March 24, 1941

Dear Harold:

I was sorry not to get back to see you the other night, but I found a chance to talk with Stacy May and knew that if I did come back I should be keeping you from work, so I went straight to the train from Stacy's.

Now I am sorry that I didn't bother you because I might have had the sense to talk with you about what clearly is our most pressing problem at the moment, namely, the location and conservation of personnel for the various intelligence services. If I remember rightly I told you of the talks I had with Kane and Graves - with the latter particularly about the supply of people with linguistic competence. I believe Kane and Graves are taking the matter up with the Civil Service Commission to point out that some special arrangements have to be made in the supply of personnel for this type of service beyond what the roster can supply.

Today I had a letter from Graves with a memorandum drawn up over the week end which shows that he is getting into the thing - but actually a little further into it than his present knowledge warrants. What he is thinking of is an office of communication and intelligence personnel, and as might be expected, and as might be expected, his memorandum shows that he knows relatively little of what is already under way in the field of communications research. I had to send back to him the only copy of his memorandum, but I am enclosing a copy of the letter I sent him commenting on it, which, as you will see, suggests that he and you get together to talk things over. Language competence certainly figures prominently in the picture, but equally prominent, and perhaps more so, are other types of competence of which Graves knows relatively little. I hope you can point this out to him, and perhaps even work with him and with Kane in getting something shaped up which would be both serviceable and conservative - if I may use the word in this rather special sense.

Now I also want to get cleared up, if I can through correspondence with you, what general lines we are going to follow in training personnel for communication intelligence service. As I see it, the present demands will be largely for analysts of what is being said. For that type of training, we now have the Kris-Speier project, for which a grant was made last Friday, and also your own enterprise at the Library of Congress. A third possibility is work of special types with Lazarsfeld, as for example, training in the type of analysis he is undertaking for the daytime serials. How much this third possibility can be utilized, I do not know, and I should
particularly like your advice on that score, since I know you have recently been pretty closely in touch with what Lazarsfeld has been doing.

As I see it, perhaps the most practical training for strict communication intelligence service would come through work with Kris in his use of what amounts to the BBC methods, but work with Kris and Speier on the theoretical side would offer a somewhat broader base, particularly for people who would be concerned with analyzing communications from the totalitarian countries.

As for your own project, first, do you want men in training? And if so, what type of men and toward what destination should they be trained? Taking the three rankings mentioned in my letter to Graves, I am inclined to think you would want in any case only men headed for section directors; that is, to take a specific example, say for Japanese, perhaps the hypothetical person with I.P.R. training who could get from your work a general introduction and perspective into the special job he would be called on to direct. But what do you think?

Then there seems likely to come into the picture another factor which involves the element of conservation. After I saw you in Washington I got pretty clearly the impression that a number of response studies will be wanted; possibly something like continuing community studies which would provide a proper sample of the population. I had an initial talk on these lines with Louis Wirth, both because I thought it time to have him in the picture, and because I found that he has been increasingly interested in this kind of thing. Evidently this type of work, if, as I expect, it is harnessed to communications research, will call for investigators with a pretty high degree of sophistication in sociology.

Again let me be specific. This question is in my mind today because I had this noon a talk with Eric Estorick, a young American, now doing part-time teaching at New York University, trained at the London School of Economics and in this country, whom Kris and Speier are considering for one of their few staff appointments. Estorick could be drawn in for work comparable to what you are doing, or he may be a man of the type who could do most in studies of response. In any event, it would seem to me well for him to start with Kris and Speier on the more theoretical phase of their job, but I can't be sure.

As you have recognised by this time, I am really writing you to try to get whatever thoughts I have on the subject somewhat clearer. Hadley is coming in in the morning, and I expect to go over much the same ground with him, but I think we have to move fairly quickly if we are not to see drafts on the limited supply of personnel that may pull people into jobs which don't demand their entire competence. To conserve personnel against that danger may call for some such step as Graves is suggesting; hence, my hope that
you will talk with him and of course with Kane.

I made these general points to Fly the other night, and found him ready to recognize the need for conservation. But faced as they are with a sudden need for personnel that may well throw the idea of conservation overboard, I should suppose that the recruitment and plans called for would be a pretty heavy draft on the existing supply.

If you can let me have promptly any reply which these random comments may suggest, I should be much obliged, since I think we have something here which calls for quick consideration and possibly for some early action.

Yours sincerely,

Mr. Harold Lasswell
Library of Congress
Washington, D. C.
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