

How Propaganda Became Public Relations

How Propaganda Became Public Relations pulls back the curtain on propaganda: how it was born, how it works, and how it has masked the bulk of its operations by rebranding itself as public relations. Cory Wimberly uses archival materials and wide variety of sources—Foucault’s work on governmentality, political economy, liberalism, mass psychology, and history—to mount a genealogical challenge to two commonplaces about propaganda. First, modern propaganda did not originate in the state and was never primarily located in the state; instead, it began and flourished as a for-profit service for businesses. Further, propaganda is not focused on public beliefs and does not operate mainly through lies and deceit; propaganda is an apparatus of government that aims to create the publics that will freely undertake the conduct its clients’ desire.

Businesses have used propaganda since the early twentieth century to construct the laboring, consuming, and voting publics that they needed to secure and grow their operations. Over that time, corporations have become the most numerous and well-funded apparatuses of government in the West, operating privately and without democratic accountability. Wimberly explains why liberal strategies of resistance have failed and a new focus on creating mass subjectivity through democratic means is essential to countering propaganda.

This book offers a sophisticated analysis that will be of interest to scholars and advanced students working in social and political philosophy, Continental philosophy, political communication, the history of capitalism, and the history of public relations.

Cory Wimberly is Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, USA.

Routledge Studies in Contemporary Philosophy

Freedom to Care

Liberalism, Dependency Care, and Culture

Asha Bhandary

Moved by Machines

Performance Metaphors and Philosophy of Technology

Mark Coeckelbergh

Responses to Naturalism

Critical Perspectives from Idealism and Pragmatism

Edited by Paul Giladi

Digital Hermeneutics

Philosophical Investigations in New Media and Technologies

Alberto Romele

Naturalism, Human Flourishing, and Asian Philosophy

Owen Flanagan and Beyond

Edited by Bongrae Seok

Philosophy of Logical Systems

Jaroslav Peregrin

Consequences of Reference Failure

Michael McKinsey

How Propaganda Became Public Relations

Foucault and the Corporate Government of the Public

Cory Wimberly

For more information about this series, please visit: www.routledge.com/Routledge-Studies-in-Contemporary-Philosophy/book-series/SE0720

How Propaganda Became Public Relations

Foucault and the Corporate
Government of the Public

Cory Wimberly

First published 2020
by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2020 Taylor & Francis

The right of Cory Wimberly to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-0-367-26314-0 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-429-29251-4 (ebk)

Typeset in Sabon
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

To my parents, for teaching me the kind of skepticism that always keeps one eyebrow cocked.

To Siena, for the joy that reminds me why I write.

And to the twins, whose birth allowed me to enjoy this project for years longer than I might have otherwise.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Contents

Introduction: From Propaganda to Public Relations	1
1 What Does Propaganda Do?	25
2 Propaganda Contra Liberalism	63
3 The Art and Science of Controlling Minds: The Influence of Political Economy and French Royalists on Public Relations	86
4 Governing Mr. and Mrs. Intelligent Quotient Minus: Lineages of Crowd Psychology in the Governmentality of Propaganda	105
5 Crossing the Atlantic, Propaganda's New Problematization for Corporate America	131
6 Edward Bernays and the Interacting Forces That Govern Public Opinion	149
7 Grappling With Propaganda Today	170
<i>Index</i>	200



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Introduction

From Propaganda to Public Relations

Everybody knows enough about propaganda to dislike it, but few know enough to say what it is that propaganda actually does. Propaganda typically conjures visions of flag-waving foreign nations where the government has the people so discombobulated that they think that up is down and down is up. Or, closer to home, people use the word ‘propaganda’ to draw a tremendous circle that encompasses all fallacious attempts at persuasion and sometimes even uncharitably shades into meaning something like ‘ideas I disagree with.’ Propaganda in popular usage is an almost uselessly broad term vaguely tied to mass deception and public manipulation. Few know that propaganda is something much more specific than this—with a well-defined and erudite body of professional knowledge, characteristic practices, and even conferences for refining their techniques—and it is one of the propagandists’ great successes that few care to know it.

Propagandists abandoned the name ‘propaganda’ in the early twentieth century to shed its negative connotations, and even many working in the field today cannot connect the contemporary name of the field with its historical one. ‘Propaganda’ first came into usage in 1622 from the Catholic Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (*Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide*), but by the twentieth century its name was already popularly soiled. At the turn of the twentieth century, propagandists entered into a long search for a new name and it took decades for another name to reach consensus. Raymond Mayer lamented the souring of the term in his 1933 *How to Do Publicity*: “Through the years propaganda has been used to help win wars and to aid in struggles for trade. It has fallen into ill repute, probably more so than it deserves.”¹ Ivy L. Lee, perhaps the most influential of the modern propagandists, wrote about his frustration in trying to replace the word ‘propaganda’ with something else in 1925: “[Propaganda] is a bad word; I wish I had some substitute for it, but after all it means the effort to propagate ideas, and I do not know any real derivative to substitute for the word.”² One can find plenty of other examples of prominent propagandists (e.g., Quitt and Casey, Arthur Page, John Price Jones, and Wilder and Buell) lamenting the bad publicity propaganda had gotten and pondering the

2 Introduction

possibilities for a new name.³ ‘Publicity’ was the early favorite, but it was ‘public relations’ that eventually gained dominance during the 1920s. Edward Bernays, perhaps the only other name in early twentieth-century propaganda to equal the prominence of Ivy Lee, took sole credit for renaming the field in his 1923 *Crystallizing Public Opinion*, and while he may have given himself too much credit (Bernays frequently did), he was certainly instrumental in the renaming:

When I came back to the United States [from World War I], I decided that if you could use propaganda for war, you could certainly use it for peace. And “propaganda” got to be a bad word because of the Germans using it, so what I did was to try and find some other words so we found the words “public relations.”⁴

The propagandists did their job well, and few people today know of the connection between public relations and propaganda; many ‘public relations counsels’ do not even know the history of their own field. Propaganda popularly remains defined as any attempt at mass manipulation, but the reality is that it is a multibillion-dollar industry with a well-defined set of practitioners, knowledges, and economic relationships.⁵

In this text I will switch between ‘public relations’ and ‘propaganda’ as interchangeable terms. Propaganda is not different from public relations except in its name: public relations and propaganda name the same activities, the same rationalization of those activities, and even the same personages. They are the same except that public relations is a kind of doubling of propaganda, in that the term ‘public relations’ is propaganda for propaganda. I use the terms interchangeably in order to highlight their connection and to reconnect them more tightly in academic and public discourse. I understand that this usage might be counterintuitive to some, but it is precisely to the degree it is counterintuitive that it is necessary to connect them. We are subject to a near constant barrage of corporate public relations and we should know it for what it is: propaganda.

What is it exactly that propagandists do? How do they conceptualize society, the public, their clients, and their relationships to them? Any research into these questions inevitably runs into thorny empirical blockages. Namely, no public relations firm is willing to open the archives of their current or even remotely recent clients to preserve trade secrets and to forestall the tremendously bad publicity that would result from their activities becoming public. As the current work is not available, this text turns to the historical archives, a strategy that is unique among the current philosophical scholarship on propaganda; earlier work did not even have the opportunity to use the archives, as many have 70- to 100-year waiting periods before they can be accessed. It is only in the last years that some of archives have become available. An overview of my approach and its unique results in comparison to past work is offered

toward the end of this introduction. Here, I would like to anticipate some of my findings and show their relation to the core thesis of this book.

Earlier materials, from 1900 to 1934, have several advantages. First, they are almost completely available to the public—a benefit that cannot be overstated. Just as importantly, the quality of the archives is excellent, not just for their breadth but also because of the quality of the materials themselves. The early twentieth century was a decisive time in the history of propaganda and the West more generally: a break had occurred with the previous propaganda methods of the nineteenth century, and a new kind of propaganda was being born a tumultuous birth. The crisis and rethinking of the field that occurred during the early part of the twentieth century produced an exceptionally articulate and philosophical discourse as these individuals created their field and created new prescriptions “for American institutions and especially for business.”⁶

The present-day consensus is that the first modern propaganda firm was the Publicity Bureau of Boston, founded in 1900.⁷ Such claims of origin must in the final analysis be somewhat arbitrary, as the Publicity Bureau was clearly influenced by developments before it and later practitioners further enhanced, modified, and rejected the relations of power and knowledge that trace from the Publicity Bureau. Across this zone of temporal and conceptual flux, this work primarily casts its net from 1900 and the founding of the Publicity Bureau to 1934, which not only marks the death of Ivy L. Lee—the foremost early counsel in public relations—but also the point at which the Great Depression was understood to be an enduring phenomenon and thinking began to be concentrated around issues arising specifically from the Depression and Roosevelt’s New Deal. Within this early period, 1900–1934, there was a decentralized but nonetheless highly interconnected construction of modern propaganda. The eventuation of public relations was tied to the similarly dispersed and contested birth of the corporation and the modern urban consumptive public at sites across the United States. Propaganda stood between its clients (usually corporations) and their publics and sought to refigure their relationships to each other so that corporations could succeed: “Business publicity comprehends the entirety of the relations between any enterprise, corporation or individual, engaged in a commercial undertaking, and their or his public.”⁸ This is in part what makes this topic so interesting: public relations explicitly and relentlessly sought to theorize and modify the relationships forming between the corporation and its publics, and there are few areas of greater importance to the present than the corporations or the public.

The first law to make incorporation easy in the United States was established in 1896 in New Jersey, and other states soon followed. From 1896 forward, the corporate apparatus played an important role in producing, shaping, and intensifying changes underway in the United States. The new urban populations, called to the cities by rapid changes in

4 *Introduction*

American life, were characterized as a corporation's 'publics' by propagandists. These publics had many competing forms of description and many possible futures outside of their construction as corporate publics: these urban massifications were the proletariat to Marxists and Socialists, a series of rational autonomous individuals to laissez-faire liberals, laborers to factory owners, voters to politicians, dangerous classes to the middle and upper classes, and consumers to merchants. Alongside these competing and in some ways overlapping characterizations of the urban mass, propaganda developed a conception of the mass that would make it governable and that would render its conduct able to be conducted by its mostly corporate clientele.

The central chapters of this book conduct a deep investigation of the publics as a peculiar invention of a time and place and position the invention of the publics as part of the creation of the larger networks of power and knowledge that would define corporations in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. It was not only corporations that were trying to theorize and govern the urban masses; many other actors were engaged in similar projects, albeit guided by different values. Evidently, it was hard to avoid thinking about the urban masses at the turn of the century when it had manifested its new size and importance through the largest mass events that had yet taken place in human history. The May Day rallies that took place across the United States and Europe beginning in 1890 were both the largest collective demonstrations (totaling all the demonstrators across all locations) and the largest single demonstrations (the most people in a single location) that had ever taken place.⁹ These tremendous gatherings of individuals, by their own size and power, called out their unprecedented character, which public relations (PR) alongside others sought to shape, harness, and tame. These new urban masses were not just visible on May 4th, but in tenements, on factory floors, on strike, at the ballot box, at sporting events, consuming at the new department stores, and as the audience for the exploding mass media outlets. The urban mass in many ways culminated in the mass readership of newspapers, a daily ritual shared by 15 million people in the United States at the turn of the century.

Propagandists intentionally placed themselves at the nexus of the corporation, the mass media, the state, and the urban masses. This makes propaganda a sensitive, multifaceted, and well-situated barometer for the tensions that marked turn-of-the-century life, much like a seismograph placed between colliding tectonic plates. William Baldwin, one of the first and most respected early public relations counsels, wrote: "Rubbing takes place at all levels—person-to-person, group-to-group, nation-to-nation, alliance-to-alliance. It can become highly abrasive where imbalances develop in management-labor, producer-consumer, landlord-tenant, majority-minority relationships and the like."¹⁰ It was the task of public relations not just to observe the rubbing of those plates but also to

adjust those plates, making sure that corporations and their publics took the forms that would best ease corporate growth and dominance.

It is no wonder then that propaganda was a site of great innovation and action: its constitution depended not just on its relationships to its publics and corporations, both of which were themselves intense poles of activity and change, but also to the contesting efforts of others within the United States to define them differently. Propagandists inserted their work into the relationship of businesses and the masses in order to shape corporations and the publics on terms favorable to its business clients, while simultaneously justifying and naturalizing the domination of business in shaping American life:

Business is in the saddle. It is the power behind the throne. The world will be what business makes it, and advertising, if it sees its opportunity in the largest light, can help business to formulate its ideals, put them into effective language, and write them not merely on the pages of newspapers and magazines or on the waves of the ether, but in the more enduring stuff of minds and hearts.¹¹

Into the deeply and rapidly changing waters of the turn of the early twentieth century public relations began to lay down piers, attempting to build and hold in place constructions of the public and corporations that were favorable to its clientele and to itself: “Publicity in its ultimate sense means the actual relationship of a company to the people, and that relationship involves far more than *saying*—it involves *doing*.”¹² Propaganda sought to build the publics and corporations that would best achieve its corporate client’s directives, which sometimes placed propagandists in the odd position of working for the client against the client’s wishes when they judged that the client was doing something damaging to its own aims.

What sets this work apart in considering propaganda is how it examines the changes propaganda created in constructing its publics, corporations, and itself. Typically, as I will explore in greater detail and specificity in Chapter 5, previous studies of propaganda have assumed that propaganda has neither significantly altered the nature of the publics nor business (i.e., capitalism). Rather, previous critics have seen propaganda as a means to spread fallacious reasoning or provide an ideological cover—a kind of masking that hides the nature of things without fundamentally altering them. Previous efforts, popular and scholarly, have taken propaganda to focus on beliefs. This work, instead of looking at propaganda as papering over reality with false belief, looks at propaganda as having an important role in creating it. Instead of taking propaganda, corporations, and the public as objects of study whose form is pre-given but hidden by propaganda, this study looks at propaganda as occupying a privileged place in the invention of corporations, their publics, and the

6 Introduction

relations of government between the two. This work starts from a different set of methodological presuppositions than those that guide most work on propaganda. I will not shelter the hope most critics have that the world they want lives just below the surface, waiting to spring forth once the right critical philosophical incantation is uttered to clear away the lies and ideological distortions. This work begins from the position, well supported by the archives, that propaganda was an apparatus for transforming all the relationships its clients had with the world and in turn transforming those clients and the publics they governed. Edward Bernays was clear that his primary strategy was not lying or ideological masking of subjects' true nature; he counseled his clients that "to make customers is the new problem."¹³ Make, not deceive, were his words and conduct, not beliefs, was his target.

At the turn of the twentieth century, massive numbers of consumers, laborers, urban dwellers, and voting blocs that hardly existed 50 years before needed to be created on a gigantic scale. Relations and subjectivities that may today seem common and even natural hardly existed as modern propaganda first went to work. Theodore Vail, head of AT&T and an early proponent for the wide-scale and continuous use of propaganda by businesses, wrote in November, 1917:

Contrast the conditions which I saw as a boy and the conditions of today. When I first entered business, man was self-dependent; with the exception of the luxuries—and there were few enough of those—the individual and his family produced every necessity of life. Most production and manufacture was by individual, manual labor. . . . Now none of us is self-contained; we depend upon others for not only the luxuries but also for the comforts and the very necessities of life.¹⁴

As corporations made steel I-beams, party dresses, and bar soap, they also needed to mass-produce the workers, voters, shoppers, and labor to fuel a stable and thriving environment for business in the twenty-first century. Propaganda did this by transforming corporations into apparatuses of government and subjectification.

One of the most powerful and provocative ways propaganda developed for thinking of itself was as an apparatus of government that worked in the last analysis through subjectification. Although the exact term 'subjectification' was not used as part of the early discourse of propaganda, the idea of mass-producing publics to fill the human needs in a rising industrial and corporate order—as laborers, consumers, managers, voters—was an exciting and innovative concept. Bernays wrote in 1928:

Mass production is only profitable if its rhythm can be maintained—that is, if it can continue to sell its product in steady or increasing

quantity. The result is that while, under the handicraft or small-unit system of production that was typical a century ago, demand created the supply, today supply must actively seek to create its corresponding demand. A single factory, potentially capable of supplying a whole continent with its particular product cannot afford to wait until the public asks for its product; it must maintain constant touch, through advertising and propaganda, with the vast public in order to assure itself the continuous demand which alone will make its costly plant profitable. This entails a vastly more complex system of distribution than formerly. *To make customers is the new problem.*¹⁵

For most public relations counsels, subjectification was an activity that could only be carried so far. Propagandists worked with a view of the subject as composed of certain innate natural drives. These drives could be satisfied in a variety of ways, so the work of propagandists was to transform how drives were translated into specific desires and how subjects went about satisfying those desires. For instance, Brewster and Palmer argued that all people have a drive for sociality and companionship. This drive, while an inalterable fact, still could be satisfied in an almost infinite number of ways, and it was the job of the propagandist to train the customer to satisfy the drive in a way useful to their clients through “repetition, impressive size, illustration and short phrases”:

We do not know just what electricity is, but we do know something about how it acts and, within certain limitations, how it can be controlled. Neither do we know just what the mind is, but through the researches of psychologists and through practical experience we have learned something of how the mind behaves and how, to some extent, its action can be influenced by advertising.¹⁶

Thus, by way of anticipation, we can glimpse here the notion that the government of the subject occurred largely through subjectification but that this subjectification was bounded: PR counsels assumed that the object of desire and the satisfaction of desire could be transformed but not the basic drives humans possess.

I differ from public relations in that I am not going to take the presupposition that the basal psychology of the subject is essentially fixed in the way that public relations agents take it to be. I follow Foucault in thinking that it is an error to regard the subject “as a sort of elementary nucleus, a primitive atom or some multiple inert matter to which power is applied, or which is struck by a power that subordinates or destroys individuals.”¹⁷ Rather than accepting propagandists’ metaphysical claims to have discovered the essence of the subject, I treat that metaphysics as a cover and legitimation for the deeper creation of the subject who bore those supposedly innate drives.

8 Introduction

Nietzsche, Foucault, and many others have worked historically and especially through the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries to provide interesting genealogies of the emergence and eventual disappearance of subjectivities; the thrust of these works is to show that what we assume to be common to people across time and culture is not. For instance, feminists like Judith Butler, Diana Taylor, and Jana Sawicki disrupt an enduring understanding of gender roles; queer theorists like Mark Halperin do the same with sexuality; Ladelle McWhorter and Cornel West do the same with race, Nietzsche with morality; and Foucault with madness, illness, health, and normality. These works empower and provide positive support for the analytical position I am taking here because they provide strong reason to be skeptical about claims to have discovered the nature of the subject. This work will take the more skeptical position that propagandists did not discover the nature of the subject but created a knowledge of the subject based on their own local needs. In this genealogical frame, I take it not only that the propagandists work through subjectification at a ‘surface’ level, altering the objects of desire and their manner of pursuit in the publics, but also that their understanding of the underlying nature of public subjectivity was also their creation and part of what they produced in their action.

This work takes its primary analytical point of departure on the subject from Foucault’s “The Subject and Power,” although it draws on complementary materials from *The History of Sexuality* and several of his lecture courses from the late 1970s. In Foucault’s work from *The History of Sexuality Volume I* (1976) to “The Subject and Power” (1982), genealogy does not posit a “theory of the subject,” so most accurately one would have to say that there is no such thing as ‘the genealogical subject’; this makes sense in my own aim to work outside of the priority of a subject that is marked by an enduring human essence. Instead of a theory of the subject that elaborates a human nature, Foucault’s genealogy performs an “analysis” of subjectivity in order to write its “history.”¹⁸ An analysis differs from a theory in that a theory seeks to give a totalizing account—it seeks to capture the quiddity of the thing, in this case the subject. In contradistinction, an analysis of the subject aims to record the conditions under which it is emergent: “My objective, instead, has been to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects.”¹⁹ Instead of looking for the subject as an autonomous, independently existing object with its own essential definition and functions, this work approaches the subject as a part of a particular situation that only materializes through the differential elaboration of relations of power in a localized context.

The subject, for Foucault and in this work, is something that only appears within a certain strategic situation; it has no being or meaning outside of it. For instance, there is no familial subject outside of familial relations (sons, daughters, mothers, fathers); there are only fathers

if there are mothers, and mothers if there are sons and daughters, and so forth. All subjects are found embedded in some particular situation and they gain their meaning (e.g., ‘corporate executive’) only within that specific arrangement of forces, in this case the arrangement known as the ‘corporation.’ The subject here is not a generic element of theory that can be anonymously transposed between contexts but a localized phenomenon that is only revealed through a situated analysis of power relations.

Power is thus an important term in understanding the subjectivities produced in propaganda. In rehashing the subject of power in Foucault, I am mindful of the possibility of needless repetition. If sometimes people write that gallons of ink have been spilled on a topic, we would have to say that the amount of ink that has been spilled on Foucault’s theory of power is closer to what spilled from the Exxon Valdez. Resultantly, in establishing the analytical framework of this text, I will move quickly to narrow the discussion of power in Foucault to conduct, which is the most relevant aspect to understanding to the approach of this text.

Foucault explored several ways of understanding power throughout his career. During the 1970s, until *Security, Territory, Population* (1977), Foucault studied power through the lens of war. Especially in *Society Must Be Defended*, he looked at power as an expression of war; power was the assertion of one agent’s prerogative over another: “Power is war, the continuation of war by other means.”²⁰ For reasons that are not directly germane to this text, Foucault found this notion of power problematic and began to explore power as conduct.

In “The Subject and Power,” Foucault asserts that the “equivocal nature of the term ‘conduct’ is one of the best aids for coming to terms with the specificity of power relations.”²¹ What is this equivocal nature, and why did Foucault feel that it would give great insight into power relations, and hence the creation of subjects? Conduct has two senses here for Foucault, senses that will also be important in this text. Conduct first refers to an individual’s own behavior in “an open field of possibilities”; conduct indicates the free constitution of comportment among many available lines of comportment. Conduct in this first sense refers to the way that a subject directs its actions in a situation in which it has several possibilities.

Conduct also has the second sense of guiding or leading others, in the sense that a train conductor conducts a train or a symphony is conducted by a conductor. Foucault states that he is thinking of conduct in this second sense less as “a confrontation between two adversaries” and more as the direction of the “possibilities or action of other people.”²² If previously Foucault had thought of power as war, as a struggle between conflicting partners, then with the notion of conduct he opened the door to the idea that power could be mutually acceptable and cooperative, if not always egalitarian. We should not make the mistake, however, of thinking that conducting others is necessarily cooperative or beneficent, just

10 *Introduction*

that it is potentially so; conduct frees us from thinking that power must be conflict, struggle, and war, not that it will never be so. It is also possible to conduct others surreptitiously, against their interests, or aggressively against their will—in the way a prison warden conducts the lives of prisoners.

Conduct in this second sense of the conduct of others is deeply tied to the idea of government in Foucault. For Foucault, the sense of government that emerges in the renaissance is an attempt to direct the conduct—or to conduct the conduct—of subjects into specific paths:

Before it acquires its specifically political meaning in the sixteenth century, we can see that “to govern,” covers a very wide semantic domain in which it refers to movement in space, material substance, diet, the care given to an individual and the health one can assure him, and also to the exercise of command, of a constant, zealous, active, and always benevolent prescriptive activity. It refers to the control one may exercise over oneself and others, over someone’s body, soul, and behavior.²³

Foucault studies government as a historically specific set of power, knowledge, and subject relations that develop in the West as a means to conduct the conduct of others. As we will see later in the text, propagandists offer a critique of the dominant modes of government in the West, especially liberalism, and holds propaganda to be a necessary corrective.

Freedom plays an important role in this thought on government, conduct, and subjectivity. The conduct of conduct makes sense as a description only if the subject being conducted is free. Stating that a subject is conducted implies that the subject could have conducted herself otherwise but was directed through those possibilities by another. Like the train conductor moves the train between its many possible routes, and the symphony conductor conducts the symphony through just one arrangement of instruments, pitches, and rhythms among many, so too does subject’s conduct get guided among many possibilities. This does not mean that all the possibilities are equally weighted in terms of their costs and rewards (some may be more greatly rewarded than others, some are heavily penalized, etc.), but nonetheless conduct implies that the subject is working in a relational context in which multiple different ways to constitute itself exist and that government is deployed to move the subject towards one of those possible lines. Conduct—whether self-conduct or the conduct of conduct by others—always occurs in a context of freedom, where freedom is the open possibility of constituting many possible lines of comportment. Propaganda, like other means of conducting the conduct of others (coaching, pastoring, parenting, etc.) is the reaction to the “intransigence of freedom” of the subject; government seeks to guide the subject’s conduct, knowing that the conduct could be

constituted in many possible ways, at least some of which the governor prefers to others.²⁴ It is the threat of the subject acting outside of the interests of the governor that makes government necessary. Without the freedom to constitute comportment in many possible ways, it is unnecessary to govern them; likewise, it is the freedom of the subject and the possibility of unwanted conduct that prompts the growth of PR.

Precisely the problem that public relations and their corporate clients were faced with was the freedom of subjects to conduct themselves in ways contrary to the desires of corporations. The goal of corporate propaganda was to alter the behavior of subjects and channel them into composing their behavior in ways favorable to the new corporate order. It should not be forgotten that propaganda began in a time of great change for subjects in the United States as the myth and reality of the Jeffersonian citizen farmer was being displaced by the many faces of the urban wage earner. In the time of this explosion of new economic, social, and political conduct at the turn of the twentieth century, corporations sought to govern the publics towards the conduct that would enhance their wealth, control, preeminence, and security. Propaganda is a response to free conduct and an attempt, not to dominate it via violence or physical constraint, but to conduct it in its freedom towards the desired outcomes. Do not mistake my point: it is not that violence and physical constraint were not used alongside propaganda—they were—but that propaganda is distinct from physical violence as a rationalization and practice of power. This Foucauldian analytics of the subject not only provides a way to take the subjectification of public relations seriously, but it also provides a lens through which the relations of power built through public relations can be understood; namely, as a particular manifestation of the conduct of conduct, government through mass subjectification.

That this genealogical framework of analysis is so different from the extant literature is outstanding on its face because many propagandists explicitly define their service as government through the transformation of the governed, “the significant revolution of modern times is not industrial or economic or political but the revolution which is taking place in the art of creating consent among the governed.” And propagandists are not shy to say that they govern through transforming businesses and publics: “[The public relations counsel] helps to mold the action of his client as well as to mold public opinion.”²⁵ To fail to consider how public relations changes its publics or its clients, either at the level of desire or in deeper ways, has left much of the literature blinkered to the effects of propaganda. To better spell this out, I would like to consider how this blinkering operates in three broad types of writing on public relations: (1) analyses in the social sciences that seek to determine how public relations and propaganda work to influence and shape minds (diagnostic analyses); (2) archival work that seeks to explain the context into and from which public relations was born (historical analyses); and

12 Introduction

(3) critical leftist work that argues for the injustice and immorality of public relations (critical theory and social epistemology).

One can cluster together a whole series of works, generally from the social sciences, that aim to explain why propaganda works and when it works best. These articles and books often do not always explicitly state their own operating assumptions about the subject but presuppose it in their discussions of propaganda. Many of these studies make claims, again some only implicitly, that follow the formula, 'Human nature is X, therefore effective propaganda can only take forms Y and Z,' or its variant, 'Human nature is X, therefore propaganda cannot effectively take forms A and B.' For example, in Ellul's canonical study of propaganda he repeatedly makes claims of the following form: "Besides, the public is only sensitive to contemporary events," or:

One trait of vertical propaganda is that the propagandee remains alone even when he is part of a crowd. His shouts of enthusiasm or hatred, though part of the shouts of the crowd, do not put him in communication with others; his shouts are only a response to the leader.²⁶

Ellul assumes a stable and apparently universal form of subjectivity in order to make these types of claims in *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes*. He makes these kind of claims because he is interested in producing scientific knowledge of the human being and its relationship to propaganda, at least in the sense that he wants to produce knowledge that does not vary with different populations, at different times, or in different circumstances. By assuming a like nature across all human beings, Ellul can proclaim the efficacy or inefficacy of different methods of propaganda across different national and historical contexts to produce universal psychological claims about how propaganda works.

Jowett, who is another important writer on propaganda and public relations, also makes similar claims. In his article, *The Korean POW Controversy and the Origins of a Myth*, he claims that brainwashing is impossible because the nature of the human psyche does not permit it: "Despite the assurances of psychologists, psychiatrists, and those who study the human brain, the notion of 'brainwashing' as a distinct possibility remains as firmly entrenched as ever."²⁷ Here, Jowett hoped to show why the subject of contemporary psychology could not be deeply affected by 'brainwashing.' He argues that the notion of brainwashing should be dropped as a serious matter of study and research because the psychological notion of the subject he adopts precludes it. Again, the implication is that the subject is something given, natural, and fundamentally inalterable, which allows for knowledge about propaganda to be produced that does not vary with changes in time, place, and culture.

Lasswell's studies are older but are nonetheless still highly influential in the study of public relations and propaganda. Like Ellul and Jowett,

he makes universalizing assumptions about human nature in order to explain the efficacy of public relations and propaganda. Unlike Ellul and Jowett, he states explicitly that his assumptions about the nature of the subject derive from 'common sense' rather than dressing them up in the white lab coat of the sciences:

The procedure in this investigation has been to stick close to common-sense analysis. . . . The present student goes no further than to develop a simple classification of the various psychological materials, which have been used to produce certain specified results, and to propose a general theory of strategy and tactics, for the manipulation of these materials.²⁸

In order to produce a theory of the efficacy of propaganda across countries, Lasswell makes assumptions about the similarity of all publics in order to show how they must be affected by propaganda. Regardless of whether he works from the framework of psychology as Jowett does or from "common-sense" assumptions, he still needs to produce the subject as an enduring and universal substrate if his knowledge of propaganda is not to be a history but a science. If he wants to give an account about "how international war propaganda may be conducted with success" which applies broadly across times and cultures, then the subject and its nature must remain fixed so that conduct of propaganda in relation to the subject can also remain fixed.²⁹

All these social scientific analyses essentially aim to create a scientific knowledge of propaganda, essentially parallel to the knowledge produced by propagandists themselves. In order to fill in the 'missing' discourse on human nature and unlock the true secrets of propaganda, these social scientists have had to proceed as if the propagandists were missing such an analysis so that they could produce it. Unfortunately for them, the propagandists had no such lack; they have an incredibly well-elaborated psychology of the human being. The cause of this problem is that many, many social scientific studies are strongly lacking in a solid knowledge of the propagandists' own texts and archives and are too willing to share their inferred assumptions.

This assumption of a stable subject of propaganda unknowingly contributes to the legitimation of the propagandists' understanding of public subjectivity. In taking the nature of the subject to be fixed, as do Lasswell and Ellul, they can have a hard time explaining how propaganda can be so effective without also having to support the propagandists' claims to have discovered the nature of the subject. For instance, if propaganda techniques work by assuming the public to be subrational and they establish techniques that work through treating the public as subrational, there is a tremendous risk of reifying public relations' assumption of the public as subrational in explaining the technique's efficacy if one

takes the nature of the subject to be fixed. Propagandists formulated their relationships of government with the public based on a precisely articulated theory of public subjectivity, which in turn shaped their practices of propaganda. When social scientists set out to ‘discover’ the fixed psychology that makes propaganda work, they are vulnerable to restating and legitimating the nature of the subject as it is framed in the discourse of propaganda.

The textbook *Effective Public Relations*—perhaps the most widely read and influential textbook on PR since its first publication in 1952—offers a clear example of this danger. On page 270 of the millennial 8th edition, the textbook states that individuals come to opinions through ‘salience,’ defined as “feelings about an object derived from an individual’s experience,” and ‘pertinence,’ defined as “the relative value of an object on the basis of an object-by-object comparison.” In other words, subjects develop *feelings* about objects and they compare those feelings to other feelings to arrive at a related understanding of things. Do subjects reason? Do subjects have a principled analysis of the larger social situation on which to base their understanding of value? Do they have an ability to put aside feelings for a commitment to an abstract sense of virtue or morality in the formation of values? No, subjects have none of these abilities. Instead what we get in this picture of the human being is a mass of feelings whose weight is only determined only by comparison with other feelings. This is not a full-fledged rational individual but an emotionally driven being whose actions are determined solely by the strength of their feelings. This is pretty much the definition of someone who is stupid, according to Merriam-Webster: someone who is “not sensible or logical.”³⁰ In building a universal notion of the subject out of a set of power relations designed to disempower and govern the publics, there is tremendous risk that the underlying assumptions of these relationships—that the public is fickle, subrational, unconsciously driven, suggestible, and impulsive—also becomes the conclusion of the scientific researcher.

Ellul’s study of propaganda demonstrates the dangers of unknowingly replicating public relations’ presuppositions about the subject as scientific fact. For instance, Ellul argues that the only real effect reason has on the public is aesthetic; people do not understand reason but relate to it as a kind of costume that inspires deference, like the medieval masses reacted to hearing the Bible read in Latin (e.g., with deference and awe but without understanding). Ellul writes that propaganda that tries to use “*facts to demonstrate, rationally, the superiority of its system and to demand everybody’s support*” only “*eliminate[s] personal judgment and the capacity to form one’s own opinion.*” In other words, facts paralyze the judgment of the average individual by catapulting the individual into a realm of thought that is beyond him: facts do “not enlighten the reader or the listener; they drown him.” The average individual “cannot

remember them all [facts], or coordinate them, or understand them.”³¹ As a result, Ellul’s study—even though he is a social scientist studying propaganda and is not a propagandist—comes to the same conclusions about public subjectivity that the public relations practitioners like Lee, Bernays, Wilder and Buell come to: propaganda is an essential part of modern life because it transcribes the demands of the technical and rational basis of modern society into an irrational and emotional discourse that builds consent at the only level that the masses are able to receive it—the subrational.³²

As the social scientific literature writings claim to be working from an objective view of human nature, they ultimately disavow their role in producing and normalizing the relations of subjectivity and control produced by propagandists. Rather than seeing propaganda *and* its publics as a development that occurred at a particular point in human history as the result of a confluence of historically unique forces, they produce a scientific discourse that argues that propagandists discovered and exploited a truth about human nature that was always already there, even if undiscovered. They give the view, at least implicitly, that propaganda is not the product and responsibility of any given society or set of relationships and it cannot be changed or eliminated; instead, they produce propaganda as something that we must live with because it preys upon weaknesses that subjects will always have as long as they remain human. In sum, many of the works in the social sciences that work diagnostically to produce a scientific knowledge of how propaganda works end up reproducing and giving legitimacy to the terrible knowledge of the subject and the governmental relations of propagandists.

A second set of literature is not social scientific but historical. This literature documents the personages, institutions, and events in public relations more than it focuses on the mechanics of how propaganda works. It is often hard to tell exactly what the issues are that these histories are interested in because the texts frequently have no explicit methodology or thesis. Miller’s *The Voice of Business: Hill & Knowlton and Post-war Public Relations* never raises the topic of methodology. Capozzola’s *Uncle Sam Wants You: World War I and the Making of the Modern American Citizen* is in many ways much more politically aware and articulate than Miller’s work but never raises the issue of its own method and perspective. Scott Cutlip’s *The Unseen Power: A History* is in many ways an unmatched work. Cutlip was a friend to many of the top figures in public relations and he had unparalleled access, not only to the public relations counsels, but also to their family and friends. In his papers at the Wisconsin Historical Society, the widow of Hamilton Wright carried on a correspondence with him about her husband’s work even though it caused her such grief that she had a serious lapse in health.³³ The willingness to endure a crisis of health as the result of interviews and then persevere through future interviews serves as an example of the loyalty

and trust Cutlip engendered. Even so, this work has little reflection on its methodology beyond carefully documenting its sources and their usefulness. I can only assume that the topic of methodology or aims is not raised in these texts because they conceive of themselves as transparent conduits of the historical facts: there can be no room for methodology or aims if the work is an exact transcription of the past.

Cutlip's work, while in many ways irreplaceable, nonetheless demonstrates the problem of going without an explicit methodology and examination of one's assumptions. In the first page of the Prologue of *Unseen Power*, we get as close as this text comes to a thesis and an explicit methodology when Cutlip states, "I held, and still hold, that only through the expertise of public relations can causes, industries, individuals, and institutions make their voice heard in the public forum where thousands of shrill competing voices daily re-create the Tower of Babel."³⁴ Here Cutlip accepts tout court the public justifications of propagandists going back to the father of public relations, Ivy L. Lee.³⁵ Cutlip accepts uncritically the propaganda about propaganda: namely that it is an aid to democracy because it makes previously unheard voices available—it makes democracy more representative and fair. The biblical reference to the Tower of Babel in Cutlip shows what he thinks the state of things is—total chaos—and astonishingly places PR in the role of God returning order.

My point here is that without an explicit thesis, methodology, and their critical review, one's assumptions are all too likely to fall back on something like a 'commonsense' perspective on propaganda. The problem with relying on common sense in a study of propaganda is that propaganda has been working for more than a century to transform the common sense about itself. If public relations has been even partially successful in transforming the perception of propaganda and public relations, we need to be very careful and quite skeptical about 'commonsense' analyses of public relations.

This situation is made more dangerous by the fact that many people writing history about propaganda are themselves often public relations counsels, once were counsels, or were trained in related disciplines like journalism, communications, or public relations (even if they never worked in PR). Cutlip again comes to mind, as does Miller, but also Lasswell, L'Etang, Olasky, Center, Broom, Ries, Gower, Mickey, and Hiebert. Let me be clear: this does not mean that the foregoing authors have not produced good work or that they have never been critical. However, it does highlight that a large number of people working on the history of public relations are working out of public relations and the related danger of writing from 'common sense.' Authors who have been trained in public relations and have been taught to view it favorably are doubly at risk of adopting a 'commonsense' view of public relations that is blinkered. When common sense is the guide, the same problems that befall the social scientific literature arise. Insofar as propagandists' views about the

subject, its governance, or the roles of corporations have become common sense, then the literature runs the risk of naturalizing those views by uncritically adopting them.

Of course, not all writing on public relations is sympathetic, uncritical, and unreflective about its methodology or its subject. There is a strong left-leaning tradition of criticism, which builds on the early work of progressives like Upton Sinclair and Ida Tarbell. More recently, Noam Chomsky has brought volumes of criticism from an anarchist perspective, and Marxian thinkers like Bourdieu, Habermas, Hall, Marcuse, Horkheimer, and Adorno have worked on propaganda and related issues. Stuart Ewen's recent work *PR!: A Social History of Spin* is less radical than the preceding authors but is nonetheless situated from a critical perspective. Of the aforementioned thinkers, Chomsky, Habermas, Marcuse, and Ewen have most specifically written at length on the specific topic of public relations and propaganda. These authors also look at subjects as having a fixed and articulable nature but unlike many of the social scientists and historians, they do not take on the propagandists' assumptions about the subject its necessary government but formulate their own counternarratives. This too is problematic for the way that it masks the changes in subjectivity brought by propagandists by assuming its nature is ultimately inviolable.

My aim here is not to address these thinkers' body of thought as a whole, which is a task that would require its own volume, but instead just to deal with their methodology vis-à-vis propaganda. Chomsky, Habermas, and Marcuse all share an assumption about the universality of the subject with the social scientists discussed earlier, though to different effect. In Chomsky's famous debate with Foucault in 1971, he said:

That is, there are two intellectual tasks: one, and the one that I was discussing, is to try to create the vision of a future just society; that is to create, if you like, a humanistic social theory that is based, if possible, on some firm and humane concept of the human essence or human nature.³⁶

At the time Marcuse wrote *One-Dimensional Man*, he had developed a notion of the human psyche based on a rewriting of Freud according to Marxist sensibilities. According to Marcuse, this psychology could be found in all human societies, though it was differently manifested according to the specific repressions demanded by that society. As a consequence, Marcuse's primary critique of propaganda in *One-Dimensional Man* was that the human psyche would be better suited to a different and lesser set of oppressions than it currently encounters in contemporary Western society:

As the liberty to work or to starve, [free enterprise] spelled toil, insecurity, and fear for the vast majority of the population. [. . .] If

the productive apparatus could be organized and directed towards the satisfaction of vital needs, its control might well be centralized; such control would not prevent individual autonomy, but render it possible.³⁷

Habermas's most relevant work on public relations is his 1962 habilitation, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit* ("Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere"). This early work of his is compelling and echoes some of the themes of my own work: public opinion as a technology of domination, public relations as a tool to manufacture consent, and advertising and public relations as technologies to manufacture the public sphere. Even given this overlap, our primary emphases differ: Habermas reads the rise of public relations and its ilk as a story about the rise and fall of reason. For Habermas, the enlightenment drive to democratization meant the growth of salons and coffeehouses in which rational-critical debate could thrive and place a check on economic and political forces. In time, structural and technological changes in society—importantly the rise of a cheap and prevalent for-profit mass media—undermined those spaces of reason and replaced them with gibberish in support of an economic and political elite. I would not deny that all of that is true in its outlines, but I think the emphasis on the story of reason is misplaced in his account. For Habermas, subjects have remained the same but their social context has shifted for the worse, drawing out irrational and atomized behavior.

In the end, for all the help and inspiration that Chomsky, Marcuse, and Habermas have given to my own work, my criticism of them is that they are too conservative. They are conservative in the sense that they aim to return to and enhance—thus conserve—what they see as essential human qualities. They all wish to return to something that has been lost: Chomsky wants to end the alienation of production, Marcuse wants to satisfy "true needs," and Habermas wants to recover critical-rational subjectivity.³⁸ These leftists seek to authorize the imposition and enforcement of a set of social relations premised on the flourishing of the subject's own true nature; in other words, these discourses portray the subject's own being as calling for the imposition of the particular social and political circumstances that they favor and that only they adequately articulate. These authors attribute a voice to the nature of the subject that has the convenient effect of allowing them to disregard the subject's own literal voice in favor of the phantasmal and essential one that appears in their manuscripts. Here Marcuse traps the public in a kind of catch-22 when he states that the public must and can have the final say over their needs but can only have that say when they are "free" (in other words, when they agree with his understanding of what a human should want by nature): "In the last analysis, the question of what are true and false needs must be answered by the individuals themselves but only in the last analysis; that is, if and when they are free to give their own answer."³⁹

The voice of human nature is created in these works through the guise of social sciences and, although the works' stated intention is to oppose oppression, they too silence these abject populations through assuming that only they, and not the subjects themselves, can speak their true wants and needs.

In one important way, the leftists are much less democratic and egalitarian than even the propagandists and public relations counsels: it is more common to see the public relations counsels question the ethics of proceeding to impose their social-political vision on the public than it is to see Chomsky, Marcuse, or Habermas engaging in such moments of self-doubt and questioning. It can be hard for do-gooders to see their image of the good as an alien imposition that is controlling, dominating, and excising of the autonomy of those they claim to speak for. Foucault criticizes Chomsky on similar grounds when he strives to get Chomsky to see that his proposals for proletarian revolution will not achieve an ideal justice but simply a different justice, a shift in power relations: "That is the justification, but one doesn't speak in terms of justice but in terms of power."⁴⁰ What is amazing about the debate is Chomsky's seeming inability to recognize the possibility of Foucault's point. Chomsky never openly grapples with the question of whether or not the ideals that he constructs are really justified by an "essential nature" or are instead just the imposition of his own ideals, no matter how well-meaning. His assumptions about the justice and accuracy of his claims do not push him to consider what might be the consequences of his ideas if in fact they are not demanded by human nature but instead are his own invention.

I am concerned about the tyranny implicit in these works that results from the way they deploy human nature as an authorization for a political regime. But in respect to propaganda, I am also worried that they fail to see some of the changes propaganda has wrought because they assumed that such changes are impossible. In other words, their problematic position can be stated thusly: since the nature of the subject is fixed in the ways that they describe in their texts, then there can be no worry of the nature of the subject being changed by propaganda; thus, it is unnecessary, in theory and in practice, to grapple with propagandists efforts to change the nature of the subject. This position is especially hard to maintain in reference to propaganda, not just because of their frequent discussions of transforming and shaping basic elements of human nature but also because the historical record is rife with tremendous changes in the public. It is astounding to see the transformation of small farmers into laborers, consumers, and pro-corporate/pro-war voters in the United States in a relatively short period following the Civil War and into the new century. My own reaction verged on incredulity on finding out that in 1850, 95% of the goods the average American used were self-manufactured and 5% purchased, but by 1950 the equation was more than reversed. It forces one not just to ask how human beings changed

over that period of time but also how they might yet change. What else might we have become other than consumers? More importantly, what might we be yet? In place of a discourse that is blinkered to the past changes wrought in human nature and how it might yet be changed, this work takes the constitution of the subjectivity of the publics to be a historical question that can only be answered in reference to the archives rather than a theory of the subject and whose future contains a multitude of possibilities and no single ideal answer. I write this work on the genealogy of the publics to reveal its contingent formation and to open the possibilities offered by the future. In other words, this text is performatively democratic insofar as it seeks to cast doubt on the naturalization of domination and make available different vectors of analysis and action on the creation of subjects and the relations of power and knowledge in which they are enmeshed today.

This democratic solution has to be differentiated from the one Stuart Ewen offers in his book *PR!: A Social History of Spin*, in that my aim is not to restore a situation that was once present but is now lost. In *PR!* Ewen essentially wants to walk democracy backwards, rolling back the inroads that corporate power and public relations have made into democratic life and returning to an ideal of Jeffersonian democracy.⁴¹ His book reads as the story of the erosion of the democracy that was, with the exception that the New Deal slowed this tide and even temporarily pressed democracy forward. Even though the New Deal made headway, it was not so much by producing a new form of democracy but by extending Jeffersonian principles: “‘To ensure this flow [of communication]’ and to further his commitment to ‘Jeffersonian’ principles, Roosevelt would promote the federal government not merely as an instrument of ‘directive intelligence,’” but as a “clearing house for the exchange of information and ideas, of facts and ideals, affecting the general welfare.”⁴² For Ewen, FDR was the return of what was in the process of being lost. In the end, even the Jeffersonian New Deal was overwhelmed by the “Hamiltonians,” the corporate “engineers of consent.”⁴³ In time, the New Deal became just another healthy piece of democracy eroded by corporate/PR influence that needs to be restored: “For this situation to change, the public sphere—currently dominated by corporate interests and consciously managed by public relations professions—must *revert* to the people.”⁴⁴

The aim of this text is not to reclaim the truth of the human essence so that an ideal political regime can be constructed or recovered. Its aim is to write a genealogy of propaganda so that we may better see just how contingent and fragile our present is. Propaganda has spent over a century at the hands of elites, mostly corporations, aiming to reconstitute mass subjectivity and public conduct through a new kind of private government; this has been done so effectively that it may be hard to see at present just how much of public life is both pernicious and contingent. Hopefully, by mapping these contingent lines of force we

can better see their effects and also how they might be resisted. Previous literature on propaganda has many things to recommend it, and this work is indebted to it. Nonetheless, that critical literature is not able to see the depth, audacity, and import of the change propaganda was proposing because it wanted to hold out the endurance of the past so that it might be recovered in the present. In contrast, I aim to chart how propaganda has framed and sought to govern public subjectivity without making the assumption that the nature of the subject is fixed and making the claim that either the propagandists have gotten it right or gotten it wrong. Instead, this text looks empirically and genealogically at how propaganda emerged within a specific context and how its relations of subjectivity, knowledge, and power were both produced and productive of its context. This genealogical approach has the advantage of not having to stand against the evidence of the archives; it makes sense of the historically different articulations of power, knowledge, and subjectivity that occurred before propaganda and the twentieth century, the break that propaganda brought to those relations, and the eventual spread and even hegemony of the relations of power, knowledge, and subjectivity of propaganda.

In sum, this text is a genealogical analysis of the emergence of apparatuses of propaganda through the archives. By ‘apparatus’ (*dispositif*), I follow Foucault’s usage, which is to use the term to frame an analysis rather than to stipulate a definition. In other words, to look at something as an apparatus is to approach it as a number of parts whose contingent relationships with each other form the contingent being of the apparatus. Foucault studies the relations between the different parts of an apparatus as driven by an “urgent need” or problem that organizes his response:

What I’m trying to pick out with this term is, firstly, a thoroughly heterogeneous ensemble consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions—in short, the said as much as the unsaid. Such are the elements of the apparatus. The apparatus itself is the system of relations that can be established between these elements. Secondly, what I am trying to identify in this apparatus is precisely the nature of the connection that can exist between these heterogeneous elements. [. . .] Thirdly, I understand by the term “apparatus” a sort of—shall we say—formation which has as its major function at a given historical moment that of responding to an urgent need.⁴⁵

To study propaganda as an apparatus means to search for the parts that compose it and to analyze their relationship as a response to an “urgent need.” One of the most interesting parts of propaganda is how, in responding to the needs of business, especially the needs of the new corporations,

it sought to meet that need and transform it. The birth of propaganda is also the story of the birth of the modern corporation and its publics. Propaganda became a vector for the induction of government into the corporation and the transformation of its relationship to its publics.

Generally, my work should only be construed to be making a claim about the propagandists' archives. Dealing with the wide variety of archival texts (for publication, to clients, for internal training, in private discussion with other PR counsels, etc.) offers more than enough for a single volume. If I were to take on further domains of analysis, it would almost certainly have to be in another volume besides this one. The kind of statistics that many would want to see accompany this analysis of propaganda—for instance, statistical analysis about changes in consumption habits—are neither available now nor will they ever be in the future. Why? The American Statistical Association was formed in 1839 in Boston, but zero professional statisticians were being trained in the United States until the 1870s. Even in 1870, there were still no master's degrees and PhDs offered in the United States. It took a significant amount of time for enough advanced practitioners to be educated and then directed to the study of business for any useful statistical information to be produced. In the United States, business statistics were not widely collected until the Hoover administration of 1929–1933. After this move by the Hoover administration, there was an additional lag until the private sector began to make extensive use of the statistics and keep their own detailed statistical information.⁴⁶ In sum, the data with which one could use to make fine-grained statistical analyses about the effects of propaganda do not exist in the time frame I am examining. What remains outside of the possibility of these statistical analyses is exactly the kind of archival analysis that I am doing here.

In terms of resisting propaganda, successful displacements of propaganda will have to take seriously that propaganda is not primarily an epistemological apparatus but one of government and subjectification. Resisting propaganda is not so much a task of liberation from various kinds of falsehood, as if underneath all the lies remained an untouched, happy, and flourishing being, waiting to be set free by the truth. Propaganda has created contemporary subjects—the publics—to be willing and cooperative agents in producing corporate profit and hegemony. If we want the kind of subjects that will produce new and more democratic relations of power and knowledge, they will have to be created in response to the disposition of contemporary relations.

Notes

1. Raymond C. Mayer, *How to Do Publicity* (New York: Harper, 1933), 8.
2. Ivy L. Lee, *Publicity: Some of the Things It Is and Is Not* (New York: Industries, 1925), 22–23.

3. R. H. Wilder and K. L. Buell, *Publicity: A Manual for the Use of Business, Civic, or Social Service Organizations* (New York: Ronald Press, 1923), 4, 14; Glenn C. Quiett and Ralph D. Casey, *Principles of Publicity* (New York: D. Appleton, 1926), V; Address to the New York Company of AT&T “Talk on Public Relations” by Arthur Page, March 28, 1932, Volume 5, Pg. 2, Arthur Page Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society; Self Published Promotional Newsletter “The Publicist” volume 1 by John Price Jones, December 1929, Box 2, Pg. 3, John Price Jones Company Collection, Baker Library, Harvard Business School. For further discussion of the term “propaganda” as a name for their field, please see Wilder and Buell, *Publicity*, 4, 10, 14; Lee, *Publicity*, 22; H. A. Bruno and R. R. Blythe, *The Modern Torchbearers* (New York: Bruno, Blythe and Associates, 1928), 2–3; Roger William Riis and Charles W. Bonner, *Publicity: A Study of the Development of Industrial News* (New York: J. H. Sears, 1926), 143–144; John Price Jones, *At the Bar of Public Opinion: A Brief for Public Relations* (New York: Inter-River Press, 1939), xiii–xiv; H. S. McCauley, *Getting Your Name in Print* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1922), v–vi; Edward Bernays, *Crystallizing Public Opinion* (Brooklyn: Ig, 1923), 50; Talk before Annual Meeting of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute “Industry’s Job in Public Relations,” John W. Hill, Toronto, June 17, 1938, Box 39, Pg. 7, John W. Hill Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
4. Edward Bernays, interview, in *Century of the Self*, directed by Adam Curtis (London: BBC, 2002), DVD.
5. Paul Holmes et al. and the USC Annenberg Center for Public Relations, “The Holmes Report,” document, posted 2016, accessed September 9, 2018, www.holmesreport.com/ranking-and-data/global-communications-report/2016-research.
6. Alan R. Raucher, *Public Relations and Business, 1900–1929* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1968), 115–116.
7. Scott Cutlip, “The Nation’s First Public Relations Firm,” *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (1966): 269–280.
8. Riis and Bonner, *Publicity*, 6.
9. Jaap van Ginneken, *Crowds, Psychology, and Politics: 1871–1899* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 163–164.
10. Draft of an unpublished autobiography, William H. Baldwin, 1/22/63, reel 10, Pg. 28, William H. Baldwin Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
11. Transcript of the fifth radio talk titled “The Mainspring of Business Activity” from the “New Business World” series, conducted by Merle Thorpe with Bruce Barton guest, November 30, 1929, Box 135, Pg. 18, Bruce Barton Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
12. Lee, *Publicity*, 48.
13. Edward Bernays, *Propaganda* (New York: H. Liveright, 1928), 63.
14. Article “Truths from Business” appearing in *The Forum* by Theodore Vail, November 1917, Box 1, Pgs. 619–620, Theodore Vail Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
15. Bernays, *Propaganda*, 63. Emphasis mine.
16. Brewster and Palmer’s book is an early textbook that combines public relations and advertising into one text. Early university textbooks often combined public relations with either advertising or journalism. Arthur Brewster and Herbert Palmer, *Introduction to Advertising* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1924), 78, 97.
17. Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), 98.

18. Michel Foucault, "The Subject and Power," *Critical Inquiry* 8, no. 4 (1982): 777.
19. *Ibid.*, 777.
20. Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976*, trans. David Macey (New York: Picador, 2003), 15.
21. Foucault, "The Subject and Power," 789.
22. *Ibid.*, 789–790.
23. Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–1978*, trans. Graham Burchill (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 112.
24. Foucault, "The Subject and Power," 790.
25. Bernays, *Crystallizing Public Opinion*, 68, 82.
26. Jacques Ellul, *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968), 31, 80.
27. Garth S. Jowett, "Brainwashing: The Korean POW Controversy and the Origins of a Myth," in *Readings in Propaganda and Persuasion: New Classic Essays*, ed. Garth S. Jowett and Victoria O'Donnell (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2006), 210–211.
28. Harold D. Lasswell, *Propaganda Technique in World War I* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971), 13.
29. *Ibid.*, 12.
30. Merriam Webster, "Stupid," accessed August 9, 2018, www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/stupid.
31. Ellul, *Propaganda*, 84.
32. Lee, *Publicity*, 47; Bernays, *Propaganda*, 10–11, 20; Wilder and Buell, *Publicity*, 5–6.
33. Letter from Frances Purdy Wright to Scott Cutlip, September 1, 1986, Box 13, "Hamilton Wright" folder, Scott Cutlip Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
34. Scott Cutlip, *The Unseen Power: Public Relations, a History* (Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1994), ix.
35. Lee, *Publicity*, 19–22.
36. Noam Chomsky and Michel Foucault, *The Chomsky-Foucault Debate on Human Nature* (New York: New Press, 2006), 41.
37. Herbert Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Capital* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964), 2.
38. *Ibid.*, 4–5.
39. *Ibid.*, 6.
40. Chomsky and Foucault, *The Chomsky-Foucault Debate*, 54.
41. Stuart Ewen, *PR! A Social History of Spin* (New York: Basic Books, 1996), 80, 121, 125, 126–127, 145, 146–147, 150, 154, 172–173, 241–242, 397, 410, 411, 414.
42. *Ibid.*, 242.
43. *Ibid.*, 241, 414.
44. *Ibid.*, 411. Emphasis mine.
45. Foucault, *Power/Knowledge*, 194–195.
46. Matthew Hannah, *Governmentality and the Mastery of Territory in Nineteenth-Century America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 71.
 1. George Creel, *How We Advertised America: The First Telling of the Amazing Story of the Committee on Public Information That Carried the Gospel of Americanism to Every Corner of the Globe* (New York: Harper, 1920), 5.
 2. Cutlip, "The Nation's First Public Relations Firm," 269–280.
 3. Raucher, *Public Relations and Business, 1900–1929*, 65–74.
 4. Creel, *How We Advertised America*, 4–5.

5. *Ibid.*, 4.
6. *Ibid.*, 17.
7. *Ibid.*, 3–5.
8. Bruno and Blythe, *The Modern Torchbearers*, 2.
9. Edward Bernays, interview, in *Century of the Self*, directed by Adam Curtis (London: BBC, 2002), DVD.
10. Bruno and Blythe, *The Modern Torchbearers*, 2–3; Bernays, *Propaganda*, 27–28; Wilder and Buell, *Publicity*, 11, 30; Riis and Bonner, *Publicity*, 106–109.
11. Ivy Lee, *Human Nature and the Railroads* (Philadelphia: E. S. Nash, 1915), 8.
12. John Whiteclay Chambers II, *The Tyranny of Change: America in the Progressive Era, 1890–1920* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2000), 25.
13. William Leach, *Land of Desire: Merchants, Power, and the Rise of a New American Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993), 8.
14. Katherine H. Adams, *Progressive Politics and the Training of America's Persuaders* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 25.
15. Chambers, *Tyranny of Change*, 55.
16. Alan Trachtenberg, *The Incorporation of America: Culture and Society in the Gilded Age* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2007), 79–91.
17. Wilder and Buell, *Publicity*, 22.
18. Lee, *Publicity*, 44.
19. Special talk at the AT&T Commercial Conference by A. W. Page, June 1927, Volume 5, Arthur Page Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
20. Raucher, *Public Relations and Business*, 67.
21. David Ames Wells, *Recent Economic Changes and Their Effect on the Production and Distribution of Wealth and the Well-Being of Society* (New York: Dr. Appleton, 1898), 25–26.
22. Bernays, *Propaganda*, 63. Emphasis mine.
23. McCauley, *Getting Your Name in Print*, v.
24. Riis and Bonner, *Publicity*, 6.
25. *Ibid.*, 121.
26. *Ibid.*, 143.
27. Tarde and crowd psychology will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3. Lee, *Human Nature and the Railroads*, 22–23.
28. Bruce Baldwin, *The Shopping Book* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1928), 1–2.
29. *Ibid.*, 3.
30. *Ibid.*, 2.
31. Matter sent out from Ivy L. Lee to Armour and Company, March 29, 1926, Ivy Ledbetter Lee Papers, Box 40, Folder 7–9, Public Policy Papers, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
32. Hayes Robbins, *Human Relations in Railroading* (New York: General, 1927), 1–3.
33. *Ibid.*, x.
34. Hannah, *Governmentality and the Mastery of Territory*, 85–93; Roland Marchand, *Creating the Corporate Soul: The Rise of Public Relations and Corporate Imagery in American Big Business* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 44–47.
35. Robbins, *Human Relations in Railroading*, 140.
36. Marchand, *Creating the Corporate Soul*, 14; Leach, *Land of Desire*, 118–119.
37. Marchand, *Creating the Corporate Soul*, 116.
38. Another excellent example of the manipulation of the public/private distinction can be found in Ewen's and Marchand's account of American Telephone and Telegraph's PR campaigns. AT&T's PR campaign would also work well

- as an example here, but the account is involved enough that it would overtake the chapter to recount. See Marchand, *Creating the Corporate Soul*, 48–87; Ewen, *PR! A Social History of Spin*, 85–101.
39. Robbins, *Human Relations in Railroadings*, 1–3.
 40. Address to the National Association of Manufacturers titled “Where We Are Headed in Public Relations by John W. Hill, June 3, 1943, Box 39, John W. Hill Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
 41. *Ibid.*
 42. Lee, *Human Nature and the Railroads*, 18–19.
 43. Upton Sinclair, *The Brass Check* (Pasadena: Upton Sinclair, 1919), 313.
 44. Hannah, *Governmentality and the Mastery of Territory*, 87.
 45. Marchand, *Creating the Corporate Soul*, 44.
 46. *Ibid.*, 44–45.
 47. *Ibid.*, 128–129.
 48. *Ibid.*, 128.
 49. Bernays, *Crystallizing Public Opinion*, 82.
 50. Lee, *Publicity*, 44.
 51. Raucher, *Public Relations and Business*, 101.
 52. Ivy L. Lee as quoted in Ray Heibert, *Courtier to the Crowd: The Life Story of Ivy Lee* (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1966), 167.
 53. “About API,” *American Petroleum Institute*, accessed January 9, 2018, www.api.org/about.
 54. The Ivy L. Lee papers contain thousands of examples and well over 100 folders of material on his work building, developing, and propagating associations. For a few examples see: Matter Sent Out from Ivy L. Lee, Ivy Ledbetter Lee Papers, Box 32, Folder 5–7; Box 33, Folder 5–7, 11; Box 27, Folders 24, 25, 28, 34; Box 28, Folder 7, 14, Public Policy Papers, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
 55. Eric F. Goldman, *Two-Way Street: The Emergence of the Public Relations Counsel* (Boston: Bellman, 1948).
 56. Creel, *How We Advertised America*, 5.
 57. *Ibid.*, 5.
 58. Bernays, *Crystallizing Public Opinion*, 148–149.
 59. Creel, *How We Advertised America*, 184.
 60. The issue of the overlapping nature of relationships of subjectification will be discussed further in Chapter 5.
 61. Stanley Kelley Jr., *Professional Public Relations and Political Power* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1956), 32.
 62. Lee, *Publicity*, 60.
 63. Bernays, *Propaganda*, 96–97.
 64. *Ibid.*, 65.
 65. Unpublished manuscript “The Twisting Trail” by James D. Ellsworth, December 1936, Box 5, Pgs. 65–66, Scott Cutlip papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
 66. Document titled “The Bell System” by James D. Ellsworth, Box 5, Pg. 1, Scott Cutlip papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
 67. Article “Truths from Business” appearing in *The Forum* by Theodore Vail, November 1917, Box 1, Theodore Vail Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
 68. Untitled and unpublished manuscript by Arthur Page, undated (approx. 1927), Box 62, “Writings” folder, Pg. 36, Arthur Page Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
 69. McCauley, *Getting Your Name in Print*, v.
 70. Curtis, *Century of the Self*.

71. Calvin Coolidge, "Address Before the American Association of Advertising Agencies, Washington, D.C., October 27, 1926," *The American Presidency Project*, accessed August 1, 2016, www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=412.
72. Allan Brandt, *The Cigarette Century* (New York: Basic Books, 2007), 84–85.
73. Leach, *Land of Desire*, 42.
74. Friedrich Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morality* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2014), 236.
75. Michel Foucault, *Dits et écrits IV* (Paris: Gallimard, 1994), 237.
76. Alan Milchman and Alan Rosenberg, "The Aesthetic and Ascetic Dimensions of an Ethics of Self-Fashioning: Nietzsche and Foucault," *Parrhesia* 2 (2007): 44–65. I also have sympathy for Harrer's view that subjectification and subjectivation are closely related in Foucault's own writing and no absolute distinction is possible. I follow Milchman and Rosenberg because the distinction they argue for between the terms mirrors one I want to make in this text. See Sebastian Harrer, "The Theme of Subjectivity in Foucault's Lecture Series 'Herméneutique du Sujet,'" *Foucault Studies* 2 (2007): 75–96.
77. Mayer, *How to Do Publicity*, 1.
78. Quiett and Casey, *Principles of Publicity*; Lee, *Human Nature and the Railroads*, 16; Bernays, *Crystallizing Public Opinion*, 152–153.
79. Bernays, *Propaganda*, 10, 19, 27, 37; Barton, "The Mainspring of Business Activity," 18; Quiett and Casey, *Principles of Publicity*, 1.
80. Jones, *At the Bar*, 32–33.
81. Ellul, *Propaganda*, 25.
 1. Prepared remarks delivered at the AT&T General Sales Conference by Arthur Page, January/February 1927, Volume 5, Arthur Page Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
 2. Foucault, "The Subject and Power," 777.
 3. John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 271.
 4. *Ibid.*, 169.
 5. Robbins, *Human Relations in Railroading*, 1.
 6. Lee, *Publicity*, 61.
 7. *Ibid.*, 58–59.
 8. For more information about the charge that corporations were soulless and the response to this charge by corporations, see Marchand, *Creating the Corporate Soul*, 1–5.
 9. Robbins, *Human Relations in Railroading*, viii–ix.
 10. For a more extensive consideration of this topic in political economy, see Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–1979*, trans. Graham Burchell (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 27–50.
 11. Adam Smith, *An Inquiry in the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, ed. R.H. Campbell and A.S. Skinner (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 25.
 12. *Ibid.*, 456.
 13. Lee, *Human Nature and the Railroads*, 107.
 14. Bernays, *Propaganda*, 51–52.
 15. Bruno and Blythe, *The Modern Torchbearers*, chapter 3.
 16. Lee, *Publicity*, 56, 47.
 17. Lee, *Human Nature and the Railroads*, 8, 12.
 18. Talk before Annual Meeting of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute "Industry's Job in Public Relations," John W. Hill, Toronto, June 17, 1938, Box 39, Pg. 7, John W. Hill Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.

19. Robbins, *Human Relations in Railroading*, ix. For a similar perspective from another author, see S. M. Kennedy, *Winning the Public* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1921), 126–133.
20. Kennedy, *Winning the Public*, 127 (emphasis added).
21. Bernays, *Propaganda*, 11, 14.
22. *Ibid.*, 104.
23. Wilder and Buell, *Publicity*, 6.
24. Lee, *Publicity*, 38.
25. Bernays, *Propaganda*, 9–10.
26. *Ibid.*, 9, 35.
27. Raucher, *Public Relations and Business*, 125.
28. Van Ginneken, *Crowds, Psychology, and Politics*, 161, 186–187.
29. Adams, *Progressive Politics*, 142.
30. Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1922), 177, 188.
31. Joseph A. Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism, Democracy* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 256–257; Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, *Aspects of Sociology* (London: Heinemann Educational, 1973), 75–87.
32. Eugene E. Leach, “Mental Epidemics: Crowd Psychology and American Culture, 1890–1940,” *American Studies* 33, no. 1 (Spring 1992): 25–26.
33. Raucher, *Public Relations and Business*, 30, 117, 131–135.
34. *Ibid.*, 128.
35. Cutlip, *The Unseen Power*, 13.
36. Excerpts from the Memoirs of James D. Ellsworth, undated, Box 5, James D. Ellsworth folder, Pg. 56, Scott Cutlip Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
37. Riis and Bonner, *Publicity*, 78.
38. *Ibid.*, 146.
39. Cutlip, *The Unseen Power*, 308.
40. University of Wisconsin Class Notes, William H. Baldwin, 1912–1913, Micro 809, Reel 1, William H. Baldwin Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
41. Speech to Newspaper Publishers, June 16, 1931, Box 135, Folder Speeches 1930–1931, Bruce Barton Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
42. Article “Getting Your Second Wind in Business” published in *American Magazine* under the pseudonym Joseph French Johnson, Bruce Barton, May 1920, Box 125, Folder American Magazine, Bruce Barton Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
43. Person Correspondence from Bruce Barton to Walter Lippmann, Bruce Barton, 12/31/31 and 11/13/33, Box 39, Bruce Barton Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
44. For an example of how Le Bon and McDougall’s ideas about how democratic publics should be engaged in complicated issues informs Barton’s everyday work see: Letter to the Editor of the Rochester Times Union, “Urges Advertising to Promote Peace,” Bruce Barton, February 12, 1929, Box 131, Folder Printer’s Ink, Bruce Barton Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
45. Draft article submitted to the New York Herald Tribune, Bruce Barton, June 1933, Box 131, Folder New York Herald Tribune, Bruce Barton Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
46. Roy L. Smith, *Capturing Crowds* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1923), 72, 76.
47. *Ibid.*, 56, 72–73.
48. *Ibid.*, 68.
49. Gustave Le Bon, *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind* (London: Benn, 1896), 66.
50. Smith, *Capturing Crowds*, 145.

51. *Ibid.*, 16.
52. *Ibid.*, 93.
53. Irving Squire, *Informing Your Public* (New York: Association Press, 1924), 5.
54. Abram Lipsky, *Man the Puppet: The Art of Controlling Minds* (New York: Frank-Maurice, 1925), 11.
55. Mary Swain Routzahn, *Traveling Publicity Campaigns* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1920), 106.
56. Herbert Heebner Smith, *Publicity and Progress* (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1915), v.
57. *Ibid.*, 37–38.
58. Address before National Association of Manufacturers “Organizing for Public Relations,” John W. Hill, November 30, 1942, Box 39, Pg. 9, Bruce Barton Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
59. Chapter draft “Some Definitions of “The Public Interest” Have Been Attempted,” John W. Hill, Box 41, Folder Anniversary Book, Pgs. 9–10, Bruce Barton Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
60. Adams, *Progressive Politics*, 84.
61. Alfred McClung Lee, “Trends in Public Relations Training,” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 11, no. 1 (Spring 1947): 83–91.
62. For a booklist from course offered at New York University by William H. Baldwin see: New York University Lecture Notes 1950–1951, First Lecture, Micro 809, Reel 8, William H. Baldwin Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
63. Gardner Edward Hall, *Effective Business Letters* (New York: Ronald Press, 1915), 256.
64. Lyle M. Spencer, *Editorial Writing* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1924), 205.
 1. Adam Ferguson, *An Essay on the History of Civil Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 58.
 2. *Ibid.*, 56.
 3. *Ibid.*, 24.
 4. Tönnies read and annotated Ferguson’s *Essays* at least twice in 1880 and 1885. Ferdinand Tönnies, *Community and Civil Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 64.
 5. *Ibid.*, 22.
 6. *Ibid.*, 52.
 7. *Ibid.*, 57.
 8. *Ibid.*, 83.
 9. *Ibid.*, 53.
10. Bernays, *Propaganda*, 92.
11. Tönnies, *Community and Civil Society*, 175.
12. *Ibid.*, 175.
13. Although some may not consider Lippmann a crowd psychologist and more of a popular author because he lacks a PhD and university appointment, his books *Public Opinion* and *The Phantom Public* were tremendously influential and dealt with all the key elements of crowd psychology. In this respect, Lippmann can be likened to Le Bon, who similarly lacked a university appointment and its professional credentials but nonetheless produced tremendously popular and influential work.
14. Van Ginneken, *Crowds, Psychology, and Politics*, 133.
15. Le Bon, *The Crowd*, 1.
16. *Ibid.*, 12.
17. *Ibid.*, 3.
18. *Ibid.*, 19.
19. *Ibid.*, 55.

20. *Ibid.*, 11.
21. *Ibid.*, 5.
22. William McDougall, *The Group Mind* (New York: Putnam, 1920), 64.
23. William Conway, *The Crowd in Peace and War* (New York: Longmans, 1915), 97–98.
24. *Ibid.*, 106.
25. *Ibid.*, 73–74.
26. *Ibid.*, 106.
27. Gabriel Tarde, “On Communication,” in *Gabriel Tarde On Communication and Social Influence*, ed. Terry Clark (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), 281.
28. Van Ginneken, *Crowds, Psychology, and Politics*.
29. Tarde, *On Communication*, 278.
30. Adams, *Progressive Politics*, 102.
31. Tarde, *On Communication*, 281.
 1. Bernays, *Propaganda*, 159.
 2. Address to AT&T General Operating Conference “What Publicity and Advertising Can Do to Help Operation,” Arthur Page, May 1927, Articles and Addresses 1927–1956, Volume 5, Arthur Page Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
 3. Transcript of radio talk hosted by Merle Thorpe “The New Business World” featuring Bruce Barton, November 30, 1929 Box 135, Folder Speeches 1929, Bruce Barton Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
 4. Transcript of a Discussion amongst Propagandists “An Informal Talk with Some Old Friends,” William H. Baldwin, 1935, Reel 7, Image 862, William H. Baldwin Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society. See also Wilder and Buell, *Publicity*, 3.
 5. Bernays, *Crystallizing Public Opinion*, 137–138. See also Kennedy, *Winning the Public*, 82–83.
 6. Bernays, *Crystallizing Public Opinion*, 150.
 7. Bernays, *Propaganda*, 41.
 8. Unpublished manuscript “The History of Fundraising,” John Price Jones, August 1930, Box BC-2, Volume 2, Pg. 13, John Price Jones Company Collection, Baker Library, Harvard Business School.
 9. McDougall, “The Group Mind,” 57–58.
10. Bernays, *Propaganda*, 50. See also: Lee, *Human Nature and the Railroads*, 14; Quiett and Casey, *Publicity*, 367; Smith, *Capturing Crowds*, 68; and Address delivered to the John Price Jones Staff Conference “Philanthropy and the Mass Mind,” Eugene L. Belisle, March 3, 1933, Box BF-10, Folder 1933 Annual Staff Conference, John Price Jones Company Collection, Baker Library, Harvard Business School.
11. Magazine article “Let’s Advertise This Hell!” published in *The American Magazine*, Bruce Barton, May 1932, Box 131, Folder American Magazine, Bruce Barton Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
12. Address to AT&T General Operating Conference “What Publicity and Advertising Can Do to Help Operation,” Arthur Page, May 1927, Articles and Addresses 1927–1956, Volume 5, Arthur Page Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
13. See Lippmann, *Public Opinion*, 165.
14. Bruno and Blythe, *The Modern Torchbearers*, chapter IV.
15. See Lee, *Publicity*, 47 and Bernays, *Propaganda*, 92.
16. Le Bon, *The Crowd*, 63.

17. Address to AT&T Traffic Conference, Arthur Page, November 11, 1927, *Articles and Addresses 1927–1956*, Volume 5, Arthur Page Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
18. “Mr. Page’s Address to the Bell Telephone Laboratories,” Arthur Page, June 15, 1929, *Articles and Addresses 1927–1956*, Volume 5, Arthur Page Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
19. Thomas F. Woodlock, “The Children of Marxism,” in *Thinking It Over* (New York: McMullen, 1947), 52.
20. Bernays, *Propaganda*, 11–12.
21. *Ibid.*, 19.
22. See Transcript of radio talk hosted by Merle Thorpe “The New Business World” featuring Bruce Barton, November 30, 1929 Box 135, Folder Speeches 1929, Bruce Barton Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
23. Cutlip, *The Unseen Power*, 102–103.
24. Le Bon, *The Crowd*, 67.
25. *Ibid.*, 55.
26. *Ibid.*
27. Unpublished article “A Statement About Public Relations and Its Practitioners,” Pendleton Dudley, June 15, 1965, Box 5, Folder Dudley-Anderson-Yutzy, Pg. 2, Scott Cutlip Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society. See also Kennedy, *Winning the Public*, 22; Lipsky, *Man the Puppet*, 33; Lee, *Human Nature and the Railroads*, 15, 18; Bernays, *Crystallizing Public Opinion*, 169–170.
28. Le Bon, *The Crowd*, 67. See also Lippmann, *Public Opinion*, 89.
29. John Price Jones, *Principles of Successful Fundraising* (New York: John Price Jones, 1936), 38. See also, Speech at the National Manufacturers Association “The Public,” Bruce Barton, December 4, 1935, Box 136, Folder Speeches 1934–1935, Bruce Barton Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society and Ivy L. Lee, *Publicity Methods for Engineers* (Chicago: Hammond Press, 1922), 174.
30. Le Bon, *The Crowd*, 67.
31. *Ibid.*, 67.
32. *Ibid.*, 69.
33. *Ibid.*, 56.
34. *Ibid.*, 64.
35. Quiett and Casey, *Publicity*, 363.
36. Wilder and Buell, *Publicity*, 222. See also, Jones, *At the Bar of Public Opinion*, 69, and Bernays, *Crystallizing Public Opinion*, 92. Note here that the usage of a priori in Bernays is close to the way that Foucault will use the term in *The Order of Things* 43 years later.
37. Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger (Boston: MIT Press, 1991), 42.
38. Immanuel Kant, *Towards Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*, trans. Ted Humphrey (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1983), 135.
39. Jürgen Habermas, “The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article,” *New German Critique* 3 (Autumn 1974): 50.
40. Bernays, *Propaganda*, 34.
41. John Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1954), 7.
42. Ken Kurson, “SHOCKER: US Govt Spent \$4.34 Billion on Outside PR in Last Seven Years,” December 9, 2015, <http://observer.com/2015/12/shocker-us-govt-spent-4-34-billion-on-outside-pr-in-last-seven-years/>.

1. Michel Foucault, "Polemics, Politics, and Problematizations," interview by P. Rabinow, in *Essential Works of Foucault*, vol. 1 (New York: New Press, 1998), 118.
 2. Bernays, *Crystallizing Public Opinion*, 137.
 3. Lee, *Human Nature and the Railroads*, 95.
 4. Robbins, *Human Relations in Railroadings*, vii–viii.
 5. Wilder and Buell, *Publicity*, 3.
 6. Mayer, *How to Do Publicity*, 46.
 7. Charles Loring Brace, *The Dangerous Classes of New York and Twenty Years' Work Among Them* (Montclair: Patterson Smith, 1967), 27.
 8. Van Ginneken, *Crowds, Psychology, and Politics*, 29.
 9. Unpublished manuscript "The History of Fundraising," John Price Jones, August 1930, Box BC-2, Volume 2, Pg. 13, John Price Jones Company Collection, Baker Library, Harvard Business School.
 10. Jones, *At the Bar of Public Opinion*, 4.
 11. Wilder and Buell, *Publicity*, 5.
 12. *Ibid.*, 6.
 13. *Ibid.*, 6.
 14. Jones, *At the Bar of Public Opinion*, 32–33.
 15. Bernays, *Propaganda*, 20.
 16. Lee, *Human Nature and the Railroads*, 8.
 17. *Ibid.*, 8.
 18. Bruno and Blythe, *The Modern Torchbearers*, chapter 5, Pg. 2 (unnumbered).
 19. Unpublished manuscript "The History of Fundraising," John Price Jones, August 1930, Box BC-2, Volume 2, Pg. 80, John Price Jones Company Collection, Baker Library, Harvard Business School.
 20. Ivy Lee's *Publicity* contains a transcript of a question and answer session with journalists and journalism students. One of the primary points of critical contention is the co-optation of journalism by propagandists like Lee for corporate purposes. See Lee, *Publicity*, 25–43.
 21. For a useful cataloging of early tactics of co-optation by early propagandists, see Creel, *How We Advertised America*. The text is usefully organized into chapters devoted to different tactics.
 22. Miguel Vatter, "Foucault and Hayek," in *The Government of Life: Foucault, Biopolitics, and Neoliberalism*, ed. Vanessa Lemm and Miguel Vatter (New York: Fordham University Press, 2014), 171.
 23. Creel, *How We Advertised America*, 17.
 24. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014), 146.
 25. Mayer, *How to Do Publicity*, 10.
 26. Kennedy, *Winning the Public*, 127. See the following address by Arthur Page for a glimpse into how similar issues were handled at AT&T, Address to AT&T Public Relations Course "Talk on Public Relations," Arthur Page, March 28, 1932, Articles and Addresses 1927–1956, Volume 5, Pgs. 1–2, Arthur Page Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society.
 27. Étienne Balibar, "Subjection and Subjectivation," in *Supposing the Subject*, ed. Joan Copjec (New York: Verso, 1996), 9.
1. An earlier and abbreviated version of this chapter was published as "The Job of Creating Desire: Propaganda as an Apparatus of Government and Subjectification," *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 31, no. 1 (2017): 101–118. This article is used by permission of The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Jones, *At the Bar of Public Opinion*, 29–30.

2. Jones, *At the Bar of Public Opinion*, 29–30.
3. John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (London: J. M. Dent, 1961), 297, 300.
4. Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, “Public Opinion and the Classical Tradition: A Re-Evaluation,” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (Summer 1979): 143–156.
5. David Hume, *Essays, Moral, Political, and Literary*, vol. I (London: Longmans, Green, 1875), 110.
6. Immanuel Kant, “On the Common Saying: ‘This May Be True in Theory, but It Does Not Apply in Practice’,” in *Kant: Political Writings*, ed. H. S. Reiss (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 84–85.
7. Upton Sinclair, “Poison Ivy,” in *The Brass Check* (New York: Arno and New York Times, 1970), 311.
8. Jason Stanley, *How Propaganda Works* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), 8.
9. *Ibid.*, 291.
10. Arnold Farr, “Herbert Marcuse,” in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, December 18, 2013, accessed August 1, 2016, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/marcuse/>.
11. Karl Marx, “The German Ideology: Part I,” in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker (London: W. W. Norton, 1978), 173.
12. Karl Marx, “Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844,” in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker (London: W. W. Norton, 1978), 117.
13. Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man*, 4, 32.
14. Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002), 118.
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*, 95.
17. *Ibid.*, 126.
18. Nick Crossley, “On Systematically Distorted Communication: Bourdieu and the Socio-Analysis of Publics,” *Sociological Review* 52 (2004): 88–112.
19. Pierre Bourdieu, “Public Opinion Does Not Exist,” in *Sociology in Question* (London: Sage, 1993), 150.
20. Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, 244.
21. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality Volume 1: An Introduction* (New York: Vintage Books, 1990), 17.
22. *Ibid.*, 156.
23. Cutlip, *The Unseen Power*, 178.
24. Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 297.
25. Bernays, *Crystallizing Public Opinion*, 99.
26. *Ibid.*, 106.
27. *Ibid.*, 68.
28. *Ibid.*, 82.
29. *Ibid.*, 113.
30. “The History of Fundraising,” August 1930, Box BC, vol. 1, 113–114, John Price Jones Company Collection, Baker Library, Harvard Business School.
31. Bernays, *Crystallizing Public Opinion*, 113.
32. *Ibid.*, 152.
33. Cutlip, *The Unseen Power*, 195–196.
34. Bernays, *Crystallizing Public Opinion*, 155.
35. Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man*, 7, 241.
36. *Ibid.*, 6.
37. Bernays, *Crystallizing Public Opinion*, 171.
38. *Ibid.*, 106.

39. *Ibid.*, 156.
 1. Virginia Woolf, *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown* (London: Hogarth Press, 1924).
 2. US Department of Health and Human Services, *Reducing Tobacco Use: A Report of the Surgeon General* (Atlanta: US Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, 2000), 14.
 3. Glen M. Broom, *Cutlip and Center's Effective Public Relations*, 10th ed. (Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 2009).
 4. *Ibid.*, 3.
 5. *Ibid.*, 340.
 6. *Ibid.*, 337.
 7. Henry Ford and Samuel Crowther, *My Life and Work* (Garden City: Garden City, 1922), 72.
 8. Celia Lury, "Brand as Assemblage," *Journal of Cultural Economy* 2, nos. 1–2 (2009): 70.
 9. Dave Doherty, "The Era of Micromanufacturing," *Digikey.com*, October 16, 2017, accessed July 30, 2019, www.digikey.com/en/blog/micromanufacturing.
10. Lury, "Brand as Assemblage," 72.
11. Harold Van Doren, *Industrial Design: A Practical Guide* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1940), x.
12. Leach, *Land of Desire*, 39.
13. Marchand, *Creating the Corporate Soul*, 36–41.
14. Curtis, *Century of the Self*.
15. A. Fuat Firat and Nikhilesh Dholakia, "From Consumer to Construer: Travels in Human Subjectivity," *Journal of Consumer Culture* 17, no. 3 (2017): 9.
16. Russell W. Belk, "Possessions and the Extended Self," *Journal of Consumer Research* 15, no. 2 (1988): 139–168.
17. Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), 8.
18. Alan Bradshaw and Nikhilesh Dholakia, "Outsider's Insights: (Mis)understanding A. Fuat Firat on Consumption, Markets and Culture," *Consumption, Markets and Culture* 15, no. 1 (2012): 124.
19. The background of much of the co-optation literature in marketing is probably the work of Sidney J. Levy. More recent work done more directly on co-optation has been done by Moor, Firat, Venkatesh, Dholakia and others. For examples, please see: Elizabeth Moor, "Branded Spaces: The Scope of 'New Marketing'," *Journal of Consumer Culture* 3, no. 39 (2003): 39–60 and Fuat Firat and Alladi Venkatesh, "Liberatory Postmodernism and the Reenchantment of Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research* 22, no. 3 (1995): 239–267.
20. Jonathan Lears, *Fables of Abundance: A Cultural History of Advertising in America* (New York: Basic Books, 1994), 235.
21. Vance Packard, *The Hidden Persuaders* (New York: Penguin, 1981), 132–139.
22. Broom, *Cutlip and Center's Effective Public Relations*, 270.
23. Jacquelyn Smith, "Two Reasons Why KIND's CEO Won't Use the E-Word," *Business Insider*, June 2014, accessed July 30, 2019, www.businessinsider.com/why-one-ceo-hates-the-word-employee-2014-6.
24. Broom, *Cutlip and Center's Effective Public Relations*, 214.
25. For examples of recent ways that new data about publics is being used in employee morale programs please see the journal *Personnel Psychology* or

- the following article for an overview: Erin White, “How Surveying Workers Can Pay Off,” *Wall Street Journal*, June 18, 2007, B3.
26. Pavel Krapivin, “How Google’s Strategy for Happy Employees Boosts Its Bottom Line,” *Forbes*, September 2017, accessed July 30, 2019, www.forbes.com/sites/pavelkrapivin/2018/09/17/how-googles-strategy-for-happy-employees-boosts-its-bottom-line/#443f2ce822fc.
 27. “50 Happiest Companies in America for 2013,” *Career Bliss*, December 2012, accessed July 30, 2019, www.careerbliss.com/facts-and-figures/careerbliss-50-happiest-companies-in-america-for-2013/.
 28. Robbins, *Human Relations in Railroading*, 13–30, 54–64.
 29. “Culture Matters: Building on Our Own It! Culture,” *Pfizer*, accessed July 30, 2019, www.pfizer.com/files/investors/financial_reports/annual_reports/2014/business_colleagues.htm.
 30. Robbins, *Human Relations in Railroading*, IX, 31.
 31. For a great description of how public relations and marketing have penetrated the practice of government, please see Liz Moor, *The Rise of Brands* (New York: Berg, 2007), 82.
 32. Eric Hellweg, “2012: The First Big Data Election,” *Harvard Business Review*, November 2012, accessed July 30, 2019, <https://hbr.org/2012/11/2012-the-first-big-data-electi>.
 33. Sarah Green Carmichael, “The Analytics Lesson from the Obama Campaign, Keep Your Data Organized, Secure,” *Harvard Business Review*, November 2012, accessed July 30, 2019, <https://hbr.org/2012/11/the-analytics-lesson-from-the>.
 34. Lury, “Brand as Assemblage,” 77.
 35. Moor, *The Rise of Brands*, 82.
 36. For recent examples of how the mass media have heralded the rise of big data, please see: Olivia Goldhill, “How Big Data Got So Powerful,” *Quartz*, July 2019, accessed July 30, 2019, <https://qz.com/1656462/how-companies-use-big-data-to-profit-from-your-personal-info/>; Gil Press, “Big Data Is Dead: Long Live Big Data AI,” *Forbes*, July 2019, accessed July 30, 2019, www.forbes.com/sites/gilpress/2019/07/01/big-data-is-dead-long-live-big-data-ai/#536da6301b05; Alison DeNisco Rayome, “Big Data: 3 Biggest Challenges for Business,” *TechRepublic*, June 2019, accessed July 30, 2019, www.techrepublic.com/article/big-data-3-biggest-challenges-for-businesses/; and Louise Matsakis, “Big Data Supercharged Gerrymandering: It Could Stop It Too,” *Wired*, June 2019, accessed July 30, 2019, www.wired.com/story/big-data-supercharged-gerrymandering-supreme-court/.
 37. Charles Duhigg, “How Companies Learn Your Secrets,” *New York Times*, February 2012, accessed July 30, 2019, www.nytimes.com/2012/02/19/magazine/shopping-habits.html?pagewanted=1&_r=1&hp&cmtrref=undefined&gwh=78FA8EA57BE65EEFA33653868CEA359.
 38. Broom, *Cutlip and Center’s Effective Public Relations*, 4–6.
 39. Lee, *Publicity*, 47, and *Human Nature and the Railroads*, 18.
 40. “What Is Persuasive Design?” *Interaction Design Foundation*, accessed July 30, 2019, <https://techcrunch.com/2016/04/03/micromanufacturing-the-future/>.
 41. Jenny Radesky, “Persuasive Digital Design: Appealing to Adults, Problematic for Kids?” *University of Michigan Health Lab*, February 2018, accessed July 30, 2019, <https://labblog.uofmhealth.org/health-tech/persuasive-digital-design-appealing-to-adults-problematic-for-kids>.
 42. *Ibid.*
 43. For a cross section of different approaches to limiting screen time, please see Klaus Wölfling, Kai Müller, et al., “Efficacy of Short-term Treatment

- of Internet and Computer Game Addiction: A Randomized Clinical Trial,” *JAMA Psychiatry*, July 2019, accessed July 30, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2019.1676>; “Supporting People Who Support Families,” *Children’s Screentime Action Network*, accessed July 30, 2019, <https://screentimenetwork.org>; and “Advocating for Kids Wellbeing in the Digital Age,” *Common Sense Media*, accessed July 30, 2019, www.common sense media.org/kids-action#.
44. While many thinkers have traversed the argument I gave in brief earlier, Todd May was one of the earliest to use it in the context of developing political goals outside of the priority of the concept of human nature. Please see Todd May, *The Political Philosophy of Poststructuralist Anarchism* (State College: Penn State University Press, 1994).
 45. My choice of the smoking cessation movement as a point of reflection might seem odd, when I could have chosen, for instance, the movements against relations of sex, sexual, or racial subjectification. Odd perhaps, but it can be explained for two reasons. First, these movements against subjectification—against sexist, homophobic, and racist relations of subjectification—have largely targeted the state and social norms rather than corporations. Where a corporation has been targeted it often has not been the corporation’s propaganda that has been the target but its hiring, promotion, or other practices. As I will detail in a moment, what is interesting about the smoking cessation movement from the point of view of this text is that it is aimed primarily against corporate propaganda and its ability to shape conduct and create publics (i.e., smokers and tobacco users).
 46. US Department of Health and Human Services, *Reducing Tobacco Use*, 5.
 47. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, “Best Practices for Comprehensive Tobacco Control Programs—2014” (Atlanta: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, 2014), 18–29.
 48. *Ibid.*, 7.
 49. *Ibid.*, 6, 20.
 50. US Department of Health and Human Services, *Reducing Tobacco Use*, 41.
 51. CDC, “Best Practices,” 22.
 52. *Ibid.*, 19.
 53. Stanley, *How Propaganda Works*, 80–83.
 54. CDC, “Best Practices,” 40–41.
 55. *Ibid.*, 7.
 56. Bernays, *Crystallizing Public Opinion*, 147–151.
 57. CDC, “Best Practices,” 8.
 58. The ideas in this last paragraph take their point of departure from Rancière’s conception of democracy, though it is out of the purview of this book to elaborate them too greatly here. For more behind my thinking, please see Jacques Rancière, *Hatred of Democracy* (New York: Verso, 2014).
 59. Lury, “Brand as Assemblage,” 7.
 60. I am not arguing that all forms of domination are equally bad—they are not equivalent. What I am arguing is that seeking to supplant propaganda’s administration of public subjectivity and conduct with another regime of administration does not strike at the fact that the administration itself is objectionable.
 61. *Ibid.*, 6.