War: The Laboratory of Truth

THE FOLLOWING SATIRE WHICH WE ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED IN 1946 IS REPRINTED FOR THE BENEFIT OF OUR NEWER READERS:

These imaginary scenes of 1920 are reproduced with a few small alterations, from the issues of “The Nation” published in the last quarter of the year 1917 and the author desires to express his thanks to the Proprietors and the Editor of that paper for permission to collect and present them in this new form.

In one of my early voyages of discovery amid the warrens of the war-bureaucracy, I came upon Paston, whom I had left some years ago at Oxford, a young philosophy don, one of the brightest and most enthusiastic exponents of the Pragmatist gospel. He explained to me that he had chucked the Varsity and was engaged in war-work. Seeing me smile and guessing the cause (for Paston had been President of the Norman Angell Club) he thought some explanation was desirable, and urged me to come into his “hut” and have a talk. I gladly accepted the invitation for I was interested to learn what line of war-work could have attracted Paston.

Pretending to be surprised at my surprise, he spun out quite a convincing story. “Why, the war brought me the chance of a hundred life-times. I might have spent all the remainder of my days grinding out futile pleasantries in that dusty old place without ever discovering the glorious significance of Pragmatism if it hadn’t been for the war.”  “But what,” I interjected, “can the war have to do with Pragmatism?” “Well, just everything,” he replied. “Of course I remember you didn’t take Greats but you must have gathered in a general way what Pragmatism means.”

“Why, yes,” I replied, “I gathered that you Pragmatists held that the actual world of experience was a sort of jelly on which a man stamped his own meaning and personal purposes and that the truth of any statement depended on whether it worked.” “Yes,” he broke in “You’ve got the gist of the idea quite right. Truth is what works. But works for what? The one weak spot in pre-war Pragmatism was its failure to give a really convincing answer to that question. With a sudden flash of illumination, war, the intangible of all human purposes, brought the needed answer. Truth is what helps to win the war.”

And then he launched into the whole story of the Conscript of Mind. “Though quite clearly in the conflict we had pretended to regard it as a War of Ideas, it took several years before we were really prepared as a nation to mobilise upon this basis. We didn’t see at first that in a War of Ideas the State must have complete control over the intellectual and moral resources of the nation. So for some years we went stumbling on with departmental censorship, continually overlapping or tripping one another up, and allowing all sorts of damaging talk and writing to go on because of foolish distinction made in Parliament between suppression of news and suppression of opinion. A Pragmatist would have pointed out at once, of course, the utter absurdity of the distinction, as if there were any fact apart from its presentation and as if all presentation did not involve the personal equation of opinion. However, they went on some time suppressing and doctoring what they called ‘news’ and merely conniving at mob-violence for the suppression of inconvenient opinions.

“Then I am vain enough to think that the word Pragmatism has proved of inestimable value, by supplying the really funda-

say the project seems on first view to have an uncommonly German look. They have made you manager of a sort of Wahrheits-Fabrik I suppose from the large lettered inscription over your door ‘Psychological Laboratory for the Preparation of War-Truth.’ I must confess that your whole conception of war-truth is a little disturbing to an old-fashioned fogey like myself.”

“Well,” Paston spoke a little warmly, “we are all put upon war bread, why not war truth? If you reflect, you will realise that the analogy is just and even necessary. As Emerson so beautifully expresses it ‘The laws above are sisters of the laws below.’ It is, indeed, the philosophic harmony that gives validity to all our spiritual war-processes. This you would better understand if I explain the fuller military service of which I am only a divisional commander.”

“Well, go ahead,” I replied, “it’s all new to me, and I want to understand.”

(continued on page 4 in column 2)
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The Development of World Dominion

There is higher authority than ours for the observation that though one rose from the dead, yet would they not believe. Yet, to take only the period of history covered by the three hundred years since Cromwell, the evidence for the existence of a conscious organised, Evil Purpose in the world appears so overwhelming that it would seem axiomatic that mankind could have no prior interest than became Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles was Chairman of the Board of the Rockefeller Foundation, that Christian A. Herter was married to the granddaughter of Charles Pratt, one of the founders with John D. Rockefeller of Standard Oil, and that Allen W. Dulles has been a Director of the Council on Foreign Relations—a Rockefeller front organisation—since 1928. There is no question that all three men knew who Castro was and what he was doing. It should never be forgotten that it was President Eisenhower's suspension of all arms deliveries to the Batista government in March of 1958 which spelled doom to any further opposition to the Castro takeover. John Foster Dulles, one of the prime movers of the world-government conspiracy, was our Secretary of State. Our present foreign policy guide, incidentally, who has permitted the Communists to consolidate their Gibraltar in the Caribbean, is none other than Dean Rusk, President of the Rockefeller Foundation from 1952 to 1960.

The major culprit in making sure that the American people didn't know what was going on, however, was the New York Times, whose present Chairman of the Board, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, has been a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation since April, 1939. It was Herbert L. Matthews, a member of the editorial board of the Times, who wrote numerous articles in Castro's favour, thus influencing an important segment of American public opinion in the wrong direction. For example, as late as July 16, 1959, after Castro had been in power for six months and had been denounced as a Communist by his own Air Force Chief, Major Pedro Luis Díaz Lanz, who had defected and testified before the Congress of the United States, Matthews wrote in the Times:

This is not a Communist revolution in any sense of the word and there are no Communists in positions of control . . .
If Mr. Matthews couldn't believe Castro when he himself admitted that he had been a Communist all along, then why should we go on believing Mr. Matthews or the New York Times? The whole raison d'être of a newspaper is to report facts to readers who want to know what's going on in the world. Thus, when a top journalist tells us that he has no way of distinguishing fact from fiction, then perhaps he ought not to be a journalist but ought to be an astrologist. But eight years have gone by since Castro took over Cuba and Mr. Matthews is still a member of the editorial board of the New York Times and still writing about Castro. His latest offering on the bearded criminal appeared in the Times of January 2, 1967. What did Mr. Matthews have to say? Here is a sampling:

The Cuban revolution begins its ninth year today as a strong, completely Communist, personalized and struggling state. [Good of you to admit it. Mr. Matthews.]

It is understandably hard—and often impossible—for North Americans to contemplate Cuba with equanimity or objectivity [especially since you, Mr. Matthews, have been their source of information]...

Yet it is important for United States citizens to try to understand Cuba in her own terms and to realize that the picture is neither all black nor all white. [It's just red.]

Nevertheless, the revolution exists [so does cancer] and as this anniversary proves, it is going on and on. It is better organized and stronger than ever...[which should make you very happy, Mr. Matthews.]

The history of the past eight years is as confusing as it is dramatic [confusing only to your readers, Mr. Matthews]. Fidel Castro and his associates came into power full of ideas and a grim determination to help the people by making a drastic social revolution. [Really, Herbert, how dumb do you think we are?] However, the little group that wielded power under the complete and personal domination of Castro were ignorant of economics, finance, politics and government administration. [They knew enough to be able to take power from all of the politicians, administrators, property owners and bank presidents—with your help, Herbert.] They found it easy to destroy the existing social, economic and political structure [using Lenin's blueprint, "State and Revolution"]; but when it came to creating a new one there was an appalling series of blunders [tsk, tsk].

Castro, who became a Communist and led his revolution into the Communist camp at some period in 1960, even today, is far more of a revolutionary than he is an orthodox Communist by any European or Chinese standard.

And so, as we see, Mr. Matthews is still at it, and he knows it. Mr. Sulzberger also knows it, but doesn't seem to mind. We know it and don't like it. We don't like to be "informed" by the New York Times that Castro became a Communist in 1960, when the slightest bit of research, such as opening a book, will show you that Castro was already engaged in Communist revolutionary activity as early as 1948. Nathaniel Weyl devoted an entire chapter of his book, Red Star Over Cuba, to Castro's early involvement. He wrote:
The Bogota uprising of 1948 was the arena in which Fidel Castro played his first serious role as an instigator and organizer of Communist insurrection. At the time, he was 21 years old and a student in the faculty of law of Havana University. He had been exposed to Communist indoctrination for the past two years, had accepted Marxian ideology eagerly and had probably submitted himself to Communist discipline. On this last point, there is some difference of opinion. Undoubtedly, Mr. Weyl had had Herbert Matthews in mind. Nevertheless, he goes on to inform us:

Security Chief Nino [of Colombia] lists the following as foreign Communists implicated in the preparations for the Bogota insurrection: Salavador Ocampo, Machado, Luis Femandez Juan, Eugene Kerbaul, Milorad Pestic B., Frances Mackinnon Damon, Blas Roca, Rafael del Pino and Fidel Alejandro Castro.

In terms of Red hierarchy, Castro was in distinguished company, for most of the nine alleged agents named by Nino were veteran Communists and either responsible Party leaders or seasoned Soviet agents.

Mr. Weyl goes on for several pages citing detail after detail of Castro's participation in this Communist insurrection. We are sure that Mr. Matthews is thoroughly familiar with all of the facts. Considering that he is an experienced journalist, an "expert" on Latin America, and attached to the editorial board of the world's most authoritative newspaper, Mr. Matthews could not afford not to know what was in Mr. Weyl's book, particularly since Mr. Weyl had devoted a considerable number of pages to exposing Mr. Matthews. Thus, one might ask: is the Times in the habit of paying "journalists" high salaries for misinforming its readers? The answer is yes. Also, one might ask, would the Rockefeller, with their billions at stake, pay anyone to misinform them? The answer is clearly no. But there is no doubt that they are quite interested in misinforming just about everybody else.

Invasion of Red China?

Tokyo, January 10—Taiwan-based Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek expresses an eagerness to invade the Chinese mainland with his 600,000-man army if the current turmoil sweeping Red China gives him an opportunity to do so according to newsmen here in Japan.

Washington, January 10—State Department Press Officer Robert J. McClosky tells newsmen that the United States is unaware of any plans by the Nationalist Chinese to invade the mainland. Furthermore American policy regarding Chiang and the mainland is still based on an exchange of notes in 1954 between Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and his Nationalist Chinese counterpart, says McClosky. In the exchange both governments agreed that "Use of force will be a matter of joint agreement subject to action of the enemy . . . the character of which clearly exercises the inherent right of selfdefense." The notes were signed on December 10, 1954, eight days after the United States and Nationalist China signed a mutual security pact.
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War: the Laboratory of Truth (continued from page 1) mental conception without which even the most bellicose of Deans or the most abject Master of a College would have spent his patriotic efforts to little purpose."

"And pray, what is that conception?" I asked perceiving that Paston was still labouring with undischarged information.

"Well," he went on, "it is the simple notion that truth is a raw material, infinitely malleable and adaptable to purposes of State. Once grasp that notion, and the full potentialities of our Psychological Laboratory will become quite clear. We begin by accepting the familiar distinction, true for me, false for you. This idea of the relativity and adaptability of knowledge is then generalised and applied in the processes of our laboratory, for producing out of the same raw material the separate truths which war requires for the home consumer, the ally, the neutral and the enemy. The crude fact is the same for all; everything depends upon the treatment.

"You would be surprised to learn how quickly it becomes a matter of laboratory routine. Here is the 'stuff' and there the recipient mind upon which a particular war impression is to be made. Given the analysis of the recipient, it becomes merely a question of preparing and applying the requisite Alloy." "Alloy!" I exclaimed, "Do you mean that you deliberately falsify the facts?" "Not at all," he replied a little warmly, "you do injustice to the delicacy of our art. It is our duty to compose the sort of news which is good for the respective parties to receive, and to mould the sentiments and opinions it is good for them to hold. And then, when our expert taster says that we have got it just right, it is pumped into the news-agencies and the other publicity machines."

(To be concluded)
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