

## MIND CONTROL

(An Address by Maj. William E. Mayer (1960)  
(Provided by G. Edward Griffin and the Reality Zone)

### FOREWORD (BY SATORI)

As you will learn, or recall, as you read what follows, at its root the tried and true formula for successful control of the population of any country requires few guns, prisons, and boot-stomping guards or police at the watch. No indeed. For purposes of contemporary history, since about the mid-20th Century, all that is required is to divide many, but not necessarily all, citizens of the target population. That is the ultimate goal of the ultimate weapon: divide people **at the individual level, and one from the other**, and they will conquer themselves; or at least participate, wittingly or unwittingly, in their own conquest.

Astonishingly enough, relatively quickly and with relative ease, the individual members of the target population will begin to voluntarily keep themselves divided and conquered with very little else required thereafter—on the part of the mind-controlling-occupying forces—to keep each individual divided and conquered. Divided and conquered, such that each is rendered unable to conceive of or consider, or even desire, organizing any resistance against their oppressors. And, least of all, to consider forming any organized efforts at the group level, whether small or large, to unite as one in a concerted effort to resist the tyranny confronting them.

These mind-occupying forces are, at every level, on an insidious and relentless political, economic, military, and social trek to becoming physical-occupying forces of the target countries. They have been for a very long time, but most notably for purposes of contemporary history, for about the past 120 years. They declared war against humanity and they alone set the terms of engagement. The prize is power and control. Power to lord over us. Control of our minds and thoughts, in order to control our actions to achieve their outcomes. Outcomes most favorable to the few, not the many. They have achieved much in accordance with their myriad programs, all designed to acquire and maintain power and control. They are winning the war, so far at least, at both the corporeal and incorporeal level.

What follows is a transcript of an address given by Army Major William Mayer. I personally transcribed the presentation from an audio recording provided to me by

G. Edward Griffin's *Freedom Force* and *Reality Zone* many years ago. I will say nothing more in this forward about the presentation. Maj. Mayer's address, as well as the introduction by G. Edward Griffin, transcribed below speaks for itself. It speaks volumes. It must be read and understood. Really understood.

The address was given in 1960.<sup>1</sup> I transcribed the entire address with no commentary or editorializing on my part. On a few occasions, I placed the word "laughter" in brackets thusly: [Laughter]. I did so because it is not apparent from the transcript, as it was to the audience, that Maj. Mayer was employing humor on a few occasions (and probably unintentionally) and not being facetious or "politically incorrect." Also, on occasion, a word was not audible or clear to me. I think I got it right, but occasionally I had to note "inaudible".

In transcribing the address, I followed the syntax and manner of speaking of Maj. Mayer. In a sense, I attempted to give the reader the experience of being in the audience during the presentation. I added punctuation as seemed proper to his style of speaking and to assist the reader. I did not fix grammar or change contractions into the component words. For example, I did not change "don't" to "do not", or "couldn't" to "could not".

A final important note: As you read, get into your time machine and bring forward to today the examples given by Maj. Mayer in his lecture and by Mr. Griffin in his introduction. Think of today's headlines. Of today's world as we perceive it, given what little we really know. You likely already know or will discover numerous examples today of what Maj. Mayer was speaking of in 1960 and Mr. Griffin some years later. Deeply unsettling, if not frightening, examples. Think, too, what the future seems to hold in store. A future we've been warned about for many decades or more. The warnings have gone unheeded, if not unnoticed, for reasons you will soon discover if you read on.

Among other things, you may ask yourself: Are we, the people, winning the war? What can, and what should, we do?

---

<sup>1</sup> It is a sequel of sorts to a presentation Maj. Mayer gave in 1956. Here: [https://www.usa-anti-communist.com/pdf1/Mayer\\_Brainwashing\\_Ultimate\\_Weapon/Brainwashing\\_The\\_Ultimate\\_Weapon-Major\\_William\\_E\\_Mayer-Oct4\\_1956.pdf](https://www.usa-anti-communist.com/pdf1/Mayer_Brainwashing_Ultimate_Weapon/Brainwashing_The_Ultimate_Weapon-Major_William_E_Mayer-Oct4_1956.pdf)

## **TRAILER**

(Speaker: Maj. William Mayer)

And then, finally, about noon the soldiers were dismissed into discussion groups of about 10 or 12 each. First monitored by the Chinese and then self-monitored. During which each man was required to take part in discussions of the content of the morning's lecture in his own words. Now, he did not have to agree with it, he just had to recapitulate it. And, there wasn't any penalty for failing to do this. They didn't pour water down your nose or pound on various parts of your anatomy with rubber hoses. They just didn't let anybody in your group go to chow until everybody in your group took part.

And this, too, shifted the blame, you see, from the communist ultimately to the other 10 GIs in your discussion group. And it was they who would say: 'Now look, buddy, start taking part in this discussion. We want to eat.'

Just like the executions in China are never done by the Chinese authorities. They are done by all the citizens in the village. By popular demand, in public trials. By acclaim. And, this is a generalization of guilt. Which, again, offends me as a psychiatrist. They are using my stuff and they are doing it immorally.....

## **INTRODUCTION**

(By G. Edward Griffin)

Welcome to the Reality Zone. I'm Ed Griffin.

The presentation you are about to hear was made in 1960 by Major William Mayer, a psychologist for the US Army, who was responsible for studying the strange behavior of American prisoners who had been captured during the Korean War.

It was discovered that they had been subjected to psychological programming, which was designed to undermine their belief systems and to keep them socially isolated from each other, because that would prevent them from organizing effective resistance. It was a way to control groups of potentially hostile people without physical coercion. In other words, a few could control many-- without guns.

This was the first time in history that American prisoners of war never even tried to escape.

At first, it may seem that this is ancient history with no relevance today. But, as you listen to this story, you will soon discover that it is as timely as today's headlines. Because you'll realize that almost every psychological technique used on these prisoners of war is now being used on us. Not by a foreign enemy, but by our own government and our own institutions. The goal is similar. It is the creation of a passive population, which is incapable of resisting authority.

For example, you will find that the technique used for undermining our soldier's loyalty to American ideals, was to endlessly review all of the imperfections and problems within our society, with no mention of our strengths and accomplishments. After a while, their minds became saturated with negative associations with the very word "American." And, many of them eventually participated in anti-American propaganda.

What has that to do with us today? Well, just in case you haven't noticed; our schools now follow exactly the same formula. We have numerous classes and texts books on what is often described as problems of democracy. These explore all the negative aspects of our history and culture. They tell us about slavery, poverty and corruption. But, there is almost nothing in these courses about our freedoms, our progress and our great accomplishments. And, perhaps, you also have noticed that the students who have been through these courses often develop contempt for their own country. In other words, their value systems, indeed, have been altered.

And, then, there is the issue of social isolation. As you will soon learn, almost all of the prisoners of war in Korea eventually became informants. This rapidly led them to distrust each other. And, under these conditions, it was impossible to organize a plan for resistance.

Now, open up your daily newspaper and read about how many people today are being encouraged by their government to inform on their friends and neighbors. To turn them in to the taxing authorities for suspicion of not paying all their taxes. Or, to child protection agencies for suspicion of child abuse. Even to water-rationing authorities for watering their lawns on the wrong day of the week.

A nation of informers is ripe for dictatorship; because its citizens are socially isolated from each other and incapable of resisting authority. No this is not ancient history. This is today. And, if we do nothing to challenge these trends, it could become our future.

And, so, the audio archives of the Reality Zone now presents '*Mind Control, The Ultimate Weapon.*'

### **AN ADDRESS BY MAJOR WILLIAM MAYER**

I'm going to talk to you about the ultimate weapon. The really ultimate weapon.

The ultimate weapon today is the same one that existed when Man's best weapon was the knife or a bow and arrow. And that is the Man and the minds that made these. And the feelings that go with these minds.

Humans today, in our school systems and elsewhere, are beginning to be thought of in terms of intelligence quotients. In terms of retentive intellectual abilities. In terms of certain kinds of imagination, growing from what has been absorbed and retained.

And there is a great denial in our culture today, particularly in America, there is a great denial of certain other aspects of the human being. Those that could be called emotional. Those that some would choose to call spiritual. Those that have to do with Man as Man, stripped down, devoid of special techniques. Considered as a human being.

And, of course, this is my particular province and my particular interest. And I am most grateful to you for listening to this most partisan point of view.

I want to talk to you about the experiences of a remarkably good, random cross-sectional sample of healthy adults, young adults—American males. When these people became the first products of our society, and its attitudes and its traditions, ever to live for a prolonged period of time in a communist controlled environment. And, the only such group in existence is the several thousand men who fell into the enemy's hands in the Korean conflict.

I've talked about this off-and-on ever since we finished an intensive study of a thousand of these men.

The methods of social science are grossly inexact, as you know. We wanted to make all the positive, definite, demonstrable findings and correlations that we could. We tried, therefore, to evaluate what had been done to these people; how they reacted to it. And we came to naught with most of our correlations.

In any event, it was clear during the war in Korea that it was going to be necessary to study the men who'd been captured by the enemy—and we have always studied prisoners of war when they got back to our hands. That we were going to have to study these people from a new point of view, and learn new things.

To begin with, it was clear to us that conditions in captivity in Korea were quite unlike anything that we knew anything about. That there had never been such a situation of captivity before endured by Americans.

Further, it was clear that they were having success in the manipulation of these people in what seemed to be the way they were thinking, and certainly in what they were doing, of a degree and of a kind that no one had ever before produced. Specifically, while the war was still going on in Korea, those of us on the front lines in combat could tune in on little portable radios, which weren't very powerful, and yet tune in Radio Peking's wave length and hear thereon Americans known to us to be prisoners of war. Speaking in their own normal voices and exhorting the rest of us to lay down our arms and join them, as guests, of the Chinese People's Volunteer Army, and in protest against the senseless slaughter of innocent civilians on behalf of the Wall Street warmongers. And this was a little astonishing.

And then we began to see articles in papers all over the World, written by Americans and signed by them. We began to see cartoons like the one that appeared in Krocodil [phonetic] of Harry Truman with bloody, dripping claws gathering up us exploited tools of the Imperialist warmongers sacrificing us on an alter labeled 'War', while General Motors and Standard Oil applauded vigorously in the background. And this cartoon was signed and drawn by an American prisoner of war.

And then we began getting letters. Not the kind Perry Como gets, but the kind of letters from disturbed relatives and friends of the people in captivity, who enclosed or quoted letters from their prisoner relatives or friends, in which the prisoner espoused many of these anti-capitalist, anti- profit-making system, anti-free enterprise, anti-America and traditionalist America values. This was disturbing.

We were further disturbed by the fact that they were not escaping and getting back to our hands.

We were even more disturbed when finally, in 1953, after most of the prisoners, the great bulk, had been in captivity more than two and one-half years, when they

were finally repatriated, by agreement of Pam and John [phonetic], and we got back to us the number of men who behaved in a way that was totally unpredictable—that we had never seen before, POW or other—who had ever shared for a prolonged period of time a difficult or threatening or dangerous experience.

When men do share such experiences, men and women, they tend to align themselves with one another on the basis of rather meaningful and intense emotional alliances. We see this after natural disasters. We see it after a bus wreck. We see it after a train that stopped in the snow for a day or two in the Sierra Nevada. We saw it at Texas City. We even saw it at the Coconut Grove fire. We see it among men who fought together in trenches in World War I.

And, if you've ever wondered how grown men can act in such an asinine and ridiculous way as American Legion Conventioneers do when they get together and drop water bombs out of 8-story hotel windows, and when they clasp each other to one another bosoms with great protestations of undying love when they haven't seen or communicated with each other for the last 20-years. If you've ever wondered about that, it is because these men have developed the kind of relationship, albeit years and years before, which was threatening to them. Which emphasized to them the need for the kind of relationship they then developed. A close one. And who somehow preserved the memory of this and the meaning of this and had it relighted when they saw their old buddies from the Argonne.

Well, these prisoners of war did not act that way. They came home to us as if they were strangers to one another. And that was really unusual. They wouldn't talk to each other, for example. They weren't hostile. They weren't at each other's throats. They didn't fight about things. They just didn't communicate, at all.

Each man was in a special little solitary confinement cell, you might say. Without any steel or concrete being involved. He was alone in a crowd of people, like you've been alone sometimes in your life in a crowd of people. And we didn't know what made this.

And so we began our study. And we very carefully, and in a very protected way, examined and interviewed these people over a period of many weeks. And we interviewed them using individuals from multiple disciplinary backgrounds. There were doctors of general medicine. Psychiatrist. Psychologist. Social workers. There were some personnel administration experts. There were some military

people whose only special training was escape and evasion tactics. There were intelligence agents.

A great many different people had contact with these men. And we recorded everything. Collected about 200 pages of verbatim statements from each man and then tried to analyze this. And what I'm going to tell you is an attempt to analyze and gain some meaning from this enormous body of material.

We found that the men had had something done to them. And we thought that what had been done was probably a thing that we had heard about called 'brainwashing'. And this brainwashing comes from two Chinese characters meaning exactly that: 'brain' and 'to wash.' And we'd heard about it from refugees from Red China who described a process of coercion, both physical and psychological. A process of executions, and torture and starvation sometimes, which had been evidently designed to change peoples' political convictions and thus their behavior as well.

And so we concluded easily and rapidly, as we have a tendency in America to seek easy-path solutions for some kinds of problems, we concluded that they'd been brainwashed. As we went into an examination of what had happened. However, we discovered that if there is such a thing as brainwashing it was really a weapon. And thus what we were looking at was very possibly the closest thing to an ultimate weapon that Man has yet come up with. Not the end of all weapons. But certainly more effective, in a constructive way, than any weapon yet devised. And I emphasize the word constructive and want to add to it an interpretation that doesn't equate being constructive necessarily with being good or moral.

However, this is a weapon of great latitude and flexibility. A weapon that can be used in cold wars and in hot wars, on prisoners and on your friends.

The reason we concluded this was because we found that the devices used on Americans in Korea, to get them to acquiesce to their captors and to get them to cooperate, actively, with their captors in a great cold war of ideas against the America civilization, that this weapon was also in use in every industrial shop, in every laboratory, every school, every office in Red China and probably also in the Soviet Union. We'd seen a similar thing among Embassy workers in Washington, DC. The Embassy of the Soviet Union and of the satellites.

This was a weapon designed not to destroy people, because there is a point of diminishing return, as I need hardly point out, to any destructive weapon. It was a



weapon designed rather to control groups. And the Communist had been demonstrably successful in doing just this. They have been more successful than anyone using any other kinds of weapons ever before in the whole history of the Human Race. And one fact alone will demonstrate this adequately. And that is the fact that 42 years ago last October there was no communist village, or state or country on the face of the Earth. Any place. And yet in this brief moment of history, using admittedly the weapons of destruction; using slave camps, and guns, mass executions and starvation, but using mainly I believe other kinds of weapons that I'll try to describe, they have managed to take over, and now control, in this moment or instant of history more than 1/3 of the whole Human Race.

More than one out of every three living human beings, every place. One third in just that period.

Now this bears looking into. We know, and have for a long time, that the people in the Communist world are mainly not communist. It's difficult to believe that they could acquiesce to what has proven to be one of the most stringent and demanding tyrannies ever imposed over, not only on the activities, but the thinking of human beings.

And, so, this weapon we need to know about—regardless of what we know about other weapons, and regardless of how effectively destructive they are—for the simple reason that in the war that rages today, the one that we are not winning, it is weapons of ideas that may in the final analysis prove our undoing, our destruction, our control. As it has already with more than a third of the Earth.

The weapon we saw in use in Korea did not conform to our preconceived ideas. We thought, for example, that it would primarily be one of physical coercion. Burning bamboo splinters under the fingernails everybody knows are used by all Orientals when they want information from you or cooperation. [Mild laughter] The average soldier knew this much about the Oriental culture. And he was indeed surprised immediately after capture to be welcomed with the outstretched hand of friendship, a pat on the back, a cigarette, and the reassurances that he would not be destroyed. That he too was considered a member of the people, that he was not going to be put to work or enslaved, that he was going to be treated well and given a chance to learn the truth.

And we had to learn this too when we studied these men. And it was very difficult to accept the idea that they had not been physically coerced. And yet 95% of all

the men captured in Korea stated that at no time had they been subject to any physical abuse. Ever.

We found also that they did not use drugs or narcotics to coerce men. We thought they might. The Communist world, China in particular, is responsible for a great deal of the illicit narcotic traffic in America. But this was not the case in Korea.

We thought that maybe, after all Pavlov was Russian, even though he was pre-revolutionary, we thought maybe they used psychological magic of some sort. Stimulus deprivation, or subliminal stimulation, or some corruption of Pavlovian conditioning to instill in these men certain ideas that they couldn't avoid. And those of us who are trained in the psychological sciences felt that this couldn't be supported, even at the beginning. But, nonetheless, we had to be sure. And, it was true. No such special exotic devices were used.

We knew the Communist have used in the past with Americans, and are using today by the way, in a general psychological warfare campaign, which relates to some of the, ...not all, but some of the pornographic literature and some of the "arty" literature that you can find on any drugstore counter. We know that the communist, using techniques of this sort, have in the past attempted to sign up the loyalties of this materialistic, self-seeking culture that is America, in their opinion.

We know, for example, that the University of Chicago during the 30's—when the Young Communist League was one of the big groups on campus—that they recruited for the Young Communist League by having a whispering campaign around the campus that at League meetings, after business and after coffee, they had free love. And this was just a rumor you see, but the result was that literally hundreds of intellectually curious college students showed up at these meetings. [Loud laughter.] The Communist got a lot of curiosity seekers, but they got very few recruits this way. And communism today is one of the most moralistic of social systems, at least for the moment. Very much like Puritan America was at one time.

Now they didn't use any of these devices and we had to look further. And in looking further we discovered that, mainly, what had been done was a process of re-education. Of indoctrination. But a process that made a deliberate, calculated and fairly intelligent use of a number of perfectly valid, sound, tested principles of psychology and psychiatry that are in use every place else in the world today.

But these were used backward. Used in reverse. Used in a corrupted fashion. Not to enhance the maturity and the independence of the individual and to strengthen his ability to obtain the only real security one ever has. The kind that comes from his relationships with other human beings. Not from insurance policies. But used, rather, in an attempt to divide individuals one from another. To put each man into this 20<sup>th</sup> Century solitary confinement. Into a kind of emotional and psychological isolation; the likes of which we have never before seen. And the explanation for which is very simple. And very obvious.

Revolution begins with a conspiracy between two men. Any two. But it has to begin with a conspiracy between two men. And there can be many groups of two men conspiring together. But they must do this on the basis of mutual faith and trust. Which makes it possible for you to expose yourself to the other's destruction by telling him where you stand and what dangerous ideas you have.

And these groups coalesce and form groups of individuals. Which in the Army in previous prison camps, we've referred to it as the 'buddy system.' We've all seen it start this way. Groups of two, and then three, and then four and then the coalescing of these groups into large groups for internal control of the camp, and resistance and escape activities, and this sort of thing.

This was the basis of the America Revolution and the basis of the only possible successful kind of revolutions. You see, the communist in 42 years, taking over a third of the earth, have never encountered serious resistance. Ever.

You can say 'Well, what about Hungary? Wasn't that resistance?' Sure. It was. It was not, however, a revolution. And I got into terrible trouble when I was a soldier and when I was not always saying exactly what the policy was of some of the policymakers in the country, when I said just this: that there was no revolution in Hungary.

Let's not be stupid about this. Let's be realistic and not take great heart and strength from unreality. Because this, ladies and gentlemen, is sick. The individual who comes into my office and says he relies upon things that are unreal for his ego support is a sick person. And it no less sick for us as a society, as a culture, to rely upon unreality or the denial of truth.

What happened in Hungary? A group of brave people—pushed against walls, wishing to take no more—finally started tearing weapons away from the Communist troops who were there. They started lynching the secret police. They

started raising all kinds of hell with the communist occupiers. It lasted a little while. Several days.

But, you see, this was a kind of spontaneous revolt. It was not a planned operation. And since it lacked a plan, it also lacked a leadership, and an organization or staff to support this leadership. It lacked a system of communication. It lacked military supply. It lacked transport facilities. And, it lacked any possibility of success!

For all that was necessary to do in the face of this kind of revolt was to mobilize a thousand tanks, and draw them up around the city, and lower their muzzles and put in their innards the anti-personnel fragmenting type of thing, that explodes in space and sends hundreds of little ugly pieces out. And fire away. And then there was no more revolt in Hungary.

Now there was another little revolt. A bunch of Germans once threw some rocks at some tanks in Berlin. But, there has never been any serious resistance to communist dictatorship.

And I think this is why: This practice of education and of psychological corruption. Dividing men at the level of the individual and conquering him in this way without destroying him.

And this is very important you see.

If you want to control a population, you want to control it for some reason. And the reason is, you want to get its production. And I hate to sound like Karl Marx, but economic factors do motivate even aggressive wars.

And, so it is, that if you merely destroy—there is something to be said in that behalf—that is, if you think this is necessary for your own protection. But most importantly, the destruction in taking over of a country, like Hungary, or Yugoslavia, or Latvia, or Lithuania, or Estonia, or any of the multitude of countries that have been taken over, is to get them to go on working and to produce for you. And, you can't very well do this if they are all suffering from radiation sickness

But you can do it if you divide and conquer them. Set one man against each other man; just to such a degree that they won't conspire against you. Yet not to such a degree that they cannot function as a platoon in the Red Army, or as the group that works the little blast furnace out behind the commune after they've worked all day on the farm—the collective farm. And this is what's happening to a great portion

of the human race today. And it can happen in America. And we have seen it happen among good, typical, average Americans. A good, random, cross-section of healthy, young American males in these prison camps.

Specifically, what we saw in the camps was a combination of formal education, with an informing system. Plus, a thing called self-criticism. Plus, a new kind of censorship. Remember, if you will, that the whole objective here is to deny men the emotional support and the inherent dangers of alliances that come from interpersonal relationships.

And, thus, it was that they controlled the mail in order to make the men feel that they were indeed cut off from home. That they did not have the support of the people at home.

It's true, had they had access to their radios and newspapers of America, that they might have concluded that for themselves. Because there was a great debate about Korea. But most of these men were captured at the beginning of the war and were not allowed to be exposed to any outside influences and never did know whether America was behind that war or not.

They could only know what the Communist taught. And, so, their mail was carefully withheld. Sorted. And from it was selected by the Communist after reading each and every piece of mail, only such documents as might produce a sense of being abandoned or being unhappy or being neglected and rejected by the people at home.

And thus it was that your wife, who loved you dearly and had 2 or 3 small children, all yours, wrote you every single night for six months and told you that she loved you, she waited for you, she prayed for your return; not to worry about her, just take care of yourself and come home. Maybe that sounds corny, but whether you're a General or a private, when you're living in a mud hut or a foxhole in Korea, this is what you want to know, however it's expressed.

That kind of letter you just didn't get to see.

But, finally, when she lets her hair down, which is the prerogative of that branch of the race, and she tells you that: the kids' noses are running, and she can't get them in at the dispensary, and the allotment isn't enough anymore, prices have gone up just terribly, the cars on the fritz, the TV programs are dull, and, significantly, she

sure wishes she could go out and go dancing once and awhile—this letter is the one you got in your little mud hut in North Korea.

Similarly, they actually delivered on the Yalu River some notices from collection companies for overdue bills. And sometimes these things reached you within two weeks of the Army postmark date, San Francisco. Meaning that the mail was getting through you see, but that the people at home really didn't care.

The result of that, by the way, was that when the soldiers came home to our hands again and were in Tokyo being studied and being checked medically, they hadn't yet been paid. And the Red Cross came by, because paying a soldier whose been a prisoner for several years is a highly complicated accounting procedure. And you know how accountants run our lives these days. So the Red Cross came by and, despite of their reputation for selling coffee to GIs, they did offer any repatriated prisoner the opportunity to call anyone he wanted in the whole North American continent and tell your sweet heart or your wife if you were married, or your mother, or anyone, that you were safe and that you were on your way home. And more than 50% of the soldiers said 'No thank you, very much. I don't think there's anybody I want to call.' Very curious.

And then there was this informing system. The informing system went hand-in-hand with the education. The education followed a printed curriculum and every student, as these men were called by the Communists, every student got a copy of the curriculum. It was a 12-phase program, which was to occupy about 24 months for the majority of the prisoners. It occupied the 24 months, 7 days a week, from about 7 in the morning until sometime reasonably late in the evening. It followed a pattern of long lectures. Very repetitious ones. Very simple ones. Rather simple ones. Attended every morning standing up out doors for the majority of prisoners. This way nobody fell asleep.

The lecture made a few points over and over, from different points of departure you might say. And then, finally, about noon the soldiers were dismissed into discussion groups of about 10 or 12 each. First monitored by the Chinese and then self-monitored. During which each man was required to take part in discussions of the content of the morning's lecture in his own words. Now, he didn't have to agree with it, he just had to recapitulate it. And, there wasn't any penalty for failing to do this. They didn't pour water down your nose or pound on various parts of your anatomy with rubber hoses. They just didn't let anybody in your group go to chow until everybody in your group took part.

And this, too—they're always thinking, these people—this too, shifted the blame, you see, from the Communist ultimately to the other 10 GIs in your discussion group. And it was they who would say: 'Look, buddy, start taking part in this discussion. We want to eat.'

And this was done consistently. Just like the executions in China are never done by the Chinese authorities. They are done by all the citizens in the village. By popular demand, in public trials. By acclaim. And, this is a generalization of guilt. Which, again, offends me as a psychiatrist. They are using my stuff and they are doing it immorally. And so it was in the discussion groups.

Now, the education didn't actually start until the soldiers had been captured more than 6 months. And it was the first 6 months that really distressed us the most. Because that 6 months of captivity, containing most of the prisoners, was in all respects similar, almost exactly similar, to the conditions of captivity of Americans during World War II in the hands of the Germans and the Japanese. With the exception of the fact that there was no overt brutality to speak of. There were isolated incidences involving less than 5%, but there was no policy of brutality.

There wasn't any pompous lording over the degraded prisoners like there was in Japanese camps. There was none of the starvation of the German camps. Actually, they were treated slightly better, as far as we can determine, than any group of American prisoners ever held in military captivity by any enemy. And this includes the way the Northerners were treated by the South, and the Southerners by the North in the Civil War.

In any event, that first 6 months, during which, based upon experience factors, there should have been very effective internal organization in the camps. Emerging leaders who took command, directed the activities in the direction of taking care of the sick, in the direction of providing for sanitation, in the direction of harassing the enemy, setting up escape channels and escape procedures. None of this took place. And, this is the first time in our history that this ever happened. And we cannot blame it on the Communist.

The failure to do this was very largely made in the USA. Made by us. Either by default or by activities. But it was our phenomenon. I'm not here to defend the Chinese. But, again, I think we have to face what seems to be reality.

This the prisoners called 'The dog-eat-dog' period.' The 'Every-man-for-himself' period. The 'You take care of yourself buddy, and I'll take care of me' period.

During this period the death rate went to,... well almost astronomical heights. During this period, attempts on the part of people to set up escape committees were met not only with verbal rebellion, sometimes with physical rebellion by other men.

During this period of time sanitation got so bad in some of the camps.... All of the camps, incidentally, were Korean villages from which the villagers had been expelled so that the Americans could be moved in. Sanitation got so bad in some of these that you could not walk in the village anywhere, without walking in human feces. And the dysentery epidemics were terrible. And finally the Chinese had to come in and dig latrines because the prisoners never could get together to do it.

This was dog eat dog.

Then followed the education. Curricula were handed out. And, here was a 12-phase program describing certain things about American aggression in Korea. About our Imperialist policy. Our profit making system, which makes war inevitable, they said, because we over produce—have to use the fruits of our over production. Talking mainly about the American national construction. The American attitude toward work. The American attitude toward human beings. And the economic, political and social history of the United States.

Well, we intercepted a number of documents written by communists for communist consumption, not for propaganda, which described Americans for the purpose of assisting camp commanders in the POW camps to better understand the men in their camps. And these documents invariably made a point of saying—mind you this was not for propaganda—that the average American, first of all, had no meaningful loyalty to other individuals; that this was not an issue. That they were great joiners, but they don't really join. They just sign up. Like in church.

They also made a point of saying that the average American was an opportunist. That our system was such that no matter what his intelligence or his moral and ethical background, offer him the right price at the right time and he will do anything.

And they also made a point of saying that the average American, regardless of his educational level, even college graduates, are astonishingly ignorant of American political and economic history and development. And even more ignorant of the



aims and the aspirations, the problems and the achievements of what they contemptuously refer to as “foreigners.”

Now, these documents we dismissed at first as being typical enemy tripe. Until soldiers came home and said, you know: ‘Thus and so was true of us. And if we’d only known this. Or if we’d only been told that. Or if we’d only realized, then maybe more of us would be coming back. Then maybe it would have been different.’

Well, the education was devised to teach you about every injustice, every crime against humanity, that’s ever been committed in the name of free enterprise. And there’s been a great deal, a great many. For example, we used child labor in the United States until relatively recently. Within the lifetime of many people in this room. There were coalmines in Pennsylvania and elsewhere who [that], within the lifetime of almost all the people in this room, actually paid off in company script sometimes. Just like that good ole-fashioned folk song *Sixteen Tons* points out. There were people on the south side of Chicago during the 30’s who were shocked during labor disputes because, as the Communists said, all big businessmen hire murdering plant policemen to shoot down innocent labor union organizers.

They talked further about other crimes. About the migrants who came from the dust bowl to the Imperial Valley in the State of California. And sometimes a family of 5 would be paid a whole dollar for working, all 5 members, all day. And this was true, and this was within everybody’s lifetime in this room, I think.

This discussion of the development of the Capitalist system never went so far as to show any of the steps that had been taken to rectify these wrongs. They never took the position, obviously, that in recognizing and correcting these social injustices, Americans had developed a system which, while far from perfect, has nonetheless guaranteed to more people more things, more rewards, more security than any comparable group of people has ever achieved before. They never said that.

Now, mind you, this is all they heard. Every day. All day. You had to reduce each of these points to your own words and discuss them. There were kids from the coalmines of Allegheny who knew about company script. There were kids from the Imperial Valley who knew about the wage scale there. There were some from San Antonio who knew the center of that town was built at 10 cents an hour, not too long ago.

And so, there was a certain amount of validity to what they were teaching. They were careful not to use Communist literature. They used Charles Dickens even to talk about child labor. They used (inaudible) and Steinbeck and Hemmingway and Howard Fast and even Tom Paine. And they got their points across.

They were not trying to turn these people into Communists. They were trying to divide and conquer them and control them with a minimum amount of expenditure of their own military strength, their own personnel and material. And, this they did.

Informing went along with it. Men were encouraged to inform on others as a service to the people. A duty and a responsibility, you see. And so you informed on another man that committed a crime against humanity. A crime like stealing food or not using the latrine and, therefore, endangering the public health. And when you informed you were, incidentally, paid for informing in the currency of captivity. A cigarette. Some candy. These things become precious in captivity. And the man who was informed upon was very carefully not punished. This is very important, you see. He was not taken out and destroyed. There was no threat of this.

He was taken out by an English speaking Chinese instructor, and there was one such for every group of 20 to 30 American prisoners, and the instructor would take you on a walking conference outside the camp, put his arm around your shoulder, tell you they knew you had done this thing. Don't deny it, you're not on trial. We're not going to hurt you. But, don't you see how destructive it is? Don't you see that the repetition of this kind of self-seeking, profit-taking that you've been taught, and that you've had built into you by your evil, immoral system, don't you see how destructive this is?

The GI's, at first, misapprehended this. They thought: 'Well this is silly. These people are ridiculous. What harm is there in this?'

The man informed upon wasn't really furious at the man who informed on him. He didn't go back to the camp and try to kill him or beat him up. He never felt exactly the same about that fellow again. He just... he just, just sort of backed out, as they said.

The result of this program was the informing grew by leaps and bounds. Until ultimately there was an informer apparently in every group of 5 or 6 men.... Five

or six men. We could name, by their own admission mostly, one informant in every ten.

That'd be almost 2 in every row [referring to the audience] who could be relied upon to run to the FBI, or the security people, or somebody anytime you expressed any kind of an opinion that wasn't absolutely in conformity with what was prescribed. Be a kinda strange way to live, wouldn't it?

Soldiers when they came home said: 'You know doc, you couldn't tell who you could trust. Didn't know who your friends were. It wasn't bad guys informing. It seemed like it was everybody informing.'

And so, we said: 'What did you do?' And over and over they told us: 'Well, the only thing you can do in a situation like that, is kinda back off. And, be careful what you say to people. And don't get close to anybody.'

Beautiful system. Worked. Worked like a charm.

Along with this went something called 'self criticism'. Now we see self-criticism in the cells of the Communist Party in San Francisco. And in the Kremlin, and in the embassies around the world that are communist dominated. This is almost in the nature of a religious ritual, this self-criticism needing thing. They get you together in groups of 10 or 12, again, this is an ideal sized group, and they use what is really a corruption of group psychotherapy. In this corruption each man as required to get up and confess, not to the Chinese, but to 10 of his peers, of his fellow prisoners, fellow students, how he was falling down. How selfish he was. The things he'd done that he'd ought not to have done. And the things he'd left undone that he ought to have done. It was very much like church. It was very moralist sounding.

And at first the soldiers undertook this in a rather facetious vein. They talked about their crimes against humanity back in the past when they had 18 servants and used to whip them every morning. And everybody snickered and it was just kind of a joke. And it continued to be a joke for almost, oh I'd say, 10 days.

Then all of a sudden it wasn't a joke anymore. And they, like you, or me, or anyone, began to run out of facetious constructions to talk about. And they began genuinely too talk about themselves. Hesitantly at first. More and more as time went on. And very soon they developed the feeling that they didn't like this; that it was dangerous to do this; but that they didn't dare stop. Not because the

Communist were threatening. But because their last vestige of social approval and group acceptance was their participation in this self-criticism kind of meeting.

And so it was that the soldier came home from this and said: ‘That was a strange thing, you know. At first we thought we’d do it to get the Chinese off your back and because it didn’t seem to do any harm. And because, well, we were all friends and we weren’t talking much about anything else anyway. But after awhile I got the feeling I was sort of naked standing there in front of the others. Like I was undressed. That they could see all of me. Like they could even tell what I was thinking about.’

And there, ladies and gentlemen, you have an ideal situation for the tyrant. If you think that the rest of us can tell what you are thinking about, in our culture today you’d be psychotic. But in that culture, once you have learned that people can tell this, that they know your shortcomings, that you are indeed exposed—you’re in great danger. You are very vulnerable.

They were very much like... They were going through something that happens to women, I think, much more than it happens to men in our culture today. And you females who’ve experienced this will know instantly what I mean. It’s the situation in which you’ve gone into the powder room with some other gals during a party or something, and you’ve talked about yourself and you suddenly find that you’ve gone farther than you intended. And maybe you’ve told more about yourself than you originally planned to do. You’ve exposed yourself. You’ve told private business; private affairs.

And I know boys do this too, but I think girls are better at it. But when you are confronted with this situation, which is definitely anxiety producing, there’s only one thing you can do to defend yourself. Isn’t there? And that is to collect an approximately equivalent amount of information about your listener. [Laughter.] Because then sort of an armed truce exists and everybody understands exactly where he stands.

And that is exactly what was happening in these camps. These men were listening to each other. Paying attention. Being critical. Making suggestions. Jotting it down, actually or just in the backs of their minds, so that they could be defended.

And they would leave the self-criticism meetings in 10 or 12 separate directions. Not together. Feeling very isolated, indeed. But this is brainwashing, if there is such a thing.

You don't have to have prisoners of war to do this. They're doing it in Shanghai. It's called the 'Neighborhood Control System.' They go into the urban areas and designate as a neighborhood a group of 30 to 50 people. They select almost invariably a house wife in this group, appoint her monitor, give her a very minimal amount of training in techniques and a continuous supply of instructional material, and directions from on high. And the neighborhood begins to function in just this way.

And, while the two Chinese that I know quite well who are psychiatrists, who have come from China, yet been educated in America and are psychiatrist in Honolulu; both have told me that they didn't believe that this communist thing could ever be imposed on China. And, they're just beginning now to see how. And, this is how.

It works. It works on perfectly good non-communists. Like you. And, like me.

Now it can be done in all degrees. By selling certain ideas this kind of thing is being communicated today in America. The same kinds of ideas that were communicated to these people rather abruptly, and then in intensified form. For example, we have among us today certain tendencies to minimize emotional things—as if emotional is somehow synonymous with bad or weak. That it is somehow not socially acceptable, don't you know. And, thus, it is that if there is a parade you shouldn't get very excited about this, and you certainly shouldn't get a lump in your throat when they play the Star Spangler Banner. Because, not only is that crass emotionalism, it is also chauvinism, you see. And it is nationalism. And this is what got Hitler going and this is how the world has always come to trouble before.

There's a tendency among us to feel, among us I mean our country, to feel that we should love more people. One world. The UN. But I say to you, unless you can learn to love your neighbor, you can never love people. Unless you learn in the first social organization you joined—your family—the meaning of real love and real devotion, and real willingness to take responsibility, and willingness even to deny yourself and give to somebody else, you can never have this kind of a feeling for a larger society. It's got to be learned on the level of the individual regardless of IQ. And this is a point that is being lost.

And so there is among us a tendency to become passive. I think this has something to do with the emancipation of women. I am not opposed to the amendment that gave the vote to our better halves. But I wonder if we've proceeded intelligently from that point. I wonder how many of our females have become not more

emancipated better females, but have instead become somehow imitation males, and are competing with males as males. I think this is unhealthy. The nice thing about males and females, is that they are different. Profoundly different.

Now this does not mean a female shouldn't be educated. Doesn't mean that she shouldn't be a physicist. It only means that, we are losing our idea of what the role of a female is and what the role of a male is in our culture.

And so it was that passivity in Korea was a deadly ailment. And it can be an equally deadly ailment—so it's slower—equally deadly in America today.

It can easily destroy us, as no fallout will ever get a chance to do. I'll talk specifically in a minute just exactly what I mean about that. First of all, however, I'd like to mention to you the fact that this process, applied to the Americans in Korea, was successful beyond any previous captor's wildest hopes.

Now the results of the program, combined, please remember, with the first six months—which was not part of the communist program, but made in the US—the results of this were phenomenal. To begin with, more men died in captivity than have ever died before in military captivity in any war in which America has engaged. Four out of 10 men died. And one of the main reasons was passivity among the soldiers.

During World War II... You know we'd been attacked in World War II. We were going to defend Pearl Harbor. That is, if you lived in California, or Washington or Oregon you may have felt this way. They didn't feel very strongly this way back in Illinois. And in New York they knew the real battle was in Europe. [Laughter] But, nonetheless, nonetheless, that was a war that supposedly we had good motivation for. Yet, we found in good studies, done on the spot, on Pacific Atolls, for example, that it was hand-to-hand combat, involving all numbers of American forces on the attack, and all members of the Japanese forces, we found that in those situations never more than 25% of the America troops ever fired their weapons or took any aggressive activity. Ever! That's World War II.

I think we had a higher percentage of shooters during Korea. But the passivity that I mentioned reflected itself in the camps in an unwillingness to do any active resistance, for fear it would create animosity. That it would get the Chinese mad. And of course indeed it would. Just like when the soldier puts his head over the edge of the foxhole and fires at the Chinese soldier, he gets him mad. And he's liable to shoot back.

And this becomes necessary. Physically and socially. It becomes necessary if we are to preserve what we think we have. If we are to stay away from our barbarians. If we're to preserve this kind of social and political order. If you don't want to preserve it that's something quite different. But men must be called upon to be able and willing to defend it. In significant ways. With facts, and if necessary, with weapons. We need weapons.

In Korea we saw lack of resistance. We found that in 10 of the 12 camps there were no barbed wire fences around the camps, no machine gun towers, no electric barricades, no guard dogs, and as few as one-armed guard per 100 American prisoners. No resistance.

Worse than that, during the first 6 months, we found, and we had four physicians who were themselves prisoners, and who examined hundreds of these cases, we found that a new disease occurred. A disease explicitly of passivity. This was a disease of that most popular of all the targets of the psychiatrist, the mother's boy. The unresolved Oedipal complex. Or whatever you want to call it. Nevertheless, the passive kid. Who would walk into his hut in North Korea look disparagingly about him and decide there was no use in trying to participate in this survival. Would go off into a corner by himself, pull his blanket over his head, and in 48 hours was dead.

You could stop these deaths by picking up these fellows—by hitting them, spitting on them, slapping them. If you could just get them angry they survived. If you couldn't, they didn't. The soldiers called this "give-upidis." The doctors couldn't diagnosis it. They had never before seen it among adults. Oh, it was seen among some elderly Jewish people who are awaiting gas chambers. Very few, but some. It's seen among newborns that are pulled out of garbage cans in Oakland, and San Francisco, and New York. And we still find them in garbage cans. And such babies abandoned at birth sometimes will not participate in their survival. And we have a diagnoses for this. It's called "marasmus". They just won't live, even though there is no medical justification for their death.

Never before had we seen this among Americans, who were adults. And these men were 19 to 24 years of age. It was not seen in anybody older than that, by the way. A lack of resistance. A passivity.

Now this kind of disease accounted for the deaths of about half of the men who died in captivity. And the death rate was 38%. Higher than Andersonville. Higher than the Revolutionary War. Higher than the Japanese camps at

Cabanatuan and Santo Tomas. The highest death rate in our military history. And half these people died, to a considerable degree, by their own volition.

This is astounding. This bears thought. By everybody. Not just doctors.

Another result of the captivity situation was that nobody ever escaped. I described to you the security measures around the camps already. Seven thousand men were captured. It's hard to escape in Korea, but it's also hard to chase somebody who's escaping in Korea. It's no harder to escape there than it was in the Philippines and in Japan in World War II. In both of which places men escaped. In Japan they escaped, sometimes, after the Japanese had gathered everybody together in groups of 10, given each one a number and said 'Anytime one of you is missing we kill the other 9.' And they did. This is not a horror story. They said they would, and they did.

And yet men escaped from these groups of 10. Sometimes with the conscious and deliberate help of the other 9. They were willing to take the risk. In Korea no American ever escaped, successfully, and got back to our hands, Ever. Not one. Another result that we saw, was that men made the intellectual, and moral, error of thinking that they could do business with the communist. We need to think seriously about this. Did you ever read Faust? You know, men have been experimenting with this idea ever since man has had any concept of ethics: Whether, or not, you can actually compromise with your enemy. Whether you can make a deal with the Devil, if you want to put it in old-fashioned words, and come out ahead. And always in the history of Man, men have tried this. In the camps a great many men sold their souls. They collaborated actively.

Actually, 1 out of every 3 men in these camps did some active collaboration at some time, knowingly, with the enemy. And 1 out of 6, about 15% of the total, were consistent, dedicated, hard-core collaborators with an enemy of the United States, then engaged in shooting at other Americans, throughout their period of captivity. 1 out of 6 men. And most of them rationalized that this would get them better treatment. That they were serving the interests of the people. And you know it never worked.

Do you know that the men who collaborated the most were treated, by and large, the worst? Just like Benedict Arnold. After all the trouble he went to, to help the British. After the terrible risks he underwent to deliver West Point. After the failure of the plot, through no fault of his own. He nonetheless was considered in deepest disgrace, by the British. And died in disgrace in Great Britain.



You cannot compromise with evil. You can't do this and remain a whole person. And by evil, I mean what you think is evil. What you yourself believe. And this of course presumes that you believe in something. And I wonder if maybe that isn't the disease.

We also found that men couldn't somehow grasp the concept of individual loyalty to any very great degree. And, remember, that the communists in their documents describing Americans pointed this out. They said that this is not a problem [for the communists]. Now an example is this—I'm not just talking about taking advantage of somebody or collaborating like this guy is doing at the expense of somebody else—the best example, a dramatic one, was the case of a man named Gallagher.

Gallagher was captured early in the war and was in a mud hut in the winter of 1950 with some other men. Three of the men in that hut were very seriously ill with diarrhea, dysentery. And, as Gallagher told us later, they were stinking up the place. So he threw them out. It was 30 below zero outside the hut and all three men died and died probably within an hour or less. All were sick.

And so, when Gallagher survived ultimately as he naturally did, when he survived and came home he was tried for murder. Three separate counts of murder. And convicted by the way.

He was convicted easily because we had witnesses. But let me tell you about the interrogations of the witnesses, because this is the point here. They would say to the soldier who had been there, they said:

'Soldier did you actually see Gallagher throw these men out of the hut, into 30 degree below zero, at least you knew freezing weather, and you knew they were sick, did you see him do it?'

And the soldier would say 'Yes sir I saw him and I'm willing to testify against him. He killed those guys.'

They said, 'Well, that's good. Huh, what were you doing at the time that he threw the men out of the hut?'

The soldier would say ‘Well nothing. Just trying to keep warm. You sorta had to huddle together. It was the warmth from all of our bodies that kept all of us warm.’

And we said ‘Yeah, we know. But what were you doing to stop Gallagher from an act that would predictably destroy these helpless people?’

And the soldier would say ‘Well nothing.’

And we’d say ‘Were you afraid that Gallagher would do it to you too?’

‘Oh, no, no, no. I wasn’t sick. I wasn’t smelling up the place.’

“Well then why not, soldier? Why didn’t you interfere?”

And over and over again we got from these witnesses the answer ‘Well sir, I just didn’t think that it was my place to interfere. It ...wasn’t...my... job.’

Do you know how many Americans were in that hut and saw that? Forty. Forty! Whose job it was not. Who are not their brothers’ keepers. It isn’t in their military occupational specialty number, even though we carry those on out to 2 decimal places. [Laughter]

I wish that you’d think about this. Because we’re all specialist today, aren’t we? Doctors are among the worst. This is one reason why we are on the defensive right now in medicine. People feel that we’re only interested in your brain, or in your....Oh, this is a mixed audience, oh dear. [Laughter] Only interested in your lungs or your stomach trouble or something and we don’t care about you as a person.

We’re not physicians any more. This charge is heard over and over.

Specialization can indeed be a disease for mathematicians, and physicist and production people. For all members of this society. And it was here a disease. You see it in the Army when the soldier refuses to pick up a cigarette butt outside his barracks. It’s not his MOS. He’s not a janitor. It’s his home, but he’s not a janitor. And he won’t pick up the butts.

Well, finally, we saw among these men a failure of the concept of leadership. We found that about 5% of the men were considered reactionary, rebellious,

recalcitrant, impossible people to deal with. Poisonous individualists. Denounced publically by the Chinese and put in a reactionary camp where they were more heavily guarded, less well fed, less well indoctrinated. And, incidentally, survived in greater numbers.

Five percent. One out of twenty. And most of these, well some of them, no most, were in the reactionary group automatically. Because they were over 30. Had a college degree. They were officers who did not volunteer to help the enemy. They said they were capitalists. Some people did this facetiously. You know, 'I've got a Cadillac at home and I intend to go home to it.' Some people actually said that to the Chinese. [Laughter]

You can see how the soldiers reacted. When they were first captured they had a great debate over what they should tell the enemy. Should we say we're capitalist and have them leave us alone, or do you think it would be better to say we're poor farmers interested in agrarian reform. And some took one position and some took the other.

And the communists didn't think this was funny at all. And if you said something capitalistic they automatically assumed you were a reactionary and off you went into the reactionary camp. Not killed, not tortured or anything. Just heavily guarded.

And then there was no leadership. Over and over we got stories of incidents in which a colonel, let's say, who would go up to a private who was drinking water out of a rice paddy. You know what they fertilize rice paddies with? And the soldiers are told this from the time they leave San Francisco. It's nothing but a practically crawling solution of pathogenic organisms. And they never drink rice paddy water if they can possibly help it. It'd be better to die of thirst.

And so the colonel would walk up to the soldier and say 'Son don't drink that water. You know it'll make you sick. You've been told that ever since you left the coast. Just because you're a prisoner now, that doesn't make any difference.'

And the soldier would look up at the colonel and say 'Buddy you ain't no colonel any more. You're just a lousy prisoner like me. You take care of yourself and I'll take care of me.'

And then the private would die from dysentery.

We founded instances of sergeants who got up and said ‘Look you guys...’ Not like the William Styed (spelling?) cartoon, but ‘Look you guys we gotta get organized. Now! Not tomorrow. And so you 10 dig a latrine for this camp. And you 10 dig up the seriously sick and wounded. Let’s take care of them. And you 10 fix up this miserable hut.’

And, usually, it didn’t get that far because by that time somebody over here was saying ‘Just a minute buddy. You want a latrine dug, you dig it. Don’t tell me what to do. You take care of yourself and I’ll take care of me.’ Very interesting approach isn’t it? And so no latrines were dug.

Leadership is in ill-repute today. It needs spokesmen. Leadership requires followship of an intelligent, deliberate sort.

We’re going to select a president soon. On what basis do you suppose? Because your daddy voted Republican. Or Democrat? Because you like his first name? Because he’s a personable, popular type? Or because he really stands for certain things you believe in? Or do you know what you believe in?

The disease that killed most of the men in Korea and permitted the rest to be coerced in this way, was a disease of non-commitment. They believed in nothing. They didn’t disbelieve. They just didn’t believe. They were committed to no system of values.

They bought the idea that there’s an infinite variety between good and bad and there’s no point of trying to pick out which is which. They bought the idea that you can always make a deal. You can always compromise. They accepted the proposition that there is something valuable for nothing. And they rejected the poisonous individualist who had the effrontery to stand up and say ‘I am going to lead you, let’s get together.’

I lived in France for a year and a half. And the number of Frenchmen from both ends of the scale there, including some of the cousins of the DuPonts on one end, and then my groundskeeper at the chateau where I rented a room at the other, explained French politics and that terrible spectacle of disorganization there, to me in this way:

He said ‘In France it is a religion that we are all exactly equal. No man is better than any other man. And so it is that we talk politics all the time. We argue the great issues every night as we stop in and have our pint or quart of wine after work.

But you know, we don't vote in France. Very few people vote. And the reason is, when a candidate gets up and says "I am a candidate." what he's really saying is that he's better than us. And we resent this. And we do not vote.'

And, this is true. They do not. The people elected to the National Assembly in France are invariably elected by small groups. Vociferous, tiny little minorities. Economic minorities. Geographic minorities. Racial minorities. Any vociferous minority can push around, and seriously afflict and affront the great bulky inertial majority.

This happened in Korea. Fifteen percent collaborated. Five percent resisted. And 80% did nothing. So where did the weight of that 80% go? It went to the stronger of the two little groups. Lent weight to a group that it didn't really approve of. And made possible the coercion of these people. Almost by default.

I think we have to learn this. I believe for you it's just as important as it is for the business men that I talk to, to understand that no matter what else we do in life—whether its producing a better product from us, or a bigger destructive weapon, or a peaceful use of this new available energy—no matter what else we do, our primary responsibility must be to preserve the very simple, fundamental, essentially moral, ethical ideas which make this system, **and alone make this system**, possible.

America is a country whose Constitution was constructed in political language out of what are basically moral and ethical ideas. It's the greatest such experiment in mankind's history, I believe. All the others have decayed through a process in which individuals have become more rewarded. Less challenged. A process in which they have willingly abdicated their own positions of responsibility to remote authority. To welfare organizations. To the government. To the Big Brother who will take care of it for you. Who will take care of your children's mental health in the public schoolroom. Who will take care of you if you don't want to work, as they do in my state. We can't let'em starve. If they don't want to work, we feed them. And we are feeding more and more.

And when this happens, government gets bigger, and bigger and bigger. And we're part of government in a way. You [the audience] more than most people. And you have a voice in this government. And the voice has to be heard. Or, ultimately what predictably will happen in America is what has always happened before. It will turn into a paternalistic, community-owned kind of Socialism. I hate to use the word, because it sounds just like a bad word these days. But, a

Socialism in its true economic meaning. Which drains out so much of the National product in administrative costs, in personnel costs, in special empires that keep building right along with Parkinson's laws, keep getting bigger and bigger, and doing less and less. Until ultimately, chaos results and the chaos is replaced, as it has always has been, by a dictatorship.

This is what we learned from prisoners of war. I hope I've given you some idea of the data. I've left out an enormous amount of things.

I believe that some of you have serious questions in your mind that maybe I can answer and maybe I can't. But as a psychiatrist, talking in my own field, I want to say: That without commitment, without genuine, conscious, at least partly verbalized dedication to something bigger than you as a person, and to other people, then theirs no point in arguing in favor of the preservation of this society. Because it cannot possibly survive.

A soldier named Lemuel Sheperd, who was once Commandant of the Marine Corp, worked on this problem, studying all this data and so on [inaudible], and after he got through, shaken to his core, as most of us were, said this statement, and I think it's an important one:

'A prison of war stockade, for example, is only another kind of a battlefield. Where they must be taught to carry on what is often an unequal struggle with the only weapons ultimately remaining to any man.'

This from a Marine General.

'The only weapons ultimately remaining to any man. Faith, and courage and a sense of personal responsibility.'

And, ladies and gentlemen, we don't issue those weapons in any military supply room on the face of the entire earth.

They're issued in your house.

Thank you.

---

Transcribed by Satori. April 2021. With the prior permission of *Reality Zone* and G. Edward Griffin. You are free to share this transcript as long as you do not charge for it and as long as attribution is given to Major William Mayer, G. Edward Griffin and *Reality Zone*.