

Linguistic Politics: Creating a Communication Canon Post World War II

Erin Miller: McNair Scholar

Dr. Ed McLuskie: Mentor

Communication



Abstract

*What does it mean to communicate and how “best” can this action be accomplished? Perhaps the second part of this question, rather than the first, describes the history of approaches to ideas of communication and their practices. The first “official” textbook providing a window on this history reveals a remarkable consensus on what “communication” and related terms should mean, if not directly in models, then in their assumptions and, especially, their orientations—both of which grew out of World War II and migrated quickly into the 1950’s. The field of communication was nascent when, in 1954, *The Process and Effects of Mass Communication* was published as educational content for budding scholars. The relevance of this “first” literature for the social sciences of communication is the variety of linearity growing out of that literature’s veiled militaristic language. This paper looks behind the veil.*

Introduction

The Process and Effects of Mass Communication set the stage for an emerging social science of communication which, as a text-compilation edited by Wilbur Schramm, reflected its WWII roots. The legacy lies in the subsequent influence on generations of communication scholars to come to think about communication in militaristic ways. Writings by social scientists became “founders” of the field, whose names and works remain in 21st-century textbooks and journal bibliographies. This paper suggests that such work was and remains ideological. Its ideology found purpose in psychologically analyzing how people behaved in certain stressful situations (after dropping H-bomb on Hiroshima or consequences from Nazi Germany) and went on to create a milieu of research regarding how people process effects of traumatic situations. The work upheld propaganda models used in World War II as relevant processes of how to conduct psychological warfare.

The research conducted was then used to group people into numbers and variables and further confirm status in narrow categories in order to understand how they behave, albeit a linear lens. As a result of understanding behaviors, early communication scholars then formulated ways to modify the populaces’ actions and behaviors in what became varying sub fields of communication. Audience became a term synonymous with capital. In order to get the audience to buy what was being sold (verbal, ideological or material capital) there was a need to perfect a process to achieve these ends. Through political rhetoric and well prepared linguistic methods such as presupposition and implicature, audiences were (and still are) won over by perceived authority. Source credibility became a goal to achieve despite using manipulative or deceptive means. And International Communication became a study to force political ideology onto other countries. Through this whole process a malignant normalization has occurred. From the early 1950’s to present, the taken-for-granted history displays a large gap of understanding in the field; understanding how to step outside of obsolete principles to conceive of communication as more than an instrumental imposition of will onto others. Whether the word is communication (and all varying sub-fields), spin, rhetoric, or strategy, propaganda by any other name is still propaganda.

In the following pages, I will expand on the discourse analysis aspect of this research that specifically references words I searched for and the results I found. The words I chose to search for were words that re-emerged throughout the book numerous times and in different contexts. The commonality of thought, from the authors that contributed to the book, stretch across themes of communication regardless of subtitles. Through allowing the book *The Process and Effects of Mass Communication* to speak as closely as possible to the original context, the basis of a canon becomes apparent in subsequent analysis.

Background

In tandem with the logical positivist philosophy inherent in the text, which I will refer to here-forward as “Process,” I present the writing as replete with militaristic and/or linear thought. How this genre of language is used within the discourse analysis painted in this historical picture is the premise for the field of study understood today. The book *Culture and Imperialism* by Edward Said (1993), discusses continua this way:

[T.S. Eliot’s] synthesis of past, present, and future, however, is idealistic and in important ways a function of his own peculiar history; also, its conception of time leaves out the combativeness with which individuals and institutions decide on what is tradition and what is not, what relevant and what not. But his central idea is valid: how we formulate or represent the past shapes our understanding and views of the present (p. 34).

There is a genre of language perpetuated in “Process” that adheres to scientific denotations of thought within academia. The reference to people as subjects (through experiments or empirical research findings) legitimizes the perception inherent in the text that implicates people solely on their “usefulness.” Not only as subjects within a research experiment but, also, the construct of people as objects, participants, audience members, or observant in a large empirical system definitively separates the totality of complexity from the person. Neatly organized labels and definitions place people in obtuse houses of efficient understanding. The only interpreters of this environment then, are experts who created the simulation.

Results of this erudite language, as aligned with scientific conceptions of how to gauge actions related to themes of communication, has become an area used for consumerist exploitation. Even if the earliest intentions of reference to people in this light was for benevolence, the resulting objectification has produced gaping holes illuminated in categorical terms such as “us” and “them.” Also, the ability to understand people in diverse and multifaceted cultures as evolved over time becomes reduced to predictability through quantitative analysis, such as percentiles and ratios. Totalities of populations, in groups and individually speaking, have been stripped of holistic interpretations while scientists conduct the melody of marginal predictability in the social sciences.

The following tables are drawn from the software program Document Explorer, which was used to complete the discourse analysis.¹ The words I chose for this paper relate to the theme of militaristic and/or linear frameworks that define the book. For example, in plugging in a search for the words Propag*, Milit*, and War*, one of these words is found every nine words throughout the 562 page book. Of the words, Nazi*, German*, and Fuehrer*, one of these words will be found every 34 words in the book. To give foresight, there are approximately between 400-500 words per page. The second set of words used denotes the increased sense of vernacular influenced from World War II.

¹ The book *Process and Effects of Mass Communication* was indexed through a database, Document Explorer 6.0. Since no electronic version of the original edition is available, the book was manually scanned into a MS Word document and edited for scanning errors. Next, the document was indexed into a database and formatted to the nuances of Document Explorer as the last step in this conversion before analysis.

Table 1

	Propag* ²	Milit*	War*
Total # of times used	753	138	622
Highest Use by Author	Ernst Kris, Nathan Leites, Leonard Doob, Joseph Klapper	Hans Speier, Leonard Doob, Edward A. Shils, Morris Janowitz	Hans Speier, Edward Shils, Morris Janowitz, Ernst Kris
Highest Use by Chapter Title	Goebbels' Principles of Propaganda, Trends in Twentieth Century Propaganda, Mass Media and Persuasion	Psychological Warfare Reconsidered, Goebbels' Principles of Propaganda, Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II	Psychological Warfare Reconsidered, Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II, Trends in Twentieth Century Propaganda

Table 2

	German*	Nazi*	Fuehrer*
Total # of Times Used	326	87	9
Highest Use by Author	Leonard Doob, Edward Shils, Morris Janowitz, Ernst Kris, Nathan Leites	Ernst Shils, Morris Janowitz, Leonard Doob, Eugene Hartley, Ruth Hartley, Clyde Hart	Edward Shils, Morris Janowitz, Leonard Doob
Highest Use by Chapter Title	Goebbels' Principles of Propaganda, Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II, Trends in Twentieth Century Propaganda	Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II, Goebbels' Principles of Propaganda, Attitudes and Opinions	Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II, Goebbels' Principles of Propaganda

Table 3

Word(s) Used	Attit* & Chang*	Audie* & psych*	Audie*& chang*
Total # of Times Used	626	376	401
Highest Use by Author	Eugene Hartley, Ruth Hartley, Clyde Hart, Joseph Klapper, William Buchanan, Hadley Cantril	Eliot Freidson, Wilbur Schramm, Joseph Klapper	Eliot Freidson, Wilbur Schramm, Joseph Klapper
Highest Use by Chapter	Attitudes and Opinions, Mass Media and Persuasion, National Stereotypes	Communications Research and the Concept of the Mass, The Process of Communication, Mass Media and Persuasion	Communications Research and the Concept of the Mass, The Process of Communication, Mass Media and Persuasion

² The symbol "*" denotes all forms associated with the root word. For example, "Propag*" represents "propaganda" as well as "propagandist," "propaganditis," "propagate," and any other words found with propag* as the root.

Table 4

Word Used	Communic*	Propag*	Milit*	Politic*	Power*
Word association (most used words neighboring original search term)	Mass, international, opinion, process, credibility, channels, research, effect, audience	Goebbels, Policy, Allied, Monopoly, Enemy, Russian, German, Goals, Lasswell, Task	Elite, Germany's, Political, Range, Fight, Counter-Elite, Deception, Supreme, Wished, Ability	Elite, Range, International, Warfare, Military, Decisions, Economic, Power, Organizational, Objectives	Seizure, Rival, Elite, Struggle, Aim, Ruling, Regime, Reactive, Bloc, Economize,

“Linguistic” within this paper refers to the analysis of the language in the book “Process,” and is unpacked in the diverse themes presented. Primarily, however, this refers to the ways in which authors present language as presupposition and implicature. Thomas et al. (2004) describes language as mediated understandings of reality through the system of signs historically available to us. The encoding of symbols called language is more a reflection of culture than individuality and can therefore be more easily normalized (Thomas et. al, 2004). While communication science argues for an objective sensibility, the argument itself is mired in realities that cannot be escaped for purposes of analysis. All signs are rooted deeply in cultural practices defining “vantage” points. The ideology that seeps into societal cracks becomes a paradigm implemented from agreed upon amorphous sources of “power.” The potential to use ideology to control the way people believe and think can be achieved through well-placed linguistic techniques. This becomes then, the locus for research: to perfect and dispel linguistic power to would-be propagandists within many areas of the public sphere.

The ways in which language is laden with power techniques, resuming with presupposition and implicature, can lead the person at the “end” of the communication chain to make assumptions not necessarily referenced in the text, rather implied. This technique allows for a scapegoat clause since the speaker did not actually *state* what is implied. Implicature and presupposition become a discourse especially rooted in advertising, political discourse, and prevalent in the book “Process.” The results of these tools create difficulty for the audience to denote and or reject perceptions communicated. Overall, the problem with utilizing these types of techniques lead to taken-for-granted stances when in actuality, the statement(s) are open for deliberation (Thomas et. al 2004).

The Book

The processes of communication, if such methods can exist, are saturated throughout the book “Process.” An overflow of ways in which to identify, improve, and solidify propaganda in communication, seeps across contributions. From all authors a consistent message bleeds across the first page to the last page: communication as a power to control. In many ways “propaganda” becomes synonymous with “communication.” A definition of communication as pointed out in Chris Simpson’s book, “The Science of Coercion” describes the initial definition, etymologically speaking, as the sharing of duties. As the book “Process” ensues the definition of communication that becomes shaped looks more like an imposition of will onto others (Simpson 1994). Propaganda becomes situated where the word communication is used. While each author has ideas of what communication is, manipulation and/or deception substitutes for alternate views of possibilities of a shared democratic community.

The demarcation of propaganda in “Process” (1954) is a straightforward explanation, “A deliberately evoked and guided campaign to induce people to accept a given view, sentiment, or value. Its peculiarity is that in seeking to attain this end it does not give fair consideration to opposing views” (p. 376). While at first glance this statement may appear critical of the ends of propaganda, the book’s course is lined with explicit statements regarding the necessity for propaganda. The audience may not know what they need, however, the authorities or “powers that be” do and they are not squeamish about using coercion to justify preservation of a nation while fervently defending the “status quo.” Often times the necessity for propaganda in the book is predicated on the fears, experiences, and lessons that war arouses.

Sole contributions and collaborations by varying authors prime the field of communication by problematizing varying behaviors and motivations of audiences. The goal through much of the book is to locate and pass on (through ensuing education) the key to unlocking methods in which an audience’s attention will be forced.

This is accomplished through quantitative analysis. Tables, graphs, and psycho-analysis drawing on scientific methods (personality, etc...) to predict and decode actions, is the modus operandi that is relied upon in the book.

Waples, Berelson, and Bradshaw (1954) analyze the situation of a boy who rejects certain editorials because "his intelligence and training, his combined motives urged him toward publications stressing urgency of solution, sudden persuasion, and specific goals" (p.67). Another analysis is drawn to the "opposite extreme". "We have the lonely, inferior, introverted reader, dissatisfied with herself, her family, and the social order." The female in this scenario has never read anything save certain editorials that the male in the former scenario rejected. She is analyzed from the vantage point that "the reader's sex, limited schooling, low occupational status, and other handicaps explain her attitudes of inferiority and insecurity" (p. 67). Polarizations of experiences from varying cultural vantage points are relied heavily upon. Differences between men and women in this article are grouped according to cultural norms of the 1950's: men are defined by their intellect and status outside of the home and women are defined by their domesticity and lack of understanding of the world around them. Gender, as well as class differences, describe not only why certain people read, also, speaks toward behaviors that certain groups find favorable and deem acceptable.

What follows from explanations on grasping and retaining audience behavior is: "The Effect of Different Channels." Joseph Klapper (1954) describes the "Comparative Effects of the Various Media" as, "*effectiveness* of the various media as instruments of informal pedagogy and of persuasion" (p. 91). Through experiments that measure retention of given material and alterations of audience attitude, Klapper can investigate preferable forms of media through empirical evidence. The type of conclusions drawn are, for example that "Radio was also established as the more common agent for *changes* in vote intention" as well as benefits for each genus of media. There was found a "pedagogical and persuasive effectiveness of mass media supplemented by face-to-face contact" (p. 102). This has been demonstrated by controlled experiments and Klapper cites, "The combined use of mass media and face-to-face contact has characterized several highly successful propaganda campaigns. The propaganda successes of Father Coughlin, the Nazis, and the Soviet Union are cases in point." Interpretive psychoanalysis supports these powerful techniques as does the appeal of mass media and face to face contact. Klapper describes this utility: "Their analysis of its peculiar power emphasizes the manner in which such a combination provides the audience with certain psychological requisites of suggestibility" (p. 103).

"Getting the Meaning Understood" with the first contribution by David Krech and Richard Crutchfield, "Perceiving the World," frames the next major category in "Process." While these authors discuss determinants of perception from a functional analysis, the next author, Leonard Doob (1954) engages the audience with the "Perception of Propaganda." Doob starts out by taking the reader on a "sense" journey in which all of the tactile senses are stimulated deriving from brain reception of this sensory experience. The purpose of this is engaged in a debate between physiologists and psychologists and the nuances between what is consciously perceived and what is established as stimuli in an environment. The purpose of these statements explains ways in which perception can be morphed into a habit. Therefore, propaganda must be perceived for effect to take place.

The war propagandist seeks desperately to break through the perceptual barriers which the enemy erects to prevent the home and fighting fronts from hearing or seeing anything which might be demoralizing. The propagandist who does not reach his audience is a failure from the outset (p. 140).

While Doob's analysis solidified the use of creating a "propaganda drug," the next authors in "Process" provided the paraphernalia through guise of psychological analysis.

A section by Gordon Allport and Leo Postman deemed: "The Basic Psychology of Rumor" focuses exclusively on wartime rumors. Experimental approaches leave the "broader social setting of the problem" to pose the question: "what processes in the human mind account for the spectacular distortions and exaggerations that enter into the rumor process and lead to so much damage to the public intelligence and public conscience?" Through "leveling, sharpening, and assimilation" the embedding process is explained. One of the major conclusions Allport and Postman make is that:

A subjective structuring process is started [result of embedding]. Although the process is complex (involving as it does, leveling, sharpening, and assimilation), its essential nature can be characterized as an effort to reduce the stimulus to a simple and meaningful structure (p. 154).

Alexander Leighton and Morris Opler (1954) collaborate on the first article in the section "Communicating to Another Culture," with their analysis, "Psychiatry and Applied Anthropology in Psychological Warfare against Japan." Leighton and Opler analyze the Japanese on the basis of WWII and American perceptions of Japanese

society and culture through “fighting forces.” The Japanese morale was perceived as an unmovable structure of collaborative strength in their military “with every enemy soldier an ideal fighting machine—fearless, fanatic, obeying instantly without question and looking only for an opportunity to die for the Emperor.” Since this was the collective view of Japanese culture, the United States needed to prepare for a long and costly war. The immediate conclusion drawn was that every Japanese force would need to be eradicated regardless of how hopeless the situation. There would be a “painful process of taking Japan foot by foot and of endless mopping up behind the lines wherever Japanese were left alive” (p. 157). In an attempt to circumvent fatalities, the question in Leighton and Opler’s article addresses whether psychological warfare could reduce the enemy’s fighting effectiveness and whether the Japanese would be more apt to surrender. The pervasiveness of this question was applied to civilians and whether the morale on the “home front” would be comparable to that of the Japanese fighting forces. In an effort to predict the enemy, Leighton and Opler use metaphors of medical practice, specifically, psychiatry to deepen the understanding of what the enemy may be thinking. When Japanese were prolonged to military defeat for a substantial amount of time, the results would be a decrease in morale (p. 159). The purpose of this research is for gauging the “right time” to embark on a psychological warfare campaign. Psychology and an understanding of Japanese people’s feelings and beliefs are understood and modified through group pressure. While Leighton and Opler were not proponents of war, per se, they ascribed to psychological manipulation of others and psychological warfare as a way to conserve economic outpouring toward war.

Within the category “Communicating to Another Culture” is an article authored by Ralph White (1954) titled, “The New Resistance to International Propaganda.” While initially asserting the prevalence and unrest with the word, propaganda, White goes on to explain that antagonism toward the term is a disservice to achieving effectiveness specifically, in combating communists. Regardless of the upheaval surrounding propaganda by those who belittle potential effectiveness of propagandist action, there is a need to improve upon the “weaknesses” of a slippery slope. White uses communist and soviet military tensions as justification for correcting the decline of the word. In order to achieve a successful democracy, America needs to embrace the reasons for using propaganda to combat soviet aggressiveness and preserve a non-communist world.

First, our *actions* must be in line with our words. The propaganda of the deed is more potent than the propaganda of the word, and the propaganda of the word is effective in direct proportion to the deeds which it is able to publicize (p. 181).

“Modifying Attitudes and Opinions” is the fourth major category. In continuing with the continuity of the theme, Charles Osgood and Percy Tannenbaum (1954) co-authored “Attitude Change and the Principle of Congruity.” Their research points out specific variables rolled into what becomes attitude theory and measurement. The variables of “existing attitude toward the source of a message, existing attitude toward the concept evaluated by the source, and the nature of the evaluative assertion which relates to the source and concept in the message” (p. 251). In presenting the scales of this empirically driven research, the labels attached to analysis derived in the form of “good, bad, fair, unfair, valuable, worthless...and the like.” In order to conduct the research comparatively there was a need for a *generalized attitude scale* (p. 252). This scale is useful in determining congruity in order to anticipate attitude change. Osgood and Tannenbaum note that linguistic assertions of implicature and presupposition shape congruity or incongruity and the latter cannot exist in neutral statements. The authors create their “generalized measuring instrument which provides quantitative unites of attitude for any object of judgment” for the purpose of locating maximum congruity. For example, the audience’s attitudes (measured by the scale mentioned) can be analyzed in order for perceptions to be changed through (speakers) presenting congruent statements or ideas to gain favorable reception (p. 259).

After research is explained on how to change opinions on a controversial subject, Hovland and Walter Weiss (1954) launch into the perceived next step: “The Influence of Source Credibility on Communication Effectiveness.” Continuing in the fashion of the books predecessors, importance is necessitated through evaluating audience attitudes toward the communicator. As most communication students are taught, prestige is a large factor in credibility. Impression management can be relegated to a whole course in communication departments. Responsiveness to an unsavory source can be circumvented when suspicion arises. Alignment with the communicator or mass media sources rests in methodologically gaining audience trust. The question becomes: how is credibility gained when sources are perceived as “untrustworthy?”

The present study was designed to minimize methodological difficulties by experimentally controlling the source and checking effects of the source in a situation in which the subject’s own opinion was obtained without reference to the source (p. 276).

The matter of untrustworthiness becomes a moot point. The difficulties that come with ascertaining trustworthiness are shown to subside after a gap in time and not immediately after the particular communication. This phenomenon has been dubbed as the “sleeper effect” (p. 276). As the passing of time fades (after initial unfavorable communication) so does the memory of “who said what to whom...” and a once negative perception can transcend into a favorable position of “what was communicated” while forgetting “who communicated it.” The results found factual information that may have transpired in communication was irrelevant to conclusions of constructed credibility. This credibility could be attained more “effectively” in light of group consensus and influence.

Communication can be synonymous with “groups” in certain circles of academia and social constructs. In “Effects in Terms of Groups” Herbert Blumer (1954) inaugurates this section with his essay: “The Crowd, the Public, and the Mass.” Collective behavior has been psychoanalyzed and prominent in early theorists’ work such as Plato, Descartes, and more modern social theorists such as Arendt and Mills. While those mentioned take varying stances on explanations of collective behavior Blumer asserts that an understanding of the crowd, the public and the mass is a priori in implicating propaganda. He breaks this down in expanding on the types, formation, characteristics, and varying expressive crowds to determine order and authority within. The struggle between individuality and cohesion in masses creates tension and suggestibility can fill the gaps created by antithetical roles within the mass. The mass is however, ultimately distinguished by their homogeneity. As the tension between varying roles surfaces, “organization” sinks and “effective” communication can cease. Therefore public opinion can step in, hold the reigns and resume solidarity under certain influences. Influences arise out of discourse where concessions are made and the public can “act as a unit.” While the descriptions of varying factions of social groups seem benign up to this point, a shift occurs in which Blumer addresses the insidiousness of propaganda:

Propaganda can be thought of as a deliberately evoked and guided campaign to induce people to accept a given view, sentiment, or value. Its peculiarity is that in seeking to attain this end it does not give fair consideration to opposing views. The end is dominant and the means are subservient to this end. Hence, we find that a primary characteristic of propaganda is the effort to gain the acceptance of a view not on the basis of the merits of that view, but instead, by appealing to other motives (p. 377).

While at once Blumer seems to acknowledge the “mold” of propaganda and the deceitfulness of playing upon emotions, attitudes and feelings disguised as logic, he nonetheless prescribes propaganda as a successful way for groups to collaborate and adhere to prevailing norms. Blumer’s cognition of propaganda’s downfalls does not prevent him advocating for its uses. This is representative of a larger theme in the book: cognition of propaganda’s short-comings, yet a zealous inclination to advocate for the many and varied uses- regardless. While some authors at once recognize inequalities produced in this environment, they end up devoting most of their work to fervently selling the functions of propaganda. As well, they concoct ways of making deceit and manipulation *more* effective. Recognition of the traps and deceitful purposes, do not slow the propaganda process. The tenets of propaganda multiply with all the focus placed on improving methods and expansion of uses. Through trying to determine what motivations the authors subscribe to, there is an insidious thread in attempting to understand how cognitive realizations of wrong-doings persist. In light of this antithetical relationship, sociological analysis within communication studies remains focused through constricting ideology.

While a perception can be justified in recognizing the lack of sociological analysis of degenerating social structures created in these varying pools of propaganda, an essay presents a once hopeful glimpse into an overlooked analysis. “A Sociological Approach to Communications Research” by Matilda While Riley and John Riley (1954) commences with a need to understand the social structures in which attitudes and opinions are formed. The authors proclaim a need for further “communications research” to be directed. However, the direction in which this research should head is apparently another justification for examining “operational terms...and long neglected social factors in the process of opinion formation” (p. 389). Taking Mannheim’s analyses a need is thrown out in which “a description and structural analysis of the ways in which social relationships, in fact, influence thought.” Through empirical evidence in the “sociology of knowledge” impulses can be derived from this “sociological” awareness. This also presents a challenge as to whether,

Operationally adequate techniques can be devised to effectively and accurately measure the relationship between the social position of the recipient of a communicated message and his awareness, rejection, acceptance, or distortion of the message itself (p. 390).

Through charts and percentages research is conducted toward children and how they attain perceptions as well as how this relates to their social groups. Regardless of age, public conduct is an integral idea in understanding

communication, especially within this text. Peer influence and issues of resulting conformity press into the public and private sphere. The political implications are supportive of an economic purpose driving capital and supporting a consumerist democracy. Ideas of morals become subservient to motives of policy. Where there might have been a once strong and assertive voice coming from an engaged public citizen is left a passive, compliant (albeit vox) audience member as citizen. The conduct of citizens is modeled by the political. Hannah Arendt discusses the political realm as being solely judged on conduct, whereas, morals are inclusive of for example, intentions (Arendt 1982).

Emphasis on the concept of audience is not embryonic in the field of communication. Twenty five (out of thirty nine), or sixty-four percent, of the segmented pieces in "Process" include mention of audience in varying contexts. The catchphrase thrown around in the field of communication is the goal of "targeting the audience." In order for a "speaker" to get across the "message" there is a requirement of "framing" an opinion, idea, etc... to nestle inconspicuously between speaker and audience. In the branch of communication known as advertising or public relations the need for "just the right message" dictates perfection of how to direct and massage audience conception. The perfunctory nature of audience studies was a heavy intrigue sparked prior to "Process" being published and continues today. An abundance of behavior studies conducted largely by psychiatrists and psychologists (aka communication scholars) directly deals with the problem of audience perceptions. Tied to the audience is its other half, so to speak: reductionism. As reductionism uses ready-made labels to synthesize (dumb-down) information for audiences, a process of coercing audiences becomes less taxing and possibilities for capital increase. Ed McLuskie (2009) says:

Anticipating the globalization of the audience commodity in advanced capitalism, Smythe (1977) located the audience labor within "free time" and "leisure," joining "the monopoly capitalist lexicon alongside "free world," "free enterprise," "free elections," "free speech," and "free flow" of information (p. 13).

The history and problems with ideas of audience commodity was not just a domestic issue. The notions imparted by the voices in "Process" regarded cultural communication or international communication as one more war to win. They perceive diverse cultural audiences as less a field for understanding intricacies of an established culture (traditions, beliefs, texts) for the sake of reciprocity. The opportunity presented is more about surface understanding of the culture for coercion. These explanations are born out of linear desire to draw out how to form and change opinions favorable to United States policy and specifically, militaristic endeavors.

Tying in with issues pertaining to international audiences, the next major category in "Process," discusses the "Special Problems of Achieving an Effect with International Communications." The first authors, W. Phillips Davison and Alexander George (1954), launch into these perceived problems describing why studies of international communications have been nascent. One reason is attributed to the study of international communications as cross disciplinary. The authors believe that one field of study needs to possess the expertise of data regarding human behavior, in lieu of many varying fields within the social sciences. The second reason, dealing with complexities of communication, addresses systematic study:

As we turn our attention to international political communication, where the "who" is a complicated propaganda apparatus in one culture, the "whom" is often an amorphous audience in another culture, and the purposes and circumstances are bound up with all the intricacies of international relations, then it is clear that we are not yet qualified to undertake a *systematic* study of international political communication (p. 434).

Another main reason given for embryonic notions of international communication is due to effect. Because effects have not been fully understood by social scientists, a successful "propaganda campaign" cannot be enforced. Effectiveness is explained through the statement made by Davison and George, "whether or not the audience likes or buys the product" (p.434). Communicative policies are vital then, to national policies concerning the international structure. Communication policy, behavior and content can take international policies and merge this with action:

...a broadcast, a leaflet, a diplomatic note- and so on...study of communication behavior includes consideration of the machinery by which communication policy is transformed [and there is a need to study] personnel who operate this machinery... (439).

While the authors momentarily diverge into the specifics of how policies can be employed, understood, etc...the focus returns back to the notion of effectiveness. The environment in which communication is received becomes

imperative to understand, most importantly, within the audience. This is referred to as “conditions” of communication. “The conditions of any given communication [referring to propaganda] include such matters as “timeliness,” whether it is forced to compete...or enjoys a monopoly position.” The actions of communication shape what the audience conceives and this can be accomplished by the propagandist exaggerating the story or giving it an “angle” (p.440). The desired impact of the audience provided a certain type of lens with which to “understand” what takes place, the purpose of communicative action. Returning again to the audience, Davison and George write, “this means that an important part of our audience or “target” analysis must be to assess in detail the political structure and dynamic political processes... How is power and influence distributed” (p.440)? Because studies of the audience can become overly involved with intricate details, the audience must be reduced to the reference of a specific attitude or behavior in which the propagandist wishes to impart. This article clearly presents the stance on the relationship procured within international communications, if not what “is,” then what “should be” from a narrow canal of thought. The notion of empire becomes very clear within “Process” as the United States, after WWII, attempts to force domestic policies and political ideologies in the laps of “other” countries in the name of “democracy” over communism.

There is a domestic perception that the United States is responsible for procuring democracy all over the world – despite opinions and deeply rooted cultures elsewhere. Some arguments refer to the monetary gain to be had by controlling other countries and political processes. Others, such as the authors in “Process” would maintain that other countries need political direction, hence, propaganda. Said, and historian Patrick O’Brien (1993) discuss the profitability of empires in noting,

We are at a point in our work when we can no longer ignore empires and the imperial context in our studies... the propaganda for an expanding empire [which] created illusions of security and false expectations that high returns would accrue to those who invested beyond its boundaries (p. 6).

The ways in which propaganda is secured can occur through specific actions: physical force, coercion (psychological warfare) or through social and cultural dependence (p.9). Authors in “Process” found psychological warfare to be best suited for matters of international purpose.

Under implicit pretense of saving lives, the section devoted to international communication emphasizes, “Psychological Warfare Reconsidered.” A lengthy explanation is given on the inadequacies of psychological warfare, how this can best be utilized, the ability and will to fight, and the democratic fallacy in mass propaganda. The fallacy is that what is portrayed in mass propaganda has to be for the control of audience to align beliefs with the propagandist. As a result, whatever picture is portrayed should be constructed based on what authorities deem necessary. Much of what Hans Speier (1954) emphasizes is “structure” within the political community through examples of using deliberate misconceptions. His specific analyses involve studying deception, political warfare (for or against) elites, and illuminating his explanations from German and/or Soviet actions. For example, Speier uses an example from Hitler (speaking to General Jodl) in order to illuminate the benefits of deception. The communicative transaction involves a false report given to the English in order to arouse suspicion that Russians (led by communist generals) will march into Germany, and Hitler says, “I told the Foreign minister to do that. That will make them [English] feel as if someone had stuck a needle into them” (p.468).

Philip Selznick (1954) concludes the book summing up the entire sweep of the book:

We must conclude...in the long view [that] political combat plays only a tactical role. Great social issues, such as those which divide communism and democracy, are not decided by political combat, perhaps not even by military clashes. They are decided by the relative ability of the contending systems to win and to maintain enduring loyalties (p. 562).

Messages become the linguistic embedding of the idea that political combat and military actions are inseparable and should prevail. The view of communication is conceived through camouflage-colored lenses. Selznick speaks of “contending systems,” “win,” and “combat” to elucidate functions of psychological warfare inherent in communication. The polarizations are representative perceptions of communication. If not winning, then losing; if not rising, then descending; and in absence of power and cunning, there must be weakness. Latent implications of manipulation and deception from this early textbook for generations of communication scholars provide bearings that persist in conceptions and orientations of communication.

Conclusion

How far can one get from history before realizing that the past is present all along—in a different shape, form, manner, perhaps, but still bound by the texts and traditions of history? This history has shaped the present to the extent of forgetting or taking for granted. There is a parable of a proverbial fish seemingly unaware of the water she has been surrounded by the whole time. The story progresses, but the fundamental nature is that this water has a history embedded in the everyday life of the fish (regardless of cognizance). In practical application of this parable within academia, to what degree is cognition surrounding world views connected to the history and culture form which we are cultivated? When ideas (realities) become taken for granted there is necessarily a lack of questioning. What this implies is a lack of understanding of the future as well as the present. The book, “Propaganda and Persuasion” (2006), cites Jacques Ellul’s ramifications of propaganda stating: “Because propaganda is instantaneous, it destroys one’s sense of history and disallows critical reflection” (p.4).

While Ellul notes here the negative implications of propaganda he also justifies the use of the word. Ellul sees propaganda as a necessary way in which mass society can participate in civic events and exercise their democracy. He expands further to say that there are no “moral forms” associated with propaganda on the ambiguous note that propaganda uses, “truth, half truth, and limited truth” (p.4). The logic is: because there is *some* truth, there are no immoral implications on the term- propaganda. If persuasion has no moral forms, then emphasis on ascertaining how people feel and behave regarding the persuasion would seem irrelevant. In that context, determining the morality of people is very relevant and helpful to do “effective” propaganda. To what extent do the people being primed for propaganda retain their sense of feelings and emotions as something uniquely their own? What ends up happening to the feelings emoted is capitalization of how to direct these reactions in a beneficial way for the propagandist.

In many instances, the use of persuasion via pathos is what is most heavily relied upon. The social-psychological research completed within “Process” attempts to draw out people’s emotions in order to, if not predict, then win-over support through emotionally deceptive messages. Ellul’s justifications of propaganda are based on the normalization: everyone uses propaganda. This is predicated on a necessity to continue traditions which leads me to ask the question, if there are parts to a tradition, what sections should be maintained through ever changing times? Even now, as the tradition of how marriage is defined enters into social consciousness, so do the inevitable challenges presented when power structures are asked to change or accommodate those not included in this tradition.

The militaristic or linear terminology prevalent throughout the book “Process” can best be described by Finley (2003) in her article, “Militarism goes to school” when she notes: “Militarism refers to a set of values or ideologies that include hierarchical relationships and domination” (p.1). The reference to hierarchy and domination arises out of a time in history in which the field of communication was struggling to create a culture amidst international power struggles. Political and economic motives were weighed against the backdrop of two world wars and the mist settling into a tense cold war with the Soviet Union. The authorities making decisions were doing so from militaristic and scientific worldviews as this was a credible tradition within this patriarchy. This way of making decisions leaves out many voices from being engaged in actions that countries act upon. While democracies have attempted to alleviate this issue through bi-partisan representation and democratic principles, the tenets of capitalism, and specifically consumer consumption, plague the process through material distractions.

Converting “audience” beliefs for political gain or economic incentive is a necessary step in a process, producing civic incompetence. Democracy cannot thrive when critical citizenship has been replaced with complicit citizenship. Notions from political representation to claiming an education have been normalized as taken for granted actions/behaviors in society. Therefore, how can the actions of voting for political representation or claiming an education increase a society’s desire to engage in civic responsibilities? An integral part of this question that remains buried in political rhetoric is: what exactly is political representation and education if not a way to engage people as citizens of a democracy? Consequently to what extent should people, outside of “strategically placed propaganda” be a part of their community and world? If desires have been replaced by impulses then the power to be grasped is through control of these impulses. Propaganda has seeped so deeply into this reactive culture that redemption through action becomes muted and unnecessary. The content perfected by audience experts becomes a democracy only understood and defined by experts. Passivity is submerged under the force of the credibility of authoritarian mandates. Through passive actions, everything from politics to civic domains become areas for the expansion of capital, i.e. power. Meanwhile, the potentially engaged citizens have checked into technological enchantment conceived of by another venue of experts; scientific experts that have given the people “what they want”: I-pods, plasma screen TV’s, and arbitrary internet information. Through these advances, this culture maintains a masquerade of participation. Can responsibility of a more hopeful future be found in the same residence

that fostered these experts: academia? If there is a corner on responsibility regarding hope for the future, academia can shed some insight into the pseudo-involved society mentioned here.

Speaking in the sphere of academia, Henry Giroux (2006) addresses the problem of complicit citizens. However, he replaces this with the hope of *inspired* critical citizens within a democracy as he claims:

Critical pedagogy is not a method looking for an audience or context; on the contrary, it is a practice that emerges out of its allegiance to the imperatives of a democracy...critical pedagogy is one of the few theoretical and pedagogical traditions that offers the history, knowledge, skills and theories [that promotes] the connection between learning and social responsibility, and schooling and democracy (p.8).

While Giroux claims that pedagogy is the answer, this is premised on academia taking a larger role in the sphere of education as a form of democracy. What results is unlimited questioning and a sustained dialogue that asks questions of what is taken for granted. There is no assumed empirical stance on necessarily what is “right” and experts are unnecessary. Experts are realized as a fallacy of people who assume all-knowing. In a time when history is so fragmented, and often forgotten, that the possibility of possessing omnipotence becomes absurd. In the absence of supremacy, communication can come closer to the etymological function as a way to share burdens and duties.

The field of communication has not travelled very far from the roots of canonical empiricism. The notion that the voices best to be listened to are that of academics, political leaders, and other “influential” (powerful) figures still directs the field. Their responsibility is manifest as the elusive “man” behind the curtain conducting necessary activities and largely shaping the present and future through perpetuating or concealing understanding of a rich and somewhat haunting past, a past ripe with: “effectiveness” via reductionism, scientific objectives for measuring behavior and attitude change, and ideas of “manufacturing consent.” Separating people into categories and groups produces quicker assessments for deriving methods to break into their thoughts and desires; this is an applauded research endeavor, as well as, perfecting psychological “warfare” in order to levy the status quo. Limiting access or affinity with a holistic past via preoccupations with deceptive messages is a wide spread academic practice. It was Voltaire that said, “Those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities.” In an illustrative example, Goebbels is quoted as saying that the “secret” of propaganda is for those being persuaded to never know they are consumed by propaganda’s grip (Pratkanis & Aronson, p. 87). Through a numbing effect of the language used to accomplish this effect, people then become pawns across domestic and international political, social, and economic rhetorical checkerboards.

While the language surrounding the essence of propaganda has turned into insidious threads in varying sub-disciplines in communication studies, this is an ever present practice. Words like “spin,” “rhetoric,” and many other colorful metaphors have replaced propaganda. Public speaking courses preach how to structure a speech in order to reel the audience in, and the imperative of “knowing your audience” is practiced. Public relations perfect ideas of impression management in order to represent companies’ favorably (regardless of reputation). Persuasion courses are the equivalent of a “how-to” manual of “doing” propaganda in order to win over the audience. Still much research conducted in the field focuses on how people behave and how people feel, for example, about a specific product, in order to perfect the media message for maximum consumption. Drawing upon theoretical models used in Nazi Germany or Soviet Russia have been normalized and reincarnated through more present interpretations in modern theory books. While the book *Process* has been buried under years of forgotten history, the voices and the messages they emphasized are alive and well in 21st century communication studies. Under the umbrella of achieving hegemony are those forgotten voices present in *Process* and now manifest in the praxis of the communication discipline. Regardless of time, place, or space, history is but a whisper away.

Works Cited

- [1] Arendt, H., & Beiner, R. (1982). *Lectures on Kant’s political philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [2] Gee, J. P. (1990). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. Critical perspectives on literacy and education. London: Falmer Press.
- [3] Giroux, H. A. (2006). *Beyond the spectacle of terrorism: global uncertainty and the challenge of the new media*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- [4] Giroux, H. (2004). War on terror: The militarising of public space and culture in the United States. *Third Text*, 18(4), 1-12.
- [5] Hardt, H. (1992). *Critical communication studies: Communication, history, and theory in America*. London: Routledge.

- [6] Jowett, G. S. (2006). *Propaganda and persuasion: new and classic essays*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- [7] McLaren, P., & Jaramillo, N. E. (2007). *Pedagogy and praxis in the age of empire: towards a new humanism*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- [8] McLuskie, E. (2009). Resituating the audience concept of communication: lessons from the audience-commodity critique. In L. Foreman-Wernet & B. Dervin (Eds.), *Audiences and the arts: communication perspectives* (pp. 151-172). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- [9] McLuskie, E. (2010). Living in worlds we'd like to live in: capitalist utopias in an age of counterfactuality. In L. Manca & A. Manca (Eds.), *Images of men, women, and utopia in the advertising age: a critical reader* (Chapter 1). Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- [10] Pratkanis, A. R., & Aronson, E. (1992). *Age of propaganda: The everyday use and abuse of persuasion*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- [11] Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Knopf.
- [12] Simpson, C. (1994). *Science of coercion: Communication research and psychological warfare, 1945-1960*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Literature Reviewed

- [13] Black, J. (2001). Semantics and ethics of propaganda. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 16(2-3), 121-137.
- [14] Department of Defense. (2003). *Information Operations Roadmap*. Department of Defense.
- [15] Halloran, R. (2007). Strategic communication. *Parameters-US Army War College Quarterly, Autumn*, 4-14.
- [16] Johnson, M., & Meyeraan, J. (2003). Military deception: Hiding the real—showing the fake. Unpublished paper. Joint Forces Military College-College of Combined Warfighting School.
- [17] Kamalipour, Y. R. (Ed.). (2004). *War, media, and propaganda: A global perspective*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- [18] Korey, W. (2001). *NGOs and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: a curious grapevine*. New York: Palgrave.
- [19] Needell, A. A. (2007). "Truth Is Our Weapon": Project TROY, political warfare, and government-academic relations in the national security state. *Diplomatic history*, 17(3), 399-420.
- [20] Nietzsche, F. (1989). *On the genealogy of morals*. (W.A. Kaufmann, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.
- [21] Noelle-Neumann, E. (1993). *The Spiral of silence: public opinion, our social skin*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [22] Rogers, E. M. (n.d.). *Book Rags*. Retrieved November 20, 2008, from *Encyclopedia of Communication and Information*: <http://www.bookrags.com/research/schramm-wilbur-1907-1987-eci-03/>
- [23] Simpson, C. (1994). Internalization and enforcement of the dominant paradigm. In *Science of coercion: Communication research and psychological warfare, 1945-1960* (pp. 94-106). New York: Oxford University.
- [24] Simpson, C. (1994). The Legacy of Psychological Warfare. In *Science of Coercion: Communication Research and Psychological Warfare, 1945-1960* (pp. 107-17). New York: Oxford University Press.
- [25] Simpson, C. (2003). Mass communication research, counterinsurgency, and "reality." In S. Braman (Ed.), *Communication researchers and policy-making* (pp. 253-291). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- [26] Wright, M. I., & Center for Constitutional Rights. (2003). *YOU back the attack! WE'LL bomb who we want!: remixed war propaganda*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- [27] Yar, M. (2006). *Hannah Arendt*. Retrieved November 24, 2008, from *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*: <http://www.iep.utm.edu/a/arendt.htm#H6>