda. Abraham Kaplan (1918–1993),<sup>53</sup> a migrant and Lasswell's future collaborator and colleague at RAND Corporation, recognised this difference as early as 1943 (Kaplan 1943), writing that 'Lasswell and his associates have developed a technique known as content analysis, which attempts to characterise the meanings in a given body of discourse in a systematic and quantitative fashion' (p.230). In his article Kaplan then discusses the similarities and differences between semiotics and content analysis and concludes that these could complement each other, and that the contribution of content analysis can make the 'provision of empirical proposition about symbol data' and 'is simply a part of semiotic' (Berelson 1952, p.25), and his view was shared by Janis and Fadner (1942; see also Janis 1943).

They thus recognised Lasswell's original idea. Janowitz writes that, for Lasswell,

meaning depends upon the superimposition of some frame of reference, and his conception of content analysis is much broader, including both manifest and latent content. Latent content includes tacit meanings and associations as well as the more readily verbalized expressions, and for Lasswell, content analysis involved the application of historical, cultural, psychological, and legal frames of reference with various levels of meaning, subtleties, and efforts at explication of ambiguities. In the broadest sense, content analysis is a system for objectifying the process of inference, since the meaning of the symbolic environment can be derived only by a process of inference. (Janowitz 1968, pp.647–48)

Lasswell's goals, however, were not achieved. Most of the research, especially after World War II, defined content analysis, as Berelson and Lazarsfeld (1948, p.18) did, as 'a research technique for the *objective, systematic, and quantitative* description of the *manifest* content of communication' (my emphasis). According to Berelson and Lazarsfeld (1948, p.19), 'there is no guarantee that the meanings in the "manifest content" are the same as the meanings actually understood by the different readers or intended by the writer'. Lasswell's formula of 'who says what to whom, how and with what effect' (Lasswell 1948, p.216) recognises that studying only manifest content does not say anything about intentions or effect. When content analysis was defined as the study of manifest content, psychoanalytic theories became obsolete since intentions and meanings were no longer the object of study.

Many of the results from the work done for the Wartime Communications Project were published after the war. *Language of Politics. Studies in Quantitative Semantics* (Lasswell, Leites and Associates 1949) is probably the most comprehensive example. Most of the work included in the book was done with the project at the University of Chicago (Lasswell 1947, p.v), and

the emphasis was clearly on quantitative techniques and applications. Perhaps the most quoted chapter from this edited book is Lasswell's own, 'Why Be Quantitative?', which summarises the book's key point that the 'study of politics can be advanced by the quantitative analysis of political propaganda' (Lasswell 1949, p.41). Lasswell (1949, p.520) writes:

Why, then to be quantitative about communication? Because of the scientific and *policy* gains that can come of it. The social process is one of *collaboration* and *communication*; and quantitative methods have already demonstrated their usefulness with the former. (my emphasis)

The results may not have been the most convincing, or therefore the most useful for policymakers or for the army, since at its best content analysis could not but show that the use of different symbols in propaganda varied over time. But the main focus was on the process, on how content analysis could be used when studying propaganda. By carrying out this study the Wartime Communications Project opened up an avenue for the further development of quantitative content analysis, and a door to the development of the behaviouralism that, in the 1950s, would sweep not only through political science but also comparative communications.

## 4.5 Conclusion

The Experimental Division for the Study of War Time Communications at the Library of Congress (the Wartime Communications Project), led by Lasswell, contributed significantly to comparative communications. In fact, many of the features we take for granted and recognise in contemporary comparative communications were formulated during a relatively short and exceptional period at the beginning of World War II. It is easy to ignore this period because the research was not principally carried out by academics in universities or research institutes but under the government and its ministries, and financed by private foundations. Most of the credited work was done by young men in their 20s or 30s and by academics with diverse education and backgrounds. The women remained unrecognised.

These young men became temporary Insiders by doing propaganda research. Simpson (1994, p.9) writes that the government agencies:

sought scientific data on the means to manipulate targeted populations at home and at abroad, and they were willing to pay well for it at a time when there was very little other funding available for large-scale communication studies.

However, the Wartime Communications Project was funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, not by the US government, and provided unforeseen opportunities for a new generation of propaganda researchers who suddenly received access to data – ‘big’ data of that time – that they could previously only have dreamed of. Some of this data was confidential or difficult to access and was coded by female research assistants paid by foundations or the government. Several men who worked as researchers later became acknowledged experts in their fields and received university chairs. This was an unequal process that academically benefitted some of them, but not all, as the next chapter shows.

What needs to be emphasised is that this was pioneering comparative research. Even though Lasswell's project was not funded by the US government, its goals served that government, and it was carried out in close cooperation with different government offices. It would be too simple, however, to conclude that the government forced the researchers to do something against their will in that research. Rather, it appears that the researchers were eager to take part in the war effort, but that they also continued to do the research they were themselves interested in. There was a hidden intergenerational conflict concerning the method of content analysis, as to whether it should become qualitative or quantitative. The quantitative side won, perhaps to Lasswell's regret, but by this point he had become a pragmatist and given up psychoanalysis (Eulau 1968, p.11), obliged to worry about where the next research grant would come from. When this happened, one of the topics for the next chapter, it also meant that the European psychoanalytic tradition, carried forward by Kecskemeti and Leites, was no longer in demand.

Did all these researchers belong to the same generation? Yes and no. They were brought together, with all their differences and different experiences, to work together for the same goal: to win the war. Many of them had traumatic pasts, with family members and friends killed in concentration camps while they themselves survived. They formed a *cross-generation* on the basis of a shared experience of the war, brought together almost randomly by world politics. This created a temporary transnational generation consisting of academics and researchers with different educational backgrounds and from different countries. Their experience was life-forming and many of them went on to work together for decades, as the next chapter shows.

We might say that, in a number of ways, the formation of these research groups was a result of both known and unknown factors. Many of the researchers had a connection with the University of Chicago and through Lasswell, a networker who would rapidly turn his network into an effective ‘old boys’ club’ that would support its members for the rest of their lives by finding positions and securing jobs for them. They also shared an intellectual agenda of promoting the comparative study of symbols using psychoanalysis and different types of content analysis. At the same time, Lasswell welcomed new members who had come to the US as émigré

scholars. There is something open about any new type of research before disciplinary boundaries are established. When new skills are needed and cannot be found close to home, new opportunities open up for Outsiders, who then may become Insiders. This is what happened to émigré scholars such as Kecskemeti, Leites and others. They not only found employment but later became defence scholars who voluntarily took the position of defending US interests at home and abroad. It is important to remember that these men saw this as their patriotic duty. There was no question about whose side they were on, all coming together to fight the enemy. This is when ideology explains a lot but not everything. If an ideology is defined as something referring to the past and a utopia as referring to the future, the difference between ideology and utopia is problematic. Winning the war may have been a utopian project in 1941, but it required a strong ideology of moral superiority, of 'us against them'.

Although the studies discussed here opened up the world to communication from other countries, which would seldom otherwise have received attention, they would not have been pursued without the deep patriotism and nationalism of men who were convinced that the US had to win the war and that their duty was to help their government to do that. This sentiment was shared by the émigré scholars, who often continued to work for the US government, army or intelligence services even after the war. Speier, himself an emigrant from Germany, has written (1989, p.17) of his own experiences:

After Pearl Harbor, U.S. Government agencies tried to obtain the service of German-born anti-Nazis who had sought refuge in the United States, become citizens, and possessed useful area knowledge. Nevertheless, I expected to encounter occasional distrust or at least reservation in government service, but I was wrong. My German origin led to difficulties only once, and this unimportant episode occurred in Europe after the fighting had ceased.

It was the unforeseen and unexpected element of research groups combining different nationalities that had one of the most lasting influences on comparative communications, which continues today. It would be almost impossible to carry out comparative research, at least qualitatively, without the expertise and experience of specialists from the country or area in question. The feeling that such men were 'one of us' did not last. Speier himself became a suspect after the war as McCarthyism took root (see Chapter 5), as did Lasswell himself and many others. The camaraderie that the team shared during the war-time project lasted and took many of them to California to work for RAND Corporation, but it did not help them to obtain academic appointments in universities, at least not immediately. Their shared mission of winning the

war against Nazism also disappeared, and was gradually turned against a new enemy, communism. In short, their professional lives were influenced by the dominant ideologies of the time: the youthful idealism that carried these men through the war was soon to be absorbed into a profession defined by US interest in expanding its own ideology around the world.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Summary of Activities on 19 October 1951. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, Biographical/Memorabilia Files 1043, Series V, Box 213, Folder 15. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>2</sup> George, A.L. (1949) The intelligence value of content analysis. RAND, D419, Copy No 10 on 13 February 1949. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series I, Box 80, Folder 1001. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>3</sup> J.M. Goldsen to P. Lewis. Analysis of tests to measure internal consistency of coders and reliability. Memorandum. Experimental Division for the Study of War Communications on 22, 23, 24 October 1941. The coders included Misses DePalma, Kretzinger and McCarter. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series I, Box 38, Folder 516. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>4</sup> J.M. Goldsen to H.D. Lasswell on 31 December 1942. Experimental Division for the Study of War-Time Communications. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files, 1043, Series I, Box 38, Folder 518. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>5</sup> J.M. Goldsen to H.D. Lasswell on 3 August 1942. Memorandum. Experimental Division for the Study of War-Time Communications. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series I, Box 38, Folder 517. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>6</sup> J.M. Goldsen to P. Lewis. Analysis of Tests to Measure Internal Consistency of Coders and Reliability. Memorandum. Experimental Division for the Study of War-Time Communications; Personnel trained in whole or in part by the War Communications Research Project on 30 December 1941. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series I, Box 38, Folder 516. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>7</sup> Lasswell H.D. A summary of activities dictated on 19 October 1951. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series V, Box 213, Folder 15. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>8</sup> Office of Facts and Figures. Bureau of Intelligence, no date. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series I, Box 95, 1160. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

- <sup>9</sup> H.D. Lasswell to Legislative Services on 9 April 1941. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series I, Box 56, Folder 797. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>10</sup> Public opinion and emergency on 1 November 1939. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series I, Box 81, Folder 1018. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>11</sup> Lasswell, H.D. Affidavit. Subscribed and sworn to before me on 23rd day of October 1951. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series V, Box 213, Folder 14. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>12</sup> Correspondence between H.D. Lasswell and J. Marshall. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, Biographical & Personal, General Files 1043, Series V, Box 213, Folder 15. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>13</sup> American Council for Émigrés in the Professions Records, 1930–1974. M.E. Grenander Department of Special Collections and Archives, University Libraries, University at Albany, State University of New York.
- <sup>14</sup> Annual reports 1940–1950, Individual files, Box 1, Folder, 26 (Brecht); Box 2, Folder 21 (Aron); Box 2older 121 (Elias); Box 3, Folder 108 (Hayek); Box 4, Folder 202 (Mannheim); Box 4, Folder 201 (Manheim), Box 5, Folder 84 (Neumann); Box 6, Folder 68 (Sartre). American Council for Émigrés in the Professions Records, 1930–1974. M.E. Grenander Department of Special Collections and Archives, University Libraries, University at Albany, State University of New York.
- <sup>15</sup> Litvan, G. (1980) In memoriam P. Kecskemeti on 25 October 1980. Hans Speier Papers. Box 3. German and Jewish Intellectual émigré Collection. M.E. Grenander Department of Special Collections and Archives, University Libraries, University at Albany, State University of New York.
- <sup>16</sup> According to the online Hungarian Encyclopaedia of Ethnography (Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon), *Századunk* (*Our Century*) was a radical social sciences journal established in 1926. It specialised in sociology, political science and ethnography. The journal harshly criticised the Horthy government (1920–1944) and was banned and ceased publication in 1939. It was considered a highly intellectual bourgeois radical monthly that was interested in Marxism (Gabel 1991, p.27).
- <sup>17</sup> K. Bickel to R.W. Howard on 28 June 1933. Roy W. Howard Papers. The Media School Archive, Indiana University.
- <sup>18</sup> Marriage certificate on 1 June 1938. Paul Kecskemeti Papers. The Robert D. Farber University Archives & Special Collections Department at Brandeis University.
- <sup>19</sup> His diary, held at Brandeis, tells a thrilling story about their escape from Paris. He writes when leaving Paris on 10 June 1940: 'Farewell journey



through Paris ... I have the feeling that I shall never see all this again.' Paul Kecskemeti Papers. The Robert D. Farber University Archives & Special Collections Department at Brandeis University.

- <sup>20</sup> Testimonial dinner for P. Kecskemeti on 20 September 1966. J.M. Goldsen presiding. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series I, Box 38, Folder 532, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>21</sup> A memo from N.C. Leites concerning his father (no date). Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series I, Box 57, Folder 790. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>22</sup> 'Among the émigré professional economists was a remarkably large group of Russians, who as young Mensheviks had fled to Germany after the October Revolution. They not only shared a political profile but were also highly qualified younger people who gave critical impetus to the field of mathematical analysis and statistics in particular ... It is interesting to note that many of these young Russian socialists, among them Paul Baran [1909–1964], Georg Garvy (Bronstein), Nathan Leites, Jacob Marschak [1898–1977], Mark Mitnitzky [1908–1984] and Wladimir Woytinski [1885–1960], came together in the Berlin seminar of the ultra-reactionary mathematician Ladislaus von Bortkiewicz in order to finish their previous studies before going to either Heidelberg or Kiel, where they then studied economics. Bortkiewicz was also a Russian by birth (born in St. Petersburg in 1868), but he had been working in Germany since the 1890s and had come to Berlin in 1901' (Krohn 1996/2013, p.181).
- <sup>23</sup> Fellowship application to the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation on 1 August 1946. Nathan Leites Papers, Box 1. Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.
- <sup>24</sup> Fellowship application to the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation on 1 August 1946. Nathan Leites Papers, Box 1. Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.
- <sup>25</sup> Fellowship application to the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation on 1 August 1946. Nathan Leites Papers, Box 1. Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.
- <sup>26</sup> Leites does not mention this in his fellowship application. Fellowship application to the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation on 1 August 1946. Nathan Leites Papers, Box 1. Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.
- <sup>27</sup> Fellowship application to the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation on 1 August 1946. Nathan Leites Papers, Box 1. Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.
- <sup>28</sup> Fellowship application to the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation on 1 August 1946. Nathan Leites Papers, Box 1. Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.

- <sup>29</sup> Kecskemeti, P. and Leites, N. (1945) *Some Psychological Hypotheses on Nazi Germany*. Document No. 60, on 30 July 1945, the Library of Congress, Washington, DC, Experimental Division for the Study of Wartime Communications, Harold D. Lasswell, Chief. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series III, Box 57, folder 790. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library,
- <sup>30</sup> Leites, N.C. and de Sola Pool, I. (1942) *On Content Analysis*. Document No. 26, on 1 September 1942. The Library of Congress, Washington, DC, Experimental Division for the Study of Wartime Communications; Harold D. Lasswell, Chief. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series VII, Box 57, Folder 790. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>31</sup> Leites, N.C. and de Sola Pool, I. (1942) *Communist Propaganda in Reaction to Frustration*. Document No. 27, on 1 December 1942. The Library of Congress, Washington, DC, Experimental Division for the Study of Wartime Communications; Harold D. Lasswell, Chief. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series VII, Box 57, Folder 790.
- <sup>32</sup> MacKenzie Pool, J. (1988) 'Nathan and Ithiel', in RAND (ed.) *Remembering Nathan Leites, An Appreciation: Recollections of Some Friends, Colleagues, and Students*, p.34, RAND Corporation Archives.
- <sup>33</sup> Biography. Joseph M. Goldsen. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series I, Box 38, Folder 529. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>34</sup> Joseph Goldsen Profile, Biographical Files, RAND Corporation Archives.
- <sup>35</sup> Goldstein, J. (1942) Content analysis. A Propaganda and opinion study. Unpublished PhD thesis. New School for Social Research, New York. New School Faculty Vertical Files. The New School Archives and Special Collections.
- <sup>36</sup> H. Speier to K. Lewin on 25 August 1945. Hans Speier Papers, German and Jewish Intellectual émigré Collection, Box 3, Folder 9. M.E. Grenander Department of Special Collections and Archives, University Libraries, University at Albany, State University of New York.
- <sup>37</sup> Leites, N.C. and de Sola Pool, I. (1942) *On Content Analysis*. Document No. 26, on 1 September 1942. The Library of Congress, Washington, DC, Experimental Division for the Study of Wartime Communications; Harold D. Lasswell, Chief on 1 September 1942. No 26. Confidential. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series I, Box 57, Folder 790. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>38</sup> H.D. Lasswell to J.M. Goldsen. Memorandum regarding research program on coding method. Experimental Division for the Study of War Time Division on 16 February 1942. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series I, Box 38, Folder 516. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

- <sup>39</sup> Affidavit. Harold D. Lasswell on 23 October 1951. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, Biographical/Memorabilia Files, 1043, Series I, Box 213, Folder 15. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>40</sup> J.M. Goldsen to H.D. Lasswell. Memorandum on 16 February 1942. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files, Series I, Box 8, Folder 516. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>41</sup> J.M. Goldsen to H.D. Lasswell. Memorandum. Re: Handbook of coding instructions on 9 May 1942. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series I, Box 8, Folder 517. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>42</sup> A. Geller, A. George, D. Kaplan and J.M. Goldsen to H.D. Lasswell. Memorandum regarding analysis of the coded British and German newspapers on 10 June 1942. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series 1, Box 8, Folder 517. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>43</sup> Leites, N.C. and de Sola Pool, I. (1942) *On Content Analysis*. Document No. 26, on 1 September 1942. The Library of Congress, Washington, DC, Experimental Division for the Study of Wartime Communications; Harold D. Lasswell, Chief. Document No. 26. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series VII, Box 57, Folder 790. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>44</sup> George, A.L. (1949) The Intelligence value of content analysis. A preliminary progress report. US Air Force Project. RAND on 15 February 1949. D-419. Harold D. Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series I, Box 89, Folder 1095. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>45</sup> Morris Janowitz was born to Samuel and Rose Janowitz, both Polish immigrants, and raised in Paterson, New Jersey. He earned a bachelor's degree from Washington Square College of New York University in 1941. After World War II started, he went to work for the Department of Justice Special War Policies Unit until he was drafted in 1943. Janowitz was assigned to the Research and Analysis Branch of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) and sent to work for the Psychological Warfare Division at the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Expeditionary Forces in London, where he analysed German radio broadcasts. He completed his PhD in sociology at the University of Chicago in 1948 and received a chair in the department of sociology in 1961 ('Guide to the Morris Janowitz Collection 1940–1989' 2009).
- <sup>46</sup> J.M. Goldsen and J. Goldstein to H.D. Lasswell. Preliminary analysis of World Attention Survey on 1 October 1943. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files, 1043, Series I, Box 58, Folder 519, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

- <sup>47</sup> MacKenzie Pool, J. (1988) 'Nathan and Ithiel', in RAND (ed.) *Remembering Nathan Leites. An Appreciation: Recollections of Some Friends, Colleagues, and Students*, p.34, RAND Corporation. RAND Corporation Archives.
- <sup>48</sup> Kecskeméti, P. (1933) 'Psychologie und Ontologie'. *Imago*, Band XIX, Heft 2. Paul Kecskemeti Papers. The Robert D. Farber University Archives & Special Collections Department at Brandeis University.
- <sup>49</sup> Leites, N.C. and de Sola Pool, I. (1942) Communist propaganda in reaction to frustration. The Library of Congress, Experimental Division for the Study of Wartime Communications, No 27 Harold D. Lasswell, Chief. Document on December 1, 1942. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series VII, Box 57, Folder 790. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>50</sup> Leites, N.C. and de Sola Pool, I. (1942) Communist propaganda in reaction to frustration. The Library of Congress, Experimental Division for the Study of Wartime Communications, No 27 Harold D. Lasswell, Chief. Document on December 1, 1942. Harold D. Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series VII, Box 57, Folder 790. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>51</sup> Kecskemeti, P. and Leites, N. (1945) Some Psychological Hypotheses on Nazi Germany. The Library of Congress, Experimental Division for the Study of Wartime Communications; Harold D. Lasswell, Chief. Document No 60 on 30 July 1945. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series VII, Box 57, Folder 790. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>52</sup> Kecskemeti, P. and Leites, N. (1945) Some Psychological Hypothesis on Nazi Germany. Document No. 60, 30 July 1945. The Library of Congress, Experimental Division for the Study of War Time Communication; Harold D. Lasswell, Chief. Harold Dwight Lasswell Papers, General Files 1043, Series III, Box 57, Folder 790. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
- <sup>53</sup> Abraham Kaplan was born in Odessa, Ukraine, in 1918 to Joseph J. Kaplan, a rabbi, and Chava (née Lerner) Kaplan. In 1923, Kaplan and his family immigrated to the United States and he became a naturalised citizen in 1930. He studied at the University of Chicago in 1937–1940 but received his PhD in 1942 from UCLA, where he became a professor of philosophy in 1952. He described himself as 'by training a positivist, by inclination a pragmatist, in temperament a mystic, in practice a democrat; my faith Jewish, educated by the Catholics, an habitual Protestant; born in Europe, raised in the Midwest, hardened in the east, and softened in California' (Casebier and Copi 1994; Kaplan (Abraham) Papers (no date)).

## References

- 'Alexander and Juliette George' (no date).  
<http://plunkettlakepress.com/ajg.html>
- 'Ármin Kecskeméti' (2008).  
<https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/kecskem-x00e9-ti-x00c1-rmin>
- Ashcraft, Karen L. and Simonson, Peter (2016) 'Gender, Work, and the History of Communication Research', in Park, David W. and Simonson, Peter (eds) *The International History of Communication Study*, USA: Taylor & Francis, pp.47–68.
- Bennett, Andrew (2008) 'Building Communities, Bridging Gaps: Alexander George's Contributions to Research Methods', *Political Psychology*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp.489–507. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20447141>
- Berelson, Bernard (1952) *Content Analysis in Communication Research*, USA: Hafner.
- Berelson, Bernard and de Grazia, Sebastian (1947) 'Detecting Collaboration in Propaganda', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp.244–53. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/11.2.244>
- Berelson, Bernard and Janowitz, Morris (1950) *Reader in Public Opinion and Communication*, USA: Free Press.
- Berelson, Bernard and Lazarsfeld, Paul F. (1948) *The Analysis of Communication Content*, Norway: Universitetets studentkontor.
- Blum, John M. (1976) *V Was for Victory: Politics and American Culture during World War II*, USA: Harcourt Brace.
- Buxton, William J. (2003) 'John Marshall and the Humanities in Europe: Shifting Patterns of Rockefeller Foundation Support', *Minerva*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp.133–53.  
[https://www.jstor.org/stable/41821239#metadata\\_info\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/41821239#metadata_info_tab_contents)
- Casebier, Allan and Copi, Irving (1994) 'Abraham Kaplan 1918–1993', *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association*, vol. 67, issue. 4, pp.137–40. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3130752>
- Cmiel, Kenneth (1996) 'On Cynicism, Evil, and the Discovery of Communication in the 1940s', *Journal of Communication*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp.88–107. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1996.tb01491.x>
- Cox, Michael (2021) "'His Finest Hour": William Beveridge and the Academic Assistance Council'. <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/lsehistory/2021/04/28/his-finest-hour-william-beveridge-and-academic-assistance-council>
- Dale, Henry (1936) *The Protection of Science and Learning*, UK: Society for Protection of Science and Learning.

- Davis, Elmer (1951) 'War Information', in Lerner, Daniel (ed.) *Propaganda in War and Crisis: Material for American Policy*, USA: George W. Stewart, pp.274–313.
- Davison, W. Phillips (2006) *A Personal History of World War II: How a Pacifist Draftee Accidentally Became a Military Government Official in Postwar Germany*, USA: iUniverse.
- de Sola Pool, Ithiel (ed.) (1959) *Trends in Content Analysis*, USA: University of Illinois Press.
- de Sola Pool, Ithiel (1969) 'Content Analysis and the Intelligence Function', in Rogow, Arnold A. (ed.) *Politics, Personality, and Social Science in the Twentieth Century: Essays in Honor of Harold D. Lasswell*, USA: University of Chicago Press, pp.197–224.
- Doob, Leonard W. (1947) 'The Utilization of Social Scientists in the Overseas Branch of the Office of War Information', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp.649–67. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1950646>
- Eulau, Heinz (1968) 'The Behavioral Movement in Political Science: A Personal Document', *Social Research*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp.1–29. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40969896>
- Farr, James; Hacker, Jacob S.; and Kazee, Nicole (2006) 'The Policy Scientist of Democracy: The Discipline of Harold D. Lasswell', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 100, no. 4, pp.579–87. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055406062459>
- 'Ferment in the Field. Introduction' (1983) *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 33, no 3, pp.4–5. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1983.tb02400.x>
- Frederick, Howard H. (1981) *The Life Work of Ithiel De Sola Pool: An Assessment and Bibliography*. Colloquium in International Communication, USA: The American University. [https://www.academia.edu/30119424/The\\_Life\\_and\\_Work\\_of\\_Ithiel\\_de\\_Sola](https://www.academia.edu/30119424/The_Life_and_Work_of_Ithiel_de_Sola)
- Gary, Brett J. (1992) *American Liberalism and the Problem of Propaganda: Scholars, Lawyers, and the War on Words, 1919–1945*, USA: University of Pennsylvania.
- Gary, Brett J. (1996) 'Communication Research, the Rockefeller Foundation, and Mobilization for the War on Words, 1938–1944', *Journal of Communication*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp.124–48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1996.tb01493.x>
- George, Alexander L. (1956) 'Prediction of Political Action by Means of Propaganda Analysis', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp.334–45. <https://doi.org/10.1086/266623>
- George, Alexander L. (1959) *Propaganda Analysis: A Study of Inferences Made from Nazi Propaganda in World War II*, USA: Row, Peterson & Co.

- George, Juliette (2008) 'Recollections of Alex George', *Political Psychology*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp.475–87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00645.x>
- Glander, Timothy R. (1999) *Origins of Mass Communications Research during the American Cold War: Educational Effects and Contemporary Implications*, USA: Routledge.
- Goldstein, Jacob (1943) 'An Exploratory Analysis of Opinion Trends with Special Reference to Conscription in the United States', *Sociometry*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp.156–81. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2785355>
- Goldsen, Joseph (1959) (ed.) *Outer Space in World Politics*, USA: Frederick A. Praeger.
- 'Guide to the Ithiel de Sola Pool Papers 1935–1948' (2011) *Biographical Note*. University of Chicago Library. <https://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/scrc/findingaids/view.php?eadid=ICU.SPCL.POOLI>
- 'Guide to the Morris Janowitz Collection 1940–1989' (2009) <https://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/scrc/findingaids/view.php?eadid=ICU.SPCL.JANOWITZM>
- 'György Kecskeméti' (2008). <https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/kecskem-x00e9-ti-gy-x0151-rgy>
- Iacobelli, Teresa (2021) *The Rockefeller Foundation's Refugee Scholar Program*. <https://resource.rockarch.org/story/the-rockefeller-foundations-refugee-scholar-program-world-war-ii-nazi-europe>
- 'Ithiel de Sola Pool' (1997). [https://web.mit.edu/m-i-t/profiles/profile\\_ithiel.html](https://web.mit.edu/m-i-t/profiles/profile_ithiel.html)
- Janis, Irving L. (1943) 'Meaning and the Study of Symbolic Behavior', *Psychiatry*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp.425–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.193.11022475>
- Janis, Irving L. and Fadner, Raymond H. (1943a) 'A Coefficient Imbalance for Content Analysis'. Library of Congress, Experimental Division for the Study of War-Time Communication, Document No 31.
- Janis, Irving L. and Fadner, Raymond H. (1943b) 'A Coefficient of Imbalance for Content Analysis', *Psychometrika*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp.105–19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02288695>
- Janis, Irving L.; Fadner, Raymond H.; and Janowitz, Morris (1942a) 'The Reliability of a Content Analysis Technique'. Experimental Division for the Study of War-Time Communication, Document No 32.
- Janis, Irving L.; Fadner Raymond H.; and Janowitz, Morris (1942b) 'Content Analysis Technique'. Library of Congress, Experimental Division for the Study of War-Time Communication, Document No 33.
- Janis, Irving L.; Fadner, Raymond H.; and Janowitz, Morris (1943) 'The Reliability of a Content Analysis Technique', *The Public Opinion*



- Quarterly*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp.293–96.  
[https://www.jstor.org/stable/2745657#metadata\\_info\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2745657#metadata_info_tab_contents)
- Janowitz, Morris (1968) 'Harold D. Lasswell's Contribution to Content Analysis', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp.646–53.  
<https://doi.org/10.1086/267652>
- Janowitz, Morris (1969) 'Content Analysis and the Study of the "Symbolic Environment"', in Rogow, Arnold A. (ed.) *Politics, Personality, and Social Science in the Twentieth Century: Essays in Honor of Harold D. Lasswell*, USA: University of Chicago Press, pp.155–70.
- Jay, Martin (1973/1996) *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923–1950*, USA and UK: University of California Press.
- Kaplan, Abraham (1943) 'Content Analysis and the Theory of Signs', *Philosophy of Science*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp.230–47.
- 'Kaplan (Abraham) Papers' (no date).  
<https://oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/c86q1z11>
- Katz, Elihu and Katz, Ruth (2016) 'Revisiting the Origin of the Administrative versus Critical Research Debate', *Journal of Information Policy*, vol. 6, pp.4–12. <https://doi.org/10.5325/jinfopoli.6.2016.0004>
- Kecskeméti, Pál (1926) 'A szociológia történetfilozófiai megalapozása: Mannheim Károly', *Századunk*, vol. 1, pp.447–57.
- Kecskemeti, Paul (1931) 'Communists Demand Hitler's Arrest'.  
<https://www.upi.com/Archives/1931/10/12/Communists-demand-Hitlers-arrest/7781144211301>
- Kecskemeti, Paul (1952) *Meaning, Communication, and Value*, USA: University of Chicago Press.
- Kecskemeti, Paul and Leites, Nathan (1947) 'Some Psychological Hypotheses on Nazi Germany: I', *The Journal of Social Psychology*, vol. 26(2), pp.141–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1947.9921742>
- Kecskemeti, Paul and Leites, Nathan (1948a) 'Some Psychological Hypotheses on Nazi Germany: II', *The Journal of Social Psychology*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp.91–117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1948.9918914>
- Kecskemeti, Paul and Leites, Nathan (1948b) 'Some Psychological Hypotheses on Nazi Germany: III', *The Journal of Social Psychology*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp.241–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1948.9918929>
- Kecskemeti, Paul and Leites, Nathan (1948c) 'Some Psychological Hypotheses on Nazi Germany: IV', *The Journal of Social Psychology*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp.141–64.

- Kettler, David and Meja, Volker (1995) *Karl Mannheim and the Crisis of Liberalism: The Secret of These New Times*, USA: Transaction.
- Kracauer, Siegfried (1952) 'The Challenge of Qualitative Content Analysis', *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp.631–42.  
<https://doi.org/10.1086/266427>
- Krippendorff, Klaus (1980/2004) *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*, UK: Sage.
- Kris, Ernst and Leites, Nathan C. (1947) 'Trends in the 20th Century Propaganda', in Roheim, Geza (ed.) *Psychoanalysis and Social Sciences – An Annual*, Vol. 1, UK: Imago, pp.393–41.
- Kris, Ernst and Speier, Hans (1944) *German Radio Propaganda: Report on Home Broadcasts during the War*, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Krohn, Claus-Dieter (1996/2013) *Intellectuals in Exile: Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research*, USA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Kuckhoff, Greta (1972) *Vom Rosenkraz zur Roten Kapelle*, Germany: Verlag Neues Leben.
- 'Kuckhoff, Greta' (no date) 'Biographische Angaben aus dem Handbuch "Wer war wer in der DDR?"', <https://www.bundesstiftung-aufarbeitung.de/de/recherche/kataloge-datenbanken/biographische-datenbanken/greta-kuckhoff>
- Kurzweil, Edith (1996) 'Psychoanalytic Science: From Oedipus to Culture', in Ash, Mitchell G. and Söllner, Alfons (eds) *Forced Migration and Scientific Change: Émigré German-Speaking Scientists and Scholars After 1933*, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp.139–55.
- Lamberti, Marjorie (2006) 'The Reception of Refugee Scholars from Nazi Germany in America: Philanthropy and Social Change in Higher Education', *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp.157–92.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/4467750.pdf>
- Lang, Kurt (1979) 'The Critical Functions of Empirical Communication Research: Observations on German-American Influences', *Media, Culture & Society*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp.83–96.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/016344377900100107>
- Lässig, Simone (2017) 'Strategies and Mechanisms of Scholar Rescue: The Intellectual Migration of the 1930s Reconsidered', *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, vol. 84, no. 4, pp.769–807.  
<https://doi.org/10.1353/sor.2017.005>
- Lasswell, Harold D. (1938) 'A Provisional Classification of Symbol Data', *Psychiatry*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp.197–204.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.1938.11022172>

- Lasswell, Harold D. (1941) 'The World Attention Survey: An Exploration of the Possibilities of Studying Attention Being Given to the United States by Newspapers Abroad', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp.456–62. <https://doi.org/10.1086/265515>
- Lasswell, Harold D. (1942) 'Analyzing the Content of Mass Communication. Brief Introduction'. Library of Congress, Experimental Division for the Study of War-Time Communication, Document No 11.
- Lasswell, Harold D. (1948) 'The Structure and Function of Communication in Society', in Bryson, Lyman (ed.) *The Communication of Ideas*, USA: Institute for Religious and Social Studies, pp.37–51.
- Lasswell, Harold D. (1949) 'Why Be Quantitative?' in Lasswell, Harold D. and Leites, Nathan (eds) *Language of Politics: Studies in Quantitative Semantics*, USA: G.W. Stewart, pp.40–52.
- Lasswell, Harold D. (1968) 'The Future of the Comparative Method', *Comparative Politics*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp.3–18. [https://www.jstor.org/stable/421372#metadata\\_info\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/421372#metadata_info_tab_contents)
- Lasswell, Harold D. and Associates (1942) 'The Politically Significant Content of the Press: Coding Procedures', *Journalism Quarterly*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp.12–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107769904201900102>
- Lasswell, Harold D. and Goldsen, Joseph M. (1947) 'Public Attention, Opinion, and Action', *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp.3–11.
- Lasswell, Harold D.; Leites, Nathan; and Associates (1949) *Language of Politics: Studies in Quantitative Semantics*, USA: George W. Stewart.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F. (1941) 'Remarks on Administrative and Critical Communications Research', *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp.2–16. <https://doi.org/10.5840/zfs1941912>
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F.; Berelson, Bernard; and Gaudet, Hazel (1944) *The People's Choice: How the Voter Makes Up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign*, USA: Duell, Sloan and Pearce.
- Leff, Laurel (2019) *Well Worth Saving: American Universities' Life-And-Death Decisions on Refugees from Nazi Europe*, USA: Yale University Press.
- Levyatan, Yaniv (2009) 'Harold D. Lasswell's Analysis of Hitler's Speeches', *Media History*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp.55–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13688800802583299>
- Library of Congress (no date) *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress 1941/1942–1943/1944*, USA: Library of Congress. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015036841743&seq=53&q1=wartime+communications>

*Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon* (Hungarian Encyclopaedia of Ethnography) (no date).  
<http://mek.niif.hu/02100/02115/html/>

Marwick, Arthur (1988) *Total War and Social Change*, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Meja, Volker and Kettler, David (1993) 'Cultural Politics in Karl Mannheim's Sociology: Introduction to the Transaction Edition', in Wolff, Kurt H. (ed.) *From Karl Mannheim*, USA: Routledge, pp.vii–xxxvi.

Morrison, David (1988) 'The Transference of Experience and the Impact of Ideas: Paul Lazarsfeld and Mass Communication Research', *Encyclopaedia of Communication*, vol. 10, pp.185–209.

Morrison, David E. (2008) 'Opportunity Structures and the Creation of Knowledge: Paul Lazarsfeld and the Politics of Research', in Park, David W. and Pooley, Jefferson (eds) *The History of Media and Communication Research. Contested Memories*, USA: Peter Lang, pp.179–204.

Morrison, David (2022) 'Lazarsfeld's Legacy| Paul Lazarsfeld: Living in Circles and Talking around Tables', *International Journal of Communication*, vol. 16, pp.616–25. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/18891/3664>

'Nachlass Greta Kuckhoff' (no date).  
<http://www.argus.bstu.bundesarchiv.de/N2506-35612/index.htm>

Némedi, Dénes (1992) "'Sociologists", Sociographers, and "Liberals": Hungarian Intellectuals Respond to Fascism', in Turner, Stephen P. and Käsler, Dirk (eds) *Sociology Responds to Fascism*, UK: Routledge, pp.151–67.

Neumann, Franz L. (1953) *The Cultural Migration: The European Scholar in America*, USA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Oren, Ido (2003) *Our Enemies and US: America's Rivalries and the Making of Political Science*, USA: Cornell University Press.

Palmer, Barbara (2006) 'Alexander George, "Giant" in International Relations, Dead at 86', *Stanford News*,  
<https://news.stanford.edu/news/2006/august23/obitgeorge-082306.html>

Committee on International Communications Research (1952) 'Proceedings of the Committee on International Communications Research', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp.705–08.  
<https://doi.org/10.1086/266434>

Rogers, Everett M. (1981) 'The Empirical and the Critical Schools of Communication Research', *Annals of the International Communication Association*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp.125–44.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.181.11923842>

Rogers, Everett M. (1994) *A History of Communication Study: A Biographical Approach*, USA: Free Press.

- Sayner, Joanne (2013) *Reframing Antifascism: Memory, Genre and the Life Writings of Greta Kuckhoff*, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schmidt, Péter (1933a) 'Az ellenforradalom győzelme Németországban', *Századunk*, vol. 9, pp.97–105.
- Schmidt, Péter (1933b) 'A harmadik birodalomból', *Századunk*, vol. 8, pp.229–33.
- Schmidt, Péter (1935) 'Hitler három éve', *Századunk*, vol. 10, pp.74–82.
- Sills, David L. (1980) 'In Memoriam: Bernard Berelson, 1912–1979', *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp.274–75.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2748438>
- Simpson, Christopher (1993) 'U.S. Mass Communication Research, Counterinsurgency, and Scientific "Reality"', in Solomon, William S. and McChesney, Robert W. (eds.) *Ruthless Criticism: New Perspectives in U.S. Communication History*, USA: University of Minnesota Press, pp.313–48.
- Simpson, Christopher (1994) *Science of Coercion: Communication Research and Psychological Warfare, 1945–1960*, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Bruce L. (1943) 'Scientific and Semi-scientific Literature on War Information and Censorship', *Journalism Quarterly*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp.1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107769904302000101>
- Sobel Robert (1976) *The Manipulators. America in the Middle Age*, USA: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Speier, Hans (1989) *The Truth in Hell and Other Essays on Politics and Culture, 1935–1987*, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Sproule, J. Michael (1997) *Propaganda and Democracy: The American Experience of Media and Mass Persuasion*, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- 'The United States and the Founding of the United Nations, August 1941–October 1945' (2005) US Department of State Archive.  
<https://2001-009.state.gov/r/pa/ho/pubs/fs/55407.htm>
- Wolfenstein, Martha and Leites, Nathan C. (1947) 'An Analysis of Themes and Plots', *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 254, no. 1, pp.41–48.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/000271624725400108>
- Wolfenstein, Martha and Leites, Nathan (1950) *Movies: A Psychological Study*, USA: Free Press.