Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Revised

INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION PLAN

for

COUNTRY-BY-COUNTRY STUDIES

in support of

PSYCHOLOGICAL-WARFARE PLANNING

I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

To support planning for psychological warfare, comparable intelligence studies are required for over fifty countries.

For the purpose of these studies, psychological warfare has been interpreted in terms of propaganda and informational measures. The fact that those who requested the studies, thus intended to limit the use of them to planning propaganda and informational measures, however, does not diminish the value, necessity, and urgency of including in these studies psychological responses to actions and conditions, as well as to words, of political, economic, military and other kinds.

The comparability required in the studies is to be secured by the use of (i) the Outline and the Detailed Requirements below, based on the original requests, and (ii) Specifications for Production of Country-by-country Studies in Physical and Psychological Accessibility

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

to Psychological Warfare, prepared specifically to implement those requirements.

II. OUTLINE

The country-by-country studies are to provide intelligence on the physical and psychological accessibility of the country's population and any occupying forces or super-imposed regime, to US-Allied psychological warfare. They should be composed of the following chief parts:

A. Summary

B. Introduction

C. Physical Accessibility to the Target Population*

D. Psychological Accessibility of the Target Population*

III. DETAILED REQUIREMENTS

A. Summary

- not more than three or four pages, devoted chiefly to psychological susceptibilities

B. Introduction

1. Brief statement of those aspects of the culture, social situation, and international relations of the country which are necessary to interpret the subsequent treatments of physical and psychological accessibility, including relevant aspects of the following:

* To include, where there is such, foreign occupation forces or the personnel of super-imposed Communist regimes.

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

a. the country's culture: its social structure and major groupings, psychology, pertinent beliefs, etc. (an outline for this section is contained in the above-mentioned Specifications for Production);

b. major population pressures on the social system, and internal population movements;

c. international relations of political, economic, and other kinds including incoming and outgoing migration;

d. contemporary trends, recent modifications, and immediately temporary shifts in the above (a, b, and c), indicated for such periods respectively as the past decade or two, the last few years, the several months just passed.

2. Estimate of relevant changes to be expected in the country's domestic and international situation under assumed, specific times and circumstances as follows;

a. the present general situation as it would be modified if

(i) war were expected within days or weeks,

(ii) war were in progress:

b. the prospective 1952 situation as if

(i) war were expected within days or weeks,

(ii) war were in progress;

c. the prospective 1956 situation under the same two conditions.

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

3. Estimate of the relevant effects of USSR psychological warfare, as follows:

a. the extent to which the findings under A, 1, above are the result of USSR psychological warfare;

b. the extent to which such findings may be further modified by USSR psychological warfare under the times and circumstances assumed in A, 2 above.

C. Physical Accessibility to the Target Population

1. Physical, or, technical, accessibility refers to the extent to which the country's target population, native and foreign, may be contacted or reached directly or indirectly through the various media and channels of communication employed by psychological warfare.

2. The outline for the investigation of physical accessibility is provided in the Specifications for Production of Country-by-country Studies. The outline should be applied first to the present situation, and then to variations from that situation to be expected under the special assumptions as to times and circumstances indicated in III, B, 2 above.

3. Where enemy occupation forces or any super-imposed regime is present or expected at any of the times indicated, it should be included specifically along with the country's own population.

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

D. Psychological Accessibility of the Target Population

1. Psychological accessibility refers to susceptibility to being influenced by psychological warfare, and as here used includes specifically "psychological factors that can be used as a basis for psychological warfare".

2. Any given psychological susceptibility is to be presented in terms of all significant elements interdependently determining it, and thus, as a general rule, in terms of a psychological-susceptibility situation. Situations not marked by immediate and direct psychological susceptibility, but definitely containing significant potentialities for it, are to be included as "indirect" psychological-susceptibility situations.

3. To insure comparability between the country-by-country studies, and comprehensiveness in each study, the analysis of susceptibility situations is to be undertaken in accordance, so far as possible, with the terms of the Specifications for Production of Country-by-country Studies in Physical and Psychological Accessibility to Psychological Warfare. It is understood that those Specifications and the methodology on which they are based, are to be employed empirically in this analysis subject to modification by personnel of relevant specialized competence

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

CONFIDENTIAL

OBJECTIVES OF THE SPECIAL REPORTS BRANCH

(Suggestions for Analysts)

1. Background Data..... 2
2. Implicit Hypotheses..... 2
3. Avoiding "Interpretation"..... 3
4. Stress on What Is New..... 4
5. The Reader's Viewpoint..... 5
6. Topics of Special Interest to Readers..... 6
7. Specificity..... 6
8. The Summary..... 7
9. Introductory Paragraphs..... 8
10. Heads and Subheads..... 9
11. Quotations..... 10
12. Opening Sentences..... 10
13. Length of Paragraphs and Sections..... 11
14. Paraphrasing Earlier Reports..... 11
15. Commentator..... 11
16. Statements on Subjects Other Than Radio Broadcasts..... 11

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

OBJECTIVES OF THE SPECIAL REPORTS BRANCH

1. Background Data

Give the reader a maximum of background data which, while not interpretive, would be useful to others in framing or testing hypotheses. The chief types of relevant background data which can be presented are:

a. Trends within Soviet propaganda. How did they do it differently last week, a month ago, a year ago? How did they do it in the case of other similar events and situations in the past?

b. Comparisons with the highlights of the week's news. What prominent events are ignored, or given much less proportional attention by Moscow than by the Western press?

c. Comparisons with actual facts. Any lie or distortion by the Soviet radio is of special interest (e.g., to the Voice of America). Where we have reason to think they are lying, and can document our impression (e.g., with the NEW YORK TIMES version of a text which differs from the Soviet radio version) we should do so.

d. Comparisons between beams. Do they tell a different story, or is their emphasis different, in talking to Frenchmen and to Germans? In talking to the home audience and foreign audiences?

e. Comparisons between areas. In talking about different areas (not to different audiences) what similarities and differences can be observed? Do they say the same things about France and Italy? Greece and Turkey? Germany and Japan?

f. Comparisons with typical Soviet propaganda techniques. See our report on propaganda techniques. Ordinary illustrations of the techniques described in this report do not need to be pointed out as such, but exceptionally good illustrations of them can be discussed, and any departure from them should be discussed as a departure from such-and-such a typical procedure. Comparisons with Hitler's techniques (or those of any other well-known propagandist) are legitimate.

g. Comparisons with Marxist, Leninist, or Stalinist ideology. For instance, resuscitations of the slogans of revolution and of proletarian dictatorship are uncommon enough to be sometimes worth pointing out as such. Clear inconsistencies, if found, should be pointed out.

2. Implicit Hypotheses

Theorize as freely as possible, in your own mind, about why the Soviet line or policy is what it is on a given point. Such hypotheses or interpretations should not be included in the SURVEY, but they are always useful as guides to the selection of data and the presentation of data. In general, we should report especially such data as are relevant to specific hypotheses, and in such a way that their relevance is clear.

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

It is worth while to keep constantly in mind the fact that we cannot expect most of our readers to supply any of the thinking that would be necessary in order to make valid and interesting inferences from our facts. They are busy people, and nearly all of them specialize in types of thinking other than propaganda-interpretation. If the wording of our statements does not suggest possible interpretations even in the mind of a more-or-less thoughtful reader, our work is simply a waste of time except in terms of summarization. It is worth while, therefore, to devote a fair amount of time, if necessary, to working on forms of statement which will point up the relevance of our data to questions which are or could be in the mind of a busy but potentially thoughtful reader. Our SURVEY should be thought-provoking wherever possible.

3. Avoiding "Interpretation"

The question of the proper limits of our function, and of our relationship to the Propaganda Analysis Branch in ORE, has not yet been finally settled. The possibility of joint interpretation, in which both we and they might share, especially calls for further exploration. At least for the present, however, the directive that we should avoid "interpretation" still stands. What is necessary is to define what the word "interpretation" means in this context.

It certainly does not mean the providing of background data as described above. We can do this, even within our function as now defined. In fact, we should do a great deal more of it than we are now doing. Nor does the limitation mean that we should refrain from theorizing in our own minds, as indicated above under "implicit hypotheses." Nor, finally, does it mean that we should not interpret freely and explicitly on the propaganda level. Within a propaganda frame-of-reference we can talk about 'why' as well as 'what.' We can say "Moscow may be putting it in this way in order to achieve such-and-such an effect in the listeners' minds" (e.g., to create an identification of the U.S. with Nazi Germany). Interpretations of this sort, which do not involve political or economic data from sources we do not have, are entirely within our province, even as it is now defined. If a certain strong impression is created in our minds, the probability is that Moscow is trying to create the same impression in all of its listeners' minds. It is legitimate, for instance, for us to say "Moscow's wording of the issue has at least two propaganda advantages..." and indicate what those advantages might be. Or we can say "Ehrenburg words it in such a way that an ordinary listener might get the impression that..."--if we back up our reasoning with quotations which convincingly demonstrate the point.

On the other hand, the following things should be definitely avoided:

a. Predictions. The most we can say about the future is to describe aspects of present reality which have a bearing on the future. For instance, we can say "Moscow has established a line which could be used as a propaganda base for justifying withdrawal from the U.N. under such-and-such conditions." We cannot say "This suggests that the USSR will withdraw from the U.N."

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

b. Inferences About Soviet Motives or Intentions. We cannot say "This suggests a Soviet intention to attack Iran," or "These tactics may be intended to conceal a rapprochement with Franco." We can say what impression they convey, but not why they are trying to convey it. For this reason it is best even to avoid certain expressions which sound as if we were trying to infer motives--expressions such as "probably because," "one reason why," "perhaps in order to," etc.

c. Value-judgments. Similarly, we should avoid expressions which sound as if we were passing judgment, either positive or negative, on what Moscow says. Scornful expressions such as "boring," "nauseating," "fallacious," "flagrant," "gross distortion," etc. should be kept to a minimum. If used at all, they should be followed by enough illustrative material so that the reader himself is fully convinced of their appropriateness. And the same applies to positive evaluations. Even if we think Ehrenburg is being eloquent or brilliant, we should ordinarily not say so; more specific terms such as "satirical," "bitter," "rapier-like," etc., are usually preferable.

Since it is not up to us to decide what the "truth" is on any of the subjects that Moscow discusses, we should especially refrain from talking about "lies" and "distortions" unless (as in the case of the repeated claim that there are 15 or 18 million unemployed in the U.S.) the obviousness of the lie can be discussed in terms which our readers are almost sure to agree with or unless we can adequately document the lie or distortion. Ordinarily, if we think they are demonstrably lying, we should present the contrary evidence (usually as a footnote) and let the reader draw his own conclusions.

The word "allegedly" implies actual disbelief on our part. We should save it, then, for occasions when we have definite reason to disbelieve, and not merely resort to it whenever we are ignorant on the point at issue.

4. Stress on What Is New

There is a real danger that the repetitiousness of Soviet propaganda will give our readers the mistaken impression that it is "always the same old stuff" and that therefore they don't need to read our report. Yet the analyst has the responsibility not only to point out what is new, but also to keep the reader informed on the major emphases of the Soviet radio, no matter how hackneyed those major emphases may be. To minimize our readers' boredom, three things are recommended:

a. Condense drastically the more familiar and repetitious material. A major theme which is continued along familiar lines can often be referred to by a single word (e.g., the "unity theme" in the German context). A short paraphrase is always possible and is usually better than a long quote; where long quotes are given there should be a definite pointing up of what is new and different in them. If there is nothing very new in a week's material on a given area, don't hesitate to make the section on that area extremely short, or to leave it out entirely; a single paragraph is perfectly acceptable.

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

b. Cut down on the number of expressions such as "repetition," "stereotyped," "familiar," "rehash," etc.; they reinforce the impression that we don't want reinforced. A certain amount of this is unavoidable, but it is often possible to use more neutral words such as "standard," "continuous," "is still emphasizing," etc.

c. Play up the new aspects or applications of old themes. "The unity theme appears in a new context this week...," etc.

5. The Reader's Viewpoint

Try always to take the reader's viewpoint toward what you write--to condense drastically what would bore him, to elaborate on what would interest him, to answer (where possible) the specific questions that would naturally come up in his mind, etc.

Usually your own reaction is the best possible guide to that of your reader. Where you yourself wonder whether a given Soviet charge is true or not, the chances are that many of your readers will wonder the same thing, and any information which you can give him (e.g., from the NEW YORK TIMES, in a footnote) would be welcome. If you yourself learned only recently what the letters ICFTU stand for, the chances are that some of your readers need to be informed on the same point. If you yourself wondered whether a certain theme was a new development or a continuation of something which was said for the first time a month ago, it is worth while to look up the SURVEY of a month ago, get the answer to your question, and pass it on to your reader.

Don't assume, however, that what is clear to you will be equally clear to the reader. Remember that we cannot expect most of our readers to supply much of the thinking that would be necessary in order to make valid and interesting inferences from our facts. Anything we can do to spell things out and to supply relevant background information--short of the tabooed type of "interpretation"--is therefore a service to our readers.

The principle of "taking the reader's viewpoint" applies even to small things such as letting him know that we also are puzzled, at those points where he is likely to be puzzled and we cannot supply him with the answer. If, for instance, Moscow makes a startling statement and does not explain or justify it, we should not hesitate to call the statement "startling" and to add that "Moscow does not attempt to explain or justify this statement." Or, if a certain name or date or figure is obviously an incongruous error, and the reader might wonder whether we ourselves had committed it, we should protect ourselves---and at the same time answer the question in the reader's mind--by adding the word "sic" in parentheses.

From the reader's point of view also, preciseness contributes to the usefulness of the SURVEY. When Moscow refers to some development with which the analyst is not familiar it would be well to consult the NEW YORK TIMES or some other reputable source so as to avoid the necessity of referring to the development in generalities which are not helpful to the reader.

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

6. Topics of Special Interest to Readers

In deciding what is worth an actual quotation, what is worth playing up in headlines, etc., some special interests of our own clientele should be considered. The weekly target lists should be carefully studied from this standpoint. References to the Voice of America, to any sort of espionage, to internal enemies within the Soviet sphere, to new weapons, etc., are cases in point. People in the State Department are probably also especially curious about the Soviet reaction to their own current actions; if Acheson, for instance, makes a new move or a new statement on a matter of policy, the first Soviet reactions to it should by all means be included. And, similarly, references to particular individuals (Truman, Acheson, Johnson, Carey, Cripps, De Gasperi) may be of special interest to those of our readers who know these individuals.

7. Specificity

Other things being equal, a specific statement is better than a general one. A specific statement serves the double function of illustrating a particular current application of a general theme and of illustrating the general theme itself; a general statement, on the other hand, usually serves only the single function of illustrating the general theme--and as a rule this is so familiar that it is of little interest. For instance, one unduly general statement is:

> "Past successes and present-day achievements are lauded, and the strength and magnitude of this 'vital' peace movement are described as ever strengthening." (This sentence, in its context, could have been simply omitted. The strength of the peace movement is one of Moscow's most familiar themes, and the same paragraph had already described specific illustrations of it.)

On the other hand, there is much more specificity, and therefore much greater interest, in one of the statements which immediately preceded this one:

> "For the first time, French soldiers are reported to have refused to be sent to the Vietnam war." (This gives a fact of current interest, and also illustrates Moscow's general current line on the strength and militancy of the peace movement.)

As we have seen, this principle applies also to headings, where the tendency to be too broad and general (in order to "cover most of what is said") is especially strong. But the heading does not necessarily have to "cover most of what is said." In headings, as well as in the summary and the introductory paragraphs, there should be a preponderance of specific illustrations over more abstract statements. For the reader who reads at least our summary and table of contents every week (and most of our readers probably do) these should give him over a period of several weeks a fairly clear and well-proportioned idea of what the major themes are on a given area, but he can get this nearly as well by seeing illustrations of the main themes as by seeing the themes themselves abstractly expressed.

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

The is some real conflict between this principle and the principle that our job is to save the reader's time by generalizing and paraphrasing, so as to save him the burden of reading innumerable specific details. But the conflict can be reduced to a minimum by applying each principle in a discriminating way. By selecting only the single most interesting "detail" in a given week, we are not burdening the reader with "innumerable" details. The "specific" fact in the headline can and should be as broad and important as the week's material contains. A trend, for instance, toward definitely more or less emphasis on a given major theme is especially good material for the headline. And in the body of the article it is possible to give the reader both--broad generalizations and well-established specific illustrations--so that he can cover both or concentrate on whichever interests him more.

8. The Summary

Since we aim at four or five pages as the average length of the Summary, the item on an area that has nothing unusual happening in it can be omitted entirely, or represented by a single sentence. Very drastic condensation is of course necessary in order to do this.

In deciding what material to include in the Summary, remember that the Summary, unlike the special articles in the body of the Survey, is read by a good many people who know very little about your own areas of specialization. The material in the Summary should therefore be self-explanatory; no matter how short it is, it should contain enough explanation to make each statement clear to person who previously had little knowledge of the subject. It should also stress Soviet reactions to those events in the week's news which have been really headlined in the American press; in reading our Summary the reader should get as often as possible a feeling of relevance to what he has recently been thinking about, or to world-wide topics in which he is already interested.

The drastic condensation needed in the Summary implies, as a rule, omitting all details such as commentator, beam, and date. It also implies omitting, where possible, expressions such as "Moscow," this week," and the name of the area concerned. For instance, a paragraph headed by the word "Greece" does not need to say "Greek people"; it can say just "people." And since the over-all assumption is that we are describing what Moscow says during a given week, the words "Moscow" and "this week" can usually be omitted.

In general, repetition of old themes does not need to be mentioned in the Summary. If a certain old theme is given really strong emphasis, it can be very briefly stated; e.g., "the voluminous attack on the Bonn Government continues." But even this does not need to be mentioned more than once in two or three weeks unless there is a marked increase in volume. As far as representativeness goes, the aim should be to give the hurried Summary-reader a fairly clear idea of what the major themes are with reference to a given area if he reads the Summary regularly for as much as two or three months, but not necessarily, to give such a representative picture each week or even each month.

On the other hand, what should be included is the cream of what is both new and significant. This means differentiating sharply according to newness and also according to your own estimate of significance. If you have an interesting

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

hypothesis about why they are stressing one thing or soft-pedaling another, always try to include it in the Summary, wording it in such a way that at least an intelligent and thoughtful reader can see what hypothesis your evidence is relevant to.

Late material that comes in on Thursday morning can be included if it is significant enough; but the criteria of significance should be nearly as stringent as for other material in the Summary. Don't include late stuff merely because it is late and would have been included in the body of the Survey if it had come earlier.

9. Introductory Paragraphs

The purpose of the introductory paragraph, at the beginning of an article in the body of the Survey, is something intermediate between the very short paragraph in the Summary and the detailed discussion in the rest of the article. Its length can therefore be three or four times the length of the paragraph in the Summary, if the latter is quite short, but it should rarely be longer than a quarter or a third of the article which it introduces, and seldom more than a third of a page in any case.

There is some question about the justification of having this introductory paragraph at all, since our general reader probably never sees it, and our careful reader, who has a special interest in a given area or topic, presumably reads all of the article and not just its introduction. He may therefore actually read the same idea expressed three times, once in the Summary, once in the introductory paragraph, and once in the body of the article. On the other hand, the introductory paragraph does have some real functions, and the repetitiousness can be reduced to a minimum if an effort is made to do so.

The special and unique functions of the introductory paragraph are:

a. To state briefly all of what is new and significant in the week's material, and not merely the part of it that gets into the Summary. A reader whose interest in a given area is intermediate in character can therefore read it and perhaps the sub-headings of the following sections, without reading the whole article, and still get something that is well worth the time he spends.

b. To describe each week not only what is new and significant but also what Moscow gives most of its attention to, even if the latter is highly repetitious and familiar. Like the beginning of the Daily Round-up, the introductory paragraph should always tell something about "emphasis" as well as about "new current topics." In this respect the function of the introductory paragraph differs from that of the paragraph in the Summary.

c. To point up the most important points--which has some value even for those who read the fuller paragraphs which follow. Repetition is by no means a complete waste of time if it results in getting the essential points really noticed and assimilated.

d. To provide a place for the very brief statement of minor points which are not important enough, or complicated enough, to warrant complete paragraphs and sub-headings for themselves. If put in at all, these should come at the end of the introductory paragraph; and no one of them should be longer than a single sentence. More often, two or three can be combined in a single sentence.

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

e. To point out the objectively important topics or events which are not discussed by Moscow.

In order to avoid giving the reader needlessly the feeling of repetition, the writer should try to use in the introductory paragraph a definitely new form of expression, which does not closely duplicate the wording of either the paragraph in the Summary or the statement of the same point in the body of the article.

If the article as a whole takes less than a page of the Survey, it is usually be best to eliminate the introductory paragraph. To express the same idea twice on the same page is usually needless repetition.

10. Heads and Sub-Heads

Like American newspaper headlines, our main headings and sub-headings should tell a story wherever possible; they should be in the form of sentences (with a verb either explicit or implicit) and give some new information that the reader did not have before. A very busy reader who happens to read something other than our summary should find the reading of our heads and sub-heads a rewarding experience, interesting in itself as well as giving him a guide to those sections in the body of the SURVEY which he might perhaps want to read in detail.

This has at least four implications:

a. Highlights of the week's news should be included in the main head if possible, so that the reader who has already though "I wonder what Moscow is saying about such-and-such" will have his eye caught by this headline in the table of contents.

b. The headline does not need to describe all, or even most, of what is said in the article. Ordinarily, a headline which does this is a more or less banal repetition of thoroughly familiar Soviet themes, such as "U.S. Imperialism Threatens Latin America," or "America: Militarism and Economic Decline." The more interesting developments are likely to consist of the application of an old broad theme in a new and specific context; when this occurs, reader-interest can be stimulated by putting the new application somehow into the headline, even though this may be only the most important single item among six or seven. The headlines should give a fairly representative and balanced picture of what is said about a given area over a period of months, but for any given week the criterion of newness and reader-interest is more important than the criterion of representative ness; and this implies that they should be fairly specific rather than broad and general.

c. A particularly striking phrase or sentence quoted from the Soviet radio is often a good headline. Ideally, it should be self-explanatory enough to convey some interesting meaning even to be hasty reader who does not read further, and at the same time it should be provocative enough to make him want to read further. On the other hand, as pointed out in our style manual, quotation marks should not be used in the main headings (i.e., the table of contents) unless they are really needed; familiar Soviet expressions such as "imperialism" and "reactionaries" do not need to be put in quotes.

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

d. Names of prominent persons also make good headline material. Remember the ingredients in Flesch's criteria of readability: shortness of sentences, shortness of words, and frequency of personal references.

11. Quotations

A long quotation is easier than an intelligent paraphrase; when we are in a hurry we are therefore likely to resort to long quotes. But, in doing so we may violate the general principle of compactness, and of not burdening the reader with more than a few words of description unless the material is both new and significant. Our most frequent technique should be the paraphase (interspersed with the most interesting and significant phrases or clauses from the original data) rather than the long indented quotation.

On the other hand, an argument in favor of the occasional use of long quotations is that sometimes the material has a certain necessary continuity or organic unity within itself, and in such cases the reader may appreciate an uninterrupted quotation. Jumping back and forth from the Soviet viewpoint to our own viewpoint is always something of a distraction to the reader; if he is to get the true "feel" of Soviet propaganda from the standpoint of a typical radio listener, he can get it best from the long quotation.

In general, indent any quotation that is more than three or four lines long. But, when you do indent such a quotation (especially if it is much longer than three or four lines) make a practice of summarizing its new and significant aspects, either just before or just after the quotation itself. If this is done consistently, the reader will realize that he can get the essentials by reading the body of the text only; then, if he is in a hurry, he can ignore or skim the indented quotations and not risk losing anything that is really important.

12. Opening Sentences

A section should ordinarily have some of the same sequence that we tend to follow in our over-all organization: the sequence from the general to the specific, or from generalization to illustration. As a rule the first sentence in the section, immediately after the sub-head, should be relatively general in character; it should describe a trend or point out a relationship between facts or make a generalization about several broadcasts. The worst possible opening of a section is a mere quotation, such as "A 15 January broadcast to French listeners declares that..." If a quotation is especially striking and significant it can be put first. But then it should always be followed by some discussion pointing out its newness and why it is significant.

This is also partly a question of clearly differentiating our function from that of the Daily Report. Our unique function is to generalize, paraphrase, relate facts to other facts, and if we allow it to appear that we are merely selecting interesting quotations, we lay ourselves open unnecessarily to the charge of merely selecting interesting quotations, we lay ourselves open

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

unnecessarily to the charge of merely duplicating the Daily Report.

13. Length of Paragraphs and Sections

Paragraphs and sections, as well as sentences and words, can be too long. A long paragraph (longer than, say, 15 lines) tends to become dull; any paragraph longer than this should be examined to see whether it can be divided naturally into two or more . This is partly also a matter of making the format of the page look more varied and interesting. For the same reason, over-long sections of an article tend to make a page too uniform; a page is livened up by having at least one underlined sub-head on it.

14. Paraphrasing Earlier Reports

References to previous issues of the SURVEY, or to other parts of the same issue of the SURVEY, should be made very freely; they are often helpful, and whenever they are helpful they should be made. But it cannot be expected that most of the readers who see a reference to a back number of the SURVEY will actually dig it up and look up what it said. On this account, the reference should usually occur only after some highly condensed paraphrase of what the Soviet radio said on the previous occasion. If a previous discussion is worth referring to at all, it is worth some sort of paraphrase. Such a paraphrase has two advantages: it satisfies the legitimate desire of the reader to know immediately the gist of what was said earlier (without having to look it up), and it also gives him a basis for judging whether the whole subject is interesting enough to be worth the trouble of going into it in more detail.

15. Commentators

The general rule is a dull uniformity of style as between different Soviet commentators. For this reason, any distinctive characteristics in the style or content of any one commentator are all the more interesting and significant, and should be pointed out. Content, of course, is more important than style; if Ehrenburg says a type of thing that other commentators don't (such as invoking the revolutionary tradition in France, or denouncing Western "breeders of microbes") this is especially worth noting.

16. Statements on Subjects Other Than Radio Broadcasts

Some readers may take it as a reflection on their knowledge if we state certain facts as if we assumed that the reader was not already familiar with those facts. This holds most obviously for recent news events which the ordinary newspaper-reader can be assumed to be familiar with. For instance:

> "On January 10, Prime Minister Attlee announced the date for the long-awaited British elections; Moscow's reaction is..." (Here it would be better to say "Moscow's reaction to the announcement of the date of the British elections is..." Recent events can usually be referred to briefly as "the so-and-so," giving the reader credit for being already familiar with the. And even if he isn't, no harm is done.)

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9

The same principle applies to any background material with which the ordinary reader may be already familiar; it should be stated as if it is a matter of common knowledge among such well-informed people as our readers are supposed to be. For instance, the following style should be avoided:

> "A similar emphasis on direct sabotage of military preparations was characteristic of the period between 1928 and 1934." (Such a statement may irritate the reader on two counts: if he already knows the fact and takes it for granted he may be irritated at seeming assumption that he does not know it; and if he doesn't know the fact or has any doubt about its complete truth, he may think we are going far beyond our legitimate field of specialized knowledge in presuming to make pronouncements on anything as long ago as 1928. It would be better, then, if we ourselves are sure of the fact, to say "This approach resembles the emphasis on direct sabotage of military preparations which was characteristic of the period between 1928 and 1934.")

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R003500150012-9