

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

HAROLD DWIGHT LASSWELL
1902—1978

A Biographical Memoir by
GABRIEL A. ALMOND

*Any opinions expressed in this memoir are those of the author(s)
and do not necessarily reflect the views of the
National Academy of Sciences.*

Biographical Memoir

COPYRIGHT 1987
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
WASHINGTON D.C.



Albertus — Yale News Bureau

Harold D. Lasswell

HAROLD DWIGHT LASSWELL

February 13, 1902–December 18, 1978

BY GABRIEL A. ALMOND

HAROLD D. LASSWELL ranks among the half dozen creative innovators in the social sciences in the twentieth century. Few would question that he was the most original and productive political scientist of his time. While still in his twenties and early thirties, he planned and carried out a research program demonstrating the importance of personality, social structure, and culture in the explanation of political phenomena. In the course of that work he employed an array of methodologies that included clinical and other kinds of interviewing, content analysis, para-experimental techniques, and statistical measurement. It is noteworthy that two decades were to elapse before this kind of research program and methodology became the common property of a discipline that until then had been dominated by historical, legal, and philosophical methods.

Lasswell was born in 1902 in Donnellson, Illinois (population ca. 300). His father was a Presbyterian clergyman, his mother, a teacher; an older brother died in childhood. His early family life was spent in small towns in Illinois and Indiana as his father moved from one pulpit to another, and it stressed intellectual and religious values. Although the regional milieu of his childhood and adolescence might suggest that Lasswell was raised in an intellectual backwater, in fact

it was an unusually rich environment. He was especially influenced in adolescence by a physician uncle who was familiar with the works of Freud; by an English teacher in the Decatur, Illinois, high school he attended who introduced him to Karl Marx and Havelock Ellis; and by a brilliant young teacher of high school civics, William Cornell Casey, who later became a professor of sociology at Barnard College in Columbia University. He excelled in high school, edited the school newspaper, gave the valedictory address at graduation, and was awarded a scholarship to the University of Chicago after winning a competitive examination in modern history and English.

When Lasswell entered the University of Chicago in 1918—at age sixteen—the university was in the third decade of its remarkable growth. At a time when sociology as a curriculum did not yet exist at most universities, Chicago had a major department that was staffed by such gifted theorists and researchers as W. I. Thomas, Albion W. Small, and Robert Park. Its philosophy department was dominated by realists and empiricists such as James Tufts and George Herbert Mead. Its economics department, in which Lasswell majored, included Jacob Viner, John M. Clark, Harry Alvin Millis, and Chester Wright. Its political science department was soon to begin its dramatic rise, but in Lasswell's undergraduate years the department was in transition with Henry Pratt Judson soon to retire, and Charles Edward Merriam in the wings. Lasswell was a member of a graduate cohort that included Robert Redfield, Louis Wirth, and Herbert Blumer.

His graduate years in the Department of Political Science at Chicago coincided with the publication of Merriam's manifesto, *The Present State of the Study of Politics*, in 1921 and with Merriam's and Gosnell's survey study of nonvoting in Chicago (1924). In *The Present State*, Merriam proposed that two steps be taken to make the study of politics more scientific: (1) the

exploration of the psychological and sociological bases of political behavior, and (2) the introduction of quantification in the analysis of political phenomena. The nonvoting study was a demonstration of the uses of social–psychological hypotheses and quantitative methods in the explanation of political phenomena. It was a survey of the “political motives” of some 6,000 nonvoters in the Chicago mayoral election of 1923; individuals to be surveyed were selected by a “quota control” sampling procedure that was intended to match the census demographic distributions. In the immediate aftermath of this study and during Lasswell’s graduate student days, Harold Foote Gosnell (then a first-term assistant professor of political science) conducted the first experimental study in political science—and what may very well have been the first experimental study in the social sciences outside of psychology. This was a survey of the effects on voting of a nonpartisan mail canvass in Chicago that was intended to get out the vote in the national and local elections of 1924 and 1925. The experimental technique Gosnell devised was quite rigorous: there were carefully matched experimental and control groups, different stimuli were employed, and the results were analyzed with the most sophisticated statistical techniques then available. Reflecting the programmatic and comparative vision of these researches, follow-up studies of voting turnout were made by Gosnell in Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, and Switzerland.

While Harold Gosnell was chosen by Merriam to develop the statistical component of his early 1920s vision, it was Harold Lasswell who was encouraged to develop the clinical, psychological, and sociological components. As a young graduate student, Lasswell published an article in 1923 entitled “Chicago’s Old First Ward,”¹ and in collaboration with Mer-

¹ *National Municipal Review*, 12:127–31.

riam he published another in 1924 on public opinion and public utility regulation.²

Merriam threw out two challenges to the brilliant and ambitious young political scientist. The first came out of Merriam's wartime experience as chief American propagandist in Rome; the second arose from Merriam's interest in the characteristics of political leaders and the uses of the study of the abnormal and the psychopathological in explaining normal and typical behavior. Merriam's first interest—the importance of morale, propaganda, and civic training in the explanation of political behavior—led to Lasswell's 1927 doctoral dissertation, *Propaganda Technique in the World War*, and ultimately to his invention of systematic content analysis and its uses in World War II. Merriam's second interest—the psychological and personality aspects of leadership and the uses of the abnormal in the explanation of the normal—led to a series of articles by Lasswell on political psychology and personality in politics, culminating in his *Psychopathology and Politics*.

Lasswell's doctoral dissertation on propaganda in the 1914–1918 war was a systematic effort to place World War I propaganda experience in the context of a theory of politics. Although there was something of antiwar muckraking in its tone, it also had the marks of rigorous scholarship: careful operational definitions, specification of the techniques of propaganda, and the conditions that limit or facilitate their effectiveness. Lasswell had done field research in Europe for this study, interviewing scholars and governmental officials regarding aspects of the propaganda experience and the Great War. He also anticipated his later invention of content analysis in a simple quantitative study—"Prussian School-

² "Current Public Opinion and the Public Service Commissions," in: *Public Utility Regulation*, ed. M. L. Cooke (New York: Ronald Press, 1924).

books and International Amity”—which was carried out in connection with his dissertation. (In the study Lasswell counted and evaluated the significance of the references to national superiority, military glory, foreign inferiority, military heroes, and the like in textbooks approved by the Prussian Ministry of Education after the establishment of the Weimar Republic.)³

Lasswell was appointed assistant professor of political science at Chicago in 1926 and soon embarked on researches in political psychology. Papers that he published from 1925 to 1929 showed him to be engaged in a search of the literature concerned with political psychology and political personality. One paper published in the *American Journal of Psychiatry* in 1929 recommended that psychiatrists keep adequate personality records and make them available to bona fide researchers; another published in the *American Political Science Review* the same year argued the case for the use of data on mentally ill persons with some involvement in politics as one approach to the analysis of the relationship between personality and politics. This literature search and his concern with the improvement of psychiatric recordkeeping were incidental to the preparation and publication of Lasswell's extraordinary book, *Psychopathology and Politics*, which appeared in 1930 when he was twenty-eight.

Lasswell's work in preparing the book was extensive. He had been granted a postdoctoral fellowship by the Social Science Research Council for 1927–1928 and spent most of that year in Berlin undergoing psychoanalysis at the hands of Theodor Reik, a student of Freud. There is a report that he made a presentation at a Freud seminar urging that psychiatric records be kept in order to facilitate research. He also

³ “Prussian Schoolbooks and International Amity,” *Journal of Social Forces*, 3(1925):718–22.

discussed these ideas with leading psychiatrists in Vienna and Berlin. In late 1928 and 1929 he consulted with the psychiatric directors of the most important mental institutions on the eastern seaboard, tapping their memories of cases of politician patients. With their permission he examined psychiatric records at St. Elizabeth's in Washington, D.C.; Sheppard and Enoch Pratt Hospital near Baltimore; Pennsylvania State Hospital in Philadelphia; Bloomingdale Hospital of White Plains, New York; and Boston Psychopathic Hospital. He also gave depth psychiatric interviews to a number of "normal" volunteers.

Psychopathology and Politics was the first relatively systematic, empirical study of the psychological aspects of political behavior, and it coincided with the very beginnings of the culture and personality movement in anthropology and psychiatry. Lasswell was already in communication with anthropologist Edward Sapir, then a colleague at the University of Chicago, as well as with the New York psychiatrist Harry Stack Sullivan. The three of them began to plan an ambitious program of culture and personality research in the middle and late 1920s. Margaret Mead's *Coming of Age in Samoa* appeared two years before *Psychopathology and Politics*, and Ruth Benedict's *Patterns of Culture* appeared four years later. The first publication of the authoritarian personality research of the Frankfurt School—*Studien über Autorität und Familie*—appeared in 1936, and the *Authoritarian Personality* of Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Daniel Levinson, and Nevitt Sanford only appeared in 1950.

Chapters 6 through 9 of *Psychopathology and Politics* report Lasswell's case materials. These are not and are not represented as being findings or scientific explanations of political behavior. They are presented as clinically supported hypotheses regarding the personality-etiological bases of recruitment to different kinds of political roles and attitudes. Thus

Lasswell draws on clinical material and his own depth interviews to suggest why some individuals become agitators and others become administrators. Similarly he illuminates the relationship between personality variables and ideological propensities such as ultrapatriotism, internationalism, pacifism, socialism, and anarchism.

The rest of the book deals with methodological and theoretical issues. Among the methodological issues he treats are the uses of life histories in political science; the uses of the study of the deviant or the abnormal for the understanding of the normal; the dimensions used in typologies of politicians, the prolonged, "depth," or psychoanalytic interview as a mode of research in the psychological bases of social behavior; and the technique of free association as a method of getting data on politically relevant feelings and attitudes. He also presents a general theory of political behavior derived from a review of the various propositions of the psychoanalytic movement. This proposition, presented in the form of an equation, reduces political behavior—in the sense of choice of political roles and ideologies—to displacements of private, essentially "oedipal" and "libidinal" motives as rationalized in terms of political ideas and issues. It is a matter of some contention among Lasswell students as to whether this equation was literally intended or was a rhetorical exaggeration to draw attention to the importance of psychological motivation in the explanation of political phenomena. Supporting the reductionist position is the fact that the Freudian movement at this time took a similarly reductionist stand in the explanation of social, political, and aesthetic phenomena. Supporting the rhetorical interpretation is the fact that in this as in later work, Lasswell interprets unconscious oedipal and libidinal tendencies as powerful constraints on rational, object-oriented behavior, constraints that can be mitigated by psychotherapy. This was to be a theme of Lasswell's entire

intellectual career; that professional political science had the obligation of discovering or inventing a “politics of prevention” of war and other evils; that there was a “commonwealth of human dignity” to which it ought to aspire; and that both of these required substantial psychotherapeutic inputs.

This dualism and ambivalence of reductionism and therapeutic optimism in some sense characterized the three principle influences on Lasswell’s thought; the Presbyterianism of his family and childhood background, which deals with the question of how good may be wrested from an intractable evil; the Marxist-sociological background, which deals with the necessarily revolutionary confrontation of the traditional and reactionary with progressive forces; and the Freudian-psychoanalytic background, which deals with the confrontation of neurosis with psychotherapy. Lasswell’s later contributions to political psychology took the constraint rather than the reductionist perspective. It is of interest that in an “Afterthoughts” he wrote for the 1960 edition of *Psychopathology and Politics*, he makes no reference to his equation; instead he tells us that at the time of writing the book he already shared in a revisionist ego-psychology trend, a movement in psychoanalysis that affirmed the importance of rational and cognitive processes.

In addition to the empirical and methodological parts, *Psychopathology and Politics* included a theoretical or meta-methodological part. Chapters 12 and 13—“The Personality System and Its Substantive Reactions” and “The State as a Manifold of Events”—presented Lasswell’s framework of politically relevant variables and a strategy of political explanation, which moves from intrapsychic processes and their etiology, to interpersonal and social processes, to domestic and international political processes, and back again. Personality, economy, society, and politics are considered and dealt with as interacting systems.

What Lasswell presented as a theoretical framework and set of hypotheses in *Psychopathology and Politics* became his research program during the decade of the 1930s. Consider the intellectual balls he was juggling during these years.

For the psychiatrists whom he had been urging to keep records of their interviews in the interest of scientific research, he set up a model laboratory in his own offices in the Social Science Research Building at the University of Chicago. Advised and encouraged by psychiatrists Harry Stack Sullivan of Sheppard and Enoch Pratt Hospital and William A. White of St. Elizabeth's, he devised a procedure under which skin conductivity, pulse rate, respiration, and body movements of experimental subjects were measured as the spoken word was recorded. Three articles describing this procedure and reporting preliminary results appeared in psychoanalytic journals in 1935, 1936, and 1937. Unfortunately these research records were destroyed in 1938 in an accident that befell the vans moving Lasswell's effects to Washington on his departure from Chicago. This project, if not the first, was certainly one of the earliest efforts to link physiological, autonomic, and behavioral variables with communications and personality processes.

If this laboratory research was an effort to implement the methodological message of *Psychopathology and Politics*, then *World Politics and Personal Insecurity* (1934) was an elaboration of the theoretical perspectives spelled out in the final chapters of *Psychopathology and Politics*. Lasswell called his approach to political explanation *configurative analysis*. In configurative analysis the political process is defined as conflict over the definition and distribution of the dominant social values— income, deference, and safety—by and among elites. In his first paragraph he proposes the formula long associated with his name: "Politics is the study of who gets what, when, and how." Political science research hence requires the analysis of

the social origins, skills, personal traits, attitudes, values, and assets of world elites, and their changes over time. Proper understanding of political processes calls for a combination of equilibrium and developmental analysis and the adoption of contemplative and manipulative attitudes toward political change. Equilibrium analysis emphasizes the systemic, the recurrent, the stable interaction of economic, social, political, and personality variables; developmental analysis stresses the dynamic, the dialectical and transformative aspects of social change. The contemplative attitude contributes to the discovery of "regularities," "laws," principles of social behavior. The manipulative attitude subjects these regularities to the test of imagination, tracing the consequences of changes in conditions and policies, extrapolating trends, and the like. What Lasswell had in mind by the manipulative attitude is not fully clear in these passages. From the beginning he had a commitment to a moral and consequential political science, but his earlier work focused on politics and power. In his early schematization of political values as income, deference, and safety, he describes them rather casually as illustrative and representative values—not a complete set of political goals. He did not begin to deal explicitly with the political value and public policy realm until his association with Myres McDougal and the Yale School of Law in the late 1930s.

The bulk of *World Politics and Personal Insecurity* illustrates his method and approach. In chapters 2 through 6, conflicts among and within nations are related to human aggressive propensities, as well as the structural conditions of international relations, and domestic societies. The consequences of economic and class structure, cultural diffusion, and the media of communication, are the topics of chapters 7, 8, and 9. In chapter 10, politics, culture, and personality are related in an interesting discussion of trends in American society: he treats the possibilities of the emergence of right-wing ex-

tremism and fascism and the approach of political psychiatry in a politics of prevention. A final chapter deals—in sociological and psychoanalytic terms—with the prospects of peace and social justice.

A briefer book, *Politics: Who Gets What, When, and How*, was published in 1936; it presented much of what was argued in *World Politics* but in a more succinct and more schematic form. If Lasswell has written a textbook, then this is it. It defined politics as the struggle among elite groups over such representative values as income, deference, and safety. The actors in these conflictual processes are groups organized around skill, class, personality, and attitude characteristics; they employ in different ways and with different effects the political instrumentalities of symbol manipulation, material rewards and sanctions, violence, and institutional practices.

These three books, which were written over a six-year period, constitute Lasswell's most important contributions to political theory. In this same productive decade of the 1930s, Lasswell was involved in two other major enterprises. He consolidated his earlier interest in propaganda research by collaborating with R. D. Casey and B. L. Smith in the preparation of an annotated bibliography of some 4,500 items. It was published in 1935 as a book—*Propaganda and Promotional Activities: An Annotated Bibliography*—with an introduction on the theory of propaganda by Lasswell. Later editions continued to guide and codify the field of communications and public opinion research. In an effort to implement the research program laid out in *World Politics*, Lasswell and a number of his graduate students carried out a field study of propaganda and political agitators and organizers among the unemployed in the city of Chicago during the depression and New Deal years. A book coauthored with Dorothy Blumenstock Jones reported these findings in 1939.

The first phase in Lasswell's career came to an end in

1938. He left the University of Chicago to join forces with psychiatrist Harry Stack Sullivan and Yale anthropologist Edward Sapir, under the auspices of the William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation. There was both “push” and “pull” behind these plans to leave. Under the presidency of Robert Maynard Hutchins, the hospitality of the University of Chicago to the empirical social sciences had notably cooled. Merriam’s department came under criticism on grounds of “number crunching” and “psychologizing,” as well as internal recruitment. Hutchins’s conception of political science was humanistic, deductive, even Aquinian. Although Lasswell had tenure—as did Gosnell—both men left the University: Lasswell in 1938 for Washington, D.C., and the William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation; Gosnell a few years later, also to the capital but for government service. Merriam himself was approaching retirement and was unable to defend his younger men.

The “pull” of the eastern seaboard on Lasswell had an earlier origin. During the mid-1920s when he was preparing for his study of psychopathology and politics, Lasswell encountered the maverick psychiatrist Harry Stack Sullivan during his visits at eastern psychiatric hospitals. He also made the acquaintance of Dr. William Alanson White, the director of St. Elizabeth’s, who was strongly interested in research and in collaboration with the social sciences. (Lasswell, because of his association with Merriam, was in a position to facilitate access for Dr. White to the early organizational meetings of the Social Science Research Council, then being held in Hanover, New Hampshire.) During these same years, Sullivan had come to know the cultural anthropologist Edward Sapir, then a colleague of Lasswell’s at the University of Chicago. The three men, although of different ages—Sapir was born in 1884, Sullivan in 1892, and Lasswell in 1902—were attracted to one another out of the strongest interest in cul-

ture–personality themes. They dreamed of a research institute that would combine the study of culture, society, and personality and contribute to a better and happier world. The research institute never came to fruition, but these encounters surely influenced Lasswell's program at the University of Chicago, Sapir's Institute of Human Relations at Yale, and Sullivan's William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation in Washington, D.C.

In 1938, however, it appeared that these plans for a social science-cum-psychiatry institute in either New York or Washington with Sapir, Sullivan, and Lasswell as the full-time core research faculty were about to mature. In April 1938 the trustees of the William Alanson White Foundation decided to seek funds to support a full-time permanent research staff in psychiatry and the social sciences. And the three men were ready to move: Lasswell was pessimistic about prospects at Chicago, Sapir was acutely uncomfortable at Yale, and Sullivan looked forward to creative research collaboration under the most favorable of auspices.

It was in this mood of high hopes that in the spring of 1938 Harold Lasswell packed and shipped his files and belongings in two moving vans—which were fated to collide and burn on a lonely Indiana highway. But this was only the beginning of misadventure and tragedy. The fund-raising plans were unsuccessful, and relations between Sullivan and Lasswell deteriorated. Sapir died in early 1939.

Lasswell thus began the second phase of his career at age thirty-six, in Washington, D.C., with uncertain prospects. He improvised for a while, giving educational radio broadcasts on "Human Nature in Action" over NBC and consulting to foundations. Beginning in the academic year 1938–39 he taught seminars as a visiting lecturer in association with Myres McDougal at the Yale School of Law; he was appointed professor of law there in 1946. As the international crisis

deepened, he became involved in research programs at the Library of Congress and the Department of Justice. The Library of Congress at Lasswell's recommendation established a war communications research project, drawing on his experience with World War I propaganda. And the Department of Justice set up a special war policies unit to help administer the Foreign Agents Registration Act and the Sedition Act. Both of these tasks involved content analysis of the media of communication: on the world scale, as the propaganda war heated up in 1939 and 1940, and on the domestic organizational scale, as Nazis and fascists infiltrated foreign language groups and media in the United States. Lasswell gave expert testimony in a number of trials under this legislation; he was also instrumental in the effort to have quantitative content analysis admitted as evidence in the federal courts.

During the war years he played an active role as a consultant to the Office of Facts and Figures and its successor organization, the Office of War Information; the Office of Strategic Services; the Foreign Broadcast Monitoring Service of the Federal Communications Commission; and the Army's Psychological Warfare Branch. For the social sciences these various research divisions of the government departments constituted advanced training centers for young social scientists. Leading scholars such as Lasswell, Lazarsfeld, Samuel Stouffer, and Carl Hovland trained groups of specialists in survey research, experimental small group research, propaganda and content analysis, and the like.

The methodological and substantive payoffs of Lasswell's wartime research are reported in *The Language of Politics; Studies in Quantitative Semantics* (1949), which was jointly edited with one of Lasswell's most brilliant students, Nathan Leites. This volume places mass communications content in the context of domestic and international politics, offers so-

lutions for the principal methodological problems of quantitative content analysis, and reports on a number of successful uses of content analysis, both as a judicial tool and as a technique of intelligence gathering.

It had been Lasswell's ambition during World War II to set up what he termed a "world attention survey": a continual quantitative analysis of the content of the principle print and broadcast media of the major nations—friend, neutral, and enemy. It was a project of immense proportions and was set aside in the war years in favor of a much more modest program of propaganda analysis located in the Office of War Information and the Federal Communications Commission. But in the aftermath of the war and working with wartime collaborators—particularly sociologist Daniel Lerner and political scientist Ithiel Pool—Lasswell pursued these research themes. Based now as a professor in the Yale School of Law, in collaboration with Lerner, Pool, and others at the Hoover Institute and Library at Stanford, he undertook a series of comparative studies of elites and political symbols. Several volumes reporting the findings of these researches appeared in the 1950s. But one of the most important products of these Stanford years was *The Policy Sciences*, a state-of-the-art analysis of social science methodology as of the early 1950s that Lasswell coedited with Daniel Lerner, with coauthors Ernest R. Hilgard, and others.

The third phase of Lasswell's career began in 1946 when he joined the Yale Law School faculty as a professor of law. He had been teaching part-time at Yale in association with Myres McDougal since 1938, and was a visiting research associate in the Institute of International Studies during the war years. His permanent location in New Haven in 1946 made possible a fruitful collaboration between Lasswell and McDougal in teaching, research, and contributions to legal and political theory, a collaboration that continued for the

next several decades. In a major monographic contribution to the *Yale Law Journal* of March 1943, Lasswell and McDougal recommended the fundamental reform of law school curricula. The monograph argued that lawyers were the principal policymakers in modern democratic societies and that traditional law school curricula failed to provide training for the variety of policymaking roles lawyers were called upon to perform. In this seminal article, Lasswell and McDougal sought to remedy these shortcomings. They formulated a curricular philosophy based on the assumption that law had to be understood as a process of authoritative decision by which the members of a community clarify and secure their common interests. They then elaborated a sequence of seminars and courses that would effectively implement this philosophy. Prominent in this and later collaborations with McDougal and other law school colleagues were two theoretical innovations—components of an “institutional and value map”—that are properly associated with Lasswell’s Yale career. The first innovation was a functional scheme for the analysis of decision-making. This became in its final form a seven-phase process beginning with intelligence, in the sense of knowledge, and proceeding to promotion, prescription, invocation, application, termination, and evaluation. The second innovation was a classification of goals or base values that included power, wealth, respect, well-being, affection, skill, rectitude, and enlightenment. These two theoretical schemes enabled the legal scholar to locate his research in the policy process and to specify its substantive value aspects. The theoretical categories served to place in context the various legal and other studies that Lasswell carried on in the next decades.

One of Lasswell’s most influential contributions in legal studies was *Power and Personality* (1948) in which he presented a series of case histories of judges to demonstrate the con-

nection between personality characteristics and patterns of legal decision-making. Other Lasswell contributions to legal research and analysis are contained in such volumes as *Studies in World Public Order* (with Myres McDougal, 1960); *In Defense of Public Order: The Emerging Field of Sanction Law* (with Richard Arens, 1961); *Law and Public Order in Space* (with Myres McDougal and Ivan A. Vlastic, 1963); and *Human Rights and World Public Order: The Basic Policies of an International Law of Human Dignity* (with McDougal and Lung-chu Chen, 1980). A final volume, entitled *Jurisprudence for a Free Society: Studies in Law, Science, and Policy* and coauthored with McDougal, is still to appear.

Lasswell became Ford Professor of Law and Social Science Emeritus at Yale in 1970. The last seven years of his life were spent in New Haven, where he continued his research interests, and in New York City, where he was affiliated with the Policy Sciences Center that he had helped to found in the 1940s.

Quantitatively Lasswell's productivity was enormous. He wrote, coauthored, edited, and coedited some sixty books. He also contributed more than 300 articles to a wide range of journals: political science, sociological, psychiatric and psychological, legal, journalism, and public opinion. His publications also include several hundred reviews and comments. Among the important works that have not yet been mentioned are *Power and Society* (with Abraham Kaplan, 1950); *Democratic Character* (1951); *The Decision Process: Seven Categories of Functional Analysis* (1956); *The Future of Political Science* (1963); *The Sharing of Power in a Psychiatric Hospital* (with Robert Rubenstein, 1966); *Peasants, Power, and Applied Social Change: Vicos as a Model* (with Henry F. Dobyns and Paul L. Doughty, 1971); and *The Signature of Power: Buildings, Communication and Policy* (with Merritt B. Fox, 1979).

These titles suggest the enormous range of Lasswell's in-

terests, which he maintained throughout his life. *Power and Society*, which was written in collaboration with the philosopher Abraham Kaplan, was a propositional inventory and conceptual handbook for political science. Among its noteworthy contents was the elaborated version of Lasswell's classification of base values (see above). Lasswell's monograph, *Democratic Character*, was an important addendum to a 1951 reprint of his *Psychopathology and Politics* and *Politics: Who Gets What, When, and How*, neither of which dealt with the psychological aspects of democracy. This monograph sought first to define the value orientations that would be supportive of democratic institutions and then to spell out "democratic" personality characteristics and the social and family conditions that were likely to produce them. His monograph on the decision process (1956) spelled out more clearly his theoretical framework for the phases of policymaking and implementation discussed above.

In *The Future of Political Science* (1963), evocative of earlier visions of a world in which social science research has reached high influence, he draws on two social science research projects in which he was engaged in the 1960s. The first of these was an anthropological study of a hacienda in Peru. In this effort Lasswell collaborated with Allan Holmberg of Cornell and later produced a book (with Dobyns and Doughty) entitled *Peasants, Power, and Applied Social Change: Vicos as a Model* (1971). The experiment involved giving increasing initiative in decision-making to the peasants in the hacienda and attempting to measure the consequences of these and other experimental inputs of modernization and democratization. The second, done collaboratively with Robert Rubenstein, was a study of an experiment at the Yale Psychiatric Institute involving the participation of patients with staff and psychiatrists in decision-making on the ward. The research was concerned with the effects of this participation on the effective-

ness of the ward and on the therapeutic goals of the institute. (A book documenting the study appeared in 1966 under the title, *The Sharing of Power in a Psychiatric Hospital*.) *The Future of Political Science* proposes that the political science profession develop the capacity to administer comprehensive surveys of world political change in order to advise effectively in the avoidance of war and other social evils. Such a survey would be informed by Lasswell's decision-process and goal-value conceptualizations. He also describes the kind of professional education that would be required to administer this kind of research program and cultivate the creativity essential for effective intervention.

Finally, in a book published after his death, *The Signature of Power: Buildings, Communication and Policy* (1979), Lasswell explores the relations between the architecture of public buildings, their public functions, and the surrounding political culture. Using photographs of public buildings and monuments from all over the world to illustrate his points, he demonstrates that the functions of buildings—civil or military, judicial, legislative, and bureaucratic—influence their structures. These structures in turn are influenced by national cultures, which produce their own structural variations.

Lasswell received many honors in the course of his career. He served as president of the American Political Science Association in 1956 and of the American Society of International Law from 1966 to 1968. He received honorary degrees from the University of Chicago, Columbia University, the University of Illinois, and the Jewish Theological Seminary. He was actively associated as officer, board member, or consultant to the Committee for Economic Development, the Commission on the Freedom of the Press, the Rand Corporation, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and many other organizations. He was a fellow of

the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and was inducted into the National Academy of Sciences in 1974.

Harold Lasswell suffered a massive stroke on December 24, 1977, from which he never recovered. He died of pneumonia in his apartment in New York City on December 18, 1978.

I WISH TO ACKNOWLEDGE the help I have received from a number of sources: from Dwaine Marvick's "Introduction" to his anthology, *Harold Lasswell on Political Sociology* (1977); from the various contributions to Harold Lasswell's festschrift, *Politics, Personality, and Social Science in the Twentieth Century* (ed. Arnold Rogow, 1969); the memorial volume, *Harold Dwight Lasswell 1902–1978*, which was published by the Yale Law School under the editorship of Myres McDougal; and Helen Swick Perry's *Psychiatrist of America: The Life of Harry Stack Sullivan* (1982), which contains information on the early collaboration of Lasswell with Sapir and Sullivan; and from personal communications and accounts provided by William T. R. Fox, Bruce L. Smith, Andrew R. Willard, Rodney Muth, and Myres McDougal.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1925

Two forgotten studies in political psychology. *Am. Political Sci. Rev.*, 19:707-17.

1927

Propaganda Technique in the World War. (Ph.D. dissertation.) New York: A. A. Knopf; London: Kegan Paul.

Types of political personalities. *Proc. Am. Sociological Soc.*, 22:159-69.

1929

Personality studies. In: *Chicago: An Experiment in Social Science Research*, ed. T. V. Smith and L. D. White, pp. 177-93. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Problem of adequate personality records: A proposal. *Am. J. Psychiatry*, 7:1057-66.

The study of the ill as a method of research into political personalities. *Am. Political Sci. Rev.*, 23:996-1001.

1930

Psychopathology and Politics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Personality system and its substitutive reactions. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.*, 24:433-40.

Psychoanalytic interviews as a method of research on personalities. *Childs Emotions*, February:136-57.

The scientific study of human biography. *Sci. Mon.*, 30:79-80.

Self-analysis and judicial thinking. *Int. J. Ethics*, 40:354-62.

1931

The measurement of public opinion. *Am. Political Sci. Rev.*, 25:311-26.

1932

Triple-appeal principle: A contribution of psychoanalysis to political and social science. *Am. J. Sociology*, 37:523-38.

1935

With R. D. Casey and B. L. Smith. *Propaganda and Promotional Activities: An Annotated Bibliography*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

World Politics and Personal Insecurity. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Verbal references and physiological changes during the psychoanalytic interview: A preliminary communication. *Psychoanal. Rev.*, 22:10-24.

1936

Politics: Who Gets What, When, How. New York: Whittlesey House, McGraw-Hill.

Certain prognostic changes during trial (psychoanalytic) interviews. *Psychoanal. Rev.*, 23:241-47.

1937

A method of interlapping observation in the study of personality in culture. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.*, 32:240-43.

1938

What psychiatrists and political scientists can learn from one another. *Psychiatry*, 1:33-39.

1939

With Dorothy Blumenstock Jones. *World Revolutionary Propaganda: A Chicago Study*. New York: A. A. Knopf.

1941

The garrison state. *Am. J. Sociology*, 46:455-68.

1943

With Myres McDougal. Legal education and public policy: Professional training in the public interest. *Yale Law J.*, 52:533-61.

1945

World Politics Faces Economics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Interrelations of world organization and society. *Yale Law J.*, 55:889-909.

1948

The Analysis of Political Behaviour: An Empirical Approach. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd.
Power and Personality. New York: W. W. Norton.

1949

With Nathan Leites, eds. *Language of Politics: Studies in Quantitative Semantics.* New York: George Stewart.

1950

With Abraham Kaplan. *Power and Society.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
National Security and Individual Freedom. New York: McGraw-Hill.

1951

With Daniel Lerner, eds. *The Policy Sciences: Recent Developments in Scope and Method.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
 Democratic character. In: *The Political Writings of Harold D. Lasswell*, pp. 465–525. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

1952

With Daniel Lerner and C. Easton Rothwell. *The Comparative Study of Elites.* Hoover Institute Studies. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
 With Daniel Lerner and Ithiel de Sola Pool. *The Comparative Study of Symbols.* Hoover Institute Studies. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

1956

The Decision Process: Seven Categories of Functional Analysis. College Park: University of Maryland Press.
 The political science of science: An inquiry into the possible reconciliation of mastery and freedom. *Am. Political Sci. Rev.*, 50:961–79.

1959

Political constitution and character. *Psychoanal. Rev.*, 46:3–18.
 The qualitative and quantitative in political and legal analysis. *Dae-*

dalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 88:633–45.

With Myres McDougal. The identification and appraisal of diverse systems of public order. *Am. J. Int. Law*, 53:1–29.

1960

With Myres McDougal. *Studies in World Public Order*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

With L. Z. Freedman. The common frontiers of psychiatry and law. *Am. J. Psychiatry*, 117:490–98.

1961

With Richard Arens. *In Defense of Public Order: The Emerging Field of Sanction Law*. New York: Columbia University Press.

With L. Z. Freedman. Cooperation for research in psychiatry and law. *Am. J. Psychiatry*, 117:692–94.

1963

The Future of Political Science. New York: Atherton Press.

With Myres McDougal and Ivan A. Vlastic. *Law and Public Order in Space*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

With Arnold A. Rogow. *Power, Corruption, and Rectitude*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

1964

With Bruce M. Russett, Hayward R. Alker, Jr., and Karl W. Deutsch. *World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators*. New Haven, Conn., and London: Yale University Press.

1965

With Daniel Lerner, eds. *World Revolutionary Elites: Studies in Coercive Ideological Movements*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

1966

With Robert Rubenstein. *The Sharing of Power in a Psychiatric Hospital*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

1967

With Myres McDougal and James C. Miller. *The Interpretation of Agreements and World Public Order: Principles of Content and Procedure*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

1968

With Myres McDougal and W. Michael Reisman. Theories about international law: Prologue to a configurative jurisprudence. *Virginia J. Int. Law*, 8:188–299.

1969

With Satish Arora. *Political Communication: The Public Language of Political Elites in India and the United States*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

With Allan Holmberg. Toward a general theory of directed value accumulation and institutional development. In: *Political and Administrative Development*, ed. Ralph Braibanti, pp. 354–99. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

1971

With Henry F. Dobyns and Paul L. Doughty. *Peasants, Power, and Applied Social Change: Vicos as a Model*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.

1975

With Warren F. Ilchman, John D. Montgomery, and Myron Weiner. *Policy Sciences and Population*. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company.

1979

With Merritt B. Fox. *The Signature of Power: Buildings, Communication and Policy*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books.

1980

With Myres McDougal and Lung-chu Chen. *Human Rights and World Public Order: The Basic Policies of an International Law of Human Dignity*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

With Daniel Lerner and Hans Speier, eds. *Propaganda and Communication in World History*. 3 vols. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.