

the research process. I—as that between the researcher and the research sponsor . . . the power deficiency of the subject . . . his position of relative disadvantage within the social system . . . also . . . his position within the particular organization in which the research is conducted. . . . (pp. 2-5).

The majority of subjects for experiments in sensory deprivation, aversive conditioning and environmental stress have been students and prisoners. (Kelman) Membership in either of these groups predisposes an individual to less than absolute free choice as regards subjecting oneself to experimentation. Both groups are all too aware that there is a relationship between "volunteering" and reinforcement contingencies. For prisoners, volunteering is often the only alternative for sheer physical survival. Administratively non-participation in the group entitles a man to a "free one way ride" to another prison because of the limited number of group psychotherapy "chairs". Among inmates Vaccaville enjoys a reputation of being one of the better correctional retreats. (P. H. Ernst & W. C. Keating, "Psychiatric Treatment of the California Felon", paper read at Western regional meeting of the APS, San Francisco, Calif. Sept. 28-29, 1963)

In a recent telephone interview, Dr. L. J. Pope, Warden of the Vaccaville facility, was also unwilling to discuss the new program in any detail. Pope did insist that prisoner participation would be voluntary, yet his word betrayed the administrative pressure that will probably influence inmate volunteers: "If they don't want to take the drug they don't have to", he said, regarding chemotherapy treatment. "If they want to stay coo-coo and stay locked up all their lives that's alright with me". (Ernst & Keating)

There is an historical precedent in psychology for the utilization of institutionalized persons as human guinea pigs. American psychologists somehow prefer to think that this kind of professional practice might have been the custom for their colleagues in Nazi Germany but that it is not a real issue in American psychology. Unfortunately, this is far from true. John B. Watson's earliest experimental work in conditioning human emotions involved, as subjects, infants and very young children who had been institutionalized through parental failures of various kinds. (They were living in orphanages consequent to birth out of wedlock or economic hardship.) The classic study of "Little Albert" who learned to be terrified of any white furry object is in itself a symbol of the heritage of Psychology and Behaviorism. It is a precedent for the perpetration of psychological violence on an individual already victimized by social injustice.

In contrast to the direction taken by Watson, John Dewey said, in 1937:

We need to recover from the impression that the essential problem is solved when chemical, immunological, physiological and emotional knowledge is sufficiently obtained. We cannot employ and understand this knowledge until it is placed integrally in the context of what human beings do to one another in the vast variety of our contacts and associations.

There is questionable validity to the continued pursuit of those studies which, in their process have probable deleterious effects on the subjects; nor those studies which very clearly have direct application to the subjugation of person through political systems enforcements. How many years and research evidence does it take to convince us, as scientists, that there are ways through which the application of scientific principles and methods can injure human beings? How many evidences do we need to know that the effects of these procedures are damaging and can readily be used to pervert human welfare? How many times must we stand indicted before our fellow human beings for "doing our job" in a very similar

fashion to the manner of Eichman "doing" his? Who is ultimately responsible for the horror and devastation of so many lives in Northern Ireland today? Is it the soldier or constable, who is employing these procedures is "doing his job"? Or is it us, the Psychologists who in inventing and legitimating these methods and promoting these findings are "only doing our job"!

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. NICHOLS (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. ALEXANDER (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN, for Wednesday, February 16 through Friday, February 18, on account of official business.

Mr. McEWEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. MURPHY of New York, for Friday, February 18, 1972, to February 28, 1972, on account of official business.

Mr. PRICE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. COLLINS of Texas, for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Young of Florida) and to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous matter:)

Mr. CRANE, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McCULLOCH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Mazzoli) and to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FUQUA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 20 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ABERNETHY, and to include an editorial.

Mr. MAHON, and to include tables and extraneous material.

Mr. MADDEN, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. JONES of Alabama to revise and extend his remarks on conference report on Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Mr. QUIE to include extraneous matter with his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Young of Florida) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. CONABLE in two instances.

Mr. STEELE in two instances.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. LANDGREBE in five instances.  
Mr. BELL.  
Mr. DERWINKER in three instances.  
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. CLEVELAND.  
Mr. CORDERBERG.  
Mr. ZWACH.  
Mr. SNYDER in two instances.  
Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.  
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.  
Mr. WHITEHURST in two instances.  
Mr. SMITH of California.  
Mr. ROBINSON of New York.  
Mr. SMITH of New York.  
Mr. BROOMFIELD in three instances.  
Mr. CONTE.  
Mr. KEITH.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.  
Mr. COUGHLIN.  
Mr. GOLDWATER in three instances.  
Mr. McCLORY.  
Mr. DICKINSON.  
Mr. HOSMER in three instances.  
Mr. FORSYTHE.  
Mr. WYDLER.  
Mr. BROTZMAN.  
Mr. McCLOSKEY.  
Mr. McKEVITT.  
Mr. SANDMAN.  
Mr. WHEALEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Mazzoli) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.  
Mr. CRANE in three instances.  
Mr. COLLINS in three instances.  
Mr. PRICE in two instances.  
Mr. FORD in two instances.  
Mr. STEELE in two instances.  
Mr. FORD in two instances.  
Mr. CRANE in two instances.  
Mr. EILEBERG.  
Mr. PICKLE in five instances.  
Mr. YATRON in two instances.  
Mr. GAYDOS in eight instances.  
Mr. DINGELL in two instances.  
Mr. MOLLOHAN in two instances.  
Mr. HARRINGTON in four instances.  
Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in six instances.  
Mr. CELLER in two instances.  
Mr. ANNUNZIO in three instances.  
Mr. VANIK.  
Mr. BROCKS.  
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mrs. CHISHOLM in three instances.  
Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.  
Mr. COTZER in three instances.  
Mr. BRIGGS in five instances.  
Mr. HUNGATE.  
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in five instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.  
Mr. RONDO in three instances.  
Mr. DANIEL of Virginia.  
Mr. JACOBS.  
Mr. MAZZOLI.  
Mr. WALDEE in six instances.  
Mr. HICKS of Washington.  
Mr. O'HARA.  
Mr. HERRERT.  
Mr. BRANCO.  
Mr. DOWN in two instances.  
Mr. STOKES in three instances.  
Mr. ROUSH in two instances.  
Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

move without fuel. Hence the valuable support of Angolan oils for our armed forces."

**Additional Information:**

A. In 1970 production was 84,700 bbdpd. (Gulf Annual Report, 1970)

B. As of late 1970, royalties are based on 12.5 percent of the posted price of a barrel of oil, less certain taxes, not 10¢ a barrel.

C. Gulf stated that in 1969 it paid \$11 million, not \$20 million, to the Angolan Government.

D. The defense budget of Angola for 1970 was cited by Gulf as \$24 million, or about double the Gulf 1969 payment. (Reply of Gulf Oil Corporation to the Ohio Conference of the United Church of Christ)

E. In 1970 Gulf claimed to employ 186 people 65 percent of whom are "nationals", with a total payroll of \$700,000, which at best would average \$3,763 per worker. Of the Angolan population of 5 million even the handful employed by Gulf receives only a minute fraction of the total wealth Gulf generates from its Cabinda find.

F. Gulf also claims to inject money into the Angolan economy through the purchase of goods and services worth \$20 million a year. The Gulf contract stipulates the purchase of "Portuguese" goods but much is spent on heavy industrial American equipment which cannot be bought from Portuguese sources.

Taken from July-August 1970 Africa Today available from the American Committee on Africa, 164 Madison Ave., N.Y.C. 10016.

**AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON AFRICA,**

New York, N.Y., October 21, 1971.

Representative RONALD V. DELLUMS,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DELLUMS: I enclose herewith for your information a copy of a letter sent to the Export-Import Bank in regard to its recent loan of \$15,100,000 to T.A.P.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD LEONARD,  
Executive Assistant.

**AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON AFRICA,**

New York, N.Y., October 21, 1971.

Mr. MURRAY KEARNS,  
Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KEARNS: Thank you for your letter of 29 September, 1971.

We protest strongly the recent Export-Import Bank loan of \$15,100,000 granted to Transportes Aereos Portugueses, S.A.R.L. (TAP), Lisbon, Portugal, for the purchase of two Boeing 747 commercial aircraft, spare engines, spare parts and related equipment and services. We see this as a serious breach of the United States embargo, in operation since 1961, on the sale and shipment of arms to Portugal for use in Africa.

We would draw the following factors to your attention in support of our request that this loan be immediately withdrawn and that the Boeing Corporation and all other United States companies involved in this transaction be prohibited in terms of the embargo from providing such aircraft to the Portuguese Government or its agencies.

I. United States policy in relation to this embargo has been outlined as follows: "since the imposition of our arms embargo in 1961, we have required assurances from the Portuguese Government that any material supplied to Portugal from public or private U.S. sources will be restricted to the NATO area, which does not include the African territories. To the best of our knowledge, these assurances have always been kept." (letter to Senator C. Case from Colgate S. Prentice, Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, November 13, 1970.)

\* African World Annual, 1967-68, p. 29.

II. In January, 1971 press reports revealed that the United States had approved the sale of two Boeing 707 aircraft to the director of civil aviation, Portugal. The administration replied to a series of questions put to Secretary of State Rogers by Senator Case on this implications of this sale as follows:

1. The only restriction normally placed on the sale of civil aircraft to foreign countries is that they must obtain our approval before they re-export the airplanes to third countries. This policy is followed with respect to Portugal. The United States has not asked Portugal for any other assurances nor sought to place restrictions on the use of these aircraft.

2. The sale about which you inquired was deemed not to come within the terms of the 1961 embargo on the export of arms for use by any of the parties to the disputes in Portuguese Africa.

3. In your third question you asked whether U.S. aircraft previously sold to the Portuguese commercial airline have ever been used for military purposes in Africa. In response to this, we presume that U.S. aircraft sold to the airline have been used in normal transport operations to carry all types of passengers and cargo, both civilian and military.

III. In fact the Portuguese Airforce has now openly admitted that the two Boeing 707 aircraft will be primarily used to ferry troops to Portugal's three war fronts in Africa. The use of these aircraft as troop transporters was announced by a Portuguese Air Force Commander, Colonel Costa Mota, in Angola, and was confirmed by a civil aviation spokesman in June, 1971.

In the light of these admissions, past United States contentions that there is no need to place restrictions on the sale of civil aircraft to Portugal might be regarded as simply naive. Continuation of such a policy in the face of avowed Portuguese military use of the so-called civilian aircraft can only be seen as a deliberate cessation of the arms embargo.

Portuguese military authorities now refer with increasing frequency to the critical role played by the air force in the wars in Africa. Airports are being rapidly extended, and General Kauliza Arriaga said recently that his most urgent concern, after assuming the command of the military operations in Mozambique, had been to give the army mobility by making it an "airborne force." Previously he said it used to take a month to transport troops or send reinforcements . . . but since 1970 the armed forces in Portugal have contracted the use of the civil air facilities in the Territory.

It appears clear that the Portuguese authorities have in the past made use of "civil aircraft" for military purposes. It is incumbent on the United States to end such deliberate Portuguese flouting of the arms embargo; this can only be done by ceasing to make available to the Portuguese any aircraft at all, since such equipment is most likely to be used for military purposes. We therefore request the Export-Import Bank to withdraw its loan to the T.A.P.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD LEONARD,  
Executive Assistant.

**AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENTIST BEHOLD THE WIRES IN NORTHERN IRELAND DETENTION CAMPS**

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, for all of us the strife in Ulster looms as a tragic mark in the history of England and

Ireland. Yet, there have been few Americans who have reported back to us with firsthand knowledge and information about recent events in the north.

Dr. Rona Fields, of Altadena, Calif., recently returned to this country from Northern Ireland. She speaks with unique authority about the situation since she was probably the first American social scientist to have visited inside the barbed wire of the Unionist internment camps. A psychologist on the staffs of both Valley State College in Northridge and California State College at Los Angeles, Dr. Fields has conducted a research study of the effects of the extremely unstable social situation on Catholic and Protestant children in Ulster.

She has sent to me copies of some of the articles she has written about her research and travels in Northern Ireland. Anyone who reads this material will acquire a new sense of urgency about the Irish situation. Dr. Fields eloquently describes the permanent damage inflicted on all sectors of the population, and especially the Catholic community living under the shadow of the Special Powers Act. She also puts the struggle into its proper context as a fight for human rights and dignity, not as a sectarian squabble.

About the present political situation in Ireland, Dr. Fields comments:

The immediate political objectives of the Civil Rights movement are: (a) direct rule from Westminster (to assure responsibility for the actions of the troops by the UK government as a whole); (b) ending the Special Powers Act; (c) some intervention by UN direction or supervision of the troops. The political realities are such that on February 16, the thirty leaders of the opposition parties (all the non-Unionist parties) are to appear in court in Belfast to answer charges of holding an illegal march and rally. The penalty for these "crimes" can be six months in jail. . . . I would suggest that US action might be taken at several levels: (a) economic sanctions . . . weapons in the arsenal employed in Northern Ireland shipped from this country. There is no reason to continue to allow such shipments under these conditions. (b) State department actions to the UN. Legislative pressure on the executive branch to request UN intervention in Northern Ireland. (c) Legislative support for ending world law.

Materials include articles from the Los Angeles Times, the New York Times, and the Irish Times; an article by Dr. Fields, "The Men Behind the Wires", recently submitted by the British Society for Social Responsibility in Science to the Committee on Interrogation Procedures; and an article by Dr. Fields and J. L. P. Thompson on the responsibility of psychologists for the use made of their methods in interrogation procedures:

**WAR WARPS LIVES OF NORTHERN IRELAND CHILDREN**  
(By Nards Trout)

The children walk to school down lanes lined with barbed wire, barricades and sentry posts that are manned by soldiers.

They go to sleep at night to the sound of bombs exploding and snipers' bullets zipping through the walls of nearby buildings.

Living in this atmosphere, the children of Northern Ireland are growing up in constant fear and they are losing all sense of human worth—including their own, accord-

ing to a San Fernando Valley State College professor who recently returned from the strife-torn country.

"If the war continues, the children of Northern Ireland will be unable to live any kind of normal, peaceful, productive existence," said Dr. Rona M. Fields, a sociologist and psychologist who has completed a study of children in the troubled British province.

#### HORROR AND ANXIETY

"All the experiences we equate with horror and anxiety to a child—like the bombing—the children of Northern Ireland are becoming desensitized to and are losing their capacity to balance between right and wrong, good and bad," said Dr. Fields, an Altadena resident.

"They are losing their ability to see the human factor in the course of events; they feel things just happen and there is nothing to do to prevent them from happening.

"Their perspective is that life and death are things over which they have no control, that the military and police control their lives," she explained.

Her study is part of years of research on "the relationship of a climate of extreme social prejudice to the development of moral judgment." It was financed by the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, a division of the American Psychological Assn.

Dr. Fields, who teaches in the education department at Valley State and in the psychology department at Cal State Los Angeles, found "the children walk the streets with no sense of security at all, and fear is a factor in their daily lives—the fear of being killed."

The professor's research in Northern Ireland included one-hour interviews with 48 children—an equal number of Catholics and Protestants—ages 6 to 14.

"Stories of children 6 to 8 years old were replete with death and destruction," she said, pointing out that these are the conditions of human life which they are daily exposed.

In addition, Dr. Fields said, Catholic children fear their fathers or brothers might be arrested and interned under the Special Powers Act, which provides that no charges need be brought against men suspected of being members of the outlawed Irish Republican Army.

"You can walk through some Catholic districts for hours and never see a man over 17, unless he is old or invalid," said Dr. Fields. "They are all on the run or already interned."

About 1,000 Catholics reportedly have been interned at one time or another.

She described the typical day of Northern Ireland youngsters:

"A Catholic child wakes at 7 a.m. and can discover that his father is on the run or the man next door has been arrested. But he doesn't talk about it.

#### HOLLER EPIPHETS

"He walks to school, realizing that at any time he can be stopped by British troopers. A Catholic girl walks past troopers who hoot and holler epithets.

"The children must get home before dark because after dark dangerous things happen.

"Once home they help their mother with the younger children—nearly all the families have 4 to 10 children—and do homework. At night they hear sniper fire and bombs exploding in the streets. Some are afraid to sleep in their own rooms.

"The Protestant child, while he doesn't have to worry about his father or brother being arrested, must worry about the gunfire that emits from snipers and patrols on his way to school.

"Often their mothers as well as their fathers work and they have to help with the chores and take care of younger brothers and sisters."

The professor said Protestant children informed her they are threatened at night to go to sleep . . . "or the Pope will get you."

"I have often thought of this as a war of children against children," Dr. Fields said, "with an 18-year-old soldier screaming epithets at a 14-year-old girl, or a 19-year-old soldier beating up a 15-year-old boy."

Other reports indicate the children hurl epithets of their own and soldiers are the frequent target of rocks and bottles tossed by children as young as 6.

#### WAY OF LIFE

Nearly all the boys she interviewed in Belfast expressed a desire to become "fighters" on one side or the other when they grow up, indicating they see no end to the conflict, which to them is a way of life.

She told of one incident in which two boys, ages 6 and 7, were playing with some chicken bones they found in the street in the Protestant Shankhill district, "just as any boys anywhere will play." But then an armed patrol came down the street and immediately the game turned to playing soldier.

The professor also conducted interviews with children in Dublin, in the neighboring Republic of Ireland, and was able to ask children in both countries: "What if there were no rules?"

"The children in the north said if there were no rules, everyone would kill each other, while the children in the south said people would steal things, cars would run into ditches, banks wouldn't work. There was no mention of killing," she noted.

"The children in the north see killing and maiming as the only actions and reactions open to humans."

Only one of the 48 North Ireland children questioned, a 13-year-old girl named Regina, saw an alternative to killing and war through negotiations.

Asked about the conflict, Regina said "It's terrible, it shouldn't be happening and what the people need to do is talk to one another."

But the extreme prejudice and lack of trust work to prevent any communication between Catholics and Protestants, Dr. Fields said.

In order to have cooperation of both Catholic and Protestant sources, in her study Dr. Fields carried a letter of introduction from the American Friends Service Committee, a neutral Quaker organization.

"I went with the blessings of the American Friends Service Committee, the Los Angeles Catholic Human Relations Council and the Anti-Defamation League."

#### PSYCHOLOGIST SAYS DETAINEES IN ULSTER UNDERGO TORTURE

LOS ANGELES, Jan. 7.—A social psychologist returned this week from an investigation of Northern Ireland with what she contends is evidence that psychological torture as well as physical abuse is being used in interrogation of Catholic prisoners held in internment camps.

Dr. Rona Field said in an interview today that submission to high-frequency sound waves and sensory deprivation—research methods that have been outlawed for use on human subjects by the American Psychological Association—were being used to undermine the dignity and destroy the effectiveness of the Catholic minority of Northern Ireland.

Although there are no clearcut indications of the effects such treatments have on humans, both methods are considered potentially dangerous. Sensory deprivation— isolation at a constant lighting condition with prisoners tied so they cannot make a sound—is thought to have been used as a brainwashing technique on prisoners of war in Korea.

"The debilitating effect of these processes will be long-range and will be a drain on any government that might evolve there," said Dr. Field, who is to present a scientific analysis of her findings at a meeting of the professional organization next month.

#### PREMATURE SENILITY

She cited the case of one 40-year-old released prisoner whose mental and physical condition suggested senility—a condition inconsistent with his health at the time of his internment.

"The big, burly man walks like he's 85, whimpers in the dark, is afraid of heights, and has an attention span so short he cannot carry on a conversation," she said.

The 18-day investigation in Northern Ireland and Dublin, where comparative studies were made to study the effects of the violence of children, included more than 100 interviews with released prisoners, their families, families of men now being held prisoner, ministers and teachers.

Dr. Field is believed to be the first psychologist admitted to the detention facility at Long Kesh, where more than 400 of the 600 detainees are being held under the Aug. 9 Special Powers Act. There she interviewed a sociologist, "interned with 89 other prisoners in a 50-by-50 meter cage," who, she said, supported her conclusions with findings of his own.

#### THE MEN BEHIND THE WIRE

(By Rona M. Fields)

On December 31, 1971, a California college professor visited with a colleague in Northern Ireland. Both professors have been employed as sociologists in schools of Education. Both professors are in their thirties; have been heavily involved in a twenty year struggle for human dignity and basic civil rights for minority group members, both received part of their education at Catholic institutions and part at non-sectarian State schools. Their meeting and conversation took place behind the wires of Long Kesh concentration camp in Northern Ireland. The California Professor had traveled to Ireland to study the relationship between a climate of extreme social prejudice and the development of moral judgment in children. The Irish professor had arrived at Long Kesh four months earlier because his work had been to alter the conditions of social prejudice which impair the development of moral judgment in children.

I am the California professor. I am, so far as I know, the first American social scientist to have visited behind the barbed wire enclosures of the internment camps set up by the Stormont government to enforce the Special Powers Act. My colleague was removed from his home and family on August 9, 1971 and is presently being held without charges and without sentence. His name is Des O'Hagan. He is a professor at Stannishill College in Belfast. He is also a member of the "rights committee of the Northern Ireland Students' Association. He is not "typical" of the men behind the wires, although he will testify to the invocation and enforcement of force in Northern Ireland and "defeat by dictatorial fiat".

A vast majority of the more than 1800 Catholic boys (some as young as 12) who have been detained and physically and psychologically brutalized in the months since August 9, 1971, have had little political involvement. The only commonality amongst them has been their having been Catholic by birth. According to the politics of Northern Ireland, however, and more specifically, the politics of the ruling Unionist party, the religious affiliation of birth is sufficient to determine whether votes will or will not be cast for the Unionist party. In maintaining the Unionist hegemony it has been essential to do two things: (a) place your opposition into a condition in which they cannot—by their acts or speeches—define themselves for their prospective constituency; (b) then define the opposition as "traitors" or "violent men", as threats to the safety and well-being of every "good citizen".

As the Civil Rights Movement in Northern Ireland grew through increasing partic-

ipation by Protestant working class, Catholics of all classes; as students, teachers, civil servants and the unemployed all began to recognize their community of interest; as a genuine multi-party system began to emerge in Northern Ireland The Unionist Party and the Stormont regime found it increasingly necessary to employ tactics "a" and "b".

Finally, by resorting to the instrumentality of the British military units placed by the UK Home Secretary conveniently under the command of the Unionist party, two further tactics could be brought into play. With the aid of the military it became possible to further isolate from any contact with each other, persons belonging to the two "identifiable" populations—Catholics and Protestants. This was accomplished through erection of barricades, and, more significantly, through differential treatment.

Second, it became feasible to enforce those aspects of a military rule which are most demoralizing to civilian populations: random searches, raids, internment without trial, confiscation of goods, destruction of personal property.

The combination of these tactics is sufficient to eliminate (for most people) any alternatives but those of violent retribution or total abject apathy. In terms of relative psychological strength (an index of mental health) the former alternative is more positive.

Conditions of internment are themselves an example of the use of all of those tactics with the additional one (guaranteed to produce maximum tension) of combining overcrowding, intense physical discomfort and maximal psychological uncertainty. Every person in these camps has been subjected to extreme physical and psychological torture prior to arrival. None have any assurance of release nor of subjection to further torture. They suffer physical pain, an aftermath of hallucinations, disorientation and extreme anxiety symptoms.

There are a variety of political orientations, allegiances and levels of commitment among those interned. Some of them are experiencing their third period of internment within eleven years.

When interned together, unrelieved by any diversion or change of company or activity their political differences become exacerbated into internecine disputes. This further fulfills the intents and purposes of those who ordered and designed the conditions of internment. The governors of these institutions and the wardens have no power in the Ministry of Home Affairs. Cognizant of the overcrowded and damaging conditions of the camps, the Governor of Long Kesh has been pressuring inmates to appeal to the Advisory Board for release. Thus far, twenty-one of the twenty-five men who have thus appealed have been released. The conditions of release demand that an oath be taken to take no part in any non-Unionist political party. This in itself bears witness to the one party plans of the Northern Ireland government.

Des O'Hagan is an exception among the prisoners in Long Kesh. He is one of the very few against whom formal charges were introduced. Professor O'Hagan's house was searched when he was arrested and he was charged with owning "subversive documents". These "documents" consisted of an assortment of social and political history and theory volumes and Sinn Féin membership applications. Considering his work as a sociologist, when he was finally brought before the magistrates, they declared that to them "it is apparent that Des O'Hagan is not a violent man" and they fined him 25 pounds (the equivalent of \$35) and dismissed the case. Whereupon the guards removed Professor O'Hagan directly back to Long Kesh! The next day, using the mass media, Brian Faulkner, Prime Minister for Northern Ireland declared that all of those who were im-

prisoned were "violent men" and thus, despite the finding by the magistrates that O'Hagan was "nonviolent", he was defined by the government as "violent". Obviously, further contradiction is made impossible when the "violent nature" in question has been placed incommunicado behind the wires!

The process of visiting an internee has become a familiar experience for the women and children of Northern Ireland. Each detainee is allowed one half hour visit per week. This is allotted to the "next of kin". Since the majority of families of detainees are without private automobiles and the camp, located on a swamp, is some miles distant from Belfast (about forty minutes drive) there are enormous complications involved in visiting.

In order to keep the visiting appointment almost an entire day is spent in arranging for transportation, child care and finally, the interminable process of being "checked in" and "waiting your turn." Finally there is the search procedure. One never knows how thorough the search will be. There are stories of body searches in which every part is thoroughly examined, and there are the more ordinary procedures during which (in deference to the Hansenist and Protestant Fundamentalist attitudes toward nudity) handbags are thoroughly searched and matrons pat the female and child visitors over their clothing.

The half hour permitted for "family togetherness" transpires in an airless, cell-like cubicle, the door to which has a large window. The wardens assigned to that cubicle peer frequently through the window. Since demonstrations of affection are not common public spectacles in Ireland, one may be quite certain that, with the exception of hugs for the children, there is no physical exchange. The usual experience, as recounted by many of the wives, consists of trying to recall and rapidly relate all of the information about all of the members of family and friends since the last visit. Usually this exchange includes news of further searches of the home, neighbors who have been lifted, the nightly sprayings of black paint by the British army patrols, occasional CS gasings, the four a.m. noise patrols which have "kept the baby and the old people from having a peaceful night's sleep" and an assortment of news about rent and rate strike warnings and notices.

Descriptions of the conditions of prisoners and the nature of internment are also subject to definition by the government. The Compton Committee of inquiry which was set up to investigate allegations of mistreatment of prisoners reported on November 16, 1971, that, while there were cases of "ill treatment" there was no "brutality or torture". The independent British and International societies which requested access to the internees for purposes of investigating these allegations (Amnesty International and the British Society for Social Responsibility in Science both applied for this permission) were denied official access. Nonetheless the findings of these investigators conducted under "unofficial" auspices substantiate the findings of this author and the allegations made by the Association for Legal Justice. These findings are that psychological torture (ranging from the very crude to the very sophisticated) and physical torture have been applied to persons as young as twelve and has resulted in severe consequences. These effects also indicate that there is a high probability of permanent damage for those so treated.

There is little continuity between the conduct of the British regiments who were originally sent in to "keep the peace" and the behaviors of the military as to December, 1971. This discontinuity can be laid to the fact that prior to the invocation of the Special Powers Act, special Scots regiments

based in Northern Ireland. These particular regiments have traditions and loyalties from their historic deployment in Scotland as "subdue Irish rebels". The combination of this tradition and the training of the officers in anti-insurgents' campaigns in Indonesia, Palestine, Aden and Cyprus provides a task-orientation consistent with the tactics of the Stormont regime. The troops are kept closely quartered and are allowed out only on patrol. They have very limited contact with their homes and families and are very restricted as to contact with civilians. They exemplify British military discipline. The Scots Guards, for instance, have notably maintained their posture and presence despite heckling harassment by tourists while on sentry duty at Buckingham Palace and elsewhere. This discipline is maintained through allowing certain mechanisms for "tension release".

Initially the routines of physical brutality were conducted with the utmost attention to the legalisms (i.e. the military conducted "interrogations" at the direction and under the supervision of the RUC Special Branch), by December of 1971, such "niceties" were no longer required. There were aborted incidents of persons being "lifted", taken to RUC stations, dismissed by the RUC and carried away by their military captors to residential barracks for "a couple of hours of beating about". British military doctors are, significantly, the only persons knowledgeable about the extent of injuries and deaths directly attributable to mistreatment. Like all other British military personnel, they are subject to the "official Secrets Act" according to which, they cannot publicly reveal anything concerning their military duties. When civilian physicians have been asked to treat the victims they have been compelled to sign release forms disclaiming the extent of injury and necessary follow-up treatment. In some instances, even without such release forms, civilian physicians who do not want to be bothered by the military have modified accounts of effects or overlooked significant symptoms. This keeps the "records straight". One is reminded sharply of those officials and medical personnel of Auschwitz and Dachau who maintained meticulous records to account for that which by any humane standards was incredible and inhuman. The power of definition owned by the writing on an "official" document serves the Stormont government very well.

Visitors from the International Red Cross have been quoted as stating that the conditions of the internment camps do not add up to prisoner of war standards. Yet these "prisoners" of an undeclared war are, theoretically citizens (or subjects) of the United Kingdom and therefore supposedly eligible for all the privileges and considerations of such nationality. Nowhere else in the United Kingdom could such treatment and practices prevail. It is therefore worthwhile to investigate why this can happen in Northern Ireland.

Irish people who have either worked in England or gone to school there frequently recount instances of having been referred to as "Irish" or "Irish barges". To them there would appear little difference between the names given and applied to many persons in the United Kingdom as to whether they were of Irish, Scottish, Welsh or English origins. The conquering hordes—Angles, Saxons, Vikings and Normans—were generous in scattering their names and seeds throughout the British Isles and with little favoritism. But ethnic identity is a major issue in these Isles. The British passport still relies for identification on somewhat archaic anthropological indices such as "blood tests". Irish identity is itself a contradiction of romantic idealism and self-deprecation. To the English who minutely exploited and reclassified the economy of all or part of Ireland, that island and

its people represent the drain and strain of the Kingdom—"the mad race", "the dreamers", "the bufoons".

There is an awful tendency in the United States and in England as well as the rest of the world, to view the present turmoil in Northern Ireland through nostalgic analogies with, or in the context of, the historic Irish Republican movement. This compendium of proclivities to distortion have combined into some very obvious media contortions, as well.

BBC's Twenty Four Hour News crews have fought for the right to present their features intact as they produce them. Despite their commitment to this position, there has been an uneven record on the part of the company in presenting these productions. For instance, the programs covering the IRA have been presented. The programs covering the Civil Resistance campaign and the Civil Rights movement have not been presented. This selective process keeps alive the image of "mad dog vengeance fighting" and obscures the real context of the violence. The BBC has had a better overall record than other network media but even at that, they have managed to contribute to the distortions. They have re-emphasized the violent alternative without presenting the context of mass support for the less dramatic but more consensual civil disobedience alternative.

There has been the neglect of mention of the former "B Specials", or as they are referred to, the "Ulster Volunteers" and "vigilantes". There's reason for this omission. This group has supposedly ceased to exist and public mention of their existence brings threats of death to the publicist. These are not idle threats. "Accidents" have been known to happen to newscasters covering the Northern Ireland scene.

Commonly known but never mentioned is the fact that bombings are carried out by this "non-existent" group. Any superficial detective work could distinguish, at the site of a bombing, which group was responsible. The IRA (Provos) use very sophisticated timing devices. The UVF do not. This omission consigns the actions of the CRA and the IRA to some degree of irrationality. It also prevents recognition of the continued presence of the very real threat which precipitated the influx of British troops.

Media distortions in the U.S. have contributed to the confusion. During the "build up" of the anti-internment campaign of the CRA during the last three weeks of December, 1971, there was only one U.S. correspondent in continual presence in Belfast. (I was, in fact, only a special correspondent on unpaid assignment by a local FM station!)

Wire services supplying U.S. newspapers and radio, received their information from ITM. (The British commercial medium which is reputed to have less thorough coverage of Northern Ireland than does BBC) The *New York Times* was obtaining its news directly from the *Irish Times* (a Dublin based newspaper which maintains constant coverage in Northern Ireland), and the *Chicago Tribune* received a weekly column from the editor of the *Sunday News* (a Belfast paper).

This terrible power of definition established and maintained by the Stormont regime has served to bury the issues and confuse the public at home and abroad. It has, in fact, served their purposes so well as to have maintained the image of this as a "holy war" of sectarian interests, rather than as it is—a struggle for civil rights and human dignity.

**EVIDENCE SUBMITTED BY THE BRITISH SOCIETY FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN SCIENCE TO THE COMMITTEE ON INTERROGATION PROCEDURES**

The Compton Report stated that detainees in Ulster had been subject to a particular procedure—well-standing (standing spread-eagle against a wall), hooding, masking noise, bread and water diet and sleep deprivation.

It considered each of these to be physical ill-treatment, a term it never defined. The Report did not explain why they should be so considered, nor what their purpose was. We believe that a consideration of the effects of the procedure will show that the value-judgment implied in the Report's attempt to distinguish between ill-treatment and brutality is not viable.

The history of certain aspects of this procedure is widely known. The technique resembles those used by the KGB in Russia for interrogation purposes. The prisoner there was arrested and taken to the detention prison, where he underwent an introductory routine which included removal of all clothes and possessions, this all occurring with no explanation. He was then placed in solitary confinement in a featureless room for an indefinite period, totally isolated from human contact except during interrogation. He had to sit or stand in a fixed position all day, was allowed to attempt to sleep only at certain times and always in a fixed position facing light. Any deviation from this regimen was punished. Throughout he was fed on an inadequate diet.

Obviously there are certain common elements between this and the Ulster procedure. However, the hooding and the noise were not part of the Russian procedure. They appear to have been developed from a line of research initiated in the early 1950s—sensory deprivation. This research began partially in an attempt to understand brainwashing, but was also being used by the Canadian psychologist, Hebb, in the development of a theory that there exists an optimum level of arousal for cognition, a theory stimulated by Moruzzi and Magoun's work on the reticular formation. The first sensory deprivation experiments were conducted in Hebb's laboratory in Montreal. They involved student volunteers who lay on a comfortable bed wearing translucent goggles that admitted only diffuse light and cuffs which reduced tactile stimuli. They were in a partially sound-proofed cubicle, and a masking noise drowned any noises which had not been completely blocked by the sound-proofing. Despite being paid twenty dollars a day few were willing to remain more than two or three days even though they slept for a considerable portion of the time. They became very bored, desperate for any kind of stimulation, could not concentrate and hallucinated. What was generally anticipated to be a handsomely-paid rest turned out to be extremely unpleasant.

Since the original study, a very large number have been performed in the USA principally sponsored by Defense Department agencies, ostensibly because of the increasing number of restricted and monotonous environments in which military personnel now operate such as in space vehicles, submarines and polar stations. In contrast we know of very few published English studies, which suggests that psychologists in England have in general found insufficient theoretical interests in the procedure to warrant the ethical difficulties involved.

The studios have used various methods of producing sensory isolation. In the most extreme studies subjects were suspended in a tepid bath of water wearing nothing but a breathing mask which also covered eyes and ears. In this environment only 10% of subjects were able to last more than 10 hours (Shurley 1963). Such an experimental situation is expensive to construct and so more typically a totally darkened room is used either sound-proofed or with a white-noise source masking extraneous sounds. Clearly such an environment is very similar to the "noise" and "hood" of the Ulster procedure.

Schultz in a review written in 1963 listed fifteen studies concerned with the affective changes produced by sensory deprivation. For

example in a study by Smith and Lewis (1959) 20 subjects volunteered to undergo the normal treatment for as long as they could stand it. The average endurance-time for man was 29 hours compared with the maximum of 43 hours reported by Compton. The authors reported that all subjects experienced anxiety and frequent panic attacks either early in the session or more commonly as they came up. Those who terminated voluntarily gave unbearable anxiety, tension and panic attacks as their reason for doing so. Nightmares involving suffocation, drowning and killing people were reported by five.

There are various ways of increasing the stress consequences of the situation. One is to restrict the subjects' movements. This can be so powerful that even with a non-noxious, but not totally deprived, sensory environment psychotic-like effects can occur. Thus Leidermann and his team (1959) noted such symptoms with confinement to an iron lung or with restriction of body movement due to complex traction. The symptoms only responded when the sensory and social environment were improved. In the Ulster situation, the spread-eagle position at the wall serves this function, as well as being a physical torture. Subjects in sensory deprivation experiments normally reduce its effects on them by sleeping extensively; this is prevented in Ulster.

Of great relevance in the Ulster situation is that psychological variables interact with the physiological ones in intensifying sensory deprivation effects. Ignorance of termination time, for instance, was sufficient to produce confusional states and fears of insanity in only a two-hour deprivation period in one experiment. Solitary confinement can produce many similar effects to that of sensory deprivation. Moreover endurance in the typical situation seems strongly related to personality dimensions such as neuroticism, narcotics being less able to stand the situations. Clearly for the detainees the psychological pressures must have been enormous. Sudden arrest in the middle of the night, being physically beaten and dreading what the future might hold can be expected to interact traumatically with the sensory deprivation situation. This could be expected also to increase greatly the pliability of the detainees under interrogation, as sensory deprivation increases the suggestibility and lowers intellectual competence. (These latter phenomena may be related to its progressive slowing of EEG frequencies in the alpha range (Zubek, 1966)). However, greater pliability and suggestibility do not produce more accurate information.

The Ulster method have much in common with methods used by the K.G.B. (see Hinkle and Wolf, 1956). The period of confinement is much shorter but the isolation techniques are more powerful, solitary confinement being superseded by the "hood." The scars left by Communist methods on the personalities of their prisoners have become well known in the West (e.g. Sargent, 1957), although the best documented are the consequences of Chinese methods (Lifton, 1961). Typically one obtains symptoms of anxiety neurosis similar to those that can be generated by any traumatic event.

As an indication of this possibility Dr. O'Malley of the Mater Hospital, who has interviewed three of the detainees at the request of their solicitors considers that probably one and possibly another will suffer long-lasting anxiety neurosis symptoms. He points out that this is only a preliminary diagnosis based on the one and a half hour interview allowed him by the authorities with each of the three.

The British Society for Social Responsibility in Science had hoped to send an independent team of psychiatrists and other scientists to examine the extent of ascertainable psychological damage among these

internees and detainees who suffered the full vigor of the "disorientation" techniques. However the Home Secretary has not seen fit to recommend to the Northern Ireland Government that it should grant us interview facilities. We regard this as regrettable, particularly in view of Lord Baimiel's statement in Parliament (Hansard, 30 November 1971) that it will be for the Parker Committee to decide from whom it wishes to take medical evidence. We have still not received a reply from the Northern Ireland Government to our request, and so must present our evidence without the benefit of a report from our investigating team.

In the light of the information currently available, both as to the techniques of interrogation used in Northern Ireland and their observed and likely effects, we hold that such techniques—wall-standing, hooding, masking noise, bread and water diet, sleep deprivation—should be prohibited. If adopted as official practice, they would incorporate a further misuse of science and technology, as well as a crudely behavioural view of the individual as an object to be manipulated mechanistically by the State.

## REFERENCES

- Hinkle, L. E. & Wolf, H. G., Communist interrogation and indoctrination of "enemies of the state." *Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry* 1956, 76, 118-174.
- Heron, W., The pathology of boredom. *Scientific American*, 1957, 196, 52-56.
- Leidermann, P. H., Mendelson, J. H., Wexler, D. & Solomon P. Sensory deprivation: clinical aspects. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1968, 101, 389-396.
- Lifton, R. J., *Thought Reform and the Psychology of Totalitarianism*, New York, Norton, 1961.
- Sargant, W., *Battle for the Mind*, New York, Doubleday, 1957.
- Schultz, D. P., *Sensory Restriction*, New York, Academic Press, 1965.
- Shurley, J. T., *Military Medicine* 1966.
- Smith S. & Lewty, W., Perceptual isolation using a silent room, *Lancet*, 1959, Pt. 2, 342-345.
- Zubek, *Sensory Deprivation*, New York, Appleton-Century-Croft, 1969.

## PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH: THE PERVERSION OF HUMAN WELFARE

(By Rona M. Fields and J. L. P. Thompson)

The recent attempts to revise the APA ethical code to provide guidelines in the conduct of psychological research is itself an acknowledgment of the potential for demotion of human welfare which is inherent in its practices. The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has additionally incorporated standards for granting funding to research proposals which utilize human subjects in order to prevent those practice which might subvert subject well being.

During the past four years, the subject of legitimacy in both the manner of psychological research and the uses and control of the findings of such research has been argued by Wright (1968), Kelman (1969, 1971), Scriven (1971), Clark (1971) and Albee (1971).

Unlike other inventors, the psychologist has no "patent rights" to either the products of their investigation nor the methodology used in its pursuit. In fact, there would appear to be little that the research psychologist can do even as regards the use of these efforts in support or attack of a thesis totally foreign to the convictions and intents of its preceding initiator. For instance, the differential data compiled on IQ scores by race was used to substantiate the thesis that there is an inherent difference in intellectual potential corollary with race. This was done despite the fact that some of the original data had been gathered for purposes of developing standardization norms more truly represent-

ative of a diverse population. (Jensen, 1971) Even more obvious have been those instances where the military use of psychological research findings and methodologies has resulted in the application of sophisticated techniques for torture, interrogation, brainwashing and terrorization of civilian populations. (Pilsuk, 1969 and 1971)

In some cases, psychologists have been in a position analogous with those physicists and other scientists who played a part in developing nuclear power and then saw it unleashed for military purposes. Some of these scientists felt then, for the first time, a sense of social responsibility. They joined together and formed groups such as SANE to call on their colleagues and fellow citizens to ban the further use of this destructive potential.

Nobel, whose invention of explosives brought him wealth and fame realized his social responsibility, then, toward peace and instituted the peace prizes. More recently chemists and physicians have recognized the applications of their discoveries for the destruction of civilian populations and have initiated public outcry. However, given the barbarity of many of the weapons currently in use and still being developed for use in southeast Asia this outcry has not seemed very effective.

There is precedent in international law for recognition of the human responsibilities for treatment of sick and wounded within the context of political matters.

Within this social framework of heightened awareness, psychologists are attempting to formulate the machinery and politics that could guide us in the production and use of our professional resources. We are recognizing that, as scientists and as professionals we can and have been used by various political interests without our direct consent. Just as insidiously, members of our profession can and have been employed to servo political interests which are inimicable to our ethic of "... to promote human welfare."

It is in this sense that we examine the use of psychology in torture at home and abroad. In all such instances, institutional psychology is employed as an instrument for maintaining particular political systems and attaining particular political objectives without the consent of the subjects.

In Northern Ireland at the present moment, the British military under the direction of the Royal Ulster Constabulary (and in some instances without their direction) is using sensory deprivation, sensory overstimulation, fatigue, environmental stress, white sound and aversive shock as interrogatory procedures against the male population, ages ranging from twelve through sixty-five.

In one barracks, they having succeeded in emulating a psychological laboratory to the extent that there is a completely soundproofed room, complete with all white perforated walls which serves as a "controlled environment." According to statements by those who have been subjected to "treatment" therein, the techniques employed are: silence, wall staring, sleeplessness, dehydration, noise tapes that operate whenever a detainee relaxes on a camp bed, hooding to restrict breathing, forced stress positioning and restrictive tying into stressful and damaging positions... (excerpts from interviews with released detainees, Fields, 1972)

The techniques employed by the British military/RUC "interrogators" are intended to deliberately produce mental disturbance and deterioration in order to persuade the victim or weaken his ego-defenses sufficiently to induce compliance with giving information. From my personal examination of one hundred cases of such applications, the intent to produce mental disturbance has been achieved. As for permanence, the effects remained clinically notable after a period of up to six months and could possibly be permanent.

It is asserted that these techniques were developed by the British military through experiences gained from the Nazis and Japanese (psychologists of both nations are still engaged extensively in research on these topics—if the Psychological Abstracts are any criterion). They then refined these techniques through use in Palestine (against the Jews); in Cyprus (against Woka); in the Hulu camp in Kenya (against the Mau Mau).

There is of course, no physical brutality that is without a component of psychological torture. These experiments which incorporate the physiological contingencies in concert with specific attacks on the cognitive processes would appear to produce the most long term and permanent damage. In this way, the "hooding" of detainees which serves at once the function of deleting sensory experience and limiting the supply of oxygen and blood sugar to the brain through restricting breathing produces mental damage. In addition to sensory deprivation and sensory deprivation, this reduction of oxygen produces effects similar to those of drugs which affect consciousness. Like drug effects, these are behavioral consequences often extending beyond the period of immediate reaction.

Regarding the use of these procedures, and especially the sensory deprivation process, we were quoted by the *New York Times* (Jan. 9, 1972) as stating that the sound aversive treatment and sensory deprivation were considered debilitating and potentially dangerous. In reaction to these statements, several colleagues whose "life work" involves such experimentation wrote angry letters to us. One such letter (Suedfeld) pointed out that:

The American Psychological Association does not have the authority to outlaw research techniques. The 1971 indices of *Psychological Abstracts*, published by the APA, list over 30 publications under the heading "Deprivation/Sensory" in which human subjects were used... extensive research on sensory deprivation has shown that while it can indeed have deleterious effects, these are temporary except when deprivation occurs during early life or for extremely long periods; and, in fact, there are beneficial effects as well. For example, the technique is being used as a tool in psychotherapy. (Suedfeld, Jan. 10, 1972.)

These comments serve to emphasize the questionable legitimacy and probable direct responsibility psychology has, for the consequences of pursuing the "pure science" research.

Following Suedfeld's direction, we researched *Psychological Abstracts* and discovered the following items:

Hocking, P. (9 Queens Rd. Melbourne Australia) *Extreme environmental stress and the significance for psychopathology* *American Journal of Psychotherapy* 1970, 34(1), 4-26—Describes some of the immediate and long term effects of a number of situations involving severe to extreme stress, semi-starvation, sensory deprivation... in people subjected to extreme forms of psychological stress suggests that permanent psychological disability may result and... personality characteristics may do no more than determine how long an individual can withstand prolonged extreme stress. (78 ref.) (*Physiological Psych.* Vol. 44, 1967)

Koishun, Osamu, Kikechi, Rajji & Murai, Noriko (Nigata U. Japan) *Studies on Sensory Deprivation VI Part 2. Effect of Sensory Deprivation upon memory processes...* Investigated the effect of sensory deprivation on recall in long- and short-term memory. In long-term memory the effect was inhibitory rather than facilitative. This result suggests the need of differentiating the respondent recall from the spontaneous recollection. In short-term memory a deteriorative effect of sensory deprivation was seen not on the rote learning function, but in the

organizing function of memory. (*Experimental Psych.* Vol. 43, 13073)

Vodanovic, Marjana (*Inst. du Psychologie, Zagreb, Yugoslavia*) *Effect of Fatigue on conformity of free associations.* A list of 94 commonly used words . . . was applied immediately after Ss had completed 7½ hrs. mental work . . . it appears legitimate to conclude that, on the average, fatigue . . . lead to a statistically significant increase in the conformity of answers. (*Experimental Psych.* Vol. 43, 13646)

These references provide a couple of additional interesting bits of data. Psychological experiments dealing with the effects of deliberate impairment indicate that such treatment may be aidant in psychotherapy only in that it makes the subject more suggestible and thus more controllable for institutional and political purposes. Along with many other abstracts, those cited above indicate that there are indeed serious long term effects of such treatment, and, in most instances, the study of effects considers only the immediate ones. There are no follow-ups longitudinally. Much of the debilitation could well be extended and increased with the passage of time.

In addition to these psycho-physiological, but nonchemical procedures, a high proportion of the detainees in Northern Ireland, claim to have been force-fed a pill and/or liquid following which they experienced hallucinations, dizziness, nausea and further dehydration. This procedure too, is not unknown in the annals of Psychological experimentation in the United States. In some experiments conducted on prisoners here in California the drugs anectine and succinylcholine have been used. (These will be cited more extensively.) Psychologists have long engaged in research relating to drug effects, stress and suggestibility.

The gamut of interrogatory techniques employed by the British Military/RUC in Northern Ireland is a compendia of "aversive conditioning" practices which have been researched and advocated primarily by psychologists as "psycho-technology". The use of these techniques has been directed toward "learning adjustive behavior". They are often predicated on complicated professional jargonese but the techniques themselves have only such substance as that which was initially stated by Thorndike as the "law of effect". That is, behaviors are learned or discarded in accordance with the degree to which their effects are rewarded. Pavlov attempted to explain the process of conditioning through the physiology of the central nervous system but there are no conclusive evidences that such conditioning produces a one-to-one relationship in development of "neural pathways". (Pribam, 1971)

"Adjustive behavior" has a direct relationship to the norms requisite for maintaining any socio-political system. Szasz has repeatedly documented the utility of institutional psychiatry for enforcing the systems norms. (1964, 1970). But institutional psychiatry has had a very effective partner during the past several decades—both at home and abroad. This partner, psychological research, and most especially aversive conditioning have been analogous with the "Inquisitor's Henchman"—the "confessions Extractor". (Szasz, 1970). While the British would appear to be relying on the application of psychological procedures by lay persons, military and constabulary personnel, in the State of California, psychologists and medical people have become more directly involved in the application of these techniques. Those who, in Ireland, are suspected of being "violent men" are "processed" in barracks and internment camps as well as in the jails. In the State of California there are "adjustment centers" which have been established by the State for "violent men". In both situations, "violent man" is a definition

placed on them by the authorities as a description of their behavioral deviance. So long as they are locked up there is no way that they can counter that definition nor provide one of their own for their persecutors. In these adjustment centers, prisoners become the subjects for psychological and medical experimentation; recipients of aversive conditioning as part of the "treatment" program; and are, in Ireland subjected to the experienced previously described.

There is something of a legalistic difference in the prisoners of California and the prisoners of Northern Ireland. The former have been charged with some offence, and have, at least theoretically been accorded due process, found guilty and sentenced. In Northern Ireland, the prisoners, including the children have not been accorded anything resembling due process, and have seldom been charged. The latter have been "lifted for questioning". Of course, in the State of California, a parolee may also be summarily "lifted for questioning" often under the guise of being taken for "psychological examination".

Another procedural difference between the two is that the stated goal of the British interrogators is to "obtain information" and the techniques are predicated on wearing away resistance to revealing such information. The goal in California is to "change" the prisoners behaviors so as to make them more susceptible to "institutional control and regulation."

The existence of the machinery for aversive conditioning has, in both instances, a larger social effect. This coercive effect is most readily seen in the situation in Northern Ireland. In order to avoid this "treatment process" being inflicted on oneself, an individual is placed in the position of making choices between two polar alternatives: (1) abrogating personal convictions to bring behaviors in line with the extant norms (which will maintain the socio-political status quo); (2) Commitment to violent actions with total disregard for their own or other human life. The latter has as its rationale, "whether or not my behavior is morally correct, I shall be unbearably chastised, therefore, there is no valid recourse to moral judgment. There is no value to human life."

This second alternative is probable despite management of contingencies. This is evidenced through the many studies which demonstrate the inconsistent long term effects of aversive conditioning. (Church, 1963; Zachman, 1955). Further, it is apparent through studies of child-rearing practices, that physical punishment results in greater aggression. (Bandura and Walters, 1959)

Bandura lists four major objections to the effectiveness of severe physical punishment as a means of correcting behavior: (1) Severe punishment gives rise to anxiety which may reinforce patterns of behavior that are even more undesirable than the experimental behavior; (2) aversive conditioning may cause the patient to avoid the therapist and thus lose the potential for more positive treatment; (3) use of physical punishment provides an aggressive model for imitation which counters the effectiveness of the aversive stimuli; (4) the aversive conditioning tends to increase the frequency and amplitude of aggressive behavior. (Bandura, 1959, p. 300)

Bandura's objections are cited in prologue to a report entitled "Assessment of an Aversive Treatment Program with Extreme Acting out Patients in a psychiatric facility for Criminal Offenders". (Mattocks and Jew, 1971). After citing the research evidences for the unreliability of aversive treatment, the authors proceeded to outline their own proposal and program of aversive treatment through the use of drugs. Like other such experiments and treatment programs, there is no attempt to morally justify this admittedly dangerous and inconsistently ef-

fective program. They make the point that a "critical attitude" is required towards the use of punishment as a means of altering behavior. In this case they have clearly decided that their procedure is justified; insofar as they have thought about the problem at all, they seem to be satisfied with two patently inadequate rationalizations: 1) The violence or torture they apply is redefined as "treatment" instead of "punishment". (It is violent torture: Succinylcholine, when injected intramuscularly, results in complete muscular paralysis including temporary respiratory arrest. Onset of effects are rapid and the reaction can be controlled by the amount injected". (Mattocks and Jew, p. 3). 2) The "patients" are seen as undeserving of consideration as human beings because previous treatments failed. The authors are concerned about aversive therapy involving violence toward children; but feel that a detailed defense is required to lift succinylcholine into "violent" prisoners.

Yet on the critical evidence they themselves refer to it is a reasonable to demand that the violent behavior of the individuals is itself a response to excessive aversive punishment in the past. Instead of testing this hypothesis they apply it as evidence in the expectation that it will simply lead to "cure". This has occurred in other cases where the use of violence in the past has led, of course, to the re-occurrence of the same violent involvement in the future.

Recommendations of expert committees are everywhere. As quoted in Victoria, British Columbia: "Interventions will continue to be carried out in the hamlet once every two days. . . . The subject will work something like a dental clinic: the peasant will be present at his next interrogation appointment as he did at his first session (1/24/66). The project will be advised by General Landale. . . . plans to issue identity cards and set up family registers (1/23/66). In addition there will be an attempt to organize every group of four to eight houses into an "inter-family group". One family head in each neighborhood grouping will be appointed as group head. (1/23/66) . . . will also organize a system of interlocking organizations . . . to try to make every member of the hamlet a member of some kind of government sponsored organization with some discipline and control over him . . . "It's a little bit totalitarian", a source remarked, "but the idea is to tie each person to some kind of controlled organization". (William Ross in *West Report*, 1966, pp. 27-32)

Most insidious perhaps, is the fact that such "expert knowledge" is most often solicited and paid for by the controlling agencies. Psychologists write handbooks for the police to control the behavior of the arrested in "extracting a confession from him" (Zimbardo, 1969). Psychologists engage in research funded by military agencies to devise means for more effectively bringing civilian populations "under control" (Pitluk, 1970). Psychologists design experiments to render inactive deviant prisoners (Mattocks & Jew, 1971). Psychologists legitimize the de-basement of human beings by providing organizational forums (such as this convention) for the presentation of such research findings.

This situation is summed up by Kelman in a soon to be published book, *Freedom and Control in the Life Sciences*:

The ethical problems surrounding social research, with their direct implications for human freedom, can be conceptualized in terms of the power relationship between the subjects of social research, on the one hand, and the social scientist as well as the sponsor and user of social research on the other hand. Ethical problems arise because of the fact that—and to the extent that—the individuals, groups, and communities that provide the data for social research are deficient in power relative to the other participants in