



THE THEORY OF POWER

Dr. Harold D. Lasswell

Property of the Library  
INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE  
ARMED FORCES

NOTICE

This lecture has not been edited by the speaker. It has been reproduced directly from the reporter's notes for the students and faculty for reference and study purposes.

You have been granted access to this unedited transcript under the same restrictions imposed on lecture attendance; namely, no notes or extracts will be made and you will not discuss it other than in the conduct of official business.

No direct quotations are to be made either in written reports or in oral presentations based on this unedited copy.

Reviewed by: Col. Bergameyer

Date: 27 Aug 63

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

1963 - 1964

The Theory of Power

21 August 1963

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION -- Dr. Ralph Sanders, Member of the Faculty, ICAF . . . . .	1
SPEAKER -- Dr. Harold D. Lasswell, Professor of Law and Political Science, Yale University. . . . .	1
GENERAL DISCUSSION . . . . .	17

Property of the Library  
 INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE  
 ARMED FORCES

NOTICE

This lecture has not been edited by the speaker. It has been reproduced directly from the reporter's notes for the students and faculty for reference and study purposes.

You have been granted access to this unedited transcript under the condition of your attendance; namely, no notes or extracts will be made and you will not discuss it other than in the conduct of official business.

No direct quotations are to be made either in written reports or in oral presentations based on this unedited copy.

Reviewed by: Col Bergameyer Date: 27 Aug 63

Reporter: Albert C. Helder

Publication No. L64-8

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

Washington 25, D. C.

## THE THEORY OF POWER

21 August 1963

DR. SANDERS: If one were to list the most eminent scholars of political science in the United States today the name of Harold D. Lasswell, our speaker today, would appear among those at the very top. His profession has often acclaimed him for pioneering new avenues in the study of politics. He is presently Professor of Law and Political Science at Yale University, and we are very privileged to have Dr. Lasswell speak on "The Theory of Power" - a subject of special significance to this audience.

It is my pleasure to introduce Dr. Lasswell.

DR. LASSWELL: Mr. Chairman; Gentlemen:

I suppose the first question that anybody asks when the word "power" is used, is how the conception of power can be usefully defined; usefully in terms of the problems that face individuals who are undertaking to effect power results, or who are undertaking to make use of power on behalf of power, or any other impact sought in society. Consequently, anything that I suggest to you about the term "power" is intended to meet the test in your minds, of utility. Are the definitions and the procedures which will be suggested, going to prove of any relevance to you as you think about and deal with the problems with which you are concerned?

I suppose that I ought to begin with a very quick characterization in one synthesis, of power; then, to consider the ways in which this brief set of words can be made relevant to social situations.

One quick way to talk about power is to say that it refers to the making of important decisions. One of the most interesting characteristics of any label that people utter about power or any other topic; one of the most important questions

is whether the term can be clearly set in reference to all the other words that are useful to employ in talking about a community or a social process. It is almost useless to define words like wealth or power or respect, unless you define them as part of an inclusive set of words that refer to a social setting. The reason why this is so is because if you rely on a single word to characterize the processes of power, wealth or respect you find it difficult when you are confronted by concrete situations, to decide how to identify those features of a given situation that are usefully referred to by the particular term that you are trying to employ.

So, when we talk about power in the social process it becomes necessary to specify, as far as one can, how the term can be employed in referring to the world of social process; to the various regional world social processes; the national social processes; the sub-national processes. Unless the term can be easily operationalized the term will not be helpful.

Well, the first question, then, that confronts us is this, "How many words shall we use in talking about the social process?" One of the words will be power. But how many words are we going to use to talk about the whole social process of which power is one part? Now, the first requirement, as I've said, is comprehensiveness; we need a comprehensive list. We need this because we need to employ these words as telescopes and microscopes that are scaled for the purpose of describing whatever events swim into our vision.

The second requirement is, the list must be short. It must be short because the human mind doesn't operate very easily with many words of the same level of abstraction.

A third requirement, of course, is that the list that we employ shall be easily related to the existing intellectual division of labor. What this last means is that we want to use words that we can employ in ways that are fairly close to the

way that political scientists, generally, and students of international politics and diplomacy and strategy, use the term. At the same time, we want a word that economists will recognize, so that we can take the data which are processed by economists in reference to their theoretical models, and employ those data for our purposes. We also need to have a word that will be fairly useful in characterizing the data which are obtained by public health people; individuals who are characterizing the flow of births, deaths and other features of health.

We also need a word that will be handy for assimilating the results of those who are specialized in the investigation of communication processes; the sharing of information; the obtaining of information. Those are the social psychologists, the students of mass-media communication, and the investigators of scientific research; the kind that is concerned with the comprehensive; the context of nature and man.

We also need a label that will be handy with tying up with the results obtained by those who are studying the family and the personal relationships of this kind. Those are, of course, the sociologist of the family, the anthropologist of the family, and the like. Then we need to tie up what we're going to do with the data brought together by the specialists on social class, including, of course, caste and ranks. These are the sociologists, anthropologists, etc., who have, historically, interested themselves in describing communities in this perspective. Likewise, we want to connect what we do with those who study comparative religion and comparative morals.

Well, this last requirement, then, means that we want a list of labels that will provide us intellectual tools for asking questions of people in our civilization who have already specialized on some of the more obvious features of the social process. Consequently, when I propose to use eight words - and I gather that some of you have suffered through power in society, so you're not altogether unprepared

for exposure to a list of eight words - you will recognize that in settling on eight labels we are settling on these because we felt they would be useful for the organization of available and prospective knowledge. So, not only is our list comprehensive; not only is it short, but it's also related to what everybody is doing in the investigation of the social process.

You remember that when you talk about a social process and the place, therefore, of power in it, that it is important to characterize it in some very broad, comprehensive way. And a very handy way to talk about the social process, I think, is this; you can say that participants are pursuing values using institutional practices effecting resources. So, you have participants, you have values, institutions and resources. And the eight categories to which we made mention or to which we've referred, are eight words which we will employ in characterizing the various value outcomes and institutional practices that are found in a social process.

The first question that faces you if you're looking at any community and undertaking to find out what the political process is, is to place political events in the perspective of all of these events, the major events that are pertinent and going on in the situation. This means as a practical matter that you ask yourself what are the kinds of outcome in the situation that are among those which are obviously specialized to power - wealth and the other values - obviously, in some simple-minded conventional sense; that is, in the sense of the meanings that are quite conventionally current in the local community and which are pretty close to established usage in the societies where you and I are operating.

I'll give a few examples of what's involved in this mode of approach, since, I imagine that one of our commoner problems is to figure out how to take a bunch of labels and make them applicable to concrete circumstances. If you look at a city, the various regions, the nations, the world, you can ask yourself, "Well,

what are the outcome events that are sufficiently distinctive to indicate that some power process is going on?" Well, it's easy enough if you're seeing a situation in which there is military activity and someone is being rather conspicuously defeated and rather conspicuously someone is winning. Or, in those moments when an agreement among participants is being signed. Or a situation in which an election is being held. So, critical events in war and peace, of the train I've described, can be chosen as, at least, specimen situations of the kind which are worthy of investigation, and of course, worthy of effort at control.

Let me run quickly through the other seven labels and talk about outcome. One of the other words is "enlightenment," and here some of the outcomes you'll be looking for in a situation are the exchange of information. That is to say, the dissemination of information over the radio; other mass-media - gossip - the act of sharing; the act of initiating communication and receiving it is the kind of outcome situation that is involved in the enlightenment context.

What's involved in wealth? Here you are talking in terms of buying and selling; extending credit; receiving credit; giving; acquiescing in the offered gifts; saving and similar activities.

What about well-being? What are the important outcomes which are involved in well-being situations? Well, giving birth, dying, being ill, being taken care of, accidents, damage, etc.

What about skill. With skill such outcomes are the giving and passing or flunking examinations as to one's level of excellence. One sees situations of graduation or non-graduation, which are among the circumstances referred to.

Affection, courtship and marriage; marriage outcomes; separation; the breakdown of marriage; the initiation of friendship; the breakdown of friendship. Respect; the giving of equal treatment or the inflicting of discrimination in modes

of address; in the giving of invitations and the like. These are the respect outcomes in the social process.

Worship; the act of participating in - permitting worship; the performance of the immoral act, or moral act, etc.

Now, then. If you start out in whatever community you're talking about and develop a flow-chart of the frequency with which typical situations for all eight values are found you can divide every situation that you see, as an approximation of each of these predominant values. We've tried this out in all kinds of circumstances; I've been involved in a number of studies with colleagues. In Peru, for example, in the "Beecose Experiment" (phonetic spelling) that Cornell University has had under its wing for the last several years - we've worked in a number of other complicated situations with the idea of seeing whether or not this is a handy and useful instrument for classifying every human interaction that occurs in any situation. And the first step, as I've indicated, is to make this initial assignment of situations that you see, of interaction in terms of power and in terms of the rest of the social outcomes.

To come back to what I've said about the social process, as man pursuing values through institutions affecting resources, I ought to indicate that even that sketch of the social process needs to be amplified by some postulated maxim that indicates the dynamics of the process. Now, since human beings are living forms, they're concerned with maximizing their preferred events; with maximizing the various outcomes. And it's fairly clear that when you're dealing with people they're undertaking to move in the direction of the outcomes which they expect to leave them better off than if they's chosen another outcome. So, the maximization postulate is simply the general common sense postulate, from one point of view, that people try to act in such a way as to be better off than they would be if they acted in another

way.

Now, this postulate doesn't tell anybody anything except that it's a very useful stimulus for concrete hypotheses which can be investigated. Because, you can define any situation in terms of who is trying to maximize what values which he interprets how. One of the problems, then, of examining a social process and after having made a preliminary discovery of what you're going to recognize as power situations, is to subject those situations to more definite investigation, more detailed investigation. What you want to do if you've decided that an acknowledgment of defeat; or acknowledgment of a loss of an election, that is to be understood as a power outcome, the question immediately arises; "Well, supposing we investigate in more detail, what an election is - what's going on in the pre-outcome phase of this election, or this war, or this campaign? And, what are the consequences? What are the post-outcome events?" At this stage you take the next step. You've gone through the preliminary stage of making your broad assignments. Now you move into concrete situations which ideally you subject to investigation, or you use material which is available from those who have investigated the situation.

What you do here, obviously, is to get down to the brassier tasks of examining these interactions and the following questions then become of great relevance. Who are the various participants in this election situation or this war situation? What are their perspectives? That is to say, what are their subjective events? What kinds of preferred events are they after? What are their value demands, in short? What are their expectations about their chances of realizing what they want? Who do they think they are? That is to say, what is the structure of the self-system? Are these participants looking upon themselves as members of a kinship group - a tribe? Are they primarily concerned with themselves as officers in a military force? Are they primarily concerned with themselves as members of a

disciplined and organized international political party? Are they chiefly concerned with themselves as upper-class in terms of wealth, respect or other values?

When you examine yourself, for example, you will discover that your own self-system can be conveniently analyzed in terms of the values which we were just talking about. You can analyze your own perspectives. To what extent do you identify yourself with a family - my family; where does your family stop? With a locality; with power groups like political parties; like national governments; with enlightenment groups. To what extent do you think of yourself as a research and investigating scientist, or a man who wants to find out and extend the limits of knowledge? To what extent do you identify yourself with any of the other specialized groupings and activities that relate to well-being, to skill, to affection, to respect, and to rectitude?

You will discover that if you want to make a checklist of yourself and any group, that it will be very convenient to ask them the questions in terms of conscious perspective, with whom am I identified and whom do I exclude from myself? What are the different value demands that I am making for each component of myself? To what extent am I concerned about the future financial security of my family? To what extent am I quite uninterested in that? And so on through the list of questions about the components of the self and about the value demands made in terms of each of these components. And then, what are the various expectations about the probability of success or failure under various future contingencies to which you assign various probabilities?

Very well. Then the first question is, the participants and perspectives. And then a third question is, "What are my base values? As of this cross-section in time, what do I, or what does that group have at its disposal? To what extent does that group have at its disposal specialized instruments of violence which can

be applied in either defense or offense? To what extent does this group have at its disposal, wealth assets? To what extent is it enlightened in the sense that it shares modern and scientific technological know-how and our views of the world?" And so on down the list of values. You can inventory for each participant - individual or collective - organized or unorganized; you can inventory the base values. That is to say, the asset position including, of course, the liabilities such as belonging to a low-respect group.

So, this represents a way to go about the business of examining a situation in terms of participants, perspectives and base values. Then, again, during a given period of time one wants to ask the further question, "What are the strategies which the individual has employed, and is likely to employ, under various contingencies in pursuing outcomes?" How are you going to classify strategies? Well, obviously, by a strategy in this broad sense of the word you simply mean a way of handling your base values in order to achieve your scope values. And, the word "strategy" in this broad sense can be conveniently and fundamentally classified in terms of to what extent, for example, you will employ combinations of indulgences and deprivations. To put it another way, "To what extent are you going to impose a deprivation in order to achieve a purpose - the goal outcome? To what extent are you going to induce an ally or others to come along with you?" So, you have indulgence and deprivation. These are the ways of classifying the use of the assets that are available at any given time.

You can also ask yourself to what extent you will employ these in isolation or in coalition with other participants in the situation. Clearly, you may want to go ahead and examine the degree to which you will employ, in general, strategies of coercion and persuasion in attaining your effects. It's very common these days to emphasize that strategies can, in a broad sense, be divided according to the degree

to which they rely on communication and the degree to which they rely on other than communication. For instance, among the communication strategies you at once think of the employment of mass propaganda; the employment of symbols addressed to large groups. You also think of diplomatic offers, counter-offers, agreements and rejections - words in the context. Or, again, you think of strategies that primarily depend upon the movement or deployment of something other than words and word substitutes. You think here of military economic strategies.

Well, I make these remarks in passing. They are simply to indicate where the detailed consideration of strategies enters into the general examination of situations.

The next question after strategies is, "What about the outcome situations themselves?" You remember that so far we've only talked about outcome in the very generalized sense of whether or not they concern in the broad context of the community, primarily power, enlightenment and wealth; there is some other value. When you subject a situation to detailed examination of the kind that we've just been referring to you discover that all of the participants are pursuing all values to some extent in every situation. And that even though you, as an outside observer, may find it very convenient to say that this is primarily a power situation, it may turn out on examination that people are not much interested in power; they're out after wealth. And that the predominant value is not power, but assets in New York, etc.

Now, this is entirely hypothetical as an example. One of the interesting points too, in examining a situation, is that you can start classifying those situations that you regard as power, for the purpose of bringing out a good many questions that you know are going to be of importance to you. For example, to what extent are the outcomes that you are dealing with, outcomes that can be taken as

expressing naked power? To what extent are you dealing with pretended power? To what extent are you dealing with lawful power?

Now, lawful power - brief is the term, of course, that refers to the exercise of power in a context in which its authority is accepted by the significant elements in the community. Now, then, authority and control are two fundamental categories in classifying power. And this is why one talks about naked power as control without authority. One talks about pretended power as a pretension of authority - which may, or may not be connected with control; and one talks about lawful power as authoritative and controlled. This means having established the outcomes that are lawful you are now in a position to characterize the public order of the state, the nation, or the other participant that you're interested in.

Now, the term "Public Order" refers to all of the basic institutions which are protected in the lawful power process of the community. The public order of the United States; the public order of any other nation can be analyzed in terms of the basic institutions and the value distributions which are lawfully protecting the community. Now, this is the fundamental concept for comparative analysis. In talking about the public order it is useful to have at hand the concept of the civic order. And the point of this is the following.

All of us recognize that the word "law" carries with it - and quite properly - the connotation of the authorized use of very severe sanctions against challengers. It's convenient to talk about a legal order as one that is in fact and in form, controlling. So that, it is expected that domestic challengers, for example, will have severe sanctions effectively employed against them in maintaining the fundamental value distribution and the fundamental institutional practices of the community. This is the public order.

Now, civic order refers to those features of the community - of its institu-

tions - which are protected by milder sanctions. Let me give you some obvious and important examples of how this concept of public order and civic order can be made use of, in dealing with communities. When you analyze a community you frequently discover that everybody agrees that the community should make all kinds of traffic regulations and that it should engage in a number of ceremonial performances for which it takes responsibility etc. through a vast number of activities. And it is also true that you'll find every once in awhile that some people don't go along with this pattern of activity; they violate the prescriptions of the community-wide institution. But, nothing much happens. Now, here you're dealing with civic order; an order in which, in this context, you're dealing with community-wide activities. But nothing much happens to people who deviate. However, on the other hand a lot of people conform. So, you're dealing with a practice that is well-established, but with a practice that somehow or other doesn't mobilize severe sanctions and support.

Public order, on the other hand, refers to those situations in which severe deprivations are mobilized against the challenger. And this distinction is very important, because it makes it feasible to draw this fundamental difference between the conventional use of language and the functional use of language in these matters. In any given locality you will find that the word "government," for example, may be locally employed to refer to a variety of institutions which, on examination, are not the power institutions. The power institutions of the community can only be revealed after you have analyzed the whole social process and find out who, in fact, makes the important decisions, and the extent to which the community as a whole is, in fact, involved in them. That's government; that's power in the functional sense of the word - the effective and authoritative control.

Now, this means that when you move into some communities you discover, on further examination, that the institutions which are called "churches" in some in-

stances turn out to be the power institutions; they make the important decisions. In other places you find that a conference of certain family heads represents the effective power of the community. They are the government. And it's a mere formalism to confuse the conventional label with so-called government in some of these circumstances.

As an analyst of power processes, then, you have the task of finding out who makes the controlling decisions; to what extent these are accepted as authoritative; and to what extent, consequently, the conventionally-labeled institutions of government are, in fact, institutions of government. Now, this is, again, a familiar distinction between convention and the function, and since we are concerned not with matching local uses of the word, but with examining the facts of social impact, we are concerned with the intellectual processes which will presently disclose to us the functional power processes.

Well, now, I've indicated, then, what public order and civic order can be said to be. I ought, also, to call your attention to the fact that in examining the power process either in the conventional or the functional sense, that it is very useful and necessary for exact comparisons to break up the outcomes that are part of the power processes, into a variety of sub-categories. I'll give you seven of these categories, fast, with some quick indication of what they are and how they may be made use of.

There are seven outcomes that are convenient for comparative purposes, to identify. The order is not important, since the processes are interdependent. But for comparative purposes you will want to recognize why they're important. In the United States we often, of course, talk about a tri-partite division of outcome - judicial, executive, legislative. This is a seven-fold breakdown which is intended to make it easier to classify the relationship between a variety of institutions

that are found in different circumstances, and the role which they play in the power process.

First, I'll mention the intelligence function within, or, the intelligence outcomes. Some information is to be made available to all institutions of government; some is not. The giving or withholding of information refers to the intelligence process. And the intelligence outcome - giving; receiving; failing to give the information - is part of this fundamental process in the power process. I would remark, in passing, it's fantastic how little attention has historically been given to the investigation of intelligence processes in society.

A second major function is promotion, or recommendation. This means the actively pressing for a decision. It includes in societies that have political parties - it includes political party and pressure group activities. It includes the protection of. It includes the active promotion and propagation of solutions.

Again, prescription - intelligence, promotion, prescription. Now, the prescribing process includes what you and I in many situations recognize as legislation of the making of an ordinance. Prescription is the fixing of a norm of conduct with the expectation, of course, that it will be supported by the use of the sanctions at the disposal of the body politic.

After prescription it's convenient to speak of invocation. Invocation includes, for instance, the activities of the police officer who confronts particular situations and makes a provisional characterization of it as a violation or a conformity with a prescription; a provisional invocation. That is the role of police officers. It's the role of many of the lower courts, etc., and many administrative offices.

Application. Application is the relatively frank; the characterization of a concrete set of facts in terms of a prescription. Application, then, is the rela-

tively final characterization of concrete circumstances by general prescription.

Next, appraisal; the appraising function. Now, the appraising function calls for the characterization of past events in terms of degree of their conformity or non-conformity to the policy objectives of the community. Thus, in the appraisal function you can talk about the degree to which, in the aggregate, processes have been efficient or inefficient; the degree to which they have been legal, or non-legal. This is an aggregate characterization; it does not refer to concrete cases; to particular isolated cases; it refers to the flow of activity through time.

Again, the terminating function it's often convenient to separate out. That's putting a stop to a general prescription and mopping up the consequences of having changed a prescription. What's meant there, for example, in the case of condemnation proceedings one of the largest problems you have is the problem of mopping up on the basis of previous expectations. They were developed in regard to the use of property in the community.

Well, these seven functions, you will find, are, for many purposes, handy. And let me give you a few quick reminders of the institutions - official or quasi-official - that are sometimes, in our experience, specialized to them. Intelligence activities - well, you think, of course, of the census, and then you think of all the various agencies from the covert to the overt, etc.

I've indicated that the promoting function is carried on, of course, by the political parties, by pressure groups; and in our society the prescribing function is, of course, highly concentrated in legislative bodies, though by no means exclusively. Again, the invoking function in our society - we think of this as coming under the role of the Prosecuting Attorneys, the Police Officers, and the initial phases of the administrative process.

Application; as I said, a large part of our administrative court activity is

the quasi-final. The application, in the sense indicated - and, of course, I've just referred to the specialized agencies of termination.

Now, then. The last phase question in an examination of any concrete situation is not the outcome, but the effect; what happens subsequently to the flow of activities with which we are concerned? What are the consequences for the future participants in the situation; for the future of value-shaping and sharing; for the future of institutions; and for the future of resources? And here you have a formal; the bringing to an end the process of classification.

Now, the last thing I want to say here is this. Whenever you are confronted by any problem it's convenient to think about five intellectual tasks connected with that problem. And so, if you're analyzing power it's convenient to think about the problem of power in terms of these five intellectual tasks.

The first one which I will refer to is the clarification of goal; the clarification of your own value outcomes. What are the power and other effects you are interested in getting?

A second question is - the order is not consequential - what are the trends in the realization in this context, of my goal? To what extent is power going up or going down, in which I'm interested?

Again, conditions; what are the conditioning factors? How can I explain the increase or decrease of my power in relation to my coalition mates, etc? What constellation of factors are significant?

Again, the future. Assuming that there's no change in my policies, what is the probable future sequence of events?

And five, the alternatives or options. What policy alternatives or options are open to me in the situation?

Now, if you want a convenient memory device, this just is: Goals, trends,

conditions, projections, alternatives. And these five questions stand for all the kinds of problems that arise in connection with any problem. And I think you will discover on reflection that when you're concerned with the problem that you initially phrase as a problem of power, the question then becomes, "For what do you exercise power?" Who, exercising what degree of power; for what outcome purposes; with what assets; by what strategies; with what probable outcomes and effects? You will find the question of goal, then, becomes very important. Then you will think in terms of organization of your trend information; the organization of your scientific knowledge of conditioning factors; your projections into the future; and the invention and evaluation of the alternatives open to you for maximizing your proclaimed preferred events. Well, these are the questions with which one may be concerned in the examination of power.

Thank you.

QUESTION: Professor, how would you apply these concepts to a community - a physical community - which, in fact, is a community of many elements - several political elements, judicial, various levels of government - to an economic community which is dominated, say, by a municipality having a large corporate entity, an incorporation that is far right; your news media owned in another area? Now, how do you apply a concept of this kind as to, say, a community that has actually 15 communities within it?

DR. LASSWELL: The most important answer to that is that in examining any social process you first of all, if you can, try to find out what the limits are within which the effective interactions are taking place. This means that although you may start with a physical community defined, let us say, as New Haven, Connecticut; say we want to examine certain kinds of outcome effects in New Haven,

Connecticut, you will take it for granted in examining those processes you do not necessarily expect that the people who are residents in what is commonly regarded as the legal community of New Haven are necessarily the most important participants in the New Haven political process. It may turn out, for example, that the most important decisions connected with employment; the most important decisions connected with the expansion of the investments - public and private - will be made in New York by those who financially control the principal corporations which are available in New Haven, for employment, and which exercise an effect upon the capital expenditure policies of New Haven.

So, what you do is to apply all of the analyses which we were referring to, to the examination, for example, of the outcomes in New Haven at a given time. But you follow the threads of interaction wherever they lead you. Now, that's a short-cut answer to the question, but of course it implies that you carefully investigate all of the interactions. Hence, in many national communities you find that the important decisions are made in Moscow. This is not altogether the startling thing in the modern world. Or, some of them are even made in New York City or Washington, D. C.

Consequently, when you are examining the facts of power and applying the system of analysis we are talking about, you eventually find yourself confronted by the facts of life; namely, who the key people are who form the coalitions under varying circumstances to get various results. So, you may influence the results in one country by going to an address in Wall Street, or an address in Moscow. What I'm saying is, this is the way you find out and demonstrate what you are talking about as distinguished from talking about it in terms which have not been subjected step by step to the kind of process that we recommend.

QUESTION: Doctor, do you believe that there is such a thing as the collective

unconscious of a people which is transmitted down through the ages in such matters as power, etc?

DR. LASSWELL: Well, the words "collective unconscious" have two meanings in ordinary usage. Some people talk about the collective unconscious to refer to something which is hypothetically transmitted in the gene structure - the genetic; the envelope that supplies the information packages that control the growth of individuals, and hence, all of the biological organisms who interact on one another in a community.

So far, on one has been able to demonstrate any useful definition of the term "collective unconscious," in that sense. I say "so far;" I'm not at the moment pre-guessing what the future will indicate. So far, when people use the term "collective unconscious" in the more empirical sense, what they are talking about is usually the cultural pre-dispositions that are found in any cross-section in time, and which constitute some of the fundamental value orientations and institutional preferences of a community. Thus, you go into a folk society as distinguished from a civilization. And when you move into a folk society, such as any of the tribal groups, etc. that we are well-acquainted with, you find at once that the transmission of the culture to individual members in that folk society, has gone on rather smoothly, up to the time that the community has faced the problem of a quick adjustment to the surrounding world which has modern technology and science.

Now, then. The collective unconscious or collective traditions of the community, I think, can be most usefully used simply as a term to characterize the predispositions that are current in the community at a given cross-section in time. Thus, you can analyze from this point of view, the class structure of a community. You can ask, "How are each of the eight values we were talking about, distributed in this community at a given cross-section in time in terms of power, and what are

the institutions that are accepted as those which are expected to be continued?" And so on through the other values on our list.

You cannot analyze how the distribution of the community in terms of each of these values, but you can analyze it in terms of interest groups; using the words "interest groups" now, to refer to groupings that are not identical with class - as you've already got those identified - you're talking about groups that pursue various value goals and expect it's to their advantage - these interest groups - and these groups are smaller than a class, and they also may cross-cut classes. Thus, you may find that individuals who develop interest in speaking a foreign language, which increases the skills that are available to them for acting as intermediaries with outside sources of wealth, power and respect, may turn out to be a specialized interest group of great importance in the community. And this is what one is talking about when one uses the word, "interest-group."

So, you can classify interest groups according to all the eight values, analyzing all of the power interest-groups that there are; the smaller component groupings; all of the component enlightenment groupings, etc. through the list.

Furthermore, there are personality groupings which are important. And you can ask, "What's the personality structure that prevails in this community, and how are these personality forms distributed at a cross-section in time in the community?" To what extent, for example, does the ego structure - the self-system that I referred to - that demands that the individual shall make a great mark for himself as a person - as an individual? Or to what extent is the demand simply that he conform simply to the tradition of the family dynasty? Etc. through that list.

Now, I've mentioned values. I mentioned first, of course, the community - the larger community context, with its characteristics of value distribution and institutional practice. Then you have the sub-classifications by the classes - upper,

middle and lower, for each of the value categories. Then, you have interest groups which you identify on the basis of their relative status. And then you have personality structures which may represent varying degrees of demand on the self, or even components of the self, to modernize or not modernize one's ways of dealing with the world. Then, of course, you have each of these categories that needs to be applied in terms of the level of crisis, since the level of crisis to which the individuals in the community have been exposed, will enormously effect their pre-dispositions to interpret their political problems. Thus, the community that has regarded itself as continually in danger of dissolution, of becoming wholly disorganized - unorganized - approaches this problem very differently from one that's in an inter-crisis period, or one that's in a non-crisis period.

Again, if you move into the economic area; some communities have been in prolonged depressions; some have had rapid prosperity and expansion. And you'll find that this, of course, makes a vast difference.

So, to summarize, some convenient categories here which serve our purpose for analysis are; you can examine any cross-section in time, the territorial communities and the sub-communities; you can examine the value classes - upper, middle and lower, for each of the values; you can examine the interest groupings that are smaller, or cross-cut - the various class categories - and also the community boundaries; you can, furthermore, classify the personality forms which are distributed; and then, the levels of crisis at these levels. And so, many of the factors which I referred to, the slogan used in the original question, call for analysis contextually to bring out the pre-dispositions in regard to outcomes among these various participants at any cross-section in time.

QUESTION: Doctor, you alluded to things that could be done in intelligence, in your first factor. Would you elaborate on that?

DR. LASSWELL: What is meant by the intelligence function is it is one of the functions that is involved in the whole decision-making process of the community. To talk analytically about it first, just to be sure that we are on the same wavelength here, the term "intelligence" is employed in this sense to refer to all of the gathering of information and the processing of information which goes on in a decision process.

In the United States if you were to follow the intelligence process in detail for the conventionally-named organs of government you would take the Senate, for example, and the House, and you would ask, "What is the in-flow of information to the Senators and the Representatives, through a given period of time? What's the source of the information which comes to them, about what?" You would analyze further the extent to which the information which is obtained by the Senate and the House is passed on to any other organ of government, including the electorate. To what extent are the statements of fact about the past and the present, the conditioning factors, the characterization of major alternatives; to what extent is this broadly shared?

So, the intelligence function, then, refers to the gathering and processing of information by all participants in the decision process. So far as the useful categories go, I think that the five intellectual tasks that I mentioned are very useful for asking questions about the flow of intelligence. That is, to what extent does the flow of information that is presented at any phase of the decision process, to what extent does this flow include provisional statements of assumption about the goal objectives? To what extent does it include statements about the past? About trends - significant trends? To what extent does it include scientific summaries of relevant conditioning factors? To what extent does it include projections? To what extent does it include a provisional forecast of the consequen-

ces of adopting a variety of alternatives or options in the context?

Now, it is useful to ask all five questions, interestingly enough, at each stop, of the flow of intelligence into any conventional agency of government. You analyze this for the courts, for example, the judicial institutions. It's extremely interesting to investigate what gets to the focus of attention of the courts in the formal arena of the courtroom, and to what extent the information gets to the court through other channels than the official channels which are employed in the courtroom.

Now, I refer to all of this because in undertaking, while it is true that you can locate in any governmental setup the specialized institutions that are devoted to different phases of the decision process, it is important to recall that each of these seven functions that I have mentioned can be employed to analyze microscopically what goes on in any given context. So, the whole flow of planning information is roughly, in this sense of the word, referred to by the term "intelligence." And all the kinds of problems that you and I are concerned about in any of these areas become relevant here.

QUESTION: Would it be possible to combine your theory of power with mathematical techniques such as gaming, for the pursuit of utilitarian ends, and if possible, to what extent would this be socially desirable?

DR. LASSWELL: Well, first of all, it's quite clear that gaming devices are now made use of by people who are studying power, in the hope of being able to elucidate the conditions under which the power changes occur. After all, you can set up mathematical models now on the basis of many different assumptions which will enable you to simulate the past events and future contingencies. And this process of undertaking extensive simulation, for example under rigorous mathematical control, is first of all, extremely important in rendering it necessary for people to seek

operational indexes for any one of their words. Just as today I was attempting very loosely to give some indication of how each of the key terms which I was using - the major value terms, etc., could be made operational in relationship to any situation.

A detailed mathematical model of the past or future of U. S. power, for example, would not only require the selection of a form which would be intuitively satisfactory, as a preliminary try, but its main effect would be that it would make it essential for the advisors of decision-makers - at least the final decision-makers - to operationalize each of the terms which they employ. And if you carefully try to operationalize a model you very quickly become aware of the degree to which the model is inapplicable. Because, the essential point is that you must learn under what circumstances you can rely upon a mathematicalized model.

Today we are in the very early stages of this process of trying to educate ourselves to understand what it is that you can obtain from a mathematicalized model; what its limits are. We don't know much about that yet because good mathematical models of the past have not yet been, shall we say, too abundant. They have not been subjected to too much detailed criticism. It's quite clear that the effort to develop these formalized models is one of the most important intellectual advances of our civilization.

It is also quite clear that we don't yet know what to do with those models. We have not had enough experience in the undertaking to evaluate the consequences of seeking to operationalize these models as ways of explaining all of history, for example, and all the future abilities.

There is one other comment about this problem, which is only partly relevant to what you were saying. You ask is this desirable, and I've already assumed that whatever contributes to enlightenment is desirable. If the process of mathematicalizing - your scientific theory of factors that determine interdetermined effects

- if this process does yield greater intellectual control, of course, we're for that. We are now in the stage, however, of taking these early steps, and it is extremely important to maintain that critical intellectual attitude in regard to the demonstration of the connection between mathematicalized ways of talk and other ways of talk about the same events. And the problem is to carry out the various comparisons of the two in order to ascertain the degrees to which one needs to modify the several processes in determining them.

Partly because of my own interest in these matters, and my own feeling that any specialized simulation technique has at the present time certain important limitations, I feel that the adaptation of our celebrated chart-room technique is especially important. Because, if you do develop decision seminars in which you present the whole social process with charts in the past and in the future, and then you agree in your seminars, on what kind of mathematical simulation models you're going to play with for the past and the contingent future, then you will subject those to continuous recheck in terms of these charts of the past flow and contingency flow. And you will be certainly liberated from any blind reliance on any one set of assumptions.

On the other hand, you will be equally liberated from a blind rejection of the possibility that these procedures can be relevant to the clarifying in your own mind, about the circumstances in which you must cast the die.

DR. SANDERS: Dr. Lasswell, I want to thank you for a very thought-provoking lecture this morning.