

Where
UNESCO
 Begins

The Climate of Opinion
In the United States and Other Countries

A Summary of Information
and Attitudes
Bearing on the Work of UNESCO

The National Opinion Research Center
UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

FOREWORD

Fundamental to the entire program of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization is the fact that UNESCO as an organization will be working with people in every member nation, which means practically every country in the world. How people feel about other people in other countries, about international cooperation in general and in specific application, about the chances for war and peace, about freedom and democracy -- however these terms may be interpreted, is of real significance to UNESCO and to men and women everywhere who believe in the UNESCO program and, in turn, in the United Nations and all that it stands for.

Results of public opinion surveys in the United States and a number of other countries can furnish many clues as to the climate of opinion and attitudes in which UNESCO must begin its work. For obvious reasons, public opinion polls can function effectively only in democratic countries where speech and press are genuinely free. The value of public opinion research depends to a great degree on both free and unbiased communications and -- perhaps to a lesser extent -- upon a high degree of literacy. For the opinion expressed to be most meaningful, the people should have access to information on which to base their opinions and must feel free to voice them.

This report is based primarily upon the analysis of public opinion in the United States, supplemented with data from Great Britain, Canada, Australia, France, the Netherlands, and -- in a few instances -- Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. Opinions from these countries are of special significance because the largest responsibility for making UNESCO work rests almost inevitably with the United States, members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and the free democracies of northern Europe. As the scientific study of attitudes and opinions is extended throughout the world, UNESCO will have at its command a more complete and representative picture of world opinion.

This report -- summarizing the highlights of surveys made through the spring of 1947 -- is a revision of an analysis prepared especially for use at the Mountain-Plains Regional Conference on UNESCO, held in Denver on May 15, 16, and 17, 1947. Many of the aspects of public opinion reviewed here only briefly have been the subject of more detailed treatment by the National Opinion Research Center in the past, or will be in the future.

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Part I <u>World-Mindedness and Tolerance:</u> People's Attitudes toward Other Countries and Nationalities	3
Democracy -- A Stereotype?	3
Knowledge and Attitudes regarding Russia	9
Attitudes toward the Axis Peoples	15
Britons and Americans Look at Each Other	20
Attitudes toward Minority Groups in the United States	25
Part II United Nations and Prospects for War or Peace	29
World War III	29
Can Wars Be Prevented?	32
Toward an Effective United Nations	36
The Scope of United Nations Power	39
Part III Specific Areas of International Cooperation	45
Willingness to Help Needy Countries	45
American Attitudes Regarding Trade and Tariff	47
Immigration: A World Problem	49
The Future of Palestine and Other Dependent Areas	51
Part IV <u>Mass Communications:</u> Their Potentialities for UNESCO	53
The Communications Media: Some Comparisons	53
International Freedom of Information	57
Publicizing American Democracy	59
Civil Rights and Freedom of Communications	63
The Responsibility of Education	66

For More Information ...

This report is based upon the findings of leading public opinion research organizations in this and other countries, including...

In the United States:

The National Opinion Research Center

The American Institute of Public Opinion

Elmo Roper

The Fortune Survey
"What People Are Thinking"

The Office of Public Opinion Research
(Princeton)

The Psychological Corporation

Abroad:

The American Military Government:
Opinion Surveys Headquarters

The Australian Public Opinion Polls

The British Institute of Public Opinion

The Canadian Institute of Public Opinion

The Danish Gallup Poll

The French Institute of Public Opinion

Mass Observation, Great Britain

The Netherlands Institute of Public Opinion

The Norwegian Institute of Public Opinion

The Swedish Gallup Poll

Unless otherwise indicated, all figures cited are based on regular national cross-sections and are subject to a sampling error of no more than 4%. Fortune figures, like those of NORC, AIPO, and other polls, are rounded to the nearest full percentage when appearing in this report.

WORLD-MINDEDNESS AND TOLERANCE

People's Attitudes toward Other Countries and Nationalities

UNESCO begins its work in a world where hatred and fear, distrust and uncertainty, still render whole-hearted cooperation between countries and peoples a future ideal rather than a present reality. Deep-rooted distrust and misunderstanding between Russia and the Western democracies are intensified by mutual fear and the ever-increasing threat of atomic war.

Almost as fundamental a barrier to the achievement of a climate of world-mindedness and tolerance is the conviction -- wavering only occasionally -- that the people of the former Axis powers, Germany and Japan, will always constitute a threat to peace in that, weak and imbued with the fuehrer prinzip, they may again become the tools of the will-to-power of ambitious and unscrupulous leaders.

While the surface relationships between Great Britain and the United States are cordial, there is considerable evidence pointing to a need for more complete understanding between the peoples of the two countries. In some respects the British people seem better informed about Americans than are Americans about the British. And the people of Great Britain are sometimes less smug than Americans and less convinced of their own superiority.

Pertinent to a consideration of possible world-wide extension of American ideals of democracy is the degree to which Americans are willing to apply those ideals to political and economic practices affecting minority groups in the United States. The climate of world-mindedness and tolerance can perhaps be evaluated more realistically by a study of attitudes toward minority groups than by analysis of more abstract definitions of the concept of democracy.

DEMOCRACY -- A STEREOTYPE?

The word "democracy" means many things to many people, even in the United States. The various connotations which the term holds for people of different nations obviously influence their evaluations of their own and other countries as democratic or not democratic. Surveys reported this spring by the American Institute of Public Opinion and Gallup affiliates in eight other countries found three phases of the democratic concept to be uppermost in people's minds:

1. The largest number said democracy means "government by the people," or the right of the people to determine who shall govern them, including the right of opposition parties to free expression and political activity.
2. The second main definition of democracy (ranking first in the United States, Great Britain, and France) was freedom, especially freedom of speech and of assembly.
3. The third definition is equality -- absence of discrimination or distinction between classes, groups, and individuals.

Substantial majorities of people in all the countries reported except Great Britain and Denmark judged their own nations to be democracies, a second question revealed. In five of the countries in which the survey was made, further questions were asked regarding the democratic status of other nations. Among the nations about which the question was asked, the United States, Great Britain, and, to a somewhat lesser degree, France were most widely accepted as democracies. Certain other countries -- Spain, Russia, and Poland were generally considered undemocratic.

What Is Democracy?

When Gallup affiliates in nine different countries asked cross-sections of people in those countries what the word "democracy" meant to them, the range and distribution of answers differed considerably from country to country. The concept of democracy as "government by the people" was most frequently held in Norway and Canada; the idea of "freedom" was implicit in most answers in France, the United States, and Great Britain; "equality" was the most common connotation in Denmark. The several polls asked:

"What does the term 'democracy' mean to you?" ("In your own words, can you tell me roughly what is meant by 'democracy'?" "What do you think 'democracy' stands for?")

	<u>GOVERNMENT BY PEOPLE</u>	<u>FREEDOM</u>	<u>EQUALITY</u>	<u>OTHER ANSWERS</u>	<u>CAN'T DEFINE</u>
United States	30%	47%	9%	1%	13% = 100%
Great Britain	15	40	7	4	34
Canada	36	24	5	11	24
Australia	33	19	9	--	39
France	23	51	3	12	11
Netherlands	27	18	6	16	33
Norway	43	17	5	7	28
Sweden	32	8	12	19	29
Denmark	13	4	18	6	59

Democracy at Home

The tendency to consider one's own country more democratic than other countries is rather widespread, survey results showed. A second question asked in the same nine nations was designed to secure opinions as to how democratic people considered their own countries:

"Would you say that we have democracy in _____?"

	<u>OWN COUNTRY DEMOCRATIC</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
United States*	88%	8%	4% = 100%
Great Britain	50	32	18
Canada	71**	15	14
Australia	64	24	12
France	65	22	13
Netherlands	67	15	18
Norway	70	12	18
Sweden*	95	5	**
Denmark	50	25	25

* IN THE UNITED STATES AND SWEDEN THE QUESTION WAS ASKED ONLY OF THOSE WHO GAVE ACCEPTABLE DEFINITIONS OF DEMOCRACY. ALL SWEDISH INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC OPINION PERCENTAGES ARE BASED ONLY ON PERSONS WITH OPINIONS.

** INCLUDES 14% QUALIFIED ANSWERS.

And Abroad

Gallup affiliates in five of the nine nations asked a third question to find out what people think about the democratic status of countries other than their own:

"Do you think there is democracy in the following countries?"

YES -- THERE IS DEMOCRACY IN:

OPINION FROM...	<u>UNITED STATES</u>	<u>GREAT BRITAIN</u>	<u>FRANCE</u>	<u>NETHERLANDS</u>	<u>POLAND</u>	<u>RUSSIA</u>	<u>YUGO-SLAVIA</u>	<u>SPAIN</u>
United States	88%	48%	32%	28%	9%	5%	4%	4%
France	74	71	65	**	16	24	15	2
Netherlands	59	68	47	67	**	11	**	3
Norway	74	69	53	**	14	11	**	1
Sweden*	85	86	59	**	25	14	**	3

Uncertainty as to whether or not countries could be judged democratic was particularly marked in the instance of Poland and Yugoslavia. In France, for example, 46% of the public were at a loss as how to classify Yugoslavia, and 44% were not sure about Poland. In Norway, 53% were unable to decide whether or not Poland could be considered a democracy. That this uncertainty reflects primarily lack of adequate or accurate information upon which to base judgments regarding the internal affairs of other countries is further suggested by the fact that 42% of people in the United States could not decide how to classify the Netherlands.

The most significant fact, however, is that certain nations are generally accepted as democracies while others are most often considered undemocratic. In addition to the countries listed in the table, it should be noted that Switzerland is judged to be a democracy by 82% of the French, Finland by 65% of the Swedish, and Belgium by 51% of the Dutch. Argentina, however, is democratic according to only 12% of Americans, and Greece according to only 6% of the French.

The British Viewpoint The relatively low percentage of the British people willing to characterize their own country as a democracy may be partially accounted for by the fact that in October, 1946, the month before the questions on democracy were asked, only 44% said they were satisfied with "the Government's record to date," and 43% were dissatisfied -- chiefly with inefficiency, red tape, and too many government controls. (In March, 1947, 39% were satisfied with the Government's record to date, and 54% were dissatisfied.)

It is of interest that after discounting the high "Don't know" response among the lower middle class and the very poor, these groups were somewhat more disposed to consider Britain democratic than were the more prosperous. Of all groups studied, Labor Party voters were most likely to answer "Yes"; Communists and other minor party voters were most likely to answer "No." The comparison:

IS THERE DEMOCRACY IN GREAT BRITAIN?	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
Labor Party supporters	55%	29%	16% = 100%
Conservatives	50	34	16
Liberals	44	37	19
Communists and other voters	29	63	8
Non-voters	45	28	27

* IN SWEDEN THE QUESTIONS WERE ASKED ONLY OF THOSE WHO GAVE ACCEPTABLE DEFINITIONS OF DEMOCRACY.

** NOT REPORTED.

Accent on Freedom The American Institute of Public Opinion survey indicated that, to almost half the public in the United States, "freedom" is the keynote of democracy. Perhaps the low ratings given other countries may be attributed to the fact that many Americans feel that no other people enjoy the same freedom. The importance of the freedom concept in American thinking was emphasized in answers to a question asked by Gallup last August:

"What would you say is the greatest advantage of our type of government?"

Freedom in general	24%
Freedom of speech and press	19
Freedom of opportunity	7
Freedom of worship	5
The four freedoms	4
Free enterprise, competition in business	3
TOTAL MENTIONS OF FREEDOM	<u>62%</u>
People have a voice in government	17
Equal rights	5
Miscellaneous advantages	6
No advantages	1
Don't know	21
	<u>112%</u>

SINCE SOME PEOPLE NAMED MORE THAN ONE ADVANTAGE, THE TOTAL ADDS TO MORE THAN 100%.

The Government and Job Security

A study of the findings of the several Gallup affiliates suggests that, while people in all nine countries tended to define "democracy" in political rather than economic terms, more Europeans than Americans think of democracy as having clearly economic functions. An AIPO release in mid-May revealed a wide divergence of opinion among various population groups as to what degree of economic responsibility a democratic government should assume. A 57% majority of union members, for example, think that the government should guarantee every man a job; only 24% of the college-educated are of the same opinion. The question:

"Which one of these statements do you most agree with?"

1. *"The most important job for the government is to make it certain that there are good opportunities for each person to get ahead on his own."*
2. *"The most important job for the government is to guarantee every person a decent and steady job and standard of living."*

THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD:	ASSURE OPPORTUNITIES	GUARANTEE JOBS	UNDECIDED
ALL ADULTS INTERVIEWED	50%	43%	7% = 100%
PROFESSIONAL AND BUSINESSMEN	67	28	5
WHITE COLLAR WORKERS	57	38	5
FARMERS	57	36	7
MANUAL AND FACTORY WORKERS	37	56	7
UNION MEMBERS ONLY	37	57	6
REPUBLICANS	60	35	5
DEMOCRATS	44	50	6
ATTENDED COLLEGE	73	24	3
ATTENDED HIGH SCHOOL	57	39	4
EIGHTH GRADE OR LESS	40	51	9

ON THE ISSUE OF GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITY FOR JOB SECURITY, THINKING IN SOCIALIST BRITAIN IS JUST THE REVERSE OF THINKING IN THE UNITED STATES. IN JUNE, 1947, THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC OPINION FOUND A 55% MAJORITY OF THE OPINION THAT THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD GUARANTEE JOBS FOR ALL. ONLY 40% SAID THEY WERE WILLING TO RELY ON THEIR OWN ABILITY AND INSURED OPPORTUNITIES.

Government Control or
Ownership of Industry

The desirability of government control or ownership of basic industries is another problem which arises in connection with a consideration of the economic as distinct from the purely political aspects of democracy. Public opinion surveys conducted in the United States, Canada, Great Britain, and Australia have found the British people, in general, favoring nationalization of industries, while Australians have been lukewarm, and Canadians and Americans have opposed such a plan.

Supporting the AMERICAN principle of free enterprise, 44% of people in this country said, according to an NORC question asked in 1943, that when we got back to peacetime conditions the American people would be better off if the government had less control of business than it had before the war. However, 41% favored MORE CONTROL and 15% suggested the same amount of government control. BRITISH attitudes were shown when in June, 1945, 48% of the British disagreed with the suggestion "that the best way to provide jobs for everyone is by private enterprise and removing all government controls." In July, 1946, 57% of AUSTRALIANS thought wage earners would be worse off "if ALL industries in Australia were owned and run by the government." CANADIANS were more opposed to nationalization after the war than they were during the war. In October, 1945, 64% said they thought workers would be better off "if all the industries in Canada were left under private management rather than being owned and run by the government." In 1943 only 47% expressed the same opinion.

NORC, in August, 1944, discovered clear majorities against outright government ownership of leading industries in this country. Substantially similar results were obtained by AIPO studies conducted in 1945 and again in February of this year. AIPO surveys found labor union members differed only in degree from the attitudes of the public as a whole and tended to favor private ownership rather than government ownership.

"After the war, do you think the government should or should not own the coal mines? The railroads? The steel mills? The automobile factories? The oil companies?"
(NORC, August, 1944)

	<u>SHOULD OWN</u>	<u>SHOULD NOT</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
Coal mines	32%	68% = 100%	15%
Railroads	22	78	14
Steel mills	20	80	16
Automobile factories	14	86	13
Oil companies	20	80	14

"Do you think the United States Government should own the following things in the country -- Banks? Railroads? Coal mines? Electric power companies?" (AIPO, February, 1947)

	<u>SHOULD OWN</u>	<u>SHOULD NOT</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
Banks	28%	72% = 100%	8%
Railroads	28	72	7
Coal mines	35	65	6
Electric power companies	30	70	8

On the question of socialization of industry, British public opinion holds an almost opposite view from public opinion in this country. On the same issue, Canadians are generally in favor of government ownership of certain basic services but are not in favor of government ownership of all industries. While Australians are somewhat more favorably inclined toward government ownership of industries, than are Americans, majorities in that country preferred private enterprise.

A comparison of attitudes in the four countries regarding specific industries must be made cautiously in view of two factors: (1) the wording of the questions used by the several polls usually differed, and (2) the questions were asked at different times. When only persons with definite opinions are considered, these are the figures:

FAVOR GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP:	UNITED STATES	GREAT BRITAIN	CANADA	AUSTRALIA
All industries	**	**	45%	20%
Public utilities	30%	58%	69	45
Coal mines	35	80	**	48
Railroads	28	**	39	**
Banks	28	66	26	39
Airlines	**	**	50	41
Radio broadcasting	**	50	71	29

Government Ownership and Americanism Approaching more directly the relationship of government control to democracy, the Psychological Corporation questioned a cross-section of this country's urban population on their attitudes as to whether certain trends toward greater government control are good or bad for America. While in most industries private enterprise was thought better for America than government ownership, the government housing program was endorsed by respondents, probably influenced in their opinions by the critical housing shortage. The question and results:

"As you know, houses and apartments are built by the government and rented to the people at rents below the actual cost. Is this good for America or bad?" (April, 1947)

Good 50% Bad 39% Undecided 11% = 100%

"Which is better for America: (a) to have the government give free doctor and medical service which would be paid for by a tax like the Social Security tax; or (b) the present system of medical service?" (April, 1947)

Present system 63% Socialized medicine 30% Undecided 7% = 100%

"The government should own and run large businesses such as the railroads, telephone and telegraph, life insurance, gasoline companies, etc.; would this be good Americanism or bad?" (October, 1946)

Good 22% Bad 69% Undecided 9% = 100%

The last question in the series explored, rather generally, attitudes on a mixed group of factors. Results should be evaluated cautiously, since many people probably have very hazy notions as to exactly what is implied by the terms "communism," "socialism," and "fascism." The question read:

"Which of these would you say were good for America and which bad: fascism, communism, labor unions, socialism, advertising?" (April, 1947)

	FASCISM	COMMUNISM	LABOR UNIONS	SOCIALISM	ADVERTISING
Good	1%	1%	61%	15%	91%
Bad	94	95	28	72	5
Undecided	5	4	11	13	4

** NO APPLICABLE RESULTS AVAILABLE.

KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES REGARDING RUSSIA

Lack of understanding and mutual distrust between the Soviet Union on one hand and the United States, together with other Western "democracies," on the other is one of the gravest problems facing the world today. It is a truism to state that international cooperation in any sphere must be planned in full cognizance of these difficulties or to point out that any substantial success in alleviating or overcoming Soviet-American misunderstandings would constitute an invaluable contribution to world peace.

Distrust of Russia

Public opinion survey results furnish a wealth of evidence as to the growing distrust of the Soviet Union on the part of the United States public. In September, 1946, for instance, Gallup reported 62% of the opinion that their "feelings toward Russia" were "less friendly" than a year earlier. In the spring of 1946, according to another American Institute of Public Opinion question, 59% believed that at least one nation "would like to dominate or run the world." In March, 1947, 65% held this view. Asked to name the nation or nations they were thinking of, 39% in 1946 and 52% last March specified Russia.

Gallup trends have shown consistent uncertainty and widely fluctuating degrees of confidence in Russian cooperation. High points of confidence that Russia could be "trusted to cooperate with us after the war" were reported after the Yalta Conference and following V-J Day. Low points of feeling that Russia will NOT "cooperate with us in world affairs" were registered last spring when the Iran situation was most tense and last fall when differences between Russia and the Western powers in United Nations deliberations and in the Paris Peace Conference were in the headlines along with sensational reports of the Wallace-Byrnes controversy. (A majority of people who said they had been following "the arguments about Byrnes' ideas and Wallace's ideas for dealing with Russia" supported Byrnes' policy, Gallup reported. Most had a reasonably good understanding of the two men's ideas on the issue.)

A New Russian Imperialism?

Much of the fear and distrust of the Soviet Union now prevalent in the United States is rooted in the belief that already, since war's end, Russia has embarked upon a new crusade to extend Russian power through the spread of communism and, eventually, to dominate the world. And there are evidences of a widespread conviction that increasingly frequent and dangerous conflicts between Soviet and United States interests are inevitable in what appears to be a new era of Russian imperialism.

How people in the United States evaluate the motivation behind Soviet foreign policy is revealed by the findings of various polling organizations. Three questions from Fortune and one from Gallup show certain common reactions:

"Do you think Russia wants to spread the communist way of life, or that she isn't particularly interested in whether or not other countries become communistic?"

WANTS TO SPREAD COMMUNISM 54% DOESN'T WANT TO 26% DON'T KNOW 20% = 100%

(If "Wants to spread") "Do you think this is mainly because she believes the world will be better off with communism, or mainly because she thinks it will make her more powerful?"

WORLD BETTER OFF 8% MAKE RUSSIA MORE POWERFUL 43% DON'T KNOW 3% = 54%

"Do you think Russia is only trying to get a fair share of raw materials from other countries, or that she is trying to get more than a fair share?"

FAIR SHARE 25% MORE THAN FAIR SHARE 58% DON'T KNOW 17% = 100%

"As you hear and read about Russia these days, do you believe Russia is trying to build herself up to be the ruling power of the world, or is Russia just building up protection against being attacked in another war?"

	<u>RULING POWER</u>	<u>PROTECTION</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>
June '46	58%	29%	13% = 100%
August '46	60	26	14

How much difference educational background makes in attitudes toward the Soviet Union is illustrated by another Fortune question reported in July, 1946:

"Do you think Russia has only been trying to get herself into a defensive position safe from attack, or that she is out to dominate as much of the world as possible?"

	<u>ALL</u>			<u>THOSE WITH OPINIONS</u>	
	<u>DEFENSE</u>	<u>DOMINATION</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>	<u>DEFENSE</u>	<u>DOMINATION</u>
ALL ADULTS INTERVIEWED	34%	50%	16% = 100%	40%	60% = 100%
ATTENDED COLLEGE	46	47	7	50	50
ATTENDED HIGH SCHOOL	36	53	11	40	60
GRADE SCHOOL	23	48	29	33	67

A year ago the British Institute of Public Opinion asked a question designed to explore English attitudes on the same point. At that time the popular British estimate of Soviet motives was somewhat different from judgment in this country:

"Some people say that Russia's foreign policy is concerned with making certain of their security, others say that it is imperialist expansion. Which do you think?"

	<u>ALL</u>			<u>THOSE WITH OPINIONS</u>	
	<u>SECURITY</u>	<u>IMPERIALISM</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>	<u>SECURITY</u>	<u>IMPERIALISM</u>
ALL ADULTS INTERVIEWED	42%	26%	32% = 100%	62%	38% = 100%
WEALTHY AND PROSPEROUS	38	43	19	47	53
MIDDLE CLASS	45	35	20	56	44
POOR	42	20	38	68	32

A Firm Stand?

The conviction that this country should be firm in dealing with Russia is indicated by a number of different survey findings. A twice-used Gallup question, for example, showed a significant increase -- between March and August '46 -- in the percentage advocating a strong stand on the part of the United States. The question was entirely open, suggesting no possible answers:

"If Russia continues to follow her present course, what should we do, if anything?"

	<u>MARCH '46</u>	<u>AUG. '46</u>
Be firm, make her stick to agreements, no appeasement	44%	28%
Keep strong military preparedness	*	28
Economic blockade; don't send money or materials	5	4
Sever relations with her	1	1
	<u>50%</u>	<u>61%</u>
Go before the United Nations	8	4
Get together and work things out	7	6
Try to appease Russia	1	1
	<u>16%</u>	<u>11%</u>
Do nothing, avoid trouble	12	10
Miscellaneous and undecided	22	22
	<u>100%</u>	<u>104%**</u>

Another Gallup question, asked in March '46, found only 18% of the public in favor of the suggestion -- made by Churchill in his highly controversial Fulton, Missouri, speech (considered by many to mark a turning point in United States relations with Russia) -- that "the present military cooperation between the United States and Great Britain" be continued "as a check on Russia's present moves." Unqualified disapproval of the suggestion was expressed by 40%. Almost a third -- 32% -- had not heard or read the speech.)

A four-choice Fortune question, however, indicated popular recognition of the importance of Soviet-American relations, in addition to the feeling that the United States should not make too many concessions to Russia:

"With which one of these four statements do you come closest to agreeing?"

	<u>SEPT. '45</u>	<u>JULY '46</u>
<i>"It is going to be very important to keep on friendly terms with Russia, and we should make every possible effort to do so.</i>	23%	16%
<i>"It is important for the U.S. to be on friendly terms with Russia, but not so important that we should make too many concessions to her.</i>	49	52
	<u>72%</u>	<u>68%</u>
<i>"If Russia wants to keep on friendly terms with us, we shouldn't discourage her, but there is no reason why we should make any special effort to be friendly.</i>	11	15
<i>"We will be better off if we have just as little as possible to do with Russia."</i>	9	11
	<u>20%</u>	<u>26%</u>
<i>Undecided</i>	8	6
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* ON THE EARLIER SURVEY "KEEP STRONG MILITARY PREPAREDNESS" WAS NOT REPORTED SEPARATELY.

** ON THE LATER SURVEY THE FACT THAT SOME OF THOSE INTERVIEWED SUGGEST MORE THAN ONE COURSE OF ACTION ACCOUNTS FOR THE TOTAL OF 104%.

USA-USSR
Disagreements

In the fall of 1946, NORC asked a series of questions to explore attitudes and information in the United States regarding differences between this country and Russia. In answering the first question, many people tended to generalize and to resort to stereotypes rather than to cite definite and specific differences between the two countries. A large number mentioned more than one cause of friction:

"What do you think are some of the main disagreements at the present time between Russia and the United States?"

- 22% of the people spoke in very general terms of a number of different attitudes which separate the people of the two countries. A general fear and distrust of each country by the other, particularly as related to preparations for another war, and a general lack of understanding or lack of cooperation were mentioned over and over. Others suggested greed ... envy ... jealousy.
- 18 cited differences in the area of world power or power politics. These included a number who saw the control of Europe as a primary issue, or suggested that United States policy determines the balance of power among this country, Britain, and Russia.
- 17 mentioned disagreements over land ... territory ... boundaries ... or, occasionally, imperialism.
- 13 named misunderstandings over the political and economic control of small countries. Policies connected with the use of troops in occupying liberated countries were seen as a serious source of difficulty. Russian "spheres of influence" in the Balkans (Yugoslavia and Greece were most often cited), Central Europe, and Poland were mentioned perhaps four times as often as were difficulties regarding China, Manchuria, or other Asiatic territories.
- 12 mentioned differences in political ideology, specifically the conflict between Russian communism and capitalistic democracy. A number of people stated their belief that Russia is trying to communize the world.
- 11 mentioned disagreements over the atomic bomb and the control of atomic energy.
- 9 cited misunderstandings regarding the occupation, policing, spoils, and future status of Germany, Japan, and Italy.
- 7 spoke of differences regarding the possession or control of strategic bases or localities, such as the Dardanelles or "an outlet to the sea," and the possession or control of oil and other natural resources of strategic importance.
- 5 mentioned disagreements over peace negotiations, commitments, and international cooperation within and without the United Nations organization. (Many items listed separately above are, of course, related to peace negotiations and the work of the United Nations.)
- 12 named other sources of misunderstanding between the United States and the Soviet Union: the "iron curtain," world trade, reparations, differences of opinion regarding UNRRA and relief policies -- distribution of food and clothing, a United States loan to Russia, and many more.
- 21 said "I don't know."

In the spring of 1947, the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion asked a somewhat different question regarding differences between Russia and the democracies. A plurality of the Canadian public felt that rival imperialisms rather than different political ideologies were at the root of East-West misunderstandings:

"Do you think the MAIN reason why democratic countries and Russia find it difficult to get along together is that their forms of government are different, or is it that each thinks the other wants to dominate the world, or do you think there is some other reason?"

Each suspects other of intent to dominate	49%
Different forms of government	25
Other reasons	14
Undecided	12
	<u>100%</u>

Responses to three questions of the NORC series would seem to indicate a "will to peace" on the part of most people in the United States -- at least a feeling that war with Russia is unnecessary and by no means the logical solution to disagreements between the two countries. (However, on the same survey, 63% said they expected the United States to fight in another war within the next 25 years.) NORC asked:

"Do you think the present disagreements between Russia and the United States are serious enough to consider going to war about, or aren't they that serious?"

Aren't that serious	73%
Serious enough	17
Undecided	10
	<u>100%</u>

"In the disagreements between Russia and the United States, do you think one of the countries is entirely to blame, or do you think both countries have something to do with the misunderstanding?"

Both countries 74% One country only 17% Undecided 9% = 100%

"If the people as a whole in either Russia or the United States had the final decision to make, do you think the people would ever decide to start a war against each other?"

No 87% Yes 9% Undecided 4% = 100%

Information Please

Opinions about Russia and Russian-American relations are without doubt influenced by popular information about the Soviet Union. In connection with various of the NORC questions just discussed, comments made by those interviewed often suggested the need for more complete and more accurate information about relations between the USA and the USSR. This feeling on the part of the public was brought into focus by the last two questions in the series, which indicated that:

ONLY 29% of the public believed the United States government releases sufficient information about "what is going on between Russia and the United States,"

AND 42% -- a plurality -- thought that the newspapers they read make Russia look worse than she really is."

(These and other questions related to communications problems are analyzed in more detail in a later section of the report.)

Tending to corroborate NORC findings that suggest, either directly or indirectly, the need for more information on Russia, a survey reported in the fall of 1946 by Elmo Roper revealed a considerable degree of misinformation on the part of the general public regarding certain basic fundamentals of the Soviet system. Roper asked:

"Which of these statements would you say are true about Russia, and which are untrue?"

	ANSWERED CORRECTLY	ANSWERED INCORRECTLY	UNDECIDED
1. "Newspapers in Russia are permitted to criticize Stalin's policies if they want to. (UNTRUE)"	73%*	8%	19% = 100%
2. "Russian citizens who don't belong to the Communist Party can vote at national elections as well as party members. (TRUE)"	20	37	43
3. "Some large factories in Russia are run by individuals who are allowed to keep their profits after paying taxes. (UNTRUE)"	45	18	37
4. "Russians are free to go to any church they want to." (TRUE)"	40	31	29

Roper pointed out the close parallel between the percentage of correct answers given by veterans interviewed and by persons with a college background:

PERCENTAGE OF CORRECT ANSWERS ON PART:	1.	2.	3.	4.
Attended college	91%	31%	54%	56%
Veterans	87	31	56	50

Roper commented: "It is encouraging that the veterans," a majority of whom had no college training at all, "rate almost as well on their knowledge of the situation in Russia as do those who are older and have had more formal education."

Further: "Considering the lack of any information from Russian sources and the lack of correct information about Russia from other sources, plus the amount of incorrect information fed out by certain parts of our press, these answers seem, at first glance, not too bad. Actually they reveal one of our largest national areas of ignorance."** The analysis below speaks for itself:

No answer correct on the four questions	15%
Only one answer correct	24
Two answers correct	35
Three answers correct	20
All four answers correct	6
	<u>100%</u>

On most questions regarding Russia, the respondent's educational background appears to influence opinions more than any other single factor. The college-educated group are most likely (1) to answer information questions correctly, (2) to express opinions (relatively fewer "Undecided" or "I don't know" responses), and (3) to choose answers which give Russia the benefit of the doubt on an issue.

* FORTUNE AND ROPER FIGURES, LIKE THOSE OF AIPO AND NORC, ARE ROUNDED TO THE NEAREST FULL PERCENTAGE WHEN APPEARING IN RESEARCH REPORTS.

** "WHAT PEOPLE ARE THINKING," NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE, OCTOBER 17, 1946; LAST UNDERLINING OURS.

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE AXIS PEOPLES

The basic purpose of UNESCO is to contribute to peace by promoting international understanding, and one of the major undertakings included in the UNESCO program is a study of tensions conducive to war. In this connection, public opinion research in a number of countries has shown that, although people of some of the United Nations feel reasonably friendly toward their former enemies, the people of the Axis nations, a considerable residue of fear and distrust remains.

Poll results suggest that it may take many years and much re-education of Allied and Axis peoples alike before other countries become convinced that the Germans and Japanese are sincere in their desire for peace and should be recognized as having earned the right of full participation in the United Nations. Although the differentiation today is far less sharp than during the war, attitudes toward the Japanese still tend to be harsher than attitudes toward the Germans.

Analysis of survey findings from a number of different sources indicates that people in the United States have tended to feel contempt and distrust rather than actual hatred for the Axis peoples. When, in May, 1942, Gallup asked: "Do you, personally hate the Japanese people? ... the German people?" only 28% of those interviewed said they hated the Japanese; 18% said they hated the Germans. A Fortune question released in December, 1945, showed that 39% of the public regarded the majority of the German people as being "naturally cruel and brutal"; 56% considered a majority of the Japanese "naturally cruel and brutal."

Germany: An Eight-Nation Appraisal

The distrust and mixed feeling which still characterize attitudes toward the people of Germany and Japan are well illustrated in the results of an eight-nation survey of attitudes toward Germany. Feeling regarding Germany was noticeably most bitter in France, Norway, and the Netherlands -- acquainted at first-hand with Nazi conquerors at their worst. Denmark, which experienced a milder type of occupation, and Britain, bombed but not over-run, were somewhat more friendly. Distant Australia was the most friendly of all, though a clear majority in that country feared that Germany might again become a dangerous aggressor. The several Gallup affiliates asked:

"At the present time, do you feel friendly or unfriendly toward the people of Germany as a whole?"

"Do you think Germany will become a peace-loving, democratic nation, or do you think she will again someday become an aggressor nation, and want to start a war?"

	FEELING TOWARD GERMANY			PROSPECTS FOR GERMANY		
	FRIENDLY	UNFRIENDLY	UNDECIDED	PEACE- LOVING	AGGRESSOR	UNDECIDED
Australia	53%	34%	13% = 100%	20%	60%	20% = 100%
United States	45	28	27	22	58	20
Great Britain	42	36	22	23	43	34
Canada	41	28	31	20	58	22
Denmark	40	32	28	**	**	**
Netherlands	29	53	18	14	63	23
Norway	21	44	35	**	**	**
France	3	56	41*	10	63	27

* THE STARTLINGLY HIGH "UNDECIDED" FIGURE REPORTED FOR FRANCE ON THE FIRST QUESTION INCLUDES LARGELY PEOPLE CHARACTERIZING THEMSELVES AS "INDIFFERENT"; THIS IS TYPICAL OF THE APATHY WHICH SEEMS TO PERVADE FRENCH THOUGHT ON INTERNATIONAL ISSUES AND IS FOUND TIME AND AGAIN IN RELEASES OF THE FRENCH INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC OPINION. IT IS UNFORTUNATE THAT THE PICTURE CANNOT BE COMPLETED BY A REPORT OF RUSSIAN POPULAR OPINION.

** NOT REPORTED.

Three other questions asked by the French Institute of Public Opinion reveal other facets of feeling in that country toward Germany and the Germans:

"Do you think that Germany will become a democratic nation?"

Yes 18% No 55% Undecided 27% = 100%

"Do you think that Germany will again become a warlike nation or that she will become a peaceful nation?"

Warlike 63% Peaceful 10% Undecided 27% = 100%

"Do you think that Germany will try to start another war?"

Yes 16% No 56% Undecided 28% = 100%

People who felt that Germany would seek to let loose another war were most likely to expect such a war within the next 25 years.

The same distrust and skepticism regarding possible progress toward peace and democracy that was revealed in the five-nation question on Germany was shown by an NORC question put to Americans a month after V-J Day. Asked, "Do you think the Japanese will ever become a peaceful nation?" only 39% answered "Yes," 42% said "No," and 19% were undecided.

Basic Characteristics:
American Evaluation

An NORC trend question, asked more recently in May, 1946, has revealed that, since the end of the war, the American people have tended to become more lenient in their evaluation of both Axis peoples. The latest analysis found the largest segment of the public judging both the Germans and the Japanese to be weak and easily influenced rather than either basically good or basically bad. The changing attitude toward the Japanese people is the most striking feature of the four-year trend:

"Which of the following statements comes closest to describing how you feel, on the whole, about the people who live in Germany (Japan)?"

"The German (Japanese) people will always want to go to war to make themselves as powerful as possible."

"The German (Japanese) people may not like war, but they have shown that they are too easily led into war by powerful leaders."

"The German (Japanese) people do not like war. If they could have the same chance as people in other countries, they would become good citizens of the world."

ESTIMATE OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE:	<u>WILL ALWAYS WANT WAR</u>	<u>TOO EASILY MISLED</u>	<u>POTENTIAL GOOD CITIZENS</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
JULY '42	25%	44%	31% = 100%	7%
JUNE '43	22	46	32	3
DEC. '44	37	37	26	4
JULY '45	41	39	20	5
NOV. '45	31	43	26	4
MAY '46	32	46	22	4

ESTIMATE OF THE JAPANESE PEOPLE:	<u>WILL ALWAYS WANT WAR</u>	<u>TOO EASILY MISLED</u>	<u>POTENTIAL GOOD CITIZENS</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
JULY '42	54%	33%	13% = 100%	15%
JUNE '43	62	27	11	7
DEC. '44	62	27	11	10
JULY '45	56	31	13	7
NOV. '45	49	34	17	7
MAY '46	37	42	21	7

Re-education?

People in the United States are fairly optimistic about the possibility of re-educating both the German and Japanese people to a peaceful way of life, although such a program is seen as a long-term undertaking, according to an NORC study made last winter. The first question:

"Do you think it is possible to re-educate the German (Japanese) people to a peaceful way of life?"

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
German people	68%	22%	10% = 100%
Japanese people	54	33	13

In each case those who thought re-education possible were asked a further question:

"About how long do you think it will take?"

	GERMANS	JAPANESE	CUMULATIVE GERMANS	TOTALS JAPANESE
Over 50 years	6%	7%	6%	7%
21-50 years	22	18	28	25
TOTAL: more than 20 years	28%	25%		
11-20 years	19	14	47	39
6-10 years	11	8	58	47
5 years or less	7	5	65	52
TOTAL: 20 years or less	37%	27%		
Don't know how long	3	2		
	68%	54%		

However, when the same basic issue was presented in terms of the eventual ability of Japan or Germany to "become a good nation," NEVER was the verdict of a third of both Canadians and Americans in regard to Germany and over half of Canadians regarding Japan. CIP0 and Fortune used this question:

"Do you believe it would be possible for Germany to become a good nation within twenty years or so after the war, do you think it would take longer than that, or do you think she never can?"

	WITHIN 20 YEARS	LONGER	NEVER	DON'T KNOW
GERMANY: UNITED STATES OPINION	24%	42%	34% = 100%	10%
CANADIAN OPINION	28	39	33	12
JAPAN: CANADIAN OPINION	18	31	51	18

Before the end of the war, an AIPO question found a widespread feeling, even at that time, that the Allies should assume some responsibility for the re-education of German youth. In September, 1944, Gallup asked:

"Do you think the Allies should supervise the education and training of German youth after this war?"

Yes 66% No 19% Undecided 15% = 100%

Exploring American attitudes regarding the re-education of Germany from another angle, a Fortune question, asked in March, 1945, showed that a majority of Americans then thought the Germans incapable of re-educating themselves without assistance. The question:

"Do you think there will or will not be enough of the right kind of Germans within Germany to re-educate the people along democratic lines?"

Will be enough 22% Will not be enough 57% Don't know 21% = 100%

Demonstrations
in Democracy

Educational authorities agree that re-education of the German people in the ways of peace cannot be effected by schools and teachers and textbooks alone, however important these means may be. Re-education of the Germans will require actual experience in democratic living. Two questions NORC asked last winter showed that a majority of Americans would favor an exchange of persons, which has been suggested as a supplement to the re-education program inside Germany. Both questions assumed that "one of our main jobs in Germany is to re-educate the German people to a peaceful way of life."

"As you know, one of our main jobs in Germany is to re-educate the German people to a peaceful way of life. Would you approve or disapprove of bringing groups of Germans who have never been Nazis to this country, to see how democracy works over here?"

"Would you approve or disapprove of sending a number of American leaders in various occupations and professions to Germany, to show the Germans how we do things in a democratic country?"

	<u>APPROVE</u>	<u>DISAPPROVE</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>
Bringing groups of non-Nazis to this country	59%	36%	5% = 100%
Sending American leaders to Germany	77	19	4

Analysis of the influence of educational background on opinions in this area shows that the value of sending American leaders to Germany was recognized by substantial majorities of people in all three groups. The proposal to bring non-Nazi Germans to this country, on the other hand, was approved by the college-educated 3-to-1, and by the high school-trained 2-to-1, but opinion among persons with grade school education or no education at all was evenly divided. The exact comparisons:

	<u>BRINGING GERMANS HERE</u>			<u>SENDING LEADERS THERE</u>		
	<u>APPROVE</u>	<u>DIS-APPROVE</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>	<u>APPROVE</u>	<u>DIS-APPROVE</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>
All adults interviewed	59%	36%	5% = 100%	77%	19%	4% = 100%
Attended college	72	25	3	79	19	2
Attended high school	63	34	3	83	14	3
Eighth grade or less	47	46	7	70	24	6

Educational background also influenced to a significant degree opinion as to the possibility of re-educating the Japanese and, to a somewhat lesser extent, opinion on re-educating the Germans. Moreover, veterans were more likely than non-veterans to be optimistic about re-educating our former enemies. The comparisons:

IS IT POSSIBLE TO RE-EDUCATE:

	<u>THE GERMANS?</u>			<u>THE JAPANESE?</u>		
	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>
All adults interviewed	68%	22%	10% = 100%	54%	33%	13% = 100%
Attended college	77	17	6	70	19	11
Attended high school	73	21	6	57	31	12
Eighth grade or less	59	25	16	43	41	16
Veterans, World War II	71	20	9	65	22	13
Non-veterans	66	24	10	52	35	13

Economic
Rehabilitation

Obviously opinions on the educational rehabilitation of the Axis peoples and the economic rehabilitation of Japan and Germany are closely inter-related. Paralleling the striking shift in attitudes, particularly toward the Japanese, since the close of the war, is the marked shift in opinion regarding economic assistance shown in this NORC trend:

"Would you like to see our government help Germany(Japan) get her peacetime industries going again after this war, or not?"

	GERMANY		JAPAN	
	FEB. '44	DEC. '46	APRIL '45	DEC. '46
Yes, unqualified	51%	72%	21%	61%
Yes, qualified	8	8	4	6
No, unqualified	34	15	65	25
Undecided	7	5	10	8
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

The major reason for opposition, analysis revealed, was the fear that a revived German and Japanese industrial economy might lead to another war.

The decline in bitterness toward the Japanese, and the increased public acceptance of the idea of helping restore their peacetime economy, are illustrated by the results of another question in the December 1946 series. The overwhelming majority of the public believed we should give Japan the same trade opportunities that we give to other countries:

"Do you think we ought to give Japan the same opportunity to sell her goods in this country that we give to other nations?"

Yes 72% No 20% Don't know 8% = 100%

When the 20% who opposed the idea were asked their reason, fear of Japanese economic competition was most frequently mentioned, but the majority of arguments were in terms either of bitterness or of fear of a future war.

THIS SPRING THE NETHERLANDS INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC OPINION REPORTED THAT 77% OF THE DUTCH PEOPLE WOULD LIKE TO SEE THEIR COUNTRY RESUME TRADE WITH GERMANY -- BEFORE THE WAR THE BIGGEST BUYER OF DUTCH PRODUCTS. THIS EXPRESSION ON THE PART OF THE DUTCH OF THEIR NEED FOR DOING BUSINESS WITH GERMANY IS OF PARTICULAR INTEREST IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT 53% FELT DISTINCTLY UNFRIENDLY TOWARD GERMANY AND 63% BELIEVED SHE WOULD AGAIN BECOME AN AGGRESSOR NATION. A YEAR AGO A 41% PLURALITY SAID THEY THOUGHT HOLLAND SHOULD ANNEX A PART OF GERMANY AS PARTIAL REPARATION FOR DUTCH LOSSES DURING THE NAZI OCCUPATION. (ALMOST AS MANY, HOWEVER, OPPOSED ANNEXATION, CHIEFLY BECAUSE THEY FEARED IT MIGHT LEAD TO ANOTHER WAR.)

Reparations NORC questions asked during the war found strong feeling on the part of the American public that the people of both Germany and Japan should be made to pay in full for the cost of the war. A 79% majority thought the United States should try to get reparation from Japan; 62% thought we should try to get reparation from Germany. Reparations in addition to the restoration of conquered territories and the punishment of war leaders were demanded from the Japanese by 64% and from the Germans by 48%. In each case, over half the public recognized the necessity of accepting goods as at least part payment. However, only 21% said they would be willing to accept as reparations Japanese goods which could be sold cheaper than similar goods made in this country-- even if that were the only way Japan could pay part, at least, of what the war cost the United States.

On all the questions in this area, the influence of information on attitudes was indicated by the tendency of the best educated segment of the population to believe that the economic rehabilitation of Germany and Japan should be encouraged in the interests of world peace.

BRITONS AND AMERICANS LOOK AT EACH OTHER

In the year following the war British feeling toward the United States became somewhat more friendly, while feeling toward Russia cooled. On both surveys, standard-of-living level differences were of interest: the prosperous were "less friendly" to Russia about twice as often as the poor, while the middle class were "less friendly" to the United States more frequently than either the prosperous or the poor. The British Institute of Public Opinion asked:

"Are your feelings toward the United States (Russia) more friendly, or less friendly, than they were a year ago?"

	UNITED STATES				RUSSIA			
	MORE FRIENDLY	SAME	LESS FRIENDLY	UNDECIDED	MORE FRIENDLY	SAME	LESS FRIENDLY	UNDECIDED
SEPTEMBER '45	9%	46%	35%	10% = 100%	16%	54%	19%	11% = 100%
JUNE '46	11	51	32	8	41	41	10	

That anti-Russian sentiment has been somewhat stronger in the United States than in Great Britain is suggested by the following comparison, based on identical questions:

	MORE FRIENDLY	ABOUT THE SAME	LESS FRIENDLY	UNDECIDED
Great Britain (June '46)	8%	41%	41%	10% = 100%
United States (Sept. '46)	2	28	62	8

Last September ('46), only 24% of the British public considered Great Britain, the United States, and Russia "still allies as they were during the war," and 50% said they thought "that friendship had disappeared." Reasons given for the change included mistrust, greed and selfishness, lack of cooperation; Russia was blamed more often than either of the Western allies.

British Attitudes:
Individual Americans

A survey made by Mass Observation in England, and reported in April of this year revealed attitudes of the British people regarding individual Americans. Two important findings of the survey were (1) that most British do have a fairly clear cut picture of Americans, even though the picture is a stereotype, and (2) that Britishers usually have the same fundamental idea of an American, so that all the qualities attributed to Americans fit into a general pattern reasonably well.

Most frequent conception Britons have is that Americans do not grow up. Britishers interpret this trait either favorably or unfavorably, i.e., either attributing to Americans good qualities of youth or childhood, or by describing Americans as "adolescent." British people favorably inclined toward Americans describe them as simple, ingenuous, impulsive, uninhibited, friendly, kind-hearted, and generous. Those feeling unfavorably toward Americans say they are immature-- emotionally and intellectually, boastful, flamboyant, bad mannered, and intolerant toward minority groups. In either case the American's likeness to a child is stressed.

Closely related to the fundamental idea of youthfulness, is the British people's second concept of Americans as being vigorous and enterprising, and as being preoccupied with technical efficiency and materialism.

The why of the concept of materialism and the other aspects of the British stereotype of Americans might be traced to the influence of Hollywood and its products, Mass Observation suggests. The impact of the GI had little effect in changing British ideas of Americans, the analysts believe. British people tended to judge the GI as an individual subject to special wartime strains rather than normal American influences.

Comments from the British people illustrate vividly and more fully the predominance of these two closely related stereotypes of Americans in the British mind:

"It's a funny thing, but when I'm with any American though they may be twice my age or more, I always feel the older and more mature person. All of them, male and female alike, seem kiddish and very naive. Their childlike desire to talk, their tactlessness and good humor of the school-age type, amuses me very much. I like them, not in the way I like the French -- as an equal-- but in the way a fond parent likes his children." (Young man)

"Mostly, I think, they have energy but lack understanding. They are like tiresome children who insist on making their presence felt without having any contribution to make as a result." (Young London woman)

"I'm thoroughly cheesed off with the Americans as a whole. They're so politically immature and although individually they appear to be warm-hearted, as a nation they seem to be completely without care as to what's happening to the rest of the world." (Young woman)

"I envy their mechanization, energy, and good standards of life." (Middle-aged housewife)

"They worship the standard of life which provides a car, an electric washer and a refrigerator." (Housewife)

"As far as I gather they haven't much interest in nature and the deep things of life." (Young forestry worker)

American Attitudes

The prevalence of stereotypes in American thinking about people of other countries, the importance of information in determining attitudes, and the common assumption (perhaps a blend of complacency and patriotism) that the United States is the best country in the world in every respect -- these and other characteristic attitudes were revealed in a wartime study of American opinion regarding the British, made in April, 1943. These are the questions:

"Have you known any English(Canadian)people personally?""*

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
English	53%	46%	1% = 100%
Canadians	46	52	2

"Have you ever visited Canada or any other part of the British Empire?""*

Yes 38% No 62% = 100%

* THESE TWO QUESTIONS WERE ASKED AT THE END OF THE SURVEY, BUT REVEAL FACTS BASIC TO THE ENTIRE ANALYSIS. NOTE THAT THE FIRST QUESTION DOES NOT DISTINGUISH BETWEEN PEOPLE BORN IN ENGLAND AND PEOPLE OF ENGLISH DESCENT WHO MAY HAVE BEEN BORN AND REARED IN THE UNITED STATES.

"What are some of the things you like about the British people?"**

Their spirit, fighting qualities, and sportsmanship	26%
Their similarity to Americans	13
Their sincerity, reliability, and frankness	11
Their democratic spirit; progressiveness, broadmindedness, love of freedom	10
Their conservative characteristics	8
Their culture and intelligence	6
Their patriotism and loyalty	4
Their thriftiness and industriousness	3
Miscellaneous qualities or no answer	37

"Do you think that our system of Social Security, such as unemployment and old-age insurance is better than Britain's, or not as good?"

BETTER 23% NOT AS GOOD 8% ABOUT THE SAME 8% DON'T KNOW 61% = 100%

"Which do you think have more to say about the way their government is run, the British people or the American people?"

AMERICANS 66% BRITISH 9% ABOUT THE SAME 11% DON'T KNOW 14% = 100%

"Which has a better chance to get ahead -- an average person in Britain, or an average person in this country?"

AMERICANS 86% BRITISH * ABOUT THE SAME 5% DON'T KNOW 9% = 100%

"Have you ever come across British criticisms of America?"

Yes 28% No 72% = 100%

"Have they [criticisms] annoyed you?"

Yes 15% No 13% = 28%

"What would you say is the main thing that might cause trouble between the United States and Britain after the war?"**

Territorial settlements	19%
Lend-lease re-payment	17
Difficulties over peace settlement	15
Trade agreements or monetary system	9
Control of sea and air traffic	5
No trouble	13
Miscellaneous or not ascertainable	30

* LESS THAN 0.5%

** SINCE, IN SOME CASES, THE PERSON INTERVIEWED GAVE MORE THAN ONE ANSWER, PERCENTAGES ADD TO MORE THAN 100.

British and
American Views on
Parallel Questions

Further exploring American and British attitudes toward each other, the American Institute of Public Opinion and the Gallup-affiliated British Institute of Public Opinion conducted parallel surveys in their respective countries in April and May of this year.

Designed to find what Americans and Britons think about each other, and to compare their opinions on certain issues, and also to ascertain the amount of information the people of each country had about the other, the two surveys used several identical questions.

Relevant to the entire survey AIPO asked three questions somewhat similar to the ones asked by NORC (see page 21) and found that only 10% of those interviewed had "been in England." However, 75% had known someone who had been in England, and 49% had discussed England with someone who had been there.

Peoples of both countries are quite happy to live in their own lands, although Americans are somewhat more satisfied with the United States than are Britons with England, to judge from a question asked on both surveys. While 22% of the English people said they would like to live in the United States (71% said "No"), only 3% of Americans thought they would like to live in England five years from now (94% answered negatively). Representative of the close ties between the two countries, a 59% majority of Englishmen and a substantial plurality of Americans -- 32% -- would favor a joint citizenship plan so that "an Englishman could come and live in the United States and an American could go to England to live without regard to immigration laws."

An overwhelming majority of people in the United States believe that England has a lower standard of living than ours. this AIPO question showed:

"Do you think the living standards are higher in England today than they are in the United States -- that is, English people are better off or worse off than Americans?"

AMERICANS BETTER OFF 94% BRITISH BETTER OFF 2% SAME 3% DON'T KNOW 1% = 100%

Another question relating to the economic situation of both countries and asked on both surveys found a majority of British thinking proportionately more poor people lived in the United States while an overwhelming majority of Americans hold the opposite view. Question wording on both surveys was much the same; the AIPO question is quoted here:

"Considering the size of population of each country, do you think there are more or fewer POOR people in England today than in the United States?"

	<u>MORE POOR PEOPLE IN ENGLAND</u>	<u>MORE POOR PEOPLE IN AMERICA</u>	<u>SAME</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
Americans think:	72%	14%	10%	4% = 100%
English think:	22	57	12	9

Americans and Englishmen again have different opinions about the amount of unemployment in their respective countries: 66% of Englishmen think there is more unemployment in America than in England, while 43% of Americans said there was more unemployment in England than in their country.

A somewhat different question round English opinion divided as to how the British and American "levels of civilization" compare:

"Has the United States reached a higher level of civilization than we have?"

AMERICAN HIGHER 27% BRITISH HIGHER 31% SAME 36% DON'T KNOW 6% = 100%

The survey conducted in America asked more informational questions concerning the British type and methods of government than the British survey asked about the American government. Accordingly, 63% of Americans correctly identified the law-making body of England, corresponding to our Congress, as Parliament. Almost half -- 49% -- knew the name of the upper house, and 48% named the lower house correctly. When asked to name the present Prime Minister, 67% knew Clement Attlee. The King of England was correctly identified as "King George VI" by 34% and 42% more gave partially correct answers by saying "King George." When asked: "In England itself, does the King have more power, less power, or about the same amount of power as the President has in the United States?" 74% correctly said "Less power." Eleven per cent said "More"; 10% thought both had the same amount of power, and 5% were undecided.

It is perhaps characteristic that, while a strong majority of people in the United States believe this government more democratic than Great Britain's, opinion in that country is divided as to which people have more voice in their government. The two questions were very similar; the AIPO one read:

"Do the people of England have more of a voice or less of a voice about the way their government is run than we do in the United States?"

	<u>AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE MORE VOICE</u>	<u>ENGLISH HAVE MORE VOICE</u>	<u>SAME</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
Americans think:	67%	10%	16%	7% = 100%
English think:	22	29	38	11

In British eyes, what is the average American like? Much the same sort of stereotyped thinking about Americans reported in the Mass Observation analysis was revealed by a British Institute of Public Opinion question. Another question showed British opinion as to what Americans think about Englishmen. BIPO asked:

"When you think of an American, what kind of person do you think of?"

"How do you think the American people regard Englishmen?"

Boaster; person who is loud voiced cocksure, opinionated	34%	Dull; backward; old-fashioned; slow; unenterprising	25%
Exuberant; boisterous; happy-go- lucky; free-and-easy	13	As inferior	11
Friendly	13	Snobbish; stand-offish	12
Go-getter; man in a hurry; pro- gressive; business type	8	With contempt	6
Candid; outspoken; uninhibited	4	Reserved; shy	8
Tough; hard-boiled	3	With dislike	3
Coarse; crude; unmannerly	1	Cold; unemotional	2
Prosperous; big-spender	1	Soft; effeminate; over-refined	2
Personal characteristics:		Clever; cunning	2
Tall person	2	Poorly	2
Person with a drawling accent	1	Boasters; swankers; conceited	1
Person chewing gum	1	Ignorant; pig-headed	1
Someone smartly dressed	1	As slightly made; "crackers"	1
Serviceman; GI	3	In a good light; all right	10
Someone like myself	6	As equals	2
Miscellaneous	6	With tolerance	1
Undecided	3	Miscellaneous	4
	<u>100%</u>	Undecided	7
			<u>100%</u>

Americans have a better sense of humor than Englishmen, 82% of people in the United States believe. Only 31% of Englishmen agree, however, an identical question asked in Great Britain indicates.

ATTITUDES TOWARD MINORITY GROUPS IN THE UNITED STATES

Information regarding the attitudes that exist in the United States toward Negroes, Japanese-Americans, and Jews has a definite bearing on analysis of the problems involved in attacking on a world-wide scale the barriers of misunderstanding and prejudice between countries and peoples.

Negroes

Twice, in 1944 and 1946, NORC made studies on a nationwide scale of white attitudes toward Negro problems. On the 1946 survey, Negro opinions regarding the same issues were also secured. Findings on the two surveys were compared to throw light on two fundamental questions. Are tolerance and understanding on the increase? There is some evidence of increased willingness on the part of whites to give Negroes equal economic opportunities, although on one specific issue-- acceptance of Negro nurses -- less tolerance was evidenced in 1946 than in 1944. Is information concerning Negroes replacing superstition and prejudice? Regarding basic learning potentialities of whites and Negroes and also regarding the fundamental similarity of Negro and white blood, an increasing proportion of the public is coming to agree with expert opinion. The most important findings may be summarized as follows:

- 53% of white Americans think that, if Negroes are given the same education, they can learn just as well as white people. (In 1944, only 44% were of this opinion.)
- 42% know that Negro blood and white blood are alike. (In 1944, only 36% answered this way.)
- 47% of white people wouldn't mind having a Negro nurse care for them in a hospital. (In 1944, 54% said "All right.")*
- 47% of whites believe Negroes and whites should enjoy equal employment opportunities. (In 1944, 42% advocated equal job chances for both.)
- HOWEVER 66% of white Americans think most Negroes in the United States are treated fairly. (In 1944, almost the same majority -- 64% -- judged Negroes to be treated fairly.)
- ALTHOUGH ONLY 28% of Negroes feel that they are being treated fairly in the United States today.

Information on the similarity of Negro and white blood seems closely related to other white opinions regarding Negroes. For example, among whites who know that Negro and white blood are alike, 60% think Negroes and whites should have equal employment opportunities. Of whites who think that racial differences are blood-deep, only 36% would give Negroes the same chance as whites to get any job. Likewise, of whites who know that Negro and white blood are the same, 62% say it would be all right with them to be cared for by a Negro nurse in a hospital. Of whites who think the two races have different blood, only 35% would accept a Negro nurse.

Information on the learning potentialities of Negroes also appears to influence to a considerable extent white attitudes toward Negroes in the economic and social spheres. For example, among whites who know that Negroes and whites can be equally intelligent, 57% think members of the two races should have equal employment opportunities. Of whites who think that Negroes are inescapably less intelligent, only 35% would grant Negroes the same chances as whites to get any job.

* ON THE 1944 SURVEY, 72% OF WHITES ANSWERED "YES" TO THE QUESTION: "IF A NEGRO IS QUALIFIED TO BE A RAILROAD ENGINEER, DO YOU THINK HE SHOULD BE GIVEN A CHANCE AT THIS JOB?" THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WHITE ATTITUDES REGARDING NEGRO RAILROAD ENGINEERS AND ATTITUDES REGARDING NEGRO NURSES MAY BE DUE TO THE FACT THAT THE RAILROAD JOB MIGHT BE CONSIDERED AS PURELY AN ECONOMIC ISSUE, WHILE THE NURSING JOB HAS SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS AS WELL.

A few of the key questions, together with analysis helpful in studying stereotypes and group prejudices are presented in full:

"Do YOU think most Negroes in the United States are being treated fairly or unfairly?"

	<u>FAIRLY</u>	<u>UNFAIRLY</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
1944, whites	64%	27%	9% = 100%
1946, whites	66	25	9
Negroes	28	66	6

"Do you think Negroes should have as good a chance as white people to get any kind of job, or do you think white people should have the first chance at any kind of job?"

	<u>NEGROES -- EQUAL CHANCE</u>	<u>WHITES FIRST</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
1944, whites	42%	52%	6% = 100%
1946, whites	47	49	4
Negroes	92	5	3

Many of those who believe that whites should have job priority mentioned more than one reason when asked:

"Why do you think so?"

- 11% of whites consider theirs a superior race and the doctrine of white supremacy mandatory; Negroes should be relegated to menial jobs.
- 11 think that Negroes are not dependable or cooperative and have other undesirable characteristics.
- 10 feel that Negroes lack general education, specific vocational training, and/or intelligence.
- 5 of whites frankly admit race prejudice.
- 8 emphasize their feeling that this is a "white man's country," that whites were here first and are in the majority numerically.
- 12 cite other reasons: that whites are not ready to accept the Negro as an equal, that Negroes are not ready for equality, that economic or social equality is undesirable, or still other arguments.
- 2 say "I don't know."

The sharpest differences in response to the questions were between Southern and Northern whites. Differences among persons of various educational backgrounds were also noticeable. These are the 1946 comparisons:

<u>WHITES:</u>	<u>NEGROES TREATED UNFAIRLY</u>	<u>EQUAL JOB OPPOR- TUNITIES</u>	<u>NEGRO NURSES ACCEPTABLE</u>	<u>NEGROES CAN BE AS INTELLIGENT</u>	<u>NEGRO BLOOD SAME</u>
All whites interviewed	25%	47%	49%	53%	42%
Northern whites	28	54	52	61	45
Southern whites	16	27	31	30	33
Attended college	43	65	62	47	62
Attended high school	24	49	50	53	45
Eighth grade or less	18	39	42	56	31

Japanese-Americans Attitudes toward another minority group in this country -- the Japanese -- were studied by NORC in May, 1946. NORC found that while the harsher judgments toward the Japanese in this country were softening, there was still evident a residue of distrust and misinformation based on rumor and hearsay. NORC first asked a nation-wide cross-section of civilian adults:

"Do you think the AVERAGE Japanese person who lives in this country is loyal or disloyal to the American government?"

Loyal 50% Disloyal 25% Don't know 25% = 100%

The 75% who answered "Loyal" or "Don't know" were asked:

"Do you think the AVERAGE Japanese person now living in this country who is not a citizen should or should not be allowed to become a citizen?"

Should be allowed 43% Should not 22% Don't know 10% = 75%

Comments volunteered by those interviewed pointed to a rather widespread ignorance of legal barriers to citizenship for Japanese born in the Orient.

An overwhelming majority of Americans felt that the Japanese living in this country were guilty of spying during the war. This opinion, to judge from comments, is often based on the feeling that spying is natural during wars or on the conviction that such spying could not have been detected by officials. Regarding possible sabotage, on the other hand, there is a high degree of uncertainty. Apparently people thought that if sabotage had been widespread they would have known about it. The questions:

"During the war, do you think the Japanese who lived in this country destroyed any American war materials?...did any spying for the Japanese government?"

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
Sabotage	31%	32%	37% = 100%
Spying	66	13	21

ON ALL THREE QUESTIONS NORC FOUND OPINIONS DIFFERING SOMEWHAT FROM GROUP TO GROUP, WITH PERSONS IN THE MORE PRIVILEGED EDUCATIONAL, ECONOMIC, AND OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS MORE TOLERANT IN THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARD JAPANESE-AMERICANS THAN PEOPLE IN THE LESS PRIVILEGED GROUPS. THE ISSUE IS NOT A POLITICAL ONE -- NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDE BETWEEN REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS WERE EVIDENT. SECTIONAL DIFFERENCES SUGGESTED PREJUDICE FELT AGAINST JAPANESE-AMERICANS IN THE PACIFIC STATES AND MISINFORMATION IN THE SOUTH. THE MOST INTERESTING COMPARISONS FOLLOW:

JAPANESE LIVING IN THIS COUNTRY:

	ARE LOYAL	SHOULD BE ALLOWED CITIZENSHIP	ARE LOYAL AND SHOULD BE ALLOWED CITIZENSHIP	DID NOT SABOTAGE	DID NOT SPY
All adults interviewed	50%	43%*	34%	32%	13%
Attended college	69	58	51	41	16
Attended high school	57	46	38	34	12
Eighth grade or less	37	34	23	27	14
Midwest	56	47	33	33	14
New England and Mid-Atlantic states	53	53	40	38	15
Rocky Mountain and Pacific Coast	50	31	27	35	11
South	41	34	24	24	12

When the "Don't know" opinions are eliminated, all percentages increase, particularly those for the least educated.

* THIS QUESTION WAS ASKED OF PERSONS UNDECIDED AS WELL AS OF THOSE ANSWERING "LOYAL."

Jews

Over a period of several years, the National Opinion Research Center has studied certain aspects of anti-Semitism among the American people through the use of two questions, the first designed primarily to give expression to latent prejudice, the second to test more active prejudice:

"Do you think that Jewish people in the United States have too much influence in the business world, not enough influence, or about the amount of influence they should have?"

	<u>TOO MUCH</u>	<u>NOT ENOUGH</u>	<u>AMOUNT THEY SHOULD HAVE</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
1942, July	51%	2%	33%	14% = 100%
1943, January	51	2	34	13
November	54	1	31	14
1944, December	58	2	29	11
1945, December	58	1	30	11

"Do you think there are any racial or religious groups that have too much power in this country?"

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
1943, November	28%	59%	13% = 100%
1945, September	27	62	11

On both occasions those who replied "Yes" were asked a further question, "Which ones?" in answering which a number of people named more than one group:

	<u>JEWS</u>	<u>CATHOLICS</u>	<u>NEGROES</u>	<u>WHITES</u>	<u>OTHER GROUPS</u>	<u>REFUSED</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
1943, November	13%	10%	2%	2%	4%	2%	1%
1945, September	13	9	4	2	4	1	*

A survey conducted by Elmo Roper and reported in the February, 1946, issue of Fortune explored anti-Semitism and related attitudes. By means of two questions somewhat similar to the second asked by NORC, Fortune identified as anti-Semites persons who took one or both of the two opportunities offered to express antagonism or hostility to Jews. To the first question, "Are there any organizations or groups of people in this country who you feel might be harmful to the future of the country unless they are curbed?" 5% answered "Jews." And 6.5% named Jews when asked, "Are there any groups of people you think are trying to get ahead at the expense of people like you?"

After identifying anti-Semites by this method, Fortune studied this group of people and compared them with the rest of the population in regard to their opinions on four controversial topics: Great Britain, Russia, labor unions, and government-sponsored public works to relieve unemployment. Anti-Semites and others were also compared with respect to age, income, and place of residence. Roper's main conclusions were that:

1. ANTI-SEMITISM INCREASES WITH WEALTH.
2. ANTI-SEMITISM IS STRONGEST IN THE NORTHEAST AND MIDDLE WEST, WEAKEST IN THE SOUTH AND FAR WEST.
3. ANTI-SEMITISM IS STRONGEST IN LARGE CITIES, WEAKEST IN SMALL TOWNS.
4. ANTI-SEMITISM IS STRONGEST AMONG THE AGE GROUP THIRTY-FIVE TO FORTY-NINE, WEAKEST AMONG THE AGE GROUP TWENTY-ONE TO THIRTY-FOUR.
5. ANTI-SEMITISM RUNS PARALLEL WITH HOSTILITY TO GREAT BRITAIN AND RUSSIA.
6. ANTI-SEMITISM RUNS PARALLEL WITH DISAPPROVAL OF LABOR UNIONS AND OF LARGE-SCALE GOVERNMENT WORK PROJECTS TO HELP PREVENT UNEMPLOYMENT.
7. ANTI-SEMITE ARE MORE ARTICULATE THAN AMERICANS AS A WHOLE, THAT IS, THEY GIVE FEWER "DON'T KNOW" ANSWERS TO THE ABOVE QUESTIONS THAN DID OTHERS.

* LESS THAN 0.5%.

Part II

THE UNITED NATIONS AND PROSPECTS FOR WAR OR PEACE

UNESCO must begin its work in a world where many minor wars are already in progress, where fear of another major conflict -- World War III -- is on the increase, and where people tend to feel that they as individuals can do little or nothing to help prevent another war. People in the United States and in other countries support the idea of world organization in general. But they tend to be only partially satisfied with the progress of the United Nations, and they are reluctant to sacrifice national sovereignty to more than a limited degree even for the purpose of giving the United Nations sufficient power to become wholly effective.

WORLD WAR III?

Any agency interested in furthering international cooperation through educational means is immediately faced with the fact that, no matter how sincerely people may desire peace, the feeling that another war is inevitable is deeply ingrained in popular thinking in the United States and many other Western democracies. Majorities in a number of countries seem convinced that the war in the offing will become a reality within the next generation, and almost half the people in the United States now expect a war within a decade.

War within 10 Years? Another war in 10 years was anticipated by 36% of the United States public in September '46 and by 48% in April '47, NORC surveys show -- clear evidence of the growing conviction that World War III is inevitable. Last fall the 63% who thought the United States would fight in another war within 25 years were asked to delineate their expectations more specifically:

"Just about how long would you guess it might be before we fight in another war?"

In 5 years or less	21%
6 to 10 years	15
11 to 25 years	21
Don't know	6
	<u>63%</u>

In April, 1947, NORC asked another question, which revealed rather wide differences of opinion among persons of various educational backgrounds:

"Do you expect the United States to fight in another war within the next 10 years?"

	<u>ALL ADULTS</u> <u>INTERVIEWED</u>	<u>ATTENDED</u> <u>COLLEGE</u>	<u>ATTENDED</u> <u>HIGH SCHOOL</u>	<u>EIGHTH GRADE</u> <u>OR LESS</u>
Yes	48%	38%	52%	50%
No	42	57	40	36
Don't know	10	5	8	14
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

War in 25 Years?

About two-thirds of the public in this country -- according to surveys made during the past year by the National Opinion Research Center, the American Institute of Public Opinion, and the Psychological Corporation -- believe that the United States will be involved in another war within the next 25 years. How pessimism regarding the likelihood of another war within a generation has increased during the last two years is shown by an NORC trend question first asked before V-E Day:

"Do you expect the United States to fight in another war within the next 25 years?"

	<u>ANOTHER WAR</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>
1945, March	36%	45%	19% = 100%
July	42	46	12
September	44	44	12
1946, March	68	20	12
September	63	25	12
1947, April	62	26	12

Corroborating NORC results are Gallup findings which for two years have closely paralleled NORC's:

"Do you think the United States will find itself in another war within, say, the next 25 years?"

	<u>ANOTHER WAR</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>
1945, March	38%	45%	17% = 100%
1946, March	69	19	12
August	65	16	19
1947, April	73	18	9

In August, 1946, only 39% of a cross-section of men and women mentioned in Who's Who in America -- in comparison with 65% of the general public-- thought that the United States would be involved in another war within 25 years. The comparison:

	<u>ANOTHER WAR</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>
<u>Who's Who</u> sample	39%	34%	27% = 100%
All voters	65	16	19

According to a trend accumulated by the Psychological Corporation, 74% of the urban population had, by October '46, come to expect another war within 25 years, and 56% believed that Russia would be the United States' "next enemy."

"After this war (now that the war is over), do you think that we will make a peace settlement that will last, or do you think that we will have another world war in 25 years or so?"

	<u>ANOTHER WAR</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>
1943, February	43%	47%	10% = 100%
1944, October	54	28	18
1945, April	51	33	16
October	59	28	13
1946, April	62	24	14
October	74	18	8

War Expectations
in Other Countries

Despite the fact (or perhaps because of it) that World War II occasioned far more personal suffering to Britons than to Americans, the people of Great Britain are less ready than the people of the United States to predict another war. Last fall the British Institute of Public Opinion found that only 34% of the British people -- in contrast to almost twice as many Americans -- expected war within 25 years. During the first six months after V-J Day only half of the French and the Dutch peoples anticipated another war within a generation. By December, 1946, however, Dutch opinion had come to parallel that in the United States, with 63% expecting war. Australians had become similarly pessimistic, with 62% -- in October '46 -- predicting a war of world proportions within a quarter-century.

These are the exact questions and results from the various polls:

GREAT BRITAIN
"Do you think that the present war is the last world war, or that another is likely during the next 25 years?"
 (January, 1945)

Another war 48% No 28% Don't know 24% = 100%

"Do you think that another world war is likely during the next 25 years?" (October, 1946)

Another war 34% No 37% Don't know 29% = 100%

FRANCE
"Do you think there will be a war within the next 25 years?" (January, 1946)

Another war 50% No 27% Don't know 23% = 100%

Only 11% anticipated another war within 10 years.

"Do you think that France will be involved in the conflict?"

Yes 51% No 7% Don't know 42% = 100%

HOLLAND
"Do you think we shall see another world war, or will peace be maintained in our time?"

	<u>ANOTHER WAR</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>
1945, December	50%	29%	21% = 100%
1946, December	63	22	15

In December, 1946, 32% anticipated a war within the next 10 years; more than half of these (16% of the total) foresaw war in 5 years.

AUSTRALIA
"Do you think there is likely to be another world war in the next 25 years?"

	<u>ANOTHER WAR</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>
1944, May	42%	34%	24% = 100%
1946, October	62	18	20

CAN WARS BE PREVENTED?

Perhaps the prevalence of pessimism regarding the probability of another world war may be partially accounted for by the fact that the American people seem to have little faith in the possibility of helping to prevent another war by their own efforts or in the ability of the United Nations to avert another conflict. In analyzing public attitudes as revealed by a number of different questions on the problem, NORC found this prevailing pessimism somewhat tempered by the belief of a substantial minority of Americans that some day there might be a world organization strong enough to maintain peace.

Can Individuals Help Prevent Wars?

"No, I can't do anything personally," is the first reaction of the average American toward his own role in helping to prevent wars. Although, theoretically, at least, people have it in their power to determine policy in a democracy where the majority rules and where the social action of that majority depends in final analysis upon the personal action of individual citizens, 64% of the public replied in the negative when the National Opinion Research Center asked:

"Can you think of anything that you personally can do that would help prevent another war?"

Yes 36% No 64% = 100%

When the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion posed a somewhat similar question, opinion was almost evenly divided. However, since the Canadian question did not pin people down quite so closely as to what they personally could do, and since it suggested that individual action to prevent wars is a duty, it is not surprising that a slight majority of Canadians felt impelled to reply "Yes" when asked:

"Some people say that it is not enough to leave the work of preventing wars and world troubles to governments and the United Nations, but that it is the duty of every individual person to try to do something to prevent war. Can you think of something people like yourself could do to help prevent another war?"

Yes 52% No 48% = 100%

A follow-up question asked in both countries elicited numerous suggestions of ways in which people as individuals can help to prevent wars. While, because of the difference in the wording of the question, Americans tended to answer in generalities, people in both the United States and Canada made such specific suggestions as: use the vote right and elect to office men who will work for peace; practice Christianity; practice tolerance and good-will; educate for peace among both children and adults; "talk peace"; join peace organizations; support the United Nations. Americans placed most emphasis on political effectiveness; Canadians, on religious effectiveness.

The apparent paradox of defeatism -- with only 36% admitting personal responsibility or recognizing individual ability to help prevent another war -- is highlighted by the fact that, during the war, 83% felt that they as individuals were doing something specific (war job, volunteer defense work, buying bonds) to further the United States' total war effort. Partial placement of responsibility is implied by the fact that, during the war, more than 80% of the public said that national leaders and the press had given them "a good idea" of how they as individuals might help the war effort, but only a third as many felt that leaders and the press had given practical suggestions of what they as individuals could do to help prevent another war.

Can the UN
Prevent Wars?

The United Nations, as it is now set up, would not be strong enough to avert a war, according to 7 out of every 10 Americans questioned by NORC last September. Regarding UN's future ability to avert wars, however, 43% of Americans registered some optimism -- including 20% who believed that United Nations was now strong enough and 23% who thought it might someday be powerful enough to prevent wars. NORC asked:

"From what you know about the way the United Nations organization is set up at this time, do you think it is strong enough to prevent wars for the next 25 years?"

Yes, strong enough 20% No, not strong enough 69% Don't know 11% = 100%

(If "No" or "Don't know") "Do you think there will ever be a world organization strong enough to prevent wars?"

Yes, there will be 23% No, there won't be 47% Don't know 10% = 80%

People who have attended college -- as a population group generally the best informed, and specifically most acquainted with the organization of the United Nations-- differed significantly from the less privileged in that the college-educated were (1) somewhat less likely than others to think that the present United Nations is strong enough to prevent wars for 25 years; (2) much more likely than others to think that some day there will be a world organization strong enough to prevent wars; and (3) considerably less likely than others to think that there will never be a world organization strong enough to prevent wars. In January, 1946, the British Institute of Public Opinion found a 55% majority of the belief that "the United Nations will be able to prevent war during the next 25 years." When asked the same question three months later, only 30% of Canadians expressed confidence in the ability of the United Nations to keep the peace. A French Institute of Public Opinion question, specifying no time-limit, found only 33% in January, 1946, and 39% the following April who thought that the United Nations would be able to avert war.

Will the Atomic Bomb
Make War Less Likely?*

Both a threat and a temptation to any aggressively minded nations, the atomic bomb is a vital factor in the consideration of the likelihood or the possible prevention of another world war. In September, 1945, only a few weeks after the initial uses of the atomic bomb which brought about the end of the war, 64% of the public said they thought the atomic bomb would make wars less likely, NORC found. A growing pessimism as to the long-term effect of the conquest of atomic energy, however, is suggested by the fact that the proportion of people considering atomic discoveries a blessing to mankind, by and large, declined significantly during the year following V-J Day. In September '45, 52% of the public, in contrast to 37% in September '46, felt that "people everywhere would be better off because somebody learned how to split the atom." (In the second NORC survey, 60% of World War II veterans in comparison with 34% of non-veterans answered "Better off.")

Although the United States -- as a master of atomic "know-how" -- might appear to hold the whip hand today, a survey conducted last fall by NORC found a 67% majority of Americans maintaining that this country's best security against war is a strong United Nations rather than a stockpile of "more and better atomic bombs." This attitude seems consistent with the belief held by 74% of the public that, no matter how strongly the United States might arm herself with atomic bombs and rockets, these offer no real guarantee against a foreign attack.

* FOR SOME DETAILS OF PUBLIC OPINION ON THE RELATED ISSUE OF UNITED NATIONS' CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY, SEE PAGES 40, 41 OF THIS REPORT.

Some Causes of War

As an approach to the problem of maintaining peace, a study of the causes of war provides some answers which might serve as a basis for future efforts to build a peaceful world. When NORC asked a cross-section of American adults "In general, what do you think is usually the main cause of wars?" greed, in general or in specific application, was mentioned four times as frequently as the second ranking factor, the actions of specific groups of people, such as militarists, politicians, and dictators. That the desire to fight is inherent in human nature itself, was the belief of many. Still other factors--politics, the ambitions of particular nations, economic rivalries and maladjustments, and misunderstandings of every sort -- were also considered serious by significant numbers of those interviewed.

Regarding United States involvement in World War II, NORC found only 29% of the American people believing that Pearl Harbor was the sole reason for our entry into war. Among the 61% who said there were other reasons, the largest number felt that circumstances had made our involvement inevitable. Almost as many people, however, mentioned the prevention of world aggression, economic considerations, and aid for the Allies as reasons why we went to war.

Geographically distant from Old World battlefields, the people of the Western Hemisphere were spared the immediate ravages of war which brought such colossal misery to men and women in Europe and Asia. Nevertheless, the United States and Canada, the two nations in this hemisphere which played a major part in the conduct of the war, felt and still feel not only economic repercussions but the more anonymous effects of the war on the personal lives of individual citizens.

When asked -- in September, 1946 -- "Has your own life been changed a great deal because of the war?" 51% of a United States cross-section said they believed their lives had been materially changed by World War II. Over half of these -- 36% of the NORC sample -- felt that the change had been for the worse, mentioning with about equal frequency, economic disruptions such as inflation, unemployment, business difficulties, and shortages of various kinds, and emotional disturbances such as the death of a close relative, marital disruptions, nervous breakdowns, the inability to lead a normal life, or character and spiritual deterioration. On the other hand, 11% reported that the war had changed their lives for the better by reason of improved financial status, new educational opportunities, better character and spiritual values, or new marriages and families.

Naturally enough, 78% of all veterans interviewed, but only 47% of non-veterans, felt that the war had been responsible for major changes in their lives. By and large, however, veterans tended to be somewhat less inclined than non-veterans to blame all their troubles on the war. Among those who felt that the war had changed their lives materially, one veteran in three -- but only one non-veteran in five -- considered the change one for the better rather than the worse.

As World War II recedes farther into the past, people may possibly become less inclined to consider the war responsible -- either in credit or blame -- for the course of their personal lives. The lapse of a few months, however, cannot account for the fact that, although last fall 51% of Americans felt the war had affected their lives materially, this spring only 38% of Canadians said that the war had changed their lives a great deal. (The questions used were identical.) Among Canadian veterans, as among American, more than 70% reported major changes in their lives as a result of the war. Canadians mentioned the same types of economic and emotional changes -- both for better and for worse -- that Americans did.

Among the many new problems which face the world as an aftermath of World War II, widespread human misery-- hunger, starvation, destitution, homelessness -- was uppermost in the minds of people in the United States, when NORC interviewed a cross-section last winter. The problem of the atom bomb and the control of atomic energy ranked second to the problem of human distress. Third in importance, so far as frequency of mention is concerned, was international cooperation in general and the particular problem of the accentuation of tensions between Russia and the Western democracies. Fourth in frequency were territorial, administrative, and political problems involving both liberated areas and the Axis countries.

In spite of mass starvation and displacement of persons, the atom bomb, and the new era of power politics, domestic difficulties still seemed the primary concern of a substantial portion of Americans. How difficult people found it to divorce national issues from international problems is shown by the fact that almost a third of all the answers citing "world problems created by the war" in reality specified national problems -- inflation, shortages, strikes and labor troubles, unemployment, veteran rehabilitation, and many more. Taken alone, this group of answers outranked even the problem of human misery throughout the world.

Outlook for the Future Like a modern-day sword of Damocles, the possibility of atomic warfare has left Americans insecure and pessimistic in their outlook for the future. In September '45, NORC found that 83% of the people in the United States believed that "most city people on earth" faced real danger of being killed by atomic bombs, should there be another war, and 38% thought it probable that atomic bombs would be used against the United States within 25 years. Six months later, 75% said that, in the event of American involvement in war, atomic bombs would be used against American cities. In the fall of '46, 76% of people living in metropolitan areas of a million or more population regarded the dropping of atomic bombs near their homes as a real danger in any future war. Most of these also expected the United States to be involved in another war within 25 years.

Even excluding the possible use of the atomic bomb, a third world war would undoubtedly mean radical changes in all aspects of American life. Public awareness of these possibilities is indicated in results of an Elmo Roper survey reported last fall in the New York Herald Tribune:

"If this country should get into another big war in the next 25 years, do you think that we would or would not come out of it:

	WOULD	WOULD NOT	DON'T KNOW
<i>"...with as high a standard of living as we have today?"</i>	31%	56%	13% = 100%
<i>"...with the same type of government as we have now?"</i>	50	33	17
<i>"...with the same capitalistic system of doing business that we have now?"</i>	38	38	24
<i>"...as the leading nation in the world?"</i>	63	17	20
<i>"...with less loss of life than we had in this war?"</i>	16	70	14

TOWARD AN EFFECTIVE UNITED NATIONS

During the past ten years public opinion regarding the desirability of active United States participation in international organization has reversed itself completely. Before the outbreak of World War II, majority opinion in the United States definitely opposed an American affiliation or cooperation with the League of Nations. Since Pearl Harbor, however, whenever a public opinion poll has asked a question regarding some type of post-war world organization, a majority of the American public has expressed approval of the idea in principle. No matter how the question was worded, a strong majority favored American participation in a "world organization," "world union," or "international organization." The public has likewise endorsed the more specific "world organization set up at San Francisco" and "United Nations organization," but has given no consistent approval to the idea of genuine world government.

World Organization:
Wartime Attitudes

In the spring of 1945, to test the stability of public opinion on world organization, NORC asked separate but comparable cross-sections of the population two differently worded questions, one stated arguments against United States participation, the other stating arguments in favor of participation. The questions:

"Some people say that there will ALWAYS be wars and that getting this country into some kind of world organization would only get us mixed up into somebody else's business. After the war, would you like to see the United States stay out of a world organization, or belong to it?"

Belong to 74% Stay out of 18% Undecided 8% = 100%

"Some people say that future wars CAN be prevented if all nations will only get together in some kind of world organization with enough power to stop any invaders. After the war, would you like to see the United States belong to a world organization, or stay out of it?"

Belong to 81% Stay out of 12% Undecided 7% = 100%

The trend away from isolationism was also brought into focus by a Fortune question, reported in June '43:

"Which of these statements comes closest to what you would like to see us do when the war is over?"

	ALL	WELL INFORMED	POORLY INFORMED	UN-INFORMED
"Stay on our side of the oceans and have as little as possible to do with Europe and Asia."	13%	5%	11%	22%
"Try to keep the world at peace, but make no definite agreements with other countries."	25	16	26	34
"Take an active part in some sort of international organization with a court and police force strong enough to enforce its decisions."	57	78	61	33
Undecided	<u>5</u> 100%	<u>1</u> 100%	<u>2</u> 100%	<u>11</u> 100%

Shortly before the San Francisco Conference, 73% of the public said they would like to see the United States delegates pledge this country to membership in a world organization. Only 50%, however, thought the delegates should make commitments regarding the use of American armed forces to enforce peace, NORC reported.

United Nations:
Popular Evaluation

Although the people of the United States continue to support the United Nations in principle, they have indicated a growing dissatisfaction with the progress of the organization to date. A year ago -- when AIPO first reported the trend -- opinion was evenly divided, with 37% expressing satisfaction and 37% dissatisfaction regarding the progress of the United Nations organization. When the same question was most recently asked this spring, a plurality of Americans (50%) reported that they were not satisfied with the accomplishments of the United Nations. The Gallup question and trend:

"Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the progress that the United Nations organization has made to date?"

	<u>SATISFIED</u>	<u>DISSATISFIED</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
1946, May	37%	37%	26% = 100%
July	26	49	25
November	27	43	30
1947, January	39	33	28
May	26	50	24

Employing an objective rather than a subjective approach to the issue, NORC found -- in a survey conducted in May '46 -- that, on an over-all appraisal of UN performance, the middle-of-the-road judgment, "Fair," was chosen by either a plurality or a majority of every group in the population. NORC asked:

"Generally speaking, up to now do you think the United Nations organization has done a good job, only a fair job, or a rather poor job?"

Good 25% Fair 45% Poor 18% Undecided 12% = 100%

On both the NORC and the AIPO surveys, the college-educated -- generally better informed on world organization and more overwhelmingly in favor of its principles -- were most critical of the progress of United Nations.

Similar questions asked by Gallup affiliates in Great Britain, Canada, and Australia have also indicated considerable dissatisfaction with the progress of the United Nations to date. Analysis of further questions asked in several countries reveals that the operation of the Security Council veto has been widely criticized, as is the apparent slowness of the organization in getting its various functions under way. People tend to place major blame for the imperfections of the United Nations on the member countries -- their selfishness and lack of cooperation and the frequency with which dealings are conducted on the level of power politics. Others believe that the organization needs more power in order to do its job fully and effectively. More specifically, most people believe the present United Nations organization incapable of preventing major wars.*

Many people, on the other hand, have expressed the opinion that the United Nations is working hard and doing as good a job as possible in view of the deep-rooted problems facing it. The value of the organization as a sounding-board for the ventilation and exchange of ideas has also been pointed out.

* SEE PAGE 31, THIS REPORT.

Our Emerging
Foreign Policy

Many public opinion survey findings have tended to substantiate evidence from other sources suggesting that the people of the United States are coming more and more to reject isolationism -- long more a tradition and a symbol than a fact, even in peacetime -- and to adhere to international cooperation as a primary element of American foreign policy. There is an increasing recognition of some of the inescapable realities of a world shrinking ever more rapidly in terms of time and space, and there is likewise a growing respect for the political and economic potentialities for either war or peace.

But the transition in thought and action is still by no means complete. Certain obvious inconsistencies in American thinking -- between the theory and the application of international cooperation as regards supporting and strengthening the United Nations -- are pointed out in the next section. And the Fortune Survey has secured some very interesting results in its attempts to study American opinion regarding what basic principles and considerations should determine United States foreign policy. That people in this country are still somewhat divided in their attitudes regarding future world cooperation is suggested by findings on a Fortune question reported last January:

"Which of these statements best describes what we SHOULD TRY to do now and in the future?"

"WE MUST DO THE BEST WE CAN FOR THE REST OF THE WORLD EVEN IF WHAT WE DO ISN'T ALWAYS THE BEST THING FOR AMERICA.	4%
"WE MUST TRY TO HELP THE REST OF THE WORLD AND AMERICA AT THE SAME TIME, SINCE WHAT IS BEST FOR THE WORLD IS BEST FOR AMERICA.	33
"WE MUST LOOK OUT FOR AMERICA FIRST, BUT AT THE SAME TIME WE MUST TRY NOT TO DO ANYTHING THAT WILL HURT THE REST OF THE WORLD TOO MUCH.	43
"WE MUST LOOK OUT FOR OUR OWN INTERESTS FIRST, LAST, AND ALL THE TIME, AND NOT CARE TOO MUCH ABOUT WHAT HAPPENS TO THE REST OF THE WORLD."	8
UNDECIDED	<u>12</u> 100%

Which of these four policies has characterized American foreign relations during the past 10 years? The first policy, 20% believe; 35% -- the second; 25% -- the third; and 4% -- the fourth, according to another question on the same survey.

According to Elmo Roper, the significance of another Fortune question (reported in March '47) "is not the superfluous proof that isolation is a dead duck; the significance is that at the extremes there are consistently more people ready to turn to the world superstate (17%) than are in favor of retreat to the nineteenth century (10%)":

"Which of these three statements comes closest to expressing your views?"

"AMERICA SHOULD GIVE UP TRYING TO BUILD ANY KIND OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AND INSTEAD FORM SEPARATE ALLIANCES WITH FRIENDLY NATIONS.	10%
"AMERICA SHOULD CONTINUE TO COUNT ON THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION AND DO ALL IT CAN TO MAKE IT WORK.	55
"AMERICA SHOULD GO A STEP FURTHER AND START PLANS FOR A WORLD GOVERNMENT IN WHICH VARIOUS COUNTRIES WILL BECOME MEMBER STATES."	17
ONE OF THE LAST TWO, BUT CANNOT DECIDE WHICH.	3
UNDECIDED	<u>15</u> 100%

THE SCOPE OF UNITED NATIONS POWER

The question of how much authority should be delegated to the United Nations by member states has many ramifications; any study of the specific issues involved leads eventually to a consideration of the degree of national sovereignty which nations may become willing to relinquish in the interests of international cooperation and world peace. Moreover there is a serious need in the United States (and in other countries as well) for formulating a unified and coherent foreign policy -- encompassing and bringing into balance, if not into complete harmony, considerations both of domestic security and of international responsibility -- regarding trade and tariff problems, the control of atomic energy, peacetime conscription, and related problems. Whether or not actual world government is the only effective alternative to atomic war, devastation, and world chaos is a question which people have difficulty in facing. Opinions in this area should be evaluated only in terms of the frame of reference (the wording and implications) of the specific questions.

Regulation of World Trade

Regarding regulation of world trade by the United Nations, public opinion in the United States is divided. People appear to endorse in theory the idea of international decisions about trade and tariff through such a body as the International Trade Organization. Yet when the possible effect on the United States of such regulation is mentioned, resistance to the idea is immediately apparent. Questions from three different NORC surveys indicate some of the limitations of attitudes in this area:

"Do you think it would be a good idea for countries to get together in a union of nations to decide how trade between countries should be handled, or do you think each country should handle trade any way it wants?" (Sept., 1943)

Union of nations 65% Each country 29% Undecided 6% = 100%

"Should each country make its own laws under which foreign goods can be shipped into its own country, or do you think the United Nations organization should make such laws?" (March, 1946)

United Nations 47% Each country 42% Undecided 11% = 100%

"How important do you think it would be for all nations to get together and set up a special organization to increase world trade -- very important, only fairly important, or not important at all?" (August, 1946)

Very important 60% Fairly 23% Not at all 7% Undecided 10% = 100%

While a majority of Americans think it very important for all nations to set up a special organization to increase trade, whether or not the people are willing to relinquish specific tariff restrictions to accomplish this end is questionable. An example of American action contradictory is the Hope Bill passed recently by the House, which sets a quota and import fees on wool for the protection of wool growers in the West. This bill violates the spirit of the Geneva Trade Conference now in session which is working toward lowering international trade barriers.

These questions and others, including studies on more specific aspects of trade and tariff problems, offer substantial evidence that, even when a point of national sovereignty is at issue, people are often more willing to make concessions in the political sphere than in the economic sphere.

The Control of Atomic Energy

The international control of atomic energy should be largely delegated to the United Nations, people in this country believe. In September, 1945, for example, while the atomic devastation of Nagasaki and Hiroshima was still fresh in the public mind, a National Opinion Research Center question on the issue found a majority of Americans in favor of making the United Nations powerful enough to be effective in outlawing the manufacture of atomic weapons anywhere in the world. NORC asked:

"If the world organization DOES try to prevent any country from ever using atomic bombs in another war, which one of these two ways do you think would have the best chance of working?"

1. *"For the world police force to have such bombs to use against any nation that attacks another, but otherwise to let the countries in the United Nations develop the bombs for themselves if they could."*

31%

2. *"For the United Nations to become a kind of world government which could pass a law that no country, not even our own, may make atomic bombs and which could also set up a world-wide FBI or detective system to make every country obey this law."*

54

Undecided

15
100%

Substantial support of the Barch recommendations is suggested by results of an NORC question series asked in the spring of 1946. Only a plurality, however, would concede that the most rigid inspection should apply to industry in the United States. The NORC findings indicated that:

- 72% of the public thought that the United Nations should pass a law with teeth in it forbidding manufacture of atomic weapons in every country in the world; AND...
- 56% would still favor the law, even if it meant that the United States would have to destroy its stockpile of atomic bombs.
- 75% of the American people would be in favor of an international atomic inspection team working under the UN; BUT ONLY...
- 39% would be willing to have this inspection if it meant that other countries would find out how the United States makes atomic bombs.

A Strong United Nations vs. Atomic Superiority for the United States?

In order to defend itself in an atomic age, should the United States depend more on its own strength or on the United Nations for security? A number of different survey questions reported by the National Opinion Research Center have indicated that a majority

of the people feel that the security of this country cannot be assured by stockpiling atomic bombs and rockets. A question asked last fall found only one person in five of the opinion that a large United States reserve of atomic weapons would be a real guarantee that this country would not be attacked by a foreign power:

"Do you think the United States could become so strong by making atomic bombs and rockets that no country would dare attack us, or do you think that regardless of how strong we become, some day another country might think she's stronger and attack us?"

ANOTHER COUNTRY MIGHT ATTACK US 74% NO COUNTRY WOULD DARE 19% UNDECIDED 7% = 100%

What consistent course of action should the United States follow in the endeavor to maintain peace and security in an atomic age? In September, 1945, NORC found 48% of the opinion that this country should rely "on the ability of the world organization to prevent any country, including our own, from ever using such bombs in another war"; almost as many -- 43%, however, would rely "on our own ability to make better atomic bombs than any other country."

A somewhat similar question asked by NORC a year later seemed to indicate a shift in opinion, with a two-thirds majority recommending that this country bend every effort to make the United Nations strong enough to enforce a world-wide ban on atomic weapons. Opinion was almost evenly divided, however, as to which policy the United States has actually been following. The questions:

"If the United States could do only one of these two things during the next few years, which ONE do you think would give us the best chance of keeping peace in the world?"

"Should we try to make the United Nations organization strong enough to prevent all countries, including the United States, from making atomic bombs and rockets?"

OR

"Should we try to keep ahead of other countries by making more and better atomic bombs and rockets?"

"Which one of these two things do you think the United States IS doing at the present time?"

POLICY UNITED STATES:	<u>STRENGTHENING UNITED NATIONS</u>	<u>MAINTAINING ATOMIC SUPERIORITY</u>	<u>BOTH (VOLUNTEERED)</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
Should follow	67%	28%	--	5% = 100%
Is following	35	34	18	13

Of unusual interest is a comparison of the way the same people answered the three questions asked in September '46. People's ideas on the likelihood of deterring foreign aggression by stockpiling atomic weapons in this country correlate to a great extent with what these same people think should be the United States' foreign policy.

Of those who thought stockpiling atomic weapons as a deterrent to foreign aggression FUTILE:

ONLY 23% advocated such action as a policy by which the United States can maintain peace;
AND 72% thought the United States should instead concentrate on helping to build a United Nations strong enough to enforce atomic control.

Of those who thought stockpiling atomic weapons would SAFEGUARD this country from attack:

50% advocated such action as a policy by which the United States can maintain peace;
BUT 48% still thought the United States should concentrate on helping to build a United Nations strong enough to enforce atomic control.

These are only a few of a considerable number of questions about the control of atomic energy which have been asked by various polling organizations. All opinions should be evaluated in light of the fact that, although most of the public recognize the futility of endeavoring to keep the "secret" of production indefinitely, they nevertheless think the United States should try.

Disarmament and
World Police Force

Common sense dictates that the establishment of a world police force and the planning of disarmament on a world-wide scale should be closely integrated with each other and in turn with the operation of atomic energy controls under the United Nations. The more specific the terms in which proposals regarding an international police force and disarmament have been made, the smaller the approving majorities have been.

In September, 1943, for instance, the Office of Public Opinion Research (Princeton) found 79% of the opinion that, after the war is over, "the countries fighting the Axis should set up an international police force to try to keep peace throughout the world." According to NORC, 77% in September '43 and 78% in July '45 believed that after the war the nations of the world should "get together in a world organization to decide how big an army, navy, and air force each country can have."

In August, 1946, a more specific AIPO question found a majority approving United Nations' control over armed forces of all the nations:

"Do you think the United Nations organization should be strengthened to make it a world government with power to control the armed forces of all nations, including the United States?"

Yes 54% No 24% Undecided 22% = 100%

Two questions reported by Elmo Roper in August, 1946, found a plurality of Americans willing to turn over military secrets to a world organization, and a majority willing for the United States to give up its army and navy and contribute its share of men to a world police force:

"If every other country in the world would turn over to a world organization all their military secrets, and allow continuous inspection, would you be willing for the United States to go along on this?"

Willing 47% Not willing 38% Undecided 15% = 100%

"If every other country in the world would give up its armies and navies and instead just contribute its share of men and materials to an international police force, would you be willing for the United States to go along on this?"

Willing 52% Not willing 33% Undecided 15% = 100%

The Canadian Institute of Public Opinion found a clear majority of opinion in favor of a proposal to turn over to a "world parliament" control of Canadian armed forces and munitions, even -- specifically mentioned -- "atomic bomb materials."

"Would you be willing to have Canada turn over control of all her armed forces and munitions, including atomic bomb materials, to a world parliament, provided leading countries did the same?"

Willing 59% Not willing 29% Undecided 12% = 100%

Peacetime Conscription Early in June, 1947, the President's Advisory Commission on Military Training, headed by Dr. Karl T. Compton of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, turned in a report unanimously recommending peacetime military training for the United States. How soon Congress will take action on the question is uncertain. On this particular issue, however, the general public agrees with the experts. Categorical questions asked by the National Opinion Research Center and the American Institute of Public Opinion during the last five years have indicated that more than two-thirds of the people of the United States are definitely in favor of peacetime conscription. The latest Gallup question, reported in mid-June, read:

"In the future, do you think every physically-fit young man (who has not already been in the Armed Forces) should be required to take military or naval training for one year?"

Yes 74% No 21% Undecided 5% = 100%

The most recent NORC question on the issue was worded as follows:

"Should every able-bodied American 20 years old be required to go into the Army or Navy for one year?"

Yes 65% No 31% Undecided 4% = 100%

No matter how the categorical question is worded, a strong majority always favors compulsory military training in peacetime. To test the stability of public opinion on the issue, in November, 1945, NORC asked separate but comparable cross-sections of the population two differently worded questions, one stating an argument against conscription in view of the military implications of the atom bomb, the other stating an argument for conscription in view of atomic implications. The differences in response were too slight to be considered statistically significant. Even when presented with the argument, "Some people say that now the atomic bomb has been discovered, compulsory military training would not defend our nation enough to bother with it," 68% said they favored military training. The pro-conscription percentage shifted only to 71% among the group who were told: "Some people say that now that the atomic bomb has been discovered compulsory military training is even more important than it was before." A question citing no arguments either way, asked on the same survey, found 73% saying they would "be in favor of a law that would require boys to take a year's military training in peacetime when they become 18 years old."

A further question found that more than half of those in favor of conscription considered it important largely as "good training for the boys." Most of the rest put their choice on the basis of national defense needs. This reasoning probably tended to minimize the relevance of the atomic bomb to decisions regarding conscription.

When the possibility that the United Nations might be able to abolish conscription everywhere in the world was suggested (in still another question on the same survey) opinion shifted significantly, but a definite majority still felt that the future security of the United States depends on conscription here:

"Which of these would you rather see our government do first-- pass a law requiring boys over 18 to take a year of military training in the future, or try to get the world organization to abolish compulsory military training in every country in the world?"

MILITARY TRAINING LAW 57% WORLD ORGANIZATION 36% UNDECIDED 7% = 100%

Immediately following the question just quoted NORC asked:

"What do you think are the chances of the world organization's being able to abolish military training in every country in the world -- does it have a good chance, a fair chance, or no chance at all?"

Good chance 11% Fair chance 29% No chance 48% Undecided 12% = 100%

Of intense interest is a study and comparison of the way people answered the two NORC questions regarding the possibility of UN's being able to abolish conscription in every country of the world. The public was consistent in that most persons who give the world organization no chance of abolishing conscription all over the world advocated concentrating first on a compulsory military training law in the United States, while those who gave the UN a good or fair chance thought the United States should endeavor primarily to further such an international program.

Despite the fact that majorities of all population groups believe that conscription in the United States will encourage conscription in other countries, only a minority in any population group believe that military training will INCREASE the chances of the United States' getting into another war. Whether or not people think conscription will make wars less likely seems to depend somewhat on the wording of the question.* Here are the results of an NORC and an AIPO question on the subject, asked a year apart:

"If the United States and other countries had laws requiring their boys to take military training, do you think it would be more likely or less likely that there would be wars in the future, or wouldn't it make any difference?" (NORC, September, 1944)

"If the young men of this country receive this training, do you think the chances of our getting into another war are increased or decreased?" (AIPO, November, 1945)

NORC		AIPO	
More likely	14%	Increased	12%
Less likely	31	Decreased	59
No difference	48	No difference	23
Undecided	7	Undecided	6
	<u>100%</u>		<u>100%</u>

Other questions regarding the scope of the power of the United Nations have indicated that most people see the maintenance of peace as the function encompassing all others. Many believe, in theory, at least, that the United Nations should have the power to make and enforce laws and to render binding decisions regarding problems between countries. People in the United States and other countries favored having the United Nations handle the Palestine problem, and there has been considerable feeling in this country that the United States should not have appeared to by-pass the United Nations in the initial approach to the problem of aid to Greece and Turkey.

Problems which the people of the United States and other nations have hesitated to turn over to the United Nations include trade regulation, immigration, and some decisions regarding the future of dependent areas and peoples.

* IN THE NORC QUESTION, "NO DIFFERENCE" WAS MENTIONED AS A SPECIFIC ALTERNATIVE. GALLUP RECORDED THIS ANSWER ONLY WHEN IT WAS VOLUNTEERED.

SPECIFIC AREAS OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

The success of the UNESCO program will depend in large part upon the acceptance of specific phases of the program by people in the various countries of the world. Of real significance to UNESCO, therefore, is the degree of willingness evidenced in the United States and other nations to approve action in specific instances of international cooperation. Selected for analysis are popular attitudes related to four particular problem areas: (1) relief for starving peoples, (2) trade reciprocity, (3) immigration, and (4) the disposition of colonial possessions and mandates.

WILLINGNESS TO HELP NEEDY COUNTRIES

During the past several years, particularly as relief needs abroad have become more widely understood, the willingness of the American people to render financial assistance to other countries has become more clearly defined. Even in the fall of 1945, when a majority of the public was unfamiliar with UNRRA and the work it was doing, almost all of those who were informed thought the United States should contribute to these relief activities. And a year ago, when public opinion was sharply divided on the issue of the British loan, explanation of the purpose and advantages of the loan was found to result in a significant increase of approval.

Financial Aid to Starving Peoples

That the American public has come to recognize the reality of the need and to approve fully of financial aid to starving peoples-- regardless of the attitudes of their government toward the United States -- is shown by results of three NORC questions asked in February of this year:

"Do you think there are any countries in Europe where the people need our help in order to get enough to eat, or can they get along all right without our help?"

Need our help 80% Can get along without 12% Undecided 8% = 100%

"Last year the United States gave more than a billion dollars to feed the hungry people in countries destroyed by the war. This year it is proposed that we give about one-third of that amount. Would you approve or disapprove of Congress' setting aside about 400 million dollars for foreign relief this year?"

Approve 65% Disapprove 21% Give more 4% Undecided 10% = 100%

"Some people say we should not send food or relief to countries where the governments say or do unfriendly things to the United States. Others say we should help those that really need it, even if their present governments are unfriendly to us. Which would you say?"

Help anyway 53% Don't help if unfriendly 41% Undecided 6% = 100%

WHEN ASKED TO NAME THE COUNTRIES MOST IN NEED OF HELP, PEOPLE MOST OFTEN MENTIONED GREECE AND GERMANY, FOLLOWED BY ITALY, FRANCE, AND POLAND. THE COLLEGE-EDUCATED MENTIONED ALL THE COUNTRIES OFTEN THAN DID PERSONS WITH LESS SCHOOLING. IT IS OF INTEREST THAT THOSE WHO HAD ATTENDED COLLEGE MENTIONED THE NEED IN GREECE SIGNIFICANTLY OFTEN THAN THE NEED IN GERMANY, WHILE PEOPLE WITH LESS EDUCATION TENDED TO MENTION GERMANY SLIGHTLY OFTEN THAN GREECE.

ON THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS, MAJORITIES OF ALL EDUCATIONAL LEVELS DIFFERED FROM THE CONSENSUS ONLY IN DEGREE, WITH AFFIRMATIVE ANSWERS TENDING TO INCREASE WITH THE AMOUNT OF EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND. ON THE THIRD QUESTION, HOWEVER, DIFFERENCES WERE MORE MARKED. AMONG THE COLLEGE-EDUCATED, TWICE AS MANY ANSWERED "HELP ANYWAY" AS REPLIED "DON'T HELP IF UNFRIENDLY"; AMONG PEOPLE WITH NO MORE THAN EIGHTH-GRADE SCHOOLING, EXACTLY THE SAME PERCENTAGE GAVE EACH RESPONSE.

Willingness to
Return to Rationing

Some further indications of the strength and stability of American feeling regarding the necessity of feeding starving peoples -- insofar as such factors can be measured -- are offered by survey findings in

the spring of 1946. At that time:

- 70% were "willing to return to food rationing in order to send food to people in other nations." (AIPO, May, 1946)
- 68% were "willing to have meat and butter rationed again so that we could send more food to needy countries that fought on our side in the war." (NORC, March, 1946)
- 67% said they would "eat less meat and less flour in order to send more food to the people of Europe." (AIPO, March, 1946)
- 84% thought we should either sell or give food to the German people. (NORC, March, 1946)
- 76% believed we should either sell or give food to the Japanese. (NORC, March, 1946)

Australians and British were also willing to sacrifice in order to ease the world food situation:

- 62% of the British people approved of a world policy of "sharing out the available food supplies" even if it meant delaying the return of pre-war luxuries. (BIPO, October, 1946)
- 72% of Australians were willing to continue the present rationing of butter, meat and sugar, for at least another year, in order to send as much food as possible overseas. (Aus., August, 1946)

Financial Aid to
Greece and Turkey

The recent decision of Congress to put into effect the program outlined by President Truman for aid to Greece and Turkey has -- in view of the political and military as well as financial implications -- set a

new precedent in the acceptance by the United States of responsibility for the internal welfare of Europe.

An AIPO study made immediately after President Truman's speech on March 12 found that more than 3 out of every 4 potential voters interviewed had heard or read about the Truman speech. Among those who had heard or read about it:

- 56% favored the proposed \$250 million loan to Greece, and 49% approved the proposed \$150 million loan to Turkey.
- 54% did not favor sending American military advisers to train the Greek army, and 55% opposed sending them for the Turkish army.
- 56% opposed by-passing the United Nations completely in handling the problem.
- 54% believed that aid to Greece and Turkey is not likely to get the United States into war.
- 68% thought that the "Truman Doctrine" will have to apply to other nations if they get themselves in the same fix as Greece.
- 58% believed this country should not try to get out of European affairs, but should take a strong stand in regard to them.

The reasons given for the foregoing beliefs indicated that people in the United States had some understanding of the implications of the policy recommended by President Truman.

AMERICAN ATTITUDES REGARDING TRADE AND TARIFF

What the people of the United States think about trade and tariff problems is of real significance when these attitudes are viewed in terms of their implications for the interdependence of nations and international prosperity and well-being.

A majority of the people in this country agree with Economic Interdependence of Countries most economic experts that national self-sufficiency is unrealistic -- that prosperity knows no national boundaries, but that the economic welfare of the United States depends upon the prosperity of the whole world. The wide acceptance of the facts of economic interdependence is shown by an NORC question asked in March, 1946:

"Generally speaking, do you think the United States is better off when foreign countries are well-to-do, or are we just as well off when other countries are having depressions?"

Better off when foreign countries are well-to-do	75%
Just as well off when other countries are having depressions	17
Undecided	8
	<u>100%</u>

That this economic interdependence of countries is recognized in relation to trade is brought out more clearly by another question asked by NORC on the same survey:

"In general, do you think we need to buy goods from foreign countries in order to sell goods to foreign countries, or isn't it necessary?"

	<u>ALL ADULTS INTERVIEWED</u>	<u>REPUBLICANS</u>	<u>DEMOCRATS</u>	<u>DID NOT VOTE '44</u>
Need to buy	76%	78%	77%	73%
Not necessary	18	19	19	18
Undecided	6	3	4	9
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Trade Reciprocity Although Democrats and Republicans in Congress have appeared to be rather sharply divided on the question of continuing the reciprocal tariff program, no such division appears among the people generally. NORC found a clear majority of every population group studied supporting -- theoretically, at least -- the principle of reciprocal tariff reduction:

"Do you think it would be a good thing for the United States, or a bad thing, if we reduced our tariffs on the goods that we buy from other countries?"

(If "Bad thing" or "Undecided") "Do you think the United States should reduce its tariffs on goods that other countries want to sell here, providing they reduce their tariffs on goods we want to sell to them?"

	<u>ALL ADULTS INTERVIEWED</u>	<u>DEMOCRATS (FDR VOTERS)</u>	<u>REPUBLICANS (DEWEY VOTERS)</u>
APPROVE GENERAL TARIFF REDUCTION	35%	36%	33%
APPROVE REDUCTION IF RECIPROCAL	38	38	39
TOTAL APPROVING RECIPROCAL REDUCTION	73%	74%	72%
OPPOSE RECIPROCAL REDUCTION	10	9	14
UNDECIDED	17	17	14
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Understanding
of Tariffs

Although the tariff question has been a perennial issue in American politics, only 42% of the public indicated a reasonably clear understanding of what tariffs are or how they work in answering an NORC question: "Do you happen to know what a tariff is? (What is it?)" When NORC explained what a tariff is, a substantial majority of people could see how tariff affects the volume of foreign trade:

"A tariff is just another name for a tax on foreign goods coming into a country. In your opinion, would high American tariffs on foreign goods coming into this country increase our foreign trade, decrease it, or make no difference?"

- 66% had a correct understanding that high tariffs decrease foreign trade.
- 34% lacked a correct understanding; specifically:
 - 12% thought high tariffs made no difference in foreign trade;
 - 5 said that high tariffs increase foreign trade; and
 - 17 answered frankly "I don't know."

Information
and Attitudes

The more people know about tariffs and the better they understand tariffs and how they function, the more likely they are to favor a continuation of tariff reduction on a reciprocal basis. Among the "informed" -- people who understood the effects of high tariffs, 80% approved reciprocal reductions; among the "uninformed" -- those who did not understand how tariffs work, 61% (a significantly smaller proportion) favored the policy. This is the exact distribution of opinion on the two tariff reduction questions combined:

	<u>INFORMED</u>	<u>UNINFORMED</u>
Approve general tariff reduction	40%	25%
Approve reduction if reciprocal	40	36
TOTAL APPROVING RECIPROCAL REDUCTION	<u>80%</u>	<u>61%</u>
Oppose reciprocal reduction	11	8
Undecided	<u>9</u>	<u>31</u>
	100%	100%

In March, 1947, a Fortune question which pointed out certain implications of United States tariff policy found consistent majorities of both Democrats and Republicans advocating lower tariffs:

"What do you think we should do about tariffs and our foreign trade -- keep out competition from other countries by raising our tariffs, even if this means we don't have as much foreign trade, or, try to increase our trade with other countries by agreeing with them to lower our tariffs if they lower theirs, even if this means some competition from foreign goods?"

	<u>LOWER TARIFFS</u>	<u>RAISE TARIFFS</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
All adults interviewed	57%	19%	24% = 100%
Consistent Democrats	63	16	21
Consistent Republicans	60	25	15
Converted Republicans*	67	18	15

* THIS GROUP MIGHT ALSO BE TERMED "DISGRUNTLED DEMOCRATS," SINCE THEY VOTED FOR ROOSEVELT IN 1944, BUT FOR REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES IN 1946.

IMMIGRATION: A WORLD PROBLEM

Results from public opinion surveys made in several countries-- although scattered and somewhat inconclusive indicate the failure of people in all countries studied to relate in their own thinking, as they are related in fact, (1) the problem of resettling the homeless and displaced persons of Europe and (2) the resultant modifications of immigration policies. Even in under-populated countries, the public tends to recommend rather highly selective immigration policies.

United Nations Control If findings on a single Canadian Institute of Public Opinion question can be considered at all indicative of how people in other countries might feel about the idea, not many are willing to delegate to the United Nations any real authority to plan immigration on a world-wide scale. The CIPO question reported last December read:

"There has been a lot of talk recently about immigration. Do you think it would work best to have all immigration planned in the United Nations' meetings, or should each country decide by itself what people, and how many, it will take in?"

Each country 79% United Nations 9% Undecided 12% = 100%

American Willingness to Admit Europeans

The marked reluctance of people in the United States to admit European refugees to this country is highlighted by the results of two questions asked last fall by the National Opinion Research Center.

"At the present time, there are over 800,000 homeless people in Europe. Do you feel the United States should let some of these people come here now?"

Yes 23% No 71% Undecided 6% = 100%

When the 71% who opposed the measure and the 6% who were undecided were asked: "Do you feel we should let some of them come here now, if other countries agreed to take some of them too?" an additional 27% replied that we should admit some refugees. When the results of the two studies were combined, it was revealed that a total of 50% were willing to share the responsibility of helping homeless Europeans if other countries agreed to do the same. Forty-five per cent were still unwilling to extend U.S. hospitality to refugees and 5% were still undecided. A 58% majority of the college-educated, but less than half of those with less schooling, were willing to admit European refugees if other countries did the same.

A question reported by the American Institute of Public Opinion a year and a half ago found similar reluctance regarding European immigration:

"Should we permit more persons from Europe to come to this country each year than we did before the war, should we keep the number about the same, or should we reduce the number?"

More 5% Same 32% Fewer 37% None 14% Undecided 12% = 100%

Most sympathetic to immigration were the college-educated, 49% of whom favored more or the same amount of immigration. Most opposed to further immigration were World War II veterans -- 56% of them preferred fewer immigrants than before the war, or none at all.

Selective Immigration

People in the United States, Canada, and Australia tend to consider English, Scandinavians, and Dutch the most desirable immigrants, Slavs and southern Europeans less desirable, and non-Caucasians the least desirable, a number of different studies indicate. In connection with the American Institute of Public Opinion question on the preceding page, all persons interviewed except those who said they favored no immigration at all were asked whether or not they would like to see people come in from certain specified European countries. Ranking from most preferred to least were: Scandinavian countries, Holland, Belgium, England, France, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Greece, Russia, Germany, Spain, and Italy.

An NORC question asked more than a year earlier (in September, 1944) found that -- when the war was at its height -- a majority of Americans would bar Germans and Japanese, but would accept northern Europeans and Chinese. No reference was made to pre-war quotas or immigration laws. NORC asked:

"Here is a list of different groups of people. Do you think we should let a CERTAIN number of each of these groups come to the United States to live after the war, or do you think we should stop some of the groups from coming at ALL?"

	ENGLISH*	SWEDES	RUSSIANS	CHINESE	MEXICANS	JEWS	GERMANS	JAPANESE
LET IN	68%	62%	57%	56%	48%	46%	36%	20%
STOP	25	27	33	36	42	46	59	75
UNDECIDED	7	11	10	8	10	8	5	5
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

In the fall of 1946, the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion asked a somewhat different question: "If Canada does allow more immigration, are there any of these nationalities which you would like to keep out?" A few of the groups rated very similarly on both the NORC and the CIPO surveys. A 60% majority of Canadians would keep out Japanese; Jewish -- 49%; Germans -- 34%; Russians -- 33%; Negroes -- 31%; Italians -- 25%; Chinese -- 24%; Middle Europeans -- 16%; Ukrainians -- 15%; Polish -- 14%.

When asked, in May, 1946, what nationalities they liked best as immigrants, Australian preferences tended to parallel those in Canada and the United States. In addition to British and Americans, the Australian vote was as follows: Dutch -- 71%; Swedes -- 68%; French -- 42%; Poles -- 28%; Germans -- 28%; Greeks -- 27%; Russians -- 21%; Yugoslavs -- 19%; Italians -- 10%.

OTHER SURVEY QUESTIONS INDICATE THAT THE PEOPLE OF BOTH CANADA AND AUSTRALIA, ALTHOUGH SAYING THAT THEY WISH TO INCREASE THEIR POPULATIONS, FAVOR THE CONTINUANCE OF RATHER STRICT RESTRICTION ON IMMIGRATION EVEN OF WHITE PEOPLE. ALTHOUGH THE QUESTION QUOTED ABOVE AND EARLIER QUESTIONS SHOW THAT CANADIANS ARE OPPOSED TO UNCONTROLLED IMMIGRATION, CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC OPINION SURVEYS IN 1945 AND 1946 HAVE SHOWN THAT ABOUT 70% OF THE PUBLIC HOLD CONSISTENTLY TO THE BELIEF THAT THE COUNTRY NEEDS A MUCH LARGER POPULATION. IN OCTOBER, 1946, 80% OF VETERANS BUT ONLY 63% OF NON-VETERANS EXPRESSED THEIR PREFERENCE FOR A LARGER POPULATION.

Australians would like to see the present population of 7 million more than doubled within the next 10 years, according to the Australian Public Opinion Polls. Nevertheless, a majority has come to believe that even white immigration should be restricted. In May, 1946, 56% said they thought immigration of white people into Australia should be limited, and 6% thought it should be stopped altogether. In 1944, 53% of the public answered "No" to the question: "After the war, would you alter the White Australia policy to admit a limited number of colored people, such as Chinese and Indians?"

* THE TABLE SHOWS THE GROUPS RANKED IN ORDER OF PREFERENCE. ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE, PEOPLE WERE ASKED THEIR VIEWS REGARDING THE GERMANS FIRST, FOLLOWED BY ENGLISH, JAPANESE, MEXICANS, JEWS, CHINESE, SWEDES, AND RUSSIANS.

THE FUTURE OF PALESTINE AND OTHER DEPENDENT AREAS

The functioning of ignorance and prejudice, particularly in terms of stereotypes, in popular thinking today is nowhere better illustrated than in attitudes revealed in connection with the discussion of what shall be decided about the future of dependent territories -- colonies, mandates, and military bases.

Palestine

Exploring attitudes on a number of aspects of the Palestine problem-- now under discussion in the United Nations, public opinion surveys in several countries have indicated that many of the opinions reported are based on only partial understanding of the actual facts. People tend (1) to believe that the United Nations should solve the problem if it can; (2) to consider continued Jewish settlement in Palestine the least undesirable solution yet advanced; and (3) to be reluctant to accept substantial numbers of Jewish immigrants into their own countries.

The limitations of public information on Palestine are suggested by the fact that in 1944 only 32% and in 1946 only 45% of the United States public knew that Great Britain governs Palestine. In the later NORC survey 45% did not know that Palestine was governed by another country rather than independent. Correct answers were given by 72% of the college-educated, 49% who had attended high school, and only 28% with no more than grade school training; by 88% of Jews, 49% of Catholics, and 42% of Protestants.

According to an American Institute of Public Opinion study made in June, 1946, three-fourths of the people who had "followed the discussion about the plan to allow 100,000 Jews to settle in Palestine" favored letting the United Nations handle the problem. The British public has been at least equally willing to see the responsibility turned over to the United Nations. Members of all political groups were in close agreement with the consensus on the following question, asked by the British Institute of Public Opinion in November, 1946:

"There are about 600,000 Jewish people who have lost their homes and are looking for a new land in which to settle. Do you think this problem should be left to the Jewish refugees themselves to solve, or do you think that it should be handled by the countries of the United Nations?"

United Nations 57% Jewish refugees 22% Don't know 21% = 100%

A further BIPO question probably secured a somewhat truer picture of British public opinion. Asked, "Have you, yourself, any ideas as to how this problem should be solved?" only 30% offered concrete practical suggestions: 10% said they thought the problem should be solved through the United Nations or some other type of international cooperation; 10% said the Jewish people should have a country of their own, preferably Palestine; and 10% made other recommendations, such as letting the Jews colonize the empty parts of the world or settle in the United States or parts of the British Empire.

In March, 1947, after the Palestine problem had been submitted to the United Nations, BIPO found a 65% majority endorsing the move:

"Do you approve or disapprove of the Palestine problem's being submitted to UNO?"

Approve 65% Disapprove 12% Undecided 23% = 100%

An NORC question asked in May, 1946, found only 28% who could recognize by name the report of the Anglo-American Committee on Palestine. When the recommendations were explained, 61% were against United States involvement in the Palestine difficulties.

An AIPO study completed soon after found only about half of the public had "followed the discussion about the plan to allow 100,000 Jews to settle in Palestine" -- by no means a guarantee of full information and understanding. Most of these semi-informed people favored the plan in general, but were against having the United States send military aid to help England keep order in Palestine, and were in favor of letting the United Nations handle the problem of Jewish immigration into Palestine.

Although survey questions asked in both Australia and Canada have revealed a full recognition of the need for increased population, the people of these countries -- like the people of the United States* -- are opposed to making concrete provisions for allowing substantial numbers of Jewish refugees to enter their countries as immigrants or to establish settlements in sparsely populated areas. Last fall, when the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion explained, "As you know, Britain is interning Jewish refugees who have attempted to enter Palestine without permission," and asked, "Do you think Canada should allow SOME of these refugees to settle here or not?" only 23% were willing and 61% answered "No." Two years earlier, 37% of Australians said they would agree to a Jewish settlement in North Australia, but 47% said "No."

A survey conducted by Elmo Roper among a cross-section of Jews in the United States (reported in November, 1945) found 80% of the opinion that a Jewish state in Palestine would be a good thing, and that every possible effort should be made to establish Palestine as a Jewish state. Roper noted that the greatest opposition to the idea of a Jewish state came from American Jews economically well-off and long-time residents of the United States. Many of this group voted against the idea of a Jewish state, not through lack of sympathy, but because they felt a separate Jewish state would only set the Jews still farther apart from people of other religions.

Other Dependent Areas An NORC trend question asked at intervals during and after the war, showed a striking increase in public sentiment in favor of securing new military bases. By March, 1946, a clear majority had come to feel that this limited expansion (in fact, retention of war-time acquisitions, largely Pacific island bases captured from the Japanese) should be the keynote of the United States' post-war territorial policy. More specific questions found people tending to favor United States trusteeship under the United Nations to outright ownership of the Pacific islands, formerly Japanese mandates.

A question reported by Elmo Roper in September, 1946, found definite majorities of the opinion that the United States should keep permanent military bases in Iceland, Okinawa, and Africa. World War II veterans favored the policy by majorities significantly larger than those registered by non-veterans.

While the people of Great Britain and Canada have been inclined to believe India not yet quite ready for independence, their attitudes have tended to be somewhat more realistic than Dutch views about self-government in Indonesia or French opinions regarding the status of Indo-China. In February, 1946, more than half the Dutch people felt that Indonesia was not yet ready for full self government, but suggested limited self-government under Dutch supervision. After the Netherlands-Indonesia Union agreement was made in November, 1946, NIPO surveys revealed that the Dutch had little understanding of the nature of the agreement. This spring, 58% of Frenchmen still felt that Indo-China should stay in the French Union.

* THE ANALYSIS PRESENTED ON PAGE 50 OF THIS REPORT INDICATED THE RELUCTANCE (IN THE GIVEN FRAME OF REFERENCE AT LEAST) OF 45% OF PEOPLE IN THE UNITED STATES AND 49% OF CANADIANS TO ADMIT EVEN LIMITED NUMBERS OF JEWS AS IMMIGRANTS.

MASS COMMUNICATIONS

Their Potentialities for UNESCO

In an organized society, the media of communications have a tremendous responsibility to foster mutual understanding and tolerance, beginning on the local level and extending their influence to become international in scope. Today -- when the human voice may reach any portion of the earth in a matter of minutes, and when man himself can encircle the globe in a matter of hours -- the role of mass media is more important than ever. Modern communications, having made close neighbors of the nations of the world, must also provide the means to make them good neighbors.

THE COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA: SOME COMPARISONS

Scope

In November, 1945, an NORC survey found that 87% of the adult population in the United States had radios in good working order in their homes; these adults, on weekdays, spent an average of 2.3 hours during the day and 2.6 hours in the evening listening to the radio.

Requiring more deliberate concentration, communications media involving reading were not as universally popular as the radio. However, in a 17-city survey conducted in January, 1945, NORC found 56% of adults reporting that they spent at least an hour a day, on the average, reading newspapers and magazines. Only 22% spent as much time reading books, and almost half -- 44% -- spent only a negligible amount of time (no more than a half-hour a week on the average) in reading books.

The public library, as a source of reading material, was utilized by only about one-third of the adults interviewed: 33% had visited the library within the previous year and 32% said they owned library cards.

Media Job Appraisal

Just how seriously do the agencies of communications take their responsibilities? In a survey of five civic institutions--including not only the mass media of radio and newspaper, but the complementary agencies of church, school, and government -- NORC found that, in the eyes of the public, radio stations are doing a relatively better job of fulfilling their responsibilities than are the four other community institutions with which they were compared.

This opinion pattern might have been influenced by the fact that most people think of radio only in the most limited and practical terms, and probably expect a great deal less of radio stations, in terms of community service, than of the other four institutions. It was also evident that, on the basis of "Undecided" replies, people found it easier to evaluate radio and newspapers than schools and local government. NORC asked:

"In every community, the schools, the newspapers, the local government, each has a different job to do. Around here, would you say that the schools are doing an excellent, good, fair, or poor job? How about the newspapers? The radio stations? The local government? The churches?"

GROUPED OPINIONS

IN DETAIL

	<u>EXCELLENT OR GOOD</u>	<u>FAIR OR POOR</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>	<u>GOOD</u>	<u>FAIR</u>	<u>POOR</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
RADIO STATIONS	82%	11%	28%	54%	10%	1%	7% = 100%
CHURCHES	76	14	25	51	12	2	10
SCHOOLS	62	23	17	45	18	5	15
NEWSPAPERS	68	25	12	56	21	4	7
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	45	38	7	38	29	9	17

Media as News Sources

In the early days of radio, when its potentialities were first becoming apparent, many people seriously considered the possibility that radio might one day completely replace the newspaper as an agency for disseminating news. These misgivings, however, proved to be unfounded when radio--developing along its own lines -- assumed a supplementary rather than a parallel function as a medium of communication. Ideally adapted to the "flash" type of news presentation, radio left details to the printed journal, providing last minute "headlines" for newspaper readers as well as presenting an outline of the day's events for people who had never bothered to read the news. That radio may have helped rather than hurt newspaper readership is evidenced by the fact that, today, newspaper circulation has risen far higher in proportion to the total population than it was before the days of radio.

In a general comparison of the two news agencies, NORC, in the November '45 study, found radio ranking as the most popular source of news. Mentioned by 61% as the media from which they obtained most of their news, radio, according to 94% was also their source for the latest news. For the most complete news, however, 67% still said they depended on the newspaper.

In a four-way comparison of the two news agencies, the National Opinion Research Center, in the November '45 study, found radio outranking newspapers as a source of daily news in general, of the most recent news, and of fair and unbiased news. For the most complete news, however, most people depend on newspapers. The questions:

"From which one source do you get most of your daily news about what is going on -- the newspapers or the radio?"

"Which one gives you the latest news most quickly -- the newspapers or the radio?"

"Which one gives you the most complete news -- the newspapers or the radio?"

"And which gives you the fairest, most unbiased news -- the newspapers or the radio?"

	<u>MOST NEWS</u>	<u>LATEST NEWS</u>	<u>MOST COMPLETE NEWS</u>	<u>FAIREST NEWS</u>
Newspapers	35%	4%	67%	16%
Radio	61	94	27	57
Undecided	4	2	6	27
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Only one group within the population -- men who had attended college -- depend on newspapers for most of their daily news, the survey showed. Another question (see page 55 of this report) found most people of the opinion that radio stations are more likely to present both sides of an argument than are either newspapers or magazines.

The radio, newspapers, and -- to a more limited extent -- magazines are the three most important sources from which the American people may obtain information regarding the people and affairs of other nations. According to a majority of the public, all three media have been satisfactorily complete in their presentation of international news. However, substantial minorities -- particularly among the better educated -- have felt that the public should receive more and possibly better information. NORC asked the following question:

"Do you think the radio stations you listen to (the newspapers you read) (the magazines you read) tell you enough about what goes on in foreign countries, or do you think they should tell you more?"

	<u>RADIO</u>	<u>NEWSPAPERS</u>	<u>MAGAZINES*</u>
Enough	53%	54%	59%
Should tell more	39	39	27
Undecided	8	7	14
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

In contrast to the slight majority of Americans who expressed satisfaction with the general amount of foreign news which they received over the radio, and in newspapers and magazines, 60% of the public felt that the government should release more information concerning USA--USSR relations. NORC asked:

"Do you think our government is telling us enough about what is going on between Russia and the United States, or should it tell us more?"

Should tell more 60% Enough 29% Undecided 11% = 100%

Are Communications Media Biased?

Freedom of information, even if practiced internationally, loses its significance without the cooperation of unbiased media to report and interpret the news. In a question comparing the relative fairness of several media, NORC found that the American public considered the radio generally most impartial in giving a hearing to both sides of an argument. NORC asked:

"I'd like to ask how FAIR you think radio stations, newspapers, and magazines generally are. For example, do you think RADIO STATIONS are generally fair in giving both sides of an argument? How about newspapers in general? Magazines?"

	<u>GENERALLY FAIR</u>	<u>NOT FAIR</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
Radio stations	81%	8%	11% = 100%
Newspapers	39	49	12
Magazines*	45	22	33

* THESE RESULTS SHOULD BE EVALUATED IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT, WHILE 87% OF THE CROSS-SECTION. (THE BASE GROUP FOR THE BULK OF THE SURVEY) HAD A RADIO IN WORKING ORDER, 84% USUALLY READ A DAILY NEWSPAPER (AND 35%, A WEEKLY), ONLY 53% SAID THAT THEY READ ANY MAGAZINES REGULARLY.

When confronted with a specific instance--the question of U.S. press treatment of Russia -- out of every five persons in the United States, two said that the newspapers tended to be unfair to the Soviet Union, two believed that the press was fair or more than fair, and one was undecided. the NORC question read:

"Do you think the newspapers you read generally make Russia look better or worse than she really is?"

Look worse	42%
Look better	17
About as she is (volunteered)	21
Undecided	20
	<u>100%</u>

At least a plurality of every population group studied believed that "the newspapers they read" tended to paint a dark picture of the Soviet Union. Most likely to hold this view were business and professional people, the wealthy and prosperous, and people who had voted for Roosevelt in 1944. Least likely to feel that the press tends to be unfair to Russia were farmers and people who voted for Dewey in 1944. Jews were more likely than Catholics or Protestants to feel that newspapers make Russia look worse than she really is.

The theory of the class struggle to the contrary, the more privileged groups--economically, occupationally, and educationally -- were more apt than the less privileged to think that Russia is misrepresented in the American press. Members of labor unions, however, were much more apt than others to express an opinion on the question, and were somewhat more apt to think newspapers biased. The differences between veterans and non-veterans were also significant, with veterans much more likely than others to voice an opinion, and, in turn, the opinion was more likely to be critical of the press.

A comparison between the way people replied to the question on biased press treatment of Russia and the way in which they answered further questions concerning Russia revealed a clear relationship in their attitudes. For instance, the people who believed that the press in this country tended to be biased against Russia were less likely to blame Russia for disagreements between the two countries, were not as inclined to consider the differences between Russia and the United States serious enough to warrant a resort to war, and were less likely to predict that the people of Russia might someday decide to start a war against the United States.

A British Institute of Public Opinion survey found half the British people of the opinion that the newspaper they read was "fair" in reporting news about Russia. Parallel questions, however, found comparably larger percentages of Britons considering their press fair in reporting news about politics, industrial affairs, the United States, and other international news. The BIPO question, like NORC's, found a substantial minority "undecided" regarding press treatment of Russia. BIPO asked:

"Do you think that the daily newspaper you usually read is fair or unfair in reporting the following news:

	FAIR	UNFAIR	UNDECIDED
"Politics?"	58%	22%	20% = 100%
"Industrial affairs?"	62	14	24
"RUSSIA?"	50	22	28
"U.S.A.?"	64	11	25
"Other international affairs?"	55	14	31

INTERNATIONAL FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Freedom of information -- vital to the most complete and effective use of communications media--cannot fulfill its real function unless it is international in scope, endorsed and practiced by all the countries of the world.

Although this issue has never been widely discussed, when the question was broached in an NORC survey conducted last winter, the American public declared themselves definitely against censorship by foreign governments of news going either in or out of their countries. The highlights of the study are these:

- 55% were against all censorship of American correspondents' dispatches from abroad, and another
- 13% opposed censorship except in the case of news which might affect the national security, making
- 68% in all who subscribed to a general policy of "freedom of information."
- HOWEVER, ONLY 23% thought the United States government should go so far as to refuse loans or bring other concrete pressure to bear on countries which deny complete press freedom to American correspondents.
- 48% thought that American publishers should be able to distribute newspapers and magazines abroad without restriction, but 42% felt foreign governments should have the right to exclude publications they don't agree with.
- AND 47% of persons with opinions on both questions thought Americans should be free to report both ways -- to send news out and to send magazines and newspapers in.
- MOREOVER 69% said they thought making it easier for people in all countries to get news of what's going on all over the world is very important to world peace.

Education and Attitudes It is significant that people who have attended college, 'usually the best informed group on international issues, were far more likely than people with less education to feel that freedom of information is an international as well as a national right. The two basic questions on the free flow of news, together with the educational comparison follow:

"Do you think American publishers should have the right to send their magazines and newspapers into foreign countries, or should the government of each country have the right to keep out things it doesn't agree with?"

"Do you think American newspapermen in foreign countries should be free to send out whatever news they want to, or should the government of each country have the right to control the news they send out?"

	SENDING NEWS ABROAD			GETTING NEWS FROM ABROAD		
	FREEDOM	CENSORSHIP	UNDECIDED	FREEDOM	CENSORSHIP	UNDECIDED
ALL ADULTS INTERVIEWED	48%	42%	10% = 100%	55%	35%	10% = 100%
ATTENDED COLLEGE	58	37	5	68	29	3
ATTENDED HIGH SCHOOL	53	42	5	60	34	6
EIGHTH GRADE OR LESS	37	46	17	43	40	17

TWO-WAY Freedom
or Censorship?

Generally consistent in their views, most people either approved the free flow of information in both directions, or they upheld the right of foreign governments to restrict the flow of information in

both directions. Here is the general pattern of attitudes:

- 47% of persons with opinions on both questions believed Americans should be free to report both ways--to send news dispatches out of foreign countries and to send magazines and newspapers in.
- 31% thought foreign governments should have the right to control news going both ways -- out and in.
- 22% answered, perhaps inconsistently, that there should be government control in one direction and free reporting in the other.

When NORC suggested alternative measures to combat censorship to the 55% who thought newspapermen should be free to send out all news without government interference, 23% indicated that our government should put pressure on other countries not allowing this freedom; 23% felt our government should try persuasion without pressure; 7% thought the government should do nothing, leaving any possible measures that might be taken to the newspaper people; and 2% were undecided.

When the 35% who had upheld the right of foreign governments to censor the dispatches of American correspondents were asked to give their reasons, more than a third indicated that they favored foreign censorship only for security reasons and to no greater extent than the United States itself exercises. The remainder seemed quite fully in sympathy with the right of foreign governments to censor any and all news going out from their countries.

A Free Flow of
Information:
Its Importance
to World Peace

World freedom of information is an important cornerstone of peace, many Americans believe. Although the actual percentage should probably be discounted somewhat in view of the generality of the following question, it is clear that the public can see a real connection between a free flow of news and the

achievement of world peace:

"How important do you think making it easier for people in all countries to get news of what's going on all over the world is in bringing about world peace? Would you say this is very important to world peace, only fairly important, or not important at all?"

	<u>VERY IMPORTANT</u>	<u>ONLY FAIRLY IMPORTANT</u>	<u>NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
All adults interviewed	69%	20%	5%	6% = 100%
Attended college	80	15	4	1
Attended high school	74	19	4	3
Eighth grade or less	59	23	6	12

AS MIGHT BE EXPECTED, THOSE WHO STATED THAT A FREE EXCHANGE OF NEWS BETWEEN COUNTRIES IS VERY IMPORTANT TO WORLD PEACE WERE FAR MORE LIKELY THAN OTHERS TO UPHOLD THE RIGHT OF FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION -- SENDING NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES INTO FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND SENDING NEWS DISPATCHES OUT OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES. SPECIFICALLY:

OF THOSE WHO CONSIDERED A FREE PRESS ...

<u>Very important</u> to world peace:	<u>Only fairly important</u> to world peace:	<u>Not at all important</u> to world peace:
58% favored the free flow of information <u>into</u> foreign countries.	35% FAVORED THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION <u>INTO</u> FOREIGN COUNTRIES.	13% FAVORED THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION <u>INTO</u> FOREIGN COUNTRIES.
65% favored the free flow of information <u>out of</u> foreign countries.	41% FAVORED THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION <u>OUT OF</u> FOREIGN COUNTRIES.	13% FAVORED THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION <u>OUT OF</u> FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

PUBLICIZING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Communications, having been largely responsible for removing the barriers of physical distance that separated nations, must assume the equally important task of breaking down the barriers of misunderstanding and tolerance that separate nations politically.

The desirability of having a special agency to serve Public Relations U.S.A. as a "public relations department" for the United States is an issue which has been of increasing concern to policy-makers over a period of several years, particularly since the end of the war and the discontinuance of the Office of War Information as an independent agency. Although one Gallup question found many people shying away from the idea of "a permanent government agency," more general questions have revealed a feeling on the part of a majority of Americans that people in other countries should be told more about life in the United States and the working of "our type of democracy." And over a year ago a clear majority was already favorably inclined toward seeing such a program financed by the government, at least for a year. Four key questions follow:

"Do you think we should have a permanent governmental agency which would explain the views and policies of this country to the people of other nations of the world?" (AIPO, June '45)

Yes 49% No 23% Undecided 28% = 100%

"Do you think people in other countries should be given a full and fair picture of American life, and of the aims and policies of our government, or don't you think this is important?" (NORC, February '46)

Should 76% Unimportant 19% Undecided 5% = 100%

"Would you approve or disapprove of having the United States government spend any money to carry out such a program during the coming year?" (NORC, February '46)

Approve 58% Disapprove 32% Undecided 10% = 100%

"Should the United States do everything it can to tell other nations the advantages of our type of democracy for the common people of the world?" (AIPO, August '46)

Yes 68% No 19% Undecided 13% = 100%

An Overseas
Information Program

In view of current agitation to reduce federal spending, it seems particularly significant that, even when reminded of the expenditure of money involved in handling such a project, almost 7 Americans out of every 10 (69%) have given their unqualified approval to the idea of an overseas information program. Another 14% approved having the government carry on a program to correct false ideas about the United States which people in other countries may have -- making a total of 83% approving a government information program to promote better understanding of this country abroad. Persons with a college background seemed most ready to see the advantages of government spending for such an objective. NORC asked first:

"Do you approve or disapprove of having the United States government spend any money to give people in other countries a full and fair picture of American life, and of the aims and policies of our government?"

Those who disapproved or were undecided-- 31% -- were asked a second question:

"Would you approve of having the government carry on a program to correct false ideas of America, which people in other countries may have?"

An analysis of the combined results follows:

	ALL ADULTS INTERVIEWED	ATTENDED COLLEGE	ATTENDED HIGH SCHOOL	EIGHTH GRADE OR LESS
Approve program				
... to give a full and fair picture of American life	69%	84%	74%	55%
... to correct false ideas	14	8	12	21
TOTAL APPROVING CORRECTIVE PROGRAM	83%	92%	86%	76%
Disapprove any such program	12	7	11	15
Undecided	5	1	3	9
	100%	100%	100%	100%

According to the May 16 issue of Tide magazine,* the Tide Leadership Survey for May found a strong majority of its cross-section (200 leaders in advertising, marketing, public relations, and related fields) in favor of a government information program abroad.

"Do you believe that the United States government should administer an information program abroad to focus on explaining the United States way of life?"

Yes 84% No 15% No answer 1% = 100%

One angle from which a businessman might view the State Department program is pointed out by Millard C. Faught of the Manhattan public relations firm of Young and Faught in a discussion of "Government Public Relations," the lead article in the same May 16 issue of Tide: "Business, which spends vast sums yearly on its own public relations, is always willing to condemn a government effort but slow to recognize that frequently it has identical interests. The State Department information program is a case in point. Good propaganda for the United States abroad would help immeasurably both toward maintaining peace and toward furthering world trade, which is an important adjunct to United States business. Other governments spend vast sums for their publicity abroad and the United States overseas program was small in comparison with the Russian and British programs, for example. Yet when this program, probably the most important propaganda yet undertaken, faltered in Congress, business did not come to its aid, or suggest any substitute."

* A MORE DETAILED REPORT OF THE SURVEY APPEARS IN THE MAY 23 ISSUE OF TIDE.

The "Voice of America"
Broadcasts

Although a majority of people in the United States have favored government action to acquaint people in other countries with America, many have been unaware of current government efforts to carry out such a program. According to the April '47 NORC study, for example, only 45% of the public in this country had heard or read of the government-sponsored broadcasts to Russia -- perhaps the most widely publicized and certainly the most controversial activity of the State Department's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs -- newly christened the Office of Information and Educational Exchange. Most of the informed groups, however, approved of the project. The questions:

"Have you heard or read anything about the radio programs that our government has been broadcasting to the Russian people?"

Yes 45% No 55% = 100%

(If "Yes") "Do you approve or disapprove of our government's carrying on such a program?"

Approve 36% Disapprove 6% Undecided 3% = 45%

Three times as many people with a college background as of those with the least education had heard or read about the broadcasts to Russia, NORC findings revealed. Among the aware, however, the ratio of approval to disapproval is high, with education making for only a minor differential. The comparison:

	A W A R E N E S S		A P P R O V A L (AMONG AWARE GROUP ONLY)		
	AWARE	NOT AWARE	APPROVE	DISAPPROVE	UNDECIDED
ALL ADULTS INTERVIEWED	45%	55% = 100%	80%	14%	6% = 100%
ATTENDED COLLEGE	78	22	84	12	4
ATTENDED HIGH SCHOOL	45	55	82	13	5
EIGHTH GRADE OR LESS	26	74	69	21	10

Today public opinion is almost evenly divided on the question of whether or not the government should continue to sponsor and finance the "Voice of America" broadcasts to Russia. In mid-June (1947), the American Institute of Public Opinion found the radio broadcasts to Russia endorsed by a substantial majority of the college-educated, a plurality of people who had attended high school, and a minority of those with little or no schooling. The question:

"Do you think our government should spend money for radio broadcasts to the Russian people-- giving them an honest picture of America and of our government's policy?"

	SHOULD	SHOULD NOT	UNDECIDED
All adults interviewed	43%	46%	11% = 100%
Attended college	62	34	4
Attended high school	48	43	9
Eighth grade or less	35	51	14

According to Gallup, "Those in favor of the radio broadcasts said the programs would help give the Russians a better understanding of our form of government and of how we live in America, and would promote better relations between the two nations." Those against the project considered it "a waste of money that could be used for better purposes," or believed that "the Russians probably don't listen anyway -- or wouldn't be allowed to listen."

News or Propaganda?

In a special study regarding broadcasts abroad, results of which appeared in the July, 1946, Fortune, both halves of a nation-wide cross-section were asked somewhat different questions on the subject. Many of those interviewed hesitated to endorse any program which might include "propaganda," but were readier to accept the idea of "explaining our point of view." People with the least education were relatively most afraid of the term "propaganda," examination of the results indicates. The questions:

"It has been proposed that the United States government start broadcasting programs to other countries in the world. With which group do you agree?"

"Some people say this is a good idea if the program sticks to news only (if the programs stick to news only and don't include any propaganda).

"Other people say it would be better to explain our point of view (to include some propaganda) as well as give the news.

"Other people think the government ought to stay entirely out of this."

	<u>ALL ADULTS INTERVIEWED</u>	<u>ATTENDED COLLEGE</u>	<u>ATTENDED HIGH SCHOOL</u>	<u>EIGHTH GRADE OR LESS</u>
News only	12%	12%	13%	9%
News only without propaganda	28%	26%	32%	23%
Explain our point of view	43	54	45	31
Include some propaganda	25	37	25	16
Stay out	34	30	33	40
Stay out	37	33	37	41
Undecided	11	4	9	20
Undecided	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>20</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%

It should be noted that the chief effect of changing the wording was to increase the percentage answering "News only" and to decrease the percentage favoring interpretation. The total percentage favoring either one or the other did not change significantly.

In his New York Herald-Tribune column of July 18, 1946, Roper commented: "At the heart of the argument in favor of American broadcasts beamed overseas is the belief that the more people there are who know what America is like and what we stand for, the greater are the prospects for world peace and the greater is America's security in one world."

To the question: "If we could only broadcast programs to one country, which country would be your first choice?" 40% named Russia; Great Britain -- 16%; Germany -- 12%; Argentina -- 3%; Japan -- 2%; France -- 2%; China -- 2%; All others -- 3%; Don't know -- 20%.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATIONS

In the United States freedom of speech and press -- at the national level -- are guaranteed in the first amendment to the Constitution. Although established in tradition and accepted in principle, the right of free communication is questioned in practice by one-third of the American people. According to a National Opinion Research Center survey,

IN PEACETIME:

- 32% would not allow people to say anything they want to in a public speech ... AND
- 31% of the public would not permit newspapers to criticize our form of government.

Still more specifically:

- 39% would not allow a Communist to speak over the radio ... AND
- 26% would not permit the Socialist Party to publish newspapers.

In November, 1945, NORC asked a number of questions concerning the application of specific civil rights guaranteed under the Constitution. The first and most general question was:

"In peacetime, do you think people in this country should be allowed to say anything they want to in a public speech?"

Yes 64% No 32% Undecided 4% = 100%

Three other questions applied to more specific instances:

"In peacetime, do you think members of the Communist Party in this country should be allowed to speak on the radio?"

Yes 49% No 39% Undecided 12% = 100%

"In peacetime, do you think newspapers should be allowed to criticize our form of government?"

Yes 64% No 31% Undecided 5% = 100%

"In peacetime, do you think the Socialist Party should be allowed to publish newspapers in this country?"

Yes 58% No 26% Undecided 16% = 100%

Stability of attitudes in this area is suggested by the fact that results on the November, 1945, survey were almost identical with those on the November, 1943, survey when the same questions were asked.

Consistency When only persons expressing an opinion on both "freedom of the press" questions are considered, 69% were consistent in giving the same answers to both applications of the principle. Of persons with opinions on both "freedom of speech" questions -- between which the issues contrasted more sharply -- 59% were consistent in their views regarding both principle and application. Upholding the Constitutional right of freedom of the press in both instances cited were 55%; 42% would back freedom of speech in both principle and application. Only 14% would consistently curtail freedom of the press and 17% freedom of speech.

To the general question on freedom of speech, answers varied little from group to group. A sharper contrast was noted in replies to a related question on the right of Communists to speak over the radio, however, with only college-educated persons consistent in giving essentially the same answers to both questions. The difference in replies between the two questions on freedom of press was less clear, since both questions posed specific applications of the general principle. On the information question concerning the Bill of Rights, educational differences were marked, with the college-educated giving the correct definition twice as often as those who had just attended high school, and five times as frequently as those with no more than an eighth grade education.

The Bill of Rights

What reason lies behind the failure of many Americans to uphold freedom of press and freedom of speech? The answer seemed to be correlated with a lack of information about the Bill of Rights, which only 21%, (about one person in every five) could satisfactorily define. Among the remainder of the population, 31% said they had never heard of the document or weren't sure that they had, 36% said they had heard of it, but couldn't identify it, and 12% gave confused, unsatisfactory, or incorrect identifications. When answers were compared, NORC found that persons familiar with the Bill of Rights were much more likely than others to support freedom of the speech and press in all applications. For instance:

Of those who could identify the Bill of Rights ...

- 62% believed Communist Party members should be allowed radio time.
- 78% thought Socialist Party newspapers permissible.
- 84% believed newspapers should be allowed to criticize our form of government.

Of those who had never heard of it...

- 39% believed Communist Party members should be allowed radio time.
- 44% thought Socialist Party newspapers permissible.
- 47% believed newspapers should be allowed to criticize our form of government.

Freedom of Speech in Germany

Of more than general interest, and of significance to the work of UNESCO, are some parallels between opinion in the American-occupied areas of Germany and opinion in the United States revealed by results of a survey recently reported by the Opinion Surveys Headquarters of the Information Control Division of the American Military Government for Germany.* While a substantial majority of the German people believe in freedom of speech in general, a slightly smaller majority believes that trade union leaders should be permitted to speak on the radio, and a significantly smaller majority believes that Communist Party members should be allowed radio time. The questions:

"Should the German people have complete freedom of speech?"

Yes 77% No 14% Undecided 9% = 100%

"Should trade union leaders be permitted to speak on the radio?"

Yes 71% No 6% Undecided 23% = 100%

"Should members of the Communist Party be permitted to speak on the radio?"

Yes 55% No 26% Undecided 19% = 100%

* ACCORDING TO THE AMG RELEASE (UNDATED), "APPROXIMATELY 3,500 INDIVIDUAL GERMANS WERE INTERVIEWED IN THEIR HOMES BY TRAINED GERMAN INTERVIEWERS IN THIS SCIENTIFIC CROSS-SECTION STUDY."

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF EDUCATION

Education to foster tolerance -- to be fully effective -- must begin in childhood, when the fundamental attitudes and ideals that determine the patterns of adult behavior and thinking are developing. Cognizance of this fact is apparent in the UNESCO program and implementation is essential if that program is to function dynamically.

The Need for a
World Agency

Popular recognition of the importance of education to encourage international understanding was revealed in results of a series of three questions, asked by the National Opinion Research Center in the spring of 1945. American people in every walk of life seemed sympathetic to the idea of trying to eliminate some of the causes of war through educational activity on an international scale.

A SIZEABLE MAJORITY SAID THEY WOULD FAVOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORLD AGENCY TO FOSTER INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING AMONG THE SCHOOL CHILDREN OF ALL COUNTRIES. AN EVEN LARGER MAJORITY SAID THEY WOULD BE WILLING TO HAVE SUCH A WORLD AGENCY EXAMINE SCHOOL BOOKS TO SEE IF THEY WERE FAIR TO ALL NATIONS. ANSWERING A MORE SPECIFIC QUESTION, DESIGNED TO PUT THIS WILLINGNESS TO THE TEST, A SUBSTANTIAL MAJORITY SAID THEY WOULD BE WILLING TO COOPERATE WITH SUCH A PROGRAM EVEN TO THE EXTENT OF AUTHORIZING CHANGES IN TEXTBOOKS WHICH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE WORLD AGENCY MIGHT JUDGE GAVE "AN UNFAIR PICTURE OF THE HISTORY OF GERMANY" -- THEN STILL AN ENEMY COUNTRY. THESE ARE THE QUESTIONS:

*"It has been suggested that the nations of the world set up a world agency that would help schools in all countries teach children how to understand the people of other countries. Would you like to see an agency like this set up, or not?"**

Would like 84% Would not like 10% Undecided 6% = 100%

"If such an agency were set up, would you be willing to have it examine the school books used in this city (county) to see if they are fair to all nations?"

Yes, willing 87% Not willing 7% Undecided 6% = 100%

(If "Yes") "Suppose the men in this agency decide that the school books used in this city (county), give an unfair picture of the history of Germany. Would you be willing to have the books changed, or not?"

Yes, willing 72% Not willing 9% Undecided 6% = 87%

In spite of their expressed willingness to cooperate with a world agency which would work with schools in all countries, the people of the United States would be reluctant to delegate unlimited authority to such an agency, according to results of an earlier question. In a survey conducted in December, 1944, NORC asked:

"Do you think one of the things the world organization should do is to decide what things can be taught in the schools of all countries in the world, or do you think each country should decide for itself what it can teach?"

WORLD ORGANIZATION DECIDE 27% EACH COUNTRY DECIDE 65% DON'T KNOW 8% = 100%

* THESE QUESTIONS WERE ASKED BY THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER UNDER CONTRACT WITH THE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMISSION, WASHINGTON, D.C., AND ARE USED WITH THEIR PERMISSION.

An Educational Program
for the United Nations

A series of more concrete and specific proposals, put to the public in another National Opinion Research Center study,* this spring, found majority public opinion behind the idea of investing United States money in a variety of United Nations projects -- all designed to foster international understanding through education. To secure a measure of popular attitudes regarding the educational responsibilities of the United Nations, the Center asked:

*"It has been suggested that each country in the United Nations put up some money to do the things on this card.** Do you think the United States should put up money to do any of these things? Are there any of these things that you think we should NOT put up money for?"*

	<u>SHOULD</u>	<u>SHOULD NOT</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>
<i>"To help pay for a United Nations broadcasting station that would send radio programs to all countries telling the people what's going on in the world.</i>	66%	24%	10% = 100%
<i>"To help rebuild schools and colleges destroyed in the war.</i>	65	25	10
<i>"To look over the school books used in all countries to see that they don't build up misunderstandings among countries.</i>	63	25	12
<i>"To send teachers and workers to foreign countries on an exchange arrangement in which other countries would send their teachers and workers here.</i>	60	30	10
<i>"To help countries exchange with each other such things as books, magazines, art and museum exhibits."</i>	56	27	17

Asked which project was most important, people tended to give top priority to rebuilding the schools and colleges that were destroyed by war. A United Nations broadcasting station ranked second in importance, followed by international exchange of teachers and workers, and steps to eliminate bias in school books. Exchange of cultural media ran a poor fifth, considered most important by only 2% of those interviewed.

As an additional test of popular conviction, NORC asked a further question of the 81% who indicated approval of two or more of the suggested projects. Even when the implications of the program were pointed out-- in terms of a possible continuation of high income taxes, 61% still approved of the investment. The question:

"Do you think the United States should help the United Nations do this, even if it meant our government couldn't lower the income taxes people are now paying?"

Yes 61% No 14% Undecided 6% = 81%

* A MORE DETAILED ANALYSIS OF RESULTS ON THE COMPLETE SURVEY WILL APPEAR IN A FORTHCOMING REPORT, UNESCO AND PUBLIC OPINION TODAY.

** EACH RESPONDENT WAS HANDED A CARD LISTING THE FIVE PROPOSALS.

P U B L I C A T I O N S

Publications of the National Opinion Research Center include:

REPORTS

22.	<u>Do Negroes Have Equal Economic Opportunities?</u> April, 1944*	\$.10
24.	<u>Germany and the Post-War World.</u> January, 1945.	.50
28.	<u>What ... Where ... Why ... Do People Read?</u> January, 1946.	.50
29.	<u>Can the United Nations Prevent Wars?</u> February, 1946.*	.25
31.	<u>Should We Return to Rationing? National Opinion on This and Other Aspects of the World Food Problem.</u> May, 1946.*	.25
32.	<u>Japan and the Post-War World.</u> July, 1946.	.50
33.	<u>Attitudes toward "The Japanese in Our Midst."</u> December, 1946.*	.25
34.	<u>Where UNESCO Begins: The Climate of Opinion in the United States and Other Countries.</u> A summary of information and attitudes bearing on the work of UNESCO. May, 1947.*	.50

SPECIAL REPORTS AND REPRINTS

	<u>WHAT DO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE THINK ABOUT FEDERAL HEALTH INSURANCE?</u> NOVEMBER, 1944.*	.50
	<u>HOW NORC BUILDS ITS CROSS-SECTION.</u> JULY, 1946.*	.15
	<u>INTERVIEWER BIAS INVOLVED IN CERTAIN TYPES OF OPINION SURVEY QUESTIONS.</u> MARCH, 1947.	.15

DISTORTED MAPS**

E.	<u>DISTRIBUTION OF WORLD POPULATION. MAP OF THE WORLD SHOWING COUNTRIES OF OVER 100,000 POPULATION AS THEY WOULD APPEAR IF THEIR AREA WERE PROPORTIONAL TO THEIR POPULATION. 11 BY 15 INCHES. 22 BY 34 INCHES, BOND PAPER -- FOR FRAMING.</u>	.25 1.00
G-5	<u>PARTY MEMBERSHIP IN THE 79TH CONGRESS BY STATES: UNITED STATES SENATE.</u>	.10
G-6	<u>PARTY MEMBERSHIP IN THE 79TH CONGRESS BY STATES: U.S.HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.</u>	.10
G-7	<u>DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS -- 1945.</u>	.10
G-10	<u>PARTY MEMBERSHIP IN THE 80TH CONGRESS BY STATES: UNITED STATES SENATE.</u>	.10
G-11	<u>PARTY MEMBERSHIP IN THE 80TH CONGRESS BY STATES: U.S.HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.</u>	.10
G-12	<u>DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS -- 1947.</u>	.10
H.	<u>STATE-BY-STATE DISTRIBUTION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES.</u>	.10

* MIMEOGRAPHED.

** THESE MAPS INDICATE GRAPHICALLY CERTAIN RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CENSUS POPULATION OR VOTING POPULATION AND OTHER PERTINENT FACTORS.

Requests for a complete list of publications or a sample copy of Opinion News, NORC's semimonthly digest of polls and surveys, inquiries about yearly memberships, and orders for reports and maps should be addressed to:

THE NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Denver
Denver 10, Colorado

FOR MORE INFORMATION . . .

MANY OF THE QUESTIONS WHICH -- FOR REASONS OF SPACE -- WERE ONLY BRIEFLY SUMMARIZED IN THIS REPORT HAVE BEEN ANALYZED IN MORE COMPLETE DETAIL IN PREVIOUS NORC REPORTS, OPINION NEWS, AND NEWS RELEASES. A LISTING OF SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS DISCUSSING THESE AND RELATED QUESTIONS, FOLLOWS:

<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>PAGES</u>	<u>PUBLICATION</u>
DEMOCRACY -- A STEREOTYPE	3- 8	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 2-19-46, 4-30-46, 5-28-46, 6-11-46, 6-10-47
KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES REGARDING RUSSIA	9-14	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 4-2-46, 4-16-46, 7-9-46, 10-1-46, 11-26-46, 12-24-46, 4-1-47; <u>REPORT 27, FOR THE RECORD . . . PUBLIC OPINION MISSES ON RUSSIA . . . BUT SCORES ON WORLD ORGANIZATION</u>
ATTITUDES TOWARD THE AXIS PEOPLES	15-19	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 1-22-46, 4-2-46, 4-16-46, 10-1-46, 12-10-46, 5-13-47; <u>REPORT 12, ATTITUDES TOWARD THE AXIS PEOPLES, REPORT 24, GERMANY AND THE POST-WAR WORLD, REPORT 32, JAPAN AND THE POST-WAR WORLD</u>
BRITONS AND AMERICANS LOOK AT EACH OTHER	20-24	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 12-25-45, 10-1-46
ATTITUDES TOWARD MINORITY GROUPS IN THE UNITED STATES		
NEGROES	25-26	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 10-15-46; <u>REPORT 22, DO NEGROES HAVE EQUAL ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES? WHY?</u>
JAPANESE-AMERICANS	27	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 9-3-46; <u>REPORT 33, ATTITUDES TOWARD THE "JAPANESE IN OUR MIST"</u>
WORLD WAR III	29-31	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 5-28-46, 7-9-46, 9-17-46, 1-7-47
CAN WARS BE PREVENTED?	32-35	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 11-27-45, 4-2-46, 7-9-46, 9-17-46, 11-26-46, 12-24-46, 1-7-47, 1-21-47, 2-4-47, 2-18-47, 4-1-47, 4-15-47; <u>REPORT 29, CAN THE UNO PREVENT WARS?</u>
TOWARD AN EFFECTIVE UNITED NATIONS	36-37	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 7-24-45, 7-9-46; <u>REPORT 19, THE PUBLIC LOOKS AT WORLD ORGANIZATION, REPORT 25, PUBLIC OPINION ON WORLD ORGANIZATION UP TO THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE</u>
SCOPE OF UNITED NATIONS POWER		
REGULATION OF WORLD TRADE	39	<u>NEWS RELEASE</u> , 11-20-46, 3-9-47; <u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 10-1-46, 3-4-47
CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY	40-41	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 11-27-45, 6-11-46, 9-17-46, 4-1-47
DISARMAMENT AND WORLD POLICE FORCE	42	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 9-17-46, 4-15-47
PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION	43-44	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 3-19-46
WILLINGNESS TO HELP NEEDY COUNTRIES	45-46	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 3-5-46, 4-16-46, 11-12-46, 4-15-47, <u>REPORT 31, SHOULD WE RETURN TO RATIONING?</u>
AMERICAN ATTITUDES REGARDING TRADE AND TARIFF	47-48	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 10-1-46, 3-4-47
IMMIGRATION; A WORLD PROBLEM	49-50	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 4-29-47
THE FUTURE OF PALESTINE AND OTHER DEPENDENT AREAS	51-52	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 3-5-46, 7-23-46, 12-10-46, 3-4-47, 4-29-47, 5-13-47; <u>REPORT 13, HAS THE UNITED STATES ANY TERRITORIAL AMBITIONS?</u>
THE COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA: SOME COMPARISONS	53-56	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 8-20-46, 11-26-46, 12-24-46; <u>REPORT 28, WHAT . . . WHERE . . . WHY . . . DO PEOPLE READ? FIELD, HARRY. LAZARSFELD, PAUL F. THE PEOPLE LOOK AT RADIO. CHAPEL HILL; THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS, 1946</u>
INTERNATIONAL FREEDOM OF INFORMATION	57-59	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 8-6-46, 12-10-46, 3-18-47, 5-27-47
PUBLICIZING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY	59-62	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 8-20-46, 3-18-47, 5-27-47
CIVIL RIGHTS AND FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATIONS	63-64	<u>OPINION NEWS</u> , 8-6-46, 12-10-46, 3-18-47, 6-10-47
THE RESPONSIBILITY OF EDUCATION	65-66	<u>REPORT 21, THE PUBLIC LOOKS AT EDUCATION</u>