***Chapter 4***

**Background in Recent History: Preparatory Stages.**

***The Raven himself is hoarse that croaks the fatal entrance of***

***Duncan under my battlements.***

***Introduction*:**

The previous three chapters left many questions hanging in mid-air. Mainly they were not questions of fact, which had already been painstakingly documented in public hearings. They were mainly ‘why’ questions about these events, and official enquiries into them, in New Zealand, Britain or elsewhere. I believe that answers to many of these questions are suggested by the history of world events over the last century, dominated by two world wars and the Cold War. This chapter provides some of that context.

A vast body of information is available. My survey reaches back a hundred years, as relevant to my larger objective, and to provide a context for later chapters. The material I select is not presented in chronological sequence, but develops several topics, I hope in logical rather than temporal order. The chapter has three objectives:

* I start by classifying the questions raised in earlier chapters, and state explicitly my hypothesis, upon which the historical evidence throws light.
* I describe precedents before World War II for methods to be developed in the war and the ensuing Cold War.
* I then describe what followed, the methods developed by military and intelligence agencies during that war and developed further during early stages of the Cold War.

There is a vast body of evidence on historical background to survey. To cover it all in one chapter would make it too long. Therefore, subsequent deployment of the methods in the period just before and during events covered in chapter 1-3 is separated, as Chapter 5.

***Summary of questions***

***Lake Alice Child & Adolescent Unit***

Why did torture occur at LACAU? What was the intent?

How, to all appearance, could Selwyn Leeks have remained outside legal sanctions?

Why did a concerted multi-agency cover-up continue for so many years?

Why has there been so little scrutiny of politicians and public servants of that day?

Was there a pay-out to Selwyn Leeks to enable him to relocate?

If so, from whom?

***Royal Commission on Abuse in Care***

Why, late in the day, were the Terms of Reference for the Royal Commission changed, preventing more exacting examination of the ultimate locus or responsibility?

Why have international influences been excluded from consideration?

Why has there been no investigation of the role of the Bi-national College of Psychiatry, only of its local branch?

***William Walters Sargant***

How did he get away with practicing the way he did, with all its shortcomings?

Who was protecting him?

Who was funding him?

What was the real objective of those who funded him?

Why did no-one ever ask in effective manner for further details of funding?

***Deep Sleep Therapy at Cherry Farm Hospital***

What was the real objective of the version of DST conducted at Cherry Farm?

Why was the program of treatment never reported via orthodox medical channels?

Given signs of advance planning for what apparently had no therapeutic objective, who - or which agency - was behind this ‘research’ program?

Who - if anyone – coordinated the cover-up?. . .and Why?

***Basil James***

What did Professor James know about DST?

What part did he play in its planning?

Did he ever meet William Sargant? What was the extent of their interaction?

Who - or which agency - guided his study of sexual reorientation in 1960?

Why, against the trend, did he actually publish this method?

Why, while he was alive, did he conceal his military service in Cyprus?

What was his knowledge of - or participation in - torture in Cyprus?

At that time did he have links with MI5, MI6, or the CIA?

Why did he emigrate to New Zealand in 1963?

Did he have links to the military before service in Cyprus (Officers Training Corps at secondary school; similar links at Cardiff University)?

How did he come to be appointed in Otago university, and a few years later, come to head the Department of Psychological Medicine at the Otago Medical School, when, at the time, he had no specialist qualification in either psychiatry, or psychological medicine?

Why did he quit as Director of Mental Health in December 1989?

Why did he then relocate, when DST was receiving press coverage?

Was he too being protected?

If so, by whom?

Who, at high levels in New Zealand administration or RANZCP knew his secrets?

***George Martinus***

To whom, if to anyone, did Martinus report about DST?

Why did he leave the country soon after DST ended at Cherry Farm?

Did he go voluntarily, or was he pushed? Was he escaping something?

Did he receive payment, to encourage him to relocate, and to start this company?

***Mellsop-Radford Inquiry and Report***

How, and by whom, were the Terms of Reference decided?

Why did the ToR not ask for the Chain of Responsibility for DST to be examined?

Why was Basil James never interviewed or named in relation to the inquiry?

What was Graham Mellsop hiding?: What does he know that he will not or cannot share?

For those in the know, how wide did the network spread?

***General***

Why, in several scenarios, was there such blatant disregard of medical ethics?

Why, in several scenarios, was there such little regard to the rule of law?

Why, in several scenarios has there been such secrecy and cover-up (or, after an initial period of openness, reversion to secrecy and cover-up)?

At first sight, links between the detail surveyed in previous chapters, and the history reviewed here may seem tenuous, perhaps stretched too far to make any firm conclusions. I ask readers to reserve judgement on this.

***My Guiding Hypothesis***

The hypothesis that has guided and motivated my investigations is relevant to questions listed above and its unravelling may provide answers to most of them. It is that *the worst atrocities carried out in New Zealand in the 1970s, as documented in Royal Commission hearings****, was instigated, coordinated, and presumably financed by military intelligence agencies from outside New Zealand***.

Where did this hypothesis originate?

In the early 1990s, at an academic conference in Hawaii, I met a Canadian psychiatrist from Montreal. We got on well, and he invited me to visit him next time I traveled. So, in 1993, on a period of study leave, I spent a couple of months at his location, the Allan Memorial Institute, on the slopes of Mont Royal in Montreal. While there, I learned of the history of that institute, especially how, in the 1950s, it had been the location for horrific psychiatric abuse, under the leadership of, Dr Donald Ewen Cameron, financed in part by the CIA. For a while, details had been a carefully guarded secret. The abuse included a version of Deep Sleep Therapy which was far more intensive and brutal than anything which went on at Cherry Farm; yet the similarities were clear. The eventual exposé and legal ramifications of these practices came after Cameron’s death. At the time I visited the institute, the authorities there probably wanted to put on a show of how open and ‘transparent’ the institute now was. In any event, I, as a non-medical researcher with a neuroscience doctorate, had access to their record room – thousands of clinical files, in shelves lining the walls. Occasionally, in older files, I came across Cameron’s handwritten notes, once or twice recommending, I vaguely remember – er – ‘sleep’. There was no detail: The detailed clinical records had disappeared. Then, in 2012, when I was on committees of RANZCP, I came to know that an acquaintance had actually been subjected to DST at Cherry Farm. I started to investigate, and came to realise that Deep Sleep Therapy at Cherry Farm was a softer version of what went on at the Allan Memorial Institute. My first version of this hypothesis was the result.

At this stage, I phrase my hypothesis without naming any intelligence agency, since, at first, I had no clear views on this. My first guess was that British agencies were implicated, including MI5, MI6 (both civilian), as well as intelligence branches divisions of British armed forces. As investigation progressed, I learned about the 3-day visit of Mr Richard Helms, Director of CIA, and his entourage to New Zealand, on 8-11 July,1972, a few months before the serious abuse started at Lake Alice and Cherry Farm. My focus became sharper when I directed my attention to Mr Helms’ visit, which I cover it in detail in chapter 7. After this discovery, my focus shifted mainly to the CIA and the USA. However, it is well known that intelligence agencies in USA, UK, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have been in collaboration for many decades as the ‘Five Eyes’ network. For the moment I step a long way back from such detail.

***PRECEDENTS BEFORE WORLD WAR II TO METHODS USED DURING THE WAR AND COLD WAR.***

***Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry.***

In humans, thought and action are separate, more so - I suggest - than in other mammalian species. The degree of separation differs greatly from one person to another. Overall, it means that we can conceal our intentions - we hold secrets in our minds - again to an extent which varies widely between persons. It has been known since ancient times that to hold secrets of high personal or public significance but never divulged, may not be good for ‘health’ (in a general sense) and may lead to physical symptoms. Going back thousands of years, most human cultures have recognized the need for confession of some sort, and, since this may be a difficult process, there have been many associated rituals to enable this. Already, hundreds of years ago in Europe, the notion of a ‘pathogenic secret’ at the root of health problems was recognized, along with healing which came when a person confesses their hidden secrets[[1]](#footnote-1). Strategies emerged for use in the confessional, in pastoral care, or in therapy, which could aid the process of uncovering a person’s troubling but closely guarded secrets. It was thereby possible to restore that person to full health or sanctity (the two originally being closely related concepts). By the late nineteenth century, hypnotism was a widely favoured method.

Uncovering secrets applies to other areas of life. In police work, it goes without saying that criminals conceal their activities. When a criminal is apprehended, part of an officer’s skill during interrogation is to uncover information that the person is reluctant to divulge. Given that ‘there is honour among thieves’, and possible retribution for informers, such persons may be intensely resistant to sharing what they know. Likewise, in military or intelligence work captured prisoners may have in their mind information, which, if divulged, might greatly assist their captors. Military or intelligence training includes strategies of resistance during interrogation. Their adversaries then need special methods to extract from captives the secret information they hold.

Persons conducting interrogation or in-depth interviews in all these situations may have any of three motives in mind, which are not sharply separate. How an interrogator proceeds and the methods he uses depends on which of the three is of highest priority, and what sort of task he tries to achieve. The three are:

(i) To obtain the hidden information, as accurately as possible. In police or military work, speed may be necessary.

(ii) In the police or military scenarios, there may be a hope of convincing the person interviewed at least temporarily, to become a ‘turncoat’, to act against his own confreres as an informer, or in a military situation as a saboteur against his own side. The interrogator thus hopes to exert *control* over that person’s future actions, to further his own agenda.

(iii) Going beyond this second objective, an interrogator may try to dominate the mental processes of the person under interrogation so completely that the entire personhood or ‘sense of self’ of the latter is reshaped. In a priest’s work it may amount to religious conversion. For psychotherapists it may mean reversing deeply inculcated attitudes at the core of personal identity. In police work it may amount to ‘straightening out’ a young person, otherwise destined for a life of crime. In the military or intelligence context, it may mean complete reversal of a captive’s allegiance, so that he or she becomes a competent double agent, apparently working with former compatriots, but quietly betraying them. Methods to control or reshape individuals can also be used on a mass scale, by skilled political operators, to control entire populations.

Sigmund Freud started practice at a time when neurology was not separated from psychiatry. Most practitioners in this area were ‘neuropsychiatrists’. The influence of Freud, as he matured, led not only to this composite discipline being split, but also, in many countries in the emerging discipline of psychiatry, to a split into two branches with different objectives. One was concerned with so-called ‘diseases’ or ‘disorders’ of the mind’. This is of little relevance here. The other - ‘dynamic psychiatry’ – has older roots which took definite form in the practice of pioneers such as Pierre Janet and Freud. The split in the profession was initially between ‘talking therapy’ – based on a psychotherapist’s personal skill, and other more physical treatment methods, which evolved into typical medical and drug-related treatment. In the USA, prior to the second World War, neither of these splits took placed, as they did in Britain and Europe. Most practitioners were neuropsychiatrists, combining methods of dynamic psychiatry with various bio-medical treatments including medications. After the war, the split of neurology from psychiatry in America did eventually occur, except in a very few centres.

Freud thought that the problems he called ‘neurosis’ arose from repression of emotions, especially sexual feelings. More broadly, neurotic symptoms arose from seeming insoluble internal conflicts between emotions, such as between social propriety and instinctive drives, or from any type of insoluble internal conflicts. In their efforts to treat psychogenic effects of trauma the objective of the pioneers of ‘talking therapy’ was to find ways to uncover secrets driving a patient’s symptoms, to reshape these emotional drivers and to resolve the resulting internal conflicts. The analysis went to varying depths, as circumstances required.

A dynamic psychiatrist who tries to discover a problem’s roots might point to inconsistency in what a patient says, or between that and his behaviour. Initially probing might be in gentle fashion, but psychiatrists often know how to project personal power. To prize open pathogenic secrets, he or she might invite a patient to indulge in ‘free association’ or they might use other means to enhance a patient’s associative processes. From late nineteenth century, hypnotism was much in use for this, especially by Freud. This evolved over a long period from concepts such as ‘animal magnetism’ and mesmerism[[2]](#footnote-2). From this history, hypnotism had also long been seen as a way of exerting *control* over hypnotized subjects. Success in using these methods depends on the intuition, skill and experience of psychotherapist or interrogator, with little need for a systematic research basis in psychology, biology, or pharmacology.

Such methods based on intuitive psychology rather than research acquired notoriety in the public mind. The notion that an individual might be ‘processed’ in such a way that he or she becomes an automaton, mindlessly following another’s instructions, had literary appeal. In 1894, French novelist George du Maurier, published an antisemitic novel in which Svengali, the villain of the piece, uses charm and skill to seduce a young half-Irish girl, and by hypnotic control, turns her into a famous popular singer.

The Svengali image may have been the origin, in 1942, of attempts by German physician Dr Kurt Plötner, member of the Hitler’s SS, to conduct experiments with mescaline in Dachau concentration camp, ‘to eliminate the will of the person examined’ (according to testimony of a prisoner’s nurse there). It may also have been the origin in the 1950s of the CIA’s aim of gaining total control over its agents, so that they perpetrate acts of sabotage in robotic fashion, with no memory of what they had just done.

Was that ever plausible? Hypnotism involves surrendering control, but this is at least in part, *voluntary*, deliberate relinquishing of personal agency, to acquiesce to commands of another person[[3]](#footnote-3). Some specialists refer to the hypnotic state as a form of regression. Without at least some voluntary component, hypnotism is scarcely possible, whether it be used to draw out secret information or to exert control. Many people ‘willingly suspend their disbelief’[[4]](#footnote-4), losing their critical faculties; and many others know how to exploit this weakness. Understandably, when people are completely confused by the world they inhabit, they prefer to be told what is ‘true’, and to accept advice on ‘what to do’ from authority figures. In moderate form, the trust people invest in doctors, lawyers and priests is of this nature. In stronger form, it amounts to comprehensive reshaping of a person’s mind, whether during in-depth psychotherapy, religious conversion, or ‘turning’ a captive to become a double agent. In extreme form, using mass media, we see this in the rhetorical control by demagogues of an entire populace.

***Ideas of Pavlov and Freud Reach North America*:**

In early years of the twentieth century Pavlov’s notions of conditioning started to be noticed. Two US scientists[[5]](#footnote-5) spent years in Pavlov’s lab in the 1920s (one of whom translated much of his work into English). Through their influence Pavlov’s insights reached America by the 1930s,. Therapists realised that *words* could count as conditioning signals. Indeed Pavlov in his later years, and his successors, developed a Russian school of psychotherapy, for which this was a key principle. It seems different from Freud’s methods, but is quite compatible with them, both making use of our associative faculties.

Two further insights came from Pavlov. Conditioning experiments could be used to explore an animal’s ability to distinguish slightly different stimuli. When alternative stimuli were made harder and harder to distinguish, a point came when an animal’s behaviour suddenly became disturbed. Pavlov’s work thus provided a new perspective on neurosis: Such insoluble tasks were similar to the emotional conflicts identified by Freud. The disturbed behaviour was then seen as ‘animal neurosis’. Later work on similar topics by ethologists such as Nobel laureate Nikolas Tinbergen, gave this notion a firm foundation.

A second insight may have been given more emphasis in USA than it deserved. It grew from a singular event. Pavlov’s laboratory in Leningrad was located in a flood-prone area. His dogs were housed in the basement. In 1924 there were major floods, and the basement filled with water. Some dogs were drowned. Others survived, by continuous swimming near the ceiling of the basement, which was an extreme stress. Subsequently all conditioned responses acquired in previous experiments had been lost. A conclusion was drawn in America that times when people are most prone to mental change in psychotherapy, are times of great stress.

This view is akin to another of Freud’s concepts – abreaction. It comes from his early studies of hysteria, based on a ‘hydrodynamic’ model: If emotional expression is blocked, pent up forces build up until pressure is so great that defensive walls break open, and there is outpouring of intense emotion. Initially Freud saw such ‘catharsis’ as inherently therapeutic, but his views became more complex and nuanced in later writings. His ideas reached the USA, especially via Adolph Meyer, a physician who left Germany in the 1890s and became head of psychiatry at Johns Hopkins hospital, Baltimore.

As psychoanalysis spread, it was realised that it was both lengthy and expensive. In the 1930s psychotherapists sought ways to accelerate the process without sacrificing its effectiveness. In addition, simplistic versions of abreaction, rather than the more mature approaches used by Freud in later years were often adopted both by therapists and an expectant public. William Sargant, in his pre-war visit to USA, may have encountered this. He certainly used a simplistic version of abreaction to treat Dunkirk evacuees. The notion that strong expression of emotion during psychotherapy is itself of therapeutic value, is not now accepted. One critic[[6]](#footnote-6) writes of ‘*the highly questionable assumption that catharsis contributed to internalized, lasting change.’*

Many psychotherapists - then as now - tended to believe that human personality was extremely malleable. They seem to be guided by philosopher John Locke’s idea, that, at birth the mind is a ‘blank slate’ (*tabula rasa’)* with no rules to interpret sensory input. As impressions from the outside world are added, rules for processing arise solely from associations made within such experiences. To produce radical change in personality, all that is needed, so it was thought, is sufficiently potent psychotherapy. That of course is their professional calling. At the time there were two mavericks who did not fully accept this view – Pavlov himself, based on his study of dogs, and Carl Gustav Jung, Freud’s one-time colleague. Both recognised that personality was in part an intrinsic feature of each individual. Jung suggested a classification of intrinsic personality types, which, some years later, grew into the Meyers-Briggs personality inventory. Modern research suggests that most personality variables are indeed partly intrinsic, partly determined by environmental influences.

***Drug Interviews in Psychotherapy.***

Drug interviews in psychotherapy to assist communication started well before Sargant’s use of barbiturates. One drug - ‘scopolamine’ (aka: hyoscine) - was isolated from herbal sources in 1880. Early in the twentieth century it was used in obstetrics in Germany, and was found to make women talkative and unrestrained in what they said. Often they had no subsequent recall of what they had said. In the 1920s in USA, scopolamine was used in psychiatry to promote conversation[[7]](#footnote-7). Combined with morphine (*Dämmerschlaf* or ‘twilight sleep’) it was widely used in childbirth in the USA, even up to the 1960s. I have not heard of its later use in psychiatry. Use by police is mentioned later.

Starting in the 1920s in France[[8]](#footnote-8), partial anaesthesia - often with barbiturates - was used by psychiatrists as a ‘short cut’ to help patients reveal secrets in psychotherapy and explore traumatic precursors of symptoms, and thus to restore functions lost as psychological reactions to trauma[[9]](#footnote-9). By the 1930s, this use was adopted in USA, and by 1936 in Britain. The barbiturate amytal was used not only to help patients express their inner world, but also to induce a highly suggestible state of mind. At such times, it was thought, they were more amenable to a physician’s suggestions, part of ‘talking therapy’. So, amytal interviews became part of the ‘control’ agenda.

Barbiturates are non-specific depressants, very different from scopolamine. We need our highest faculties to limit what we choose to divulge, and to whom. Partial loss of such faculties weakens this before other faculties are lost. Scopolamine on the other hand has a specific effect on registering memories. Retrieval of newly-formed memories often depends on reactivating the context in which they were acquired, while, older, well-formed memories may be retrieved without referring to the original context. Scopolamine is thought to block the system by which memory is laid down linked to prevailing context. This explains why scopolamine, in suitable doses, may prevent recall of recent events, including conversations, and why it may also ‘unlock’ memories otherwise hidden, once freed from any context. If applied with care, it may be useful to aid to recall, but is not reliable.

***Drug Interviews by Police to Aid Disclosure of Information held by Detainees*:**

As far back as classical Rome, it was known that wine ‘loosened people’s tongues’. Early use of ‘drug interviews’ in forensic work, mainly in the USA is reviewed by Muehlenberger[[10]](#footnote-10). In the 1920s, Dr Robert House used scopolamine in forensic situations[[11]](#footnote-11). He popularised the method and introduced the term ‘truth serum’. Police use of this was probably more common than publicly known[[12]](#footnote-12). Over the next fifteen years several cases came to US courts, where validity of statements made under scopolamine was at issue.

At the Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory of North-western University Law School an experimental test of scopolamine was conducted on student and staff volunteers, published in 1931. In twenty-five subjects, questioning under scopolamine brought forth 75-85% factually-correct answers, including detail which subjects could not normally recall, but which, on investigation, was proved correct. Replication of the experiment was not always successful. Success appeared to depend on dose, and individual adjustment of dose. For forensic examination, Muehlenberger comments:

*After the proper stage of disorientation has been reached, one can bring in a whole group of investigators and even informers (‘stool pigeons’) who are personally known by the subject, and they can participate in the interrogation. The subject will recognize them at the time and will talk with them. If they are removed before the subject is too far out of the scopolamine influence, he will not know that they have been around.’*

In many jurisdictions, drug interviews are illegal. Nonetheless, drugs interviews, or interrogation under narcosis have been used extensively in military intelligence.

***Relation between Police, Mental Hospitals, and Military Intelligence*:**

In Britain, since the mid-19th century, attempts were made to build a community police force - the local ‘bobby’ on his beat - the essence of which was trust between police and each local community. Policing was administered separately from mental hospitals, which were also mainly separate from prisons; but there were areas of overlap, for instance at top-security hospitals for mentally disturbed serious offenders.

After the second world war, when colonial regimes often faced violent independence movements, British police might be seconded to serve in trouble spots. Police investigation, whose objective was to achieve successful prosecution, was separate from intelligence-gathering by civilian or military agencies with other agendas.

The structural separations meant that different methods were used in different services. Military and intelligence services could be more brutal in interrogation than police (at least in Britain). Nonetheless, despite the separation, individual professionals could move across boundaries, or inhabit a shadowy ‘in-between’ land. Kenneth Milner, mentioned in the last chapter, was a psychiatrist who came to hold key positions in both the prison service, and top-security hospitals***.*** Sir Percy Sillito, head of MI5 in post-war years, was ex-police. William Sargant was a psychiatrist but with known - if secret - links to British intelligence agencies.

In the USA such structural divisions were less certain, differing across states; The idea of a trusted community police force was far from reality. Interrogation by police could be more brutal and at times undisciplined. ‘Third degree’ brutality by police to extract confessions was an American, not a British style.

In New Zealand, prisons and asylums were administered jointly until 1948, an alliance which endured *de facto* long after that. As mentioned in Chapter 1, a clause in the Children & Young Persons Act 1974, meant that police needed no warrant to remove children from their home to a mental institution.

***Distortion of Pavlov’s Legacy*:**

Pavlov’s contributions to psychology and psychiatry were known in North America before reaching Britain, but were misunderstood, and his legacy distorted: In popular imagination his name is linked indelibly to conditioning methods, and automatic conditioned responses. This fed the stereotype, of the ever-unsmiling Russian, apparently a product of insidious, nation-wide conditioning[[13]](#footnote-13). This rested in turn on a view of the Soviet Union as atheistic, materialistic (in a derogatory sense), and therefore - as it were - devoid of natural human values and instincts. Mainly, I believe, this was a product of western propaganda.

A specific mistake was mentioned in Chapter 3: Pavlovian conditioning is not a complete account of psychology in animals, nor is it in humans. Pavlov knew that the processes he defined were but part of the repertoire of human faculties. Much learning is not Pavlovian. This was not realised for a long time in USA, nor in Britain, after translations of his works became available. Behaviour therapy was often based on simplistic versions of Pavlov.

The notion derived from Pavlov - that people are more prone to Pavlovian influences at times of great stress - was largely correct, but for reasons different from those derived from the Leningrad flood in 1924. To explain, I go far back in time. Two thousand three hundred years ago, Aristotle defined two ways in which we make inferences. *Deduction* is the process by which general statements - ‘premises’ – lead, of necessity, to conclusions – that is, ‘inference from the general to the particular’. *Induction - ‘*inferencefrom particular to the general’ - draws general conclusions from several instances of a ‘particular’ - a specific example. It can be called ‘inference by association’ and includes Pavlovian conditioning. Normally in both animals and humans, inductive and deductive inference work hand in hand as we navigate our environment. Inductive inference is intrinsically simpler and faster than deductive inference. It is built into - and repeated countless times - in the function of each of our innumerable brain cells. Deductive inference requires more stages. Prior to confirming a new deductive step, a reasoner must be alert for contradictions, by which a conclusion might be refuted. He therefore needs to scan vast troves of memories before he can be sure his inference is sound. Thus deduction is shown only in vast networks of nerve cells. It is not a property of individual cells.

The corollary is that deductive inference is more vulnerable to disruption than inductive inference. Associative inference goes on all the time, mainly unconsciously, even if we are half asleep. Deduction requires full attention, and fails if we are tired, stressed, overloaded with incoming signals, or sick. We then revert to basic ways of thinking. So, stress attenuates our deductive capacity, turning us bit-by-bit into Pavlovian automatons.

***Pavlov and Propaganda*:**

Pavlov was a subtle thinker, albeit a cantankerous individual. He was an uncompromising opponent of the Soviet regime, insisting on open, free talk amongst scientists; but he was so important that, unlike lesser scientists, he was never touched by criticism or purges; indeed he was supported. He lived through times of enormous upheaval in Russia. He knew that rhetoric for political persuasion, or to impose army discipline, or in psychotherapy, was based on principles of association similar to those he defined. He knew that the best defence against propagandists was to understand the process in one’s own mind as he did in his.

Beyond processes of association, the principle just mentioned - that most of us can be induced to abandon our higher faculties, if stressed sufficiently - can be used in powerful ways, in entire populations, using methods of mass communication. Pavlov’s ideas ***were*** used in such ways, for instance by his student, Sergei Chakhotin, who sided with White Russians during the civil war to become their propaganda chief. As Bolsheviks consolidated power, he left settled in Germany. As the Nazi party grew stronger, he supported social democrat resistance. Under his guidance, Pavlovian principles were used to give socialists enough seats to remain in power until 1933. In 1940 he wrote a book on the principles of such propaganda.

We are all vulnerable to influence by Pavlovian means of control, if we are under stress. In such circumstances, many of us ***are*** easily turned into Pavlovian automatons. This was never put more succinctly than by Joseph Goebels, Hitler’s Propaganda Minister. When testifying at the Military Tribunal at Nuremberg in 1946, he was asked how he got German people to accept Nazism. His reply was:

*‘It was very easy, it has nothing to do with Nazism, it has something to do with human nature. You can do it in a Nazi, socialist, communist regime, in a monarchy and even in a democracy. The only thing that needs to be done to enslave people is to scare them. If you manage to find a way to scare people, you can make them do what you want.’*

Likewise, psychologist, GM Gilbert interviewed Goebels in his cell, who said:

*‘Naturally, the common people don’t want war; neither in Russia nor in England, nor in America, nor for that matter in Germany. . it is always a simple matter to drag the people along . . .All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same way in any country.’*

Being Pavlovian, the method thrives on endless repetition. Goebels knew this and so in recent years does Donald J Trump.

Sadly, I think that propagandists’ population-wide conditioning is hard to evade or prevent. Before and after the world war, the immense propaganda blitz was invincible. There ***were*** scholars with enough time and insight to grasp what was going on, but the mass of the populace had neither of these advantages. To persuade them in large numbers was easy, and more important in shaping political events than the wisdom of a few scholars. The only effective defense in my view - dare I say it - is to rely on the intrinsic madness and unpredictability of humanity *en masse.* We really are a crazy species when we get together! Few could have predicted the insurrection outside the US Capitol building in Washington DC on 6 January 2020, nor somewhat similar events in New Zealand a year later. These events were in large part unpredicted expressions of incoherent, blind frustration – figuratively, we can call them ‘the rebellions of Pavlov’s dogs’.

***Roots of the ‘Cold War’*:**

Early in this chapter I stated my hypothesis that atrocities committed in the 1970s in New Zealand were instigated by military intelligence agencies offshore to New Zealand. Extending this, I suggest that what happened in New Zealand reflected in small way extreme practices of such agencies during the Cold War. Although my real focus is on events in New Zealand. I must briefly review the origins of the Cold War. There are compelling reasons to think that it started even before the second World War began.

Going back many decades, the main power in the USA was the corporate world of huge business enterprises, every bit as powerful as government. In 1917, the Russian revolution and rise of the USSR was unacceptable to corporate America and had to be opposed by every possible means. During the Great Depression, against all expectations, Roosevelt’s New Deal attempted to change the balance of power; but, given where real power lay, a potent backlash was to be expected. Rise of the Third Reich and Hitler soon made it clear that another major war was inevitable. In May 1938, the House Committee for Un-American Activities was set up, at first to scrutinize US links with Nazi Germany. It soon grew to include investigation of communists in USA. In 1939, the Hatch Act was passed, requiring federal employees to be sacked if they were members of a body advocating overthrow of constitutional government of the USA. By May 1940, the Civil Service Commission issued a more specific policy, that it would not hire anyone ‘when it had been established that he is a member of the Communist Party, the German Bund, or any other Communist or Nazi organization’.

When war began in Europe, important people supported the Nazi cause. They included Fred Trump (father of Donald), active in the New York ‘Americadeutscher Bund’, which supported, and was supported by the Nazi party’. Prescott Bush (banker and US Senator, father of President George Bush and Grandfather of President George W Bush) continued trading with Germany even after America joined the war. Split loyalties (found to a lesser extent in British elite classes) continued during the war.

During the war, the alliance between the ‘Big Three’ (Britain and its empire, the USSR and the USA), was only skin deep, a facade to celebrate a three-way marriage of convenience. In reality, Churchill, Stalin and Roosevelt were hardly honest with each other. Each was trying to guess the limits of collaboration with the others, and at times were deliberately deceptive. As the war ended, divorce proceedings went ahead without so much as a blink. Previous split loyalties made the shift of adversaries easy when the war ended.

Straight after atom bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Britain and USSR decided they had to have their bomb. There were strenuous efforts to place nuclear weapons under international control; but they were over-ridden symbolically by the trial of British physicist Allan Nunn-May in 1946 for giving atomic secrets to the Soviets[[14]](#footnote-14), and in substance by the McMahon Act in the USA, separating the nuclear program in USA from that in Britain.

The end of the war saw the Nuremberg Trials in Germany (an international military tribunal, including the ‘trial of doctors’), the Japanese trials of war criminals (which had better claims to justice, since they were non-military), and, by 1949, from the four-year-old United Nations Organization, the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, which, together with a new version of the Geneva convention, ruled against torture. Nonetheless in 1945 there was an astonishing transformation within a few months from World War to Cold War. Western politicians’ views of the Soviet Union switched from being America’s staunch wartime ally, to being the ultimate adversary.

The inexorable sweep of Soviet forces over a two-year period, from the battle of Stalingrad to the Brandenburg Gate in Berlin, had been, in anyone’s estimate, impressive. The ‘politics of fear’ now kicked in - that Soviet forces might sweep further west to the straits of Dover. This view gained traction with some people. As war ended, Winston Churchill, famous for defiant speeches against Naziism, and support of alliance with the USSR, floated the idea that war should continue in ‘Operation Unthinkable’, to eject the USSR from eastern Europe. On 5 March 1946, he gave another speech, at Westminster College, Fulton Missouri, asserting that USA and Britain must act as guardians of peace and stability against the Soviet menace. He popularised the phrase ‘Iron Curtain’[[15]](#footnote-15), which had been used in similar metaphorical ways by others including Joseph Goebels in dying days of the Third Reich.

In March 1947, President Truman announced an explicit shift in foreign policy, that the USA was now engaged in a global struggle against communism. His policies included a loyalty program, preventing employment in public service of anyone who might be a threat to national security (by support of communist subversion). By 1956, over five million federal workers underwent screening, plus about 2,700 dismissals and 12,000 resignations.

I offer my views on this: The threat of Soviet expansion west after the world war was always exaggerated as part of the politics of fear. At the end of the war, every power was utterly exhausted. Stalin had not been invited to the disastrous pre-war Munich conference in 1938, and was also effectively excluded from the Potsdam agreement, signed in July 1945 by Truman, Atlee, and the Chinese delegate, but not by Stalin. He believed in ‘Socialism in One Country’. It was the late Leon Trotsky, his one-time rival, who believed in international revolution. During the Cold War, there were several overtures from the USSR, seeking a less hostile relationship with the west, as well as attempts in American administration on similar lines. Mutual rapprochement failed for two reasons, in my view:

* Major powers in the west, were dominated by factions who could not conceive a world order where ultimate power was *shared* between nation groups with different values and political philosophies.
* In America the focus against Soviet communism had an aim of keeping left wing movements on American soil under control, as much as combatting Soviet expansion.

In September 1947, the US Central Intelligence Agency was formed from its precursor, the wartime Office of Strategic Services (OSS). It soon wielded considerable power. Its first ‘success’ was to throw the Italian General Election, so that communists did not gain power. Two important figures in my story are Allen Dulles (Director of CIA, 1951 to 1961), and Richard Helms who occupied the post from 30 June 1966 to 2 February 1973. During the war, Dulles, as a member of OSS, had been located in the Swiss city of Bern. Like many US citizens at the time, he saw the Soviet Union rather than Nazi Germany as the real enemy. After the war, he used his influence to keep some war criminals from trial at Nuremberg, and helped scientists of value to US war industries to relocate to the USA. This was ‘Operation Paperclip’, mirrored in the USSR by its own program to recruit former Germany scientists, not least for its nuclear weapons and missile programmes.

The other figure, more important in my story, is Richard Helms. Son of a US banker, he studied in Germany and Switzerland before the war, becoming fluent in French and German. As a journalist, he covered the 1936 Berlin Olympic games, and was one of several western journalists to interview Hitler. When USA joined the war, he joined OSS, in a position on the US mainland, well aware that the Soviet Union was a likely future adversary. By the end of the war he was in Berlin, recruiting German experts into American intelligence services; and it was he who coordinated action to prevent a communist election victory in Italy.

Between 1950 and 1954 Cold War rhetoric intensified. Military and intelligence personnel in the USA became concerned about Soviet interrogation methods, which may have achieved genuine shift of loyalties, attitudes, and personal values of captives. This concern was intensified when captives from the Korean war returned, with their loyalties to USA profoundly changed. The term ‘brain washing’ – translation of a Chinese concept – came into use in America. Senator Joseph McCarthy carried out a campaign accusing many state employees and other public figures of communist subversion. His campaign included not only a ‘red scare’, but also a ‘lavender scare’ directed against homosexuals’. With television in most homes, propaganda slogans proliferated - ‘reds under the bed’ and ‘better dead than red’. Eisenhauer won the presidency in 1952, and John Foster Dulles (Allan Dulles’s elder brother) became Secretary of State until 1959. A few years earlier, Dulles had helped draft the United Nations Charter; yet as Secretary of State, he massively increased anti-communist alliances, helped instigate several anti-communist coups d’état, and made major conflict in Vietnam more likely in years to come.

By 1965, Helms had become Director of CIA, and this position led him to additional leadership positions – Chair of the US Intelligence Board, under which lay not only the CIA, but also the FBI, the Atomic Energy Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency as well as intelligence services for the four armed services, and the State Department. In short, he amassed immense power in the US Foreign policy-intelligence establishment.

***Biography of Donald Ewen Cameron*:**

A central figure internationally, both in mid-twentieth century psychiatry, and in some of the CIA’s atrocities, was Donald Ewen Cameron (1901-1967). His work sponsored by the CIA is described in a later section. Here I present a brief biography:

He was born at Bridge of Allan, Stirlingshire, north-east of Glasgow, graduated in medicine at Glasgow University in 1924, and obtained a Diploma in Psychological Medicine from the University of London in 1925. He undertook further training in Glasgow, then at the Phipps Clinic (Johns Hopkins Hospital) 1926-1928, and at the Burghölzli Hospital in Zürich (1928-1929). At the Burghölzli he is likely to have learned about prolonged narcosis in use at the time to treat schizophrenia. He then had positions in Manitoba, Worcester (Massachusetts), Albany (New York State) where, from 1938, he was Professor of Neurology and Psychiatry. During World War II, he had some involvement with the OSS Research Division at Albany, although he was not listed amongst the huge number of OSS personnel[[16]](#footnote-16). His earliest known involvement with OSS was when despatched to Britain by Allen Dulles[[17]](#footnote-17), to give a psychiatric assessment of the captured German emissary, Rudolf Hess. Hess had piloted into Scotland on 10 May, 1941. Cameron acquired American citizenship in 1942, and retained this throughout his life, despite working mainly in Canada. It is said[[18]](#footnote-18) that in early stages of the war, he was involved with OSS in experiments to discover a ‘truth drug’ (see Chapter 2); and that he used mental patients at the Veterans Administration hospital in Albany, New York State as experimental subjects. More detail on this is needed.

In 1943 he was invited to McGill University by pioneer neurosurgeon, Wilder Penfield, to be foundation Professor of Psychiatry. A grant from the Rockefeller Foundation allowed Sir Hugh Allan’s mansion, close to McGill University, to be converted into a psychiatric institute, later named as the Allan Memorial Institute. It is claimed that the position across the border in Canada was made available to enable him to do things which were illegal in the USA[[19]](#footnote-19). This needs corroboration: Details are coming out of larger crimes committed in the USA. He continued work for OSS for the rest of the war, and held the position at McGill for the next twenty years. Towards the end of the war, he was one of those called on to comment on the psychology of German leaders, on national characteristics of Germany as a whole, and on measures to be taken as ‘rehabilitation’ for the entire German nation. He wasone of four psychiatrists to examine Rudolf Hess, but Hess was a minor figure amongst defendants at the Nuremberg trials, and Cameron never testified in the Trials of Doctors, or other trials.

In 1948 he published a book, ‘*Life is for Living’,* for the non-specialist reader*.* It is well written, full of original metaphors, and wry humour, perhaps infused with hints of Scottish Presbyterian rhetoric. He saw employment as having an important social function, giving meaning to people’s lives. He advocated a major shift of focus ‘if we can see that the next round is to develop the other side of work – to build up work primarily as a means of living and secondarily as a means of production.’ He was thus a psychosocial radical. However, some statements attributed to him on German mentality portray him as having extreme views: The psychology of the German ‘race’ was so intrinsic to German people that, unless strong measures were taken, in 30 years’ time, they would rise up again to challenge international order. Germans were not suitable to become parents, or take positions of responsibility. In other words, it was claimed, he seemed comfortable combatting genetic racism of the Third Reich with his own brand of genetic racism and eugenic measures which followed. It has also been claimed that the idea of ‘collective guilt’ of German people for two world wars grew mainly from his pronouncements.

By the 1950s he was one of the world’s leading psychiatrists, holding presidencies of American Psychiatric Association (1952-3), Canadian Psychiatric Association (1958-9), American Psychopathological Association (1963), Society of Biological Psychiatry (1965); and second President of the World Psychiatric Association (1961-66). To have achieved such pre-eminence, his publications are diverse, including papers on psychotherapy (some patients regarding him as a good therapist), teaching, and the administration required in new organisations for psychiatry. Some papers were on social psychiatry and philosophy, and the place of psychiatry in society. A full bibliography, including titles of talks and lectures as well as his published works, became available to the American Psychiatric Association, as two collections in 1977, and a third in 1981[[20]](#footnote-20).

Cameron, like Sargant was in the vanguard of new developments, at the time when behaviourism and Pavlov’s ideas supplanted Freudianism in North America. Unlike Sargant, he wrote widely on psychotherapy, and appears to have been more interested in it. A major theme in parts of *Life is for Living,* is the harmful influence which many parents of the time exert on healthy psychological development of their offspring. In terms of public health he drew an analogy with spread of infectious diseases.

In association with a notorious program from the CIA called MKULTRA Cameron developed two procedures, ‘psychic driving’ and ‘depatterning’. The origins of these, and their details are described later in this chapter’ Both were radical extensions of contemporary psychiatric treatments. When combined Cameron became involved in atrocious psychiatric practices at the Allan Memorial Institute. Some years after his death in 1967 there were major lawsuits and compensation pay-outs. Reverberations still continue.

***The Macy Conferences: The ‘Engineering Model of Human Nature*’:**

By the 1930s the discipline of psychiatry in the USA had many strands. JD Rockefeller had ploughed huge largesse into his version of psychiatry, which he saw as another specialty of orthodox medicine, with a social and eugenicist agenda, to match his corporate interests. Biological and physical treatments were introduced in the 1930s, including insulin coma therapy, seizures induced by drugs, soon replaced by seizures caused by electrical stimulation of the head; and last of all, psychosurgery (prefrontal leucotomy). Prior to the second World War, attempts were made by American psychiatric researchers to blend ideas of Pavlov and Freud with biological understanding of the human brain. The three were brought together under a new discipline - ‘psychosomatic medicine’.

At this stage there was little hint in USA that Pavlovian conditioning was to be used for propaganda or military intelligence. All this changed on 7 December, 1941, when Pearl Harbour was attacked. Focus shifted overnight to an ensuing world war. Henceforth Pavlov’s insights were increasingly seen as a complete account of human psychology, used in both mass propaganda and human intelligence. His ideas were simplified and distorted for military ends, and by denigrating Pavlov, as anti-communist propaganda.

In May 1942, six months after USA joined the war, a secretive high-level meeting – by invitation only - was held in New York. It was run by the Macy Foundation, founded in 1930 by Kate Macy Ladd in honour of her father, a New England Quaker, Josiah Macy, Jr. (1838-1876). His family made a fortune in whaling, shipping, ship building and oil, working closely with JD Rockefeller Snr. Its declared aim was to ‘improve the health of the public by advancing education and training of health professionals’. The 1942 meeting was supported by the Rockefeller Foundation, with emphases similar to the Macy Foundation, albeit at times a little strange from today’s perspective.

At the time, ‘interdisciplinary studies’ were in vogue, and in war-time, this emphasis increased. The war required specialists with very different backgrounds to work together on defined practical goals. Government funds for academic conferences were likely to be limited, so a private foundation had an important role to play. Keynote speakers were those who could communicate across disciplinary boundaries. Topics in focus included early notions of cybernetics, electrical engineering, hypnotism (part of Freud’s methodology), Pavlovian conditioning, child development, the new field of psychosomatic medicine, and, from physiologist Walter Cannon, the concept of ‘homeostasis’: This grew from the fact that the level of many chemicals in body fluids was controlled to lie within narrow ranges by negative feedback processes. In this way, the body’s ‘internal environment’ was stabilized.

In the post-war period up to the early 1950s, the Macy conference was followed by a series of interdisciplinary meetings, again backed by Macy money. Participants included physicists, mathematicians, engineers, physiologists, psychologists, psychiatrists and anthropologists. The fact that basic signals in nervous cells had an ‘all-or-none’ property, seemed to match the principal of binary coding in the yet-to-be-realized digital computers. This led to a belief that brains and computers operated in similar ways, a claim which still prevails, but which, in my view, is a profound fallacy. Other focal points included mathematical theory of ‘servo mechanisms’ - the sophisticated negative feedback systems developed during the war, so that artillery could aim accurately at moving targets; and the new field of cybernetics, a term popularized at these meetings. Servo mechanisms, like many biological systems, seemed to be ‘purposive’ a feature seen as a hallmark of living things - their minds included. This insight was thought by some to throw light on the ‘mind-brain problem’ and by others to conceptualize living things, including human beings as essentially deterministic machines. Human behaviour was assumed to be predictable. Overall, these conferences aimed to produce a new ‘scientific’ model of the mind, in which ‘mind control’ was a realistic objective, a view supporting the Rockefeller social control agenda.

Overall, the outcome of these conferences supported engineers’ perspectives, even when applied to human sciences. What emerged - albeit not explicitly – is what I call the ‘engineering model of human nature’. This might have been expected in a world dominated by wartime thinking and military discipline designed in part to turn civilised humans into automatons committed to obeying orders. This was to be imposed in a supposedly ‘scientific’ way on human beings and societies, to such an extent that they could be controlled as surely as engineers controlled other devices. Assumptions of biological determinism prevailed. I point out that, if Pavlovian conditioning is seen, quite incorrectly, as a model for the entirety of human learning processes of learning, it is implicitly akin to the simple determinism of engineering devices devised by humans in the previous century-and-a-half. By the 1950s, these rather inchoate ideas started to guide research of the US CIA.

In the 1950s world of global rivalry, after atom bombs were dropped on Japanese cities, it was thought in many quarters that ‘science had won the war.’ With the rise the CIA’s power, and the vast resources at its disposal, its own unaccountable experts wanted to claim some of the action and glory of fundamental scientific advance. This was not to be in physical sciences, but in an exciting new field, intelligence about the human mind, dominated by an engineer’s concept of human nature. Of course, the Macy conferences, and the model of human nature they fostered directly challenged every notion of democratic principle, and the rule of law, as well as advances in mathematics, logic, philosophy, medical ethics, and, in due course, brain theory.

***Critique of Macy conferences, and Engineering Model of Human Nature*:**

This goes very deep.

* The analogy between computers and brains is false. Nerve cells are not binary coders, except at a very superficial level. To assert that they are is ultimately dangerous.
* Large-scale architecture of brains differs from that of digital computers. By the 1960s, the architecture of digital computers, as it was evolving, was *imposed* on neuroscientist’s understanding of brain processes (whose large-scale coordination was at the time a mystery) rather than our understanding of the latter being derived by research on the brain.
* To be specific, signals in the brain reaching higher centres have no significance for the organism until they are located in - and assimilated with - perceptions, goals and understanding possessed by the organism as a whole. For such perceptions, goals and understandings, I use a generic term - ‘context’. In contrast, in computers, basic signals are items of ‘information’ independent of each other, or of any larger agenda.
* Representation of contexts in the brain is utterly different from basic signals in the brain. Like the faculty for deduction, such representations are collective aspects of vast networks of nerve cells working together, never a property of individual nerve cells. They cannot arise simply by compounding of innumerable signals.
* When contexts are used to decipher individual signals, the latter acquire meaning. The brain’s basic function is then not to ‘process information’, but to ‘discover meaning’.
* ‘Information’, conceived in computer technology, is neither biological nor psychological, but an engineer’s idea derived from higher mathematics. To impose it on living organisms is a profound and dangerous fallacy.
* Beyond such fallacies, Macy meetings were dominated by a distinctly deterministic view of the world. Engineers’ devices *do* approximate determinist ideal, precisely because they are designed to exclude unpredictable – technically chaotic – interactions. Chaotic interaction is typical of living things, making them very different from engineers’ devices.
* The Macy meeting emphasised a fallacy with much older roots, the attempt to use technical methods for human problems which are not technical in nature. The most obvious such approaches are physical methods of treatment in psychiatry (which are *not* wholly misguided, but may be so, if seen as the sole method of treatment). One may include in this approach, attempts to replace human interaction by ‘survey technology’. I suggest that this strategy may be adopted to avoid the challenge of face-to-face interaction for staff ill-prepared for such encounters[[21]](#footnote-21).
* An implicit assumption in the Macy meetings was that new cross-discipline scientific theories can emerge by bringing together in dialogue experts from many different fields. I believe this to be a misconception. Historically, when major cross-disciplinary advance occurs, they do so in the mind of a single person, a Newton, a Clerk-Maxwell or an Einstein. The mind of such polymaths cannot be replicated in committees of lesser minds.
* Important influences were missing in the meetings, which might have challenged implied determinism and other limitations, had they been included.
* There was little contribution from quantum physicists, for whom indeterminacy was coming to be accepted;
* There was no input from those who could have shared insights into what is now called chaos theory
* Invitations did not include Kurt Gödel who had recently developed a complex theorem, proving that in a defined set of axioms, there were statements which can never be proved either true or false; so, reasoning had insurmountable limits. Albert Einstein, an avowed pacifist, and one who had a far better blend of ethics and intellect than most of the others, was not invited and perhaps not welcome. (Both Gödel and Einstein were in the vicinity of the Macy conference venue, as refugees.)
* The only participants who might have marshalled a defence were members of the Gestalt psychology school, which had flourished in Germany between the wars, and who were now also in the USA as refugees. Their contribution, if properly understood, was to define limits to the precision of quantitative reasoning: Qualities, recognised only by human minds, were as significant as quantities, and could not be reduced to quantities. However, confident arguments from mathematicians and engineers were more impressive than the ‘fuzzy’ reasoning of the Gestalt psychologists.

Deeper yet again, the Macy conferences seemed to be wedded to the idea that there was such a thing as irrefutable scientific ‘truth’, which was objective and separate from biases of any observer. The best physical scientists of the day knew this to be incorrect. This alternative viewpoint went back much further: A thousand years ago, a most important philosopher from the ‘golden age of Islam’ - Avicenna (Ib’n Sina in Arabic) - from the centre of learning in Bukhara (present day Uzbekistan) had the amazing definition of truth: ‘*What is in the mind, which corresponds to that which is outside the mind’*. In other words, the concept of truth, if it has any validity, is at once subjective and objectives, as inseparable interdependent facets. This was a deep challenge to the view we inherit from Greek scholars, that there is such a thing as objective truth, distinct from minds to contemplate it.

Closely related to this is the view we inherit from classical Greece, that mind and brain are separate substances. The rise of natural sciences could not cope with this. In the English-speaking world, the ‘mental world’ - the world of subjectivity - was banished to a realm beyond reach of scientific methods; while on the European continent, increasingly, science came to be based on a metaphysics akin to Avicenna’s definition of truth, as an interplay between what is subjective and what is objective, the two merging into one another, always interdependent. There was little grasp of this in the Macy conferences, nor indeed that continued expansion of natural sciences depends ultimately on metaphysical underpinning. The end-product of this fallacy was an attempt in offshoots from Macy conferences, notably the CIA, of strident and simplistic notions of the mind, as implied by what they took to be scientific. Sometimes it was mind/brain dualism (for instance in the CIA’s dallying with extra-sensory perception); or it abolished the world of subjectivity. The term ‘memory’ referred to physical mechanisms and quantified information storage, rather than personal experiences of recall. Out of range at Macy conferences were ideas of meaning rather than information, or of nerve signals gaining significance in the context of an entire organism and its history.

***Conclusions so far*:**

I soon explore the outrages to which the CIA was led. This arose partly because important people, to a degree, had been unhinged by the enormous power they appeared to have after detonation of atom bombs. They continued to adopt a semblance of rationality without an adequate context for their alarming reasoning. For now, my conclusions take the form of pithy aphorisms. One of these - attributed to various sources: Immanuel Kant, Kurt Lewin, and indeed Leonid Brezhnev - reads:

* *There is nothing so practical as a good theory[[22]](#footnote-22).*

To this I add two corollaries:

* *There is nothing so impractical as a bad theory.*
* *There is nothing so intrinsically dangerous as bad theory pursued doggedly blind to its inadequacies.*

When propaganda gathers momentum, it often convinces the propagandists as much their intended target population – or even more so. It is then hard to unwind the rhetoric. I add a sharp line from that wise US journalist of a past generation, HL Mencken:

* *To every complex problem, there is a solution which is simple, neat, and wrong.*

. . . and a line following easily from this, which I got from my father in his last years:

* *Every problem which is technical or technological is now soluble. The many problems that remain are all non-technical, non-technological.*

A major problem then arises when human problems are construed as technical ones.

I amplify this by extending the meaning of the word ‘technical’ in two ways. First, if human mentality is regarded as little more than a Pavlovian associative mechanism (which seems to be true in some circumstances), human behaviour becomes predictable and mechanical. ‘Technical’ then includes human interactions (or control of humans) based on this assumption.

Second, control of humans by administrators may rely on assumptions of predictability, and in this sense is also ‘technical’. The history of this is worth explaining. After Isaac Newton’s historic achievements in the late seventeenth century, the power of quantitative reasoning started to be appreciated, first in France (where translation of Newton’s *Principia* from Latin into the vernacular was first available), and then in London. At the same time city administrators started to collect quantitative statistics (e.g., age-related life expectancy, or suicide rates) which were found to follow mathematical regularities. As a result, it was thought that decisions based on such statistics followed Newton’s methods, thereby gaining ‘scientific’ authority. The fallacies are numerous: Numbers derived from those statistics are not necessarily quantities, in that they need not permit even the simplest arithmetic operations. In addition, concepts around which statistics are collected are choices of the administrators, in contrast to the hard-won core concepts of Newton’s system – mass, length and time – refined over centuries, such that they *would* support quantitative reasoning. In truth, concepts are defined for administrator’s own purposes (and statistics are collected) in such a way that often, they are bound to support their prior purposes. This is then an exercise of power, not of science.

The alternative to these technical approaches is ‘relational’ interaction, assuming that humans are only partly predictable, and that therefore continued mutual interaction is the best way to understand other people, and to achieve both shared understanding and shared goals.

I maintain that all the above fallacies – examples of profound unreason – and their extensions, mentioned below, are the roots of the atrocities committed by the CIA. Of course - as a tiny footnote, which is nevertheless my real focus - they provide a context for the abuses and torture which unfolded in New Zealand in the 1970s.

**OBJECTIVES OF MILITARY/INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES IN THE SECOND WORLD WAR AND EARLY COLD WAR**

***Interrogation by British Intelligence Agencies in the Second World War and in 1950s Colonial Insurgencies*:**

When MI5 and MI6 were established in 1909, MI5 was intended to deal with home territory, MI6 with overseas intelligence. After 1945, the Atlee government extended MI5’s reach, to include territories of the Empire – or, after 1949, ‘the Commonwealth’. Thus, in the post-war period, in trouble spots around the world, MI5 and MI6 were often present together, as well as intelligence branches of the armed forces. There was rivalry between agencies working in the same region, often resolved by their having different functional roles.

During World War II interrogation of captives by intelligence personnel had a special style. A policy was steadfastly maintained to avoid physical maltreatment of captives when persuading them to disclose what they knew. This was not because of moral scruples, but because physical violence was said to be less effective, compared to diverse and sophisticated types of mental cruelty they devised. Some of this - as in police forces - amounted to the ‘good cop/bad cop’ routine (‘blow hot/blow cold’). Sometimes it was more sophisticated, requiring more planning. I quote Calder Walton[[23]](#footnote-23):

*‘. . .tactics for ‘breaking’ agents . . .included every conceivable trick of what Stephens[[24]](#footnote-24) termed ‘mental pressure’: newly arrived prisoners were usually stripped, humiliated, and disorientated; they were terrified by rows of barking dogs; confined to small solitary cells; threatened with court-martial and execution. Microphones were installed in their cells to overhear conversations; guards disguised as prisoners (known as ’stool pigeons’) were sent into cells to get them talking; false newspapers were printed to get them into thinking their friends and family at home had been killed.’*

These methods, it was claimed, produced fuller and more accurate information than ‘third degree’ brutality. Another reason to use shrewd but intense psychological pressure short of physical violence was interrogators’ hope that, by adopting ‘gentler’, even ‘sympathetic’ approaches, some captives might turn their allegiance so completely that they became effective double agents. There were remarkable successes in this regard.

This meant that MI5 tried to ensure that all captives for interrogation were transported to Britain, to be processed by experts at its specialist centre in south London (Latchmere house, formerly a mental institution)[[25]](#footnote-25). Persons of interest might be detained overseas before their secret ‘rendition’ to London (not at that time by air transport). Sometimes detention was little short of kidnapping. On mainland Britain, emergency regulations meant that this was within the law. In colonial jurisdictions the principle of *habeas corpus* sometimes still held firm. If a detainee then succeeded in bringing their detention before law courts, MI5 was in a tricky position legally. It should be noted that rendition in this case was different in an important way from the ‘extraordinary rendition’ which has been in the news in recent decades: It was rendition to mainland Britain, whereas modern rendition is usually to a distant ‘black site’ well away from British or American jurisdiction. Overall, the British style of interrogation during the second World war was based on a shrewd understanding of human nature as it really is, rather than the distorted, oversimplified version developed, by analogy with early concepts of digital computers, from the Macy conferences. The British style was developed further in methods explained by Professor Alexander Kennedy during a lecture in early 1960, based, we learned later, on his practice of interrogation nearly twenty years earlier, during the World War. In Supplementary Document no 3 for Chapter 5, I describe the published version of his lecture. It makes interesting comparison with methods used by William Sargant and Basil James. Therefore, I add my comments in that Supplement, on this comparison.

By the 1950s, Britain had other problems to contend with: In the wind-down of its global empire, its forces had to deal with several small wars, insurgencies, and independence movements. Eventually Britain also had ‘Troubles’ in Northern Ireland on its hands, starting in the late 1960s. This had elements in common with colonial insurgencies. These conflicts led to greater use of physical brutality to extract information from prisoners The military Governor Harding of Cyprus in the 1950s wrote:

*‘As far as ill-treatment, rough treatment on capture* [of terrorists] *I think it is something which inevitably does happen. . . and that is something which is perfectly natural, and to my mind acceptable.’*

The shift probably reflected changed circumstance: In the world war, intelligence agencies combined information gathering with a hope of ‘turning’ captives into double agents. In the 1950s, this double objective was not a priority. The focus was on obtaining information about incipient threats as quickly as possible. Most of it occurred in military rather than intelligence contexts, and in any case, discipline may not have been so strict.

***British Research on New Methods of Interrogation*:**

By 1950, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was well known. The ruling that torture was unacceptable was reinforced in a revised Geneva Convention. Nonetheless, in the USA, the immediacy of the Cold War, and in Britain, urgent requirements of the small wars in the twilight of empire, took precedence over prestigious moral statements. In military encounters, extreme physical manhandling of captives by British forces occurred, sometimes leading to death. The Mau Mau uprising in Kenya was accompanied by horrific torture. Survivors eventually received compensation payout from HM government. With this as a precedent, survivors of torture in Cyprus also recently received compensation.

Intelligence agencies - MI5 and MI6 - were involved in these small wars. New methods, perhaps more ‘thoughtful’, had to be devised for ‘enhanced’ interrogation – torture in all but name - which left no physical mark[[26]](#footnote-26), and no evidence of breach of Geneva conventions. I have no exact information on methods used in any specific theatre, but specialized ways to process captives *were* developed through the dying days of the British empire. In these contexts, electrical torture, and cruel use of drugs made some sense.

By the early 1950s, at Porton Down, at the biological weapons research centre in Salisbury Plain, various toxins were tested on military recruits (conscripts), without informed consent. On 6 May 1953, one subject - Raymond George Maddison – died, after exposure to a toxic agent - sarin. The death was hushed up for a very long time; but 51 years later, an inquest was held, and cause of death established.

Just before war broke out, a molecule known as Lysergic acid-25 had been synthesized in labs of Swiss drugs company Sandoz. Its hallucinogenic properties were discovered there by accident there during the war. The first publication in 1947 was from Werner Stoll of Sandoz. The first British publications on LSD (on a fish species) were in April and August 1953 and the first publications of a trial in humans in 1954. Later in the 1950s investigations of LSD in the UK, led to large numbers of military recruits being exposed to LSD, without informed consent. A legal case was brought in 2008 by Don Webb about his being given LSD at Porton Down. An unnamed psychiatrist was mentioned as having administered the agent. At the time, the number of British psychiatrists in the know about LSD was very few. The plaintiff considered that the photo of William Sargant best matched the face he remembered.

Focusing on Cyprus, and the time spent there by Dr Basil James, many reports on the EOKA insurgency there were highly politicised. However, a detailed account by Andreas Varnevas[[27]](#footnote-27) leaves little doubt that in Cyprus new methods of interrogation (etc!) were being progressively elaborated; and that medical personnel attended interrogation sessions:

*‘Cyprus was filled with interrogation centres at which English interrogators assisted by Turks applied every kind of maltreatment on arrested men and women, with the purpose of extracting information or out of sheer vengeance. The tortures kept being perfected, as it is proven by the depositions of the victims, and were later organized on a scientific basis, being carried out by experienced English interrogators in the presence of English doctors, who watched not in order to offer medical help to the victims but to monitor their endurance. Consequently, torture was not the work of a few hot-headed English interrogators, but it must have been carried out with the approval of the British Government, which supplied the detention centres with the necessary 'torture equipment.’*

Varnevas’s book names torturers, and gives profiles of those who died under torture but does not name doctors present. I have nothing to link this directly to Dr James, but he was a commissioned officer with RAMC, which had its own ‘intelligence’ section. There is no mention of drugs being used in interrogation, but electric shocks and high-intensity electric lights generating heat applied to prisoners at close quarters are described. A more scholarly monograph by Ian Cobain confirms the use of electric shocks (although ‘rarely used’) and mention uses of drugs during interrogations in Cyprus (with details ‘yet to be established’). From sources like these, it is clear that the situation of *devising* methods of interrogation was a substantial research effort. Experience in several theatres of conflict would need to be coordinated at a research centre. Where was it? Where were practitioners trained?

On a visit to the Imperial War Museum, London (17 April, 2016) I listened to two recorded interviews, relating to a military establishment at Maresfield, Sussex[[28]](#footnote-28). This centre opened in 1956, charged with training personnel from all three branches of UK armed forces in operational matters requiring intelligence, notably methods of interrogation. It was separate from MI5 or MI6[[29]](#footnote-29), and was military, not civilian.

One of those interviewed, William Croxson was a regular conscript on National Service, probably therefore before 1960. He explains that trainees practised their art on personnel from the territorial army, and were later seconded to parts of the empire, including Cyprus, where insurgencies were occurring. The other interview, conducted in the mid-1960s was with Angus Southwood, who became an instructor at Maresfield from 1965. Methods he describes are likely to have been developed in the previous decade. Training exercises (again often with reservists as non-consenting subjects) include the following: Subjects were placed in a situation where they had to escape, and were then brought in and subjected to ‘communist style’ interrogation. That is, they were brought in with a hood over their head, up against a wall, with white sound, for an hour or two, before being brought in for their first interrogation. At this stage just words and suggestions were used, for instance, that non-cooperation would be seen as disloyalty to comrades. After escaping over Dartmoor, they might be told that some parts were very boggy, so their mates might be in danger, unless the interrogatee explained where he had been. According to the Geneva convention, captured soldiers being interrogated were required to give no more than Number, Rank, and Date of Birth. Trainees had to resist attempts to go beyond this. Often the style of interrogation was a standard ‘play soft, play hard’ alternation, and playing on basic motives, for instance by offering a meal when the trainee had had nothing to eat for three days, then pull it away when he was about to eat. An army psychiatrist was always present. Some trainees were completely disoriented, and did not know what day it was. When newspapers heard about this there were claims that trainees were being tortured. However all that went on was authorised by Ministry of Defence as ‘Combat Survival Training Exercises’. That army psychiatrists were present is a sign of high-level approval, corroborating testimony from victims in Cyprus.

Southwood himself argued in his interview that training was not in methods of torture, but in resistance against potential enemy forces (especially Soviet interrogators). This is not convincing. Methods used at Maresfield *did* include parts of a Polish account of Soviet methods of military interrogation[[30]](#footnote-30), but the ones in the Maresfield training program (and used elsewhere) excluded any which caused physical injury. If the objective was to simulate, and develop resistance to Soviet methods, it was singularly limited. In addition, evidence is now clear that the methods *were* used, for real, not just for training in resistance. The idea that they originated in the USSR was a red herring, although Southwood may have believed it.

Apart from Maresfield as coordinating and training centre, ‘sophisticated’ methods of interrogation were developed near the frontline, in Cyprus, Aden and Oman. In due course, these were abandoned in favour of simpler methods, the ‘Five Techniques’ as used in Northern Ireland. These had been developed overseas. A paper from Salford University[[31]](#footnote-31) describes how they were progressively refined in Kenya, Malaya, British Cameroons, and Aden. In 1963 in Brunei, all five techniques were used together for the first time. After coordination at Maresfield they were used by the Royal Ulster Constabulary, under guidance of military personnel, with an army advisory team[[32]](#footnote-32). When publicity arose, it led to two major inquiries (Compton and Parker Inquiries).

Not only was the attempt made to leave no *physical* evidence: In British intelligence thinking, no *documentary* evidence should be left. Methods used in Northern Ireland were never written in a manual but were passed on by word of mouth between practitioners. This made it difficult for lawyers and their investigative teams to prove what had happened, and why. The Compton Inquiry, which reported on 9 August 1971 heard endless testimony from soldiers, police witnesses, prison officers and regimental officers, but from only one witness who was a complainant, whose lawyer was not allowed to access transcripts of evidence or cross-examine witnesses.

Eventually there was better documentation. The Compton and Parker enquiries, avoided the word ‘torture’ in their reports, but did accept that the Five Techniques had been used in Ulster, and in other places before this; and as a result techniques were forbidden by the British parliament. In 1976, the European Commission on Human Rights found the British to have been in breach of article 3 of their convention, and made a finding of torture. However, according to Cobain (p.168), the RUC used other methods, including water-boarding, electric shocks of gradually increasing intensity, and disorientation about time elapsed (sleep allowed for just ten minutes before detainees were awakened and told they had slept for hours).

***US Bio-Psycho-Medical Research in Early Cold War: Introduction*:**

US forces were active in Europe during the world war for a shorter period than British forces. Many intelligence methods were learned from the British. British-style interrogation during the world war, described above, was adopted at two centres in mainland USA. One of them – Fort Hunt in Alexandra Virginia - processed over 3000 prisoners from 1942 to the end of the war, with interrogation supported by listening devices, stool pigeons, etc. Vital information was gathered. How effective these centres were in ‘turning’ captives into double agents is unclear. It may have been less important than in Britain.

With onset of the Cold War, extreme policies appeared in the USA, some of them grotesque or absurd, some more positive, including major expansion of universities, with massive growth of their research capability. This continued wartime policy when much war-related research was contracted to universities. Research in aid of bio-warfare, psycho-warfare, and cold war intelligence expanded greatly. What developed in the US Central Intelligence Agency, was separate from and different in style from British methods. As far as one can tell, it had different objectives.It led to the incredible research undertaken by the CIA under names such as Projects Bluebird, Artichoke and MKULTRA.

The story becomes immensely complex, in part because of traditions of openness of information flow supposedly defined in the US constitution. This strong principle means that, unlike Britain, the USA has no Official Secrets Act. Over the centuries, there have been innumerable breaches of the principle, but there was always a right to petition the Government for redress. However, when this strong principle – and the need to put things in writing - is combined with the intrinsic secrecy of the CIA, extraordinary administrative contortions developed . The First Amendment protects freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly. These rights mean that, in the USA, public records are more open to scrutiny than those in Britain. In practice, it means that access to secret documents, such as those from intelligence agencies, *are* eventually released, but often only many decades later. At the time of writing, 70 years after events in question, secret documents from the early Cold War are being continually released. Each year more become available, a rich field for future historians.

In the 1950s very few people knew the full extent of clandestine CIA research. Such concealment should not have been possible, because the CIA had an Inspector General, whose role was to ensure that everything was above board, and legal. However, various parts of the agency somehow dodged his scrutiny. Richard Helms, at the time in a position in the CIA Directorate of Operations, was involved more than anyone in activities which went beyond its founding charter (and the US constitution). From the start he knew more than anyone - more than Allan Dulles and far more than the President of the USA. Two other individuals came under his influence at this time and contributed greatly to lawlessness in the CIA These were Sidney Gottlieb and James Jesus Angleton (see later in this chapter). Gottlieb’s crimes were committed under the aegis of the Technical Services Division of CIA. Angleton’s role was ‘counterintelligence’, to detect Soviet agents who had infiltrated western intelligence services. His role should have been limited to intelligence collection, but , from 1955 onwards, he used it to expand massively the practice of mail interception, mainly for mail addressed to US citizens, which was highly illegal. The full extent of covert extra-charter CIA research and operations will never be known, because, when President Nixon dismissed Helms as Director in January 1973, Helms ordered vast troves of sensitive documents to be destroyed. In 1975 the Church Committee and Rockefeller Commission relied on sworn testimony of direct participants and the small number of surviving documents. Even then, evidence provided by the CIA to the Church Committee was doctored before release[[33]](#footnote-33). Release of evidence on MKULTRA drew attention away from Project Artichoke – operational deployment of MKULTRA research - which included worse atrocities.

***History of Development of Bio-Psycho-Medical Research by CIA*:**

At the end of December 1948, a new section was established in the CIA – the Office of Scientific Intelligence (OSI) - aimed to integrate existing scientific capabilities of various intelligence agencies. Early in 1949, an event in Hungary - the trial of Catholic prelate, Cardinal József Mindszenty - alarmed many in the USA. He had long been seen as a staunch opponent of both fascism and communism. After the communist take-over the regime suppressed religious organizations and by 1948 banned religious orders. On 26 December, 1948, Mindszenty was arrested, charged with treason and conspiracy, was tortured and appeared at a show trial on 3 February, 1949. In dazed and automatic fashion, he confessed to all charges, including quite outlandish ones, and was sentenced to life imprisonment. Regardless of the charges, many in the USA concluded that the Soviet Union had used unknown yet powerful methods to control minds of its prisoners.

In April 1949 Irving Janis wrote a paper for the RAND corporation suggesting that Mindzsenty had been under hypnotic influence. In mid-summer 1949, the first director of OSI - Willard Frank Machle - made a two-month trip to Western Europe to investigate Soviet methods of interrogation. Details of his reports are not known to me, but he set up a program to interrogate captured Soviet spies. By April 1950, Sheffield Edwards, head of Information & Security Service in the CIA, launched Project Bluebird. Its original role was defensive, to find improved ways to interrogate defectors arriving in USA, and (in smaller number) agents employed in all branches of the CIA[[34]](#footnote-34). Further meetings followed (see below), and from this the notorious MKULTRA was started, on 13 April 1953.

At this point I introduce briefly the elusive, incredible, yet frightening figure of Sidney Gottlieb. By training a chemist, his biographer characterises him as ‘Poisoner in Chief’. On 13 July 1951, he became head of the newly-formed Technical Services Division of CIA and soon was the technical mastermind for the atrocities of MKULTRA. Within the agency, very few were in the know. In 1961, when Allan Dulles was replaced as Director of CIA, the new director was not told of the existence of MKULTRA; nor, at this time, did Gottlieb’s deputy – Richard A. Krueger - know much about it. Of those in the know, Gottlieb’s immediate superior, Richard Helms, knew more than anyone. Much of what Gottlieb did will never be known. I mention him only partly for his technical wizardry, but also because his strange persona serves my aim of exploring the dark world of personal and collective connivance regarding the huge crimes perpetrated by the CIA. Gottlieb was responsible for the technical side of many CIA assassination attempts around the world. He used a variety of poisons, or dangerous micro-organisms, along with his own extraordinary tricks, as ways to deliver these poisons. He had vast experience of LSD, both personally (over 200 trips, it is said) and for military or intelligence purposes.

On 16 August 1951, one month after Gottlieb joined the CIA, an incident occurred in a village in south-east France, Pont St Esprit, near the Swiss border (and headquarters of Sandoz in Basel). Suddenly across the village many people started to have strange experiences including visual hallucinations and showed odd behaviour. About 250 people were affected; 50 required hospital care; five of them died. There was report of a low-flying aircraft just before the outbreak, spraying an unknown substance. At the time, US bio-warfare researchers were investigating aerosol versions of agents they had studied. Events at Pont St Esprit suggest that LSD was under test for military use.

In the USA, a celebrated case was that of Frank Olson, a US intelligence operative, who had visited to Porton Down. He died on 25 November 1953 after potent psychoactive agents, probably including LSD, had been given him surreptitiously. The actual death was a fall from the window, high in a New York hotel. There are several speculative accounts of what might have happened before that, a common theme being that Olson was a potential whistle blower, who should be silenced. He might have been about to reveal details of the Pont St Esprit episode, of biowarfare in Korea, or of unspeakable and deadly torture in American facilities in Germany in the late 1940s. In any case, dangerous games were played with LSD in intelligence agencies on both sides of the Atlantic, most likely coordinated between respective biowarfare departments. Gottlieb was certainly involved in the poisoning, and death of Olson. The legal ramifications of his death continued long after and may have played a part in Gottlieb’s own death in 1999 (as we see later).

Some research funding by the CIA under MKULTRA supported very prestigious research centres, such as Hans Eysenck at the Institute of psychiatry, in London; Sarnof Mednick, a US psychiatrist who developed a long-term follow-up study of schizophrenia in collaboration with Danish centres). Other projects were worrying: Several projects were to be conducted on inmates of penitentiaries, or other vulnerable populations. Subproject 107 is documented as follows: *‘MKULTRA: American Psychological Association: Army Testing: Assassination: Raymond A. Bauer: Berlin Poison Case: Biometric Lab: Biophysical Measurements: Beecher (Henry K.): Brainwashing.’* In the main however, the more drastic projects were in the ‘operations’ agenda, within Project Artichoke (see later).

In 1963 MKULTRA was officially ended. It this seems to have been a delicate process. One report[[35]](#footnote-35) comments:

*In 1962, Dr. Gottlieb, who had been Chief of R&D for TSD, was promoted to Deputy Chief/TSD under Seymour Russell. Richard Krueger replaced Dr. Gottlieb as Chief of R&D for TSD but was not initially briefed on any of the MKULTRA projects, which continued to report to Gottlieb. Following the IG* [Inspector General of CIA] *report, however, Krueger was “read into the program” and developed a process for phasing out over three years all remaining projects. Three years were required to close down the projects through orderly steps that would not expose the covert relationships or compromise the security of the participating institutions and individuals as well as fulfil government contractual obligations to the parties*

Parts of MKULTRA continued beyond the three years just mentioned, as MKSEARCH and MKOFTEN. In particular, MKSEARCH did not end until late June 1972.Richard Krueger, deputy chief of TSD, is a name to remember, appearing again in Chapter 7.

After President Nixon was re-elected in November 1972, he dismissed Richard Helms as Director of CIA, effective from February 1973. At this point Helms ordered destruction of large troves of documentation, mainly carried out by Gottlieb. A few years later, by chance, some financial records on MKULTRA were discovered. These and other sources enabled reconstruction of some of research under this title. In 1975, the Church committee heard much evidence about crimes of CIA in previous years (although much was still suppressed). Knowledge remains incomplete, but, year-by-year more details are emerging.

***New Age Cults and Spiritual Movements.***

There are strange contradictions in Sidney Gottlieb’s story which arise in part from social trends of the times, which also help to understand some of the CIA’s activities. This is the appearance of new (or ‘new-age’) religious cults or spiritual movements. Growth of such movements is not at all a new phenomenon. Over many centuries, they have appeared in many parts of the world sometimes attracting a large number of followers, with robust spiritual traditions (eg the Bahai faith arising in Persia-Iran in 1844).However, in the 1960s and 1970s, there was world-wide proliferation of such movements. Perhaps they appealed to people who, amid unsettling global events from earlier in the century, and current scientific and social trends, they felt they had to abandon mainstream religious affiliations of their parents, but still felt a need for a spiritual focus. Often such new movements were linked to established Judeo-Christian or eastern religions, or combinations of the two. This pattern certainly included Gottlieb, who had rejected the faith of his Jewish upbringing, but yet tried, throughout his life to find a suitable alternative spiritual base. The new movements might have little emphasis on theological rhetoric/reasoning of mainstream religions, which might have brought a form of rationality to moral questions, and thus imposed restraints on their more outrageous practices. However, given the immense diversity of such groups, one should not generalise

Often the new movements adopted an odd blend of supposed understanding of ‘modern science’ and religion. Some can be described as ‘UFO religious groups’ with invasion from other worlds as part of their core beliefs. Others incorporated environmental concerns into their spiritual understanding. This included Gottlieb, who, outside the CIA, adopted on an isolated off-grid life style, raising goats (and milking them by hand each morning). Within some of these movements powerful discipline might be imposed, with powerful methods of control (including financial control) over initiates, and strong sanctions against those who broke faith. Methods used were sometimes akin to - or derived from - brainwashing methods of the CIA for instance in their use of LSD in rituals - a modern version of ancient drug cults. In the case of Scientology, this was partly a means of protecting members from the powerful methods of the CIA. Many such movements were very secretive - even dangerous - and were legally banned in some countries as ‘cults’. On the other hand, they sometimes acquired official recognition as religious organizations, with charitable status. The CIA itself took an interest in such cults. In some cases the agency sought allies within such movements, or used them for its own purposes.

***Motives, Objectives*:**

*Gen****eral Comments*:** Early in the Cold War, some US clandestine research drew on recent experience in police interrogation and psychotherapy. New methods of interrogation and the need for rapid processing of persons, probably drew on attempts by both psychotherapists and police to streamline psychoanalysis/interrogation. Methods ranged from effects of stress on shift of mind-set, hypnosis, psychoactive drugs and ECT. To this mix - believe it or not – was added ‘extrasensory perception (ESP).

Innovative offensive methods developed by CIA covered several areas (including possible use of LSD in bio-warfare), but mainly on ‘mind control’ and ‘brain washing’. Add to this the methods of propaganda derived from Pavlovian conditioning, and an implied ‘engineering’ model of human nature. Fear grew that the Soviets had discovered secrets of ‘mind control’, although there was little direct evidence for this. Of course, Soviets and Chinese had extremely brutal ways to ‘process’ prisoners; but what the CIA developed was mainly ‘home grown’, with some origins in Europe pre-war, in Germany during the war, or from other western intelligence agencies. Much of what emerged, was a product of fearful over-imaginative minds, loose associations in absence of direct evidence, and loads of money.

Some of this was for *defensive* purposes, some for *offensive* use*,* but such classification is imprecise because motives for much of this now seems to have been *confused*, based on flawed assumptions, questionable beliefs, and defense and intelligence chiefs accepting their own propaganda as ‘gospel truth’. Confusion arose from questionable theories or assumptions or ones which for other reasons, had to be strenuously denied:

* There was not much subtlety in Soviet or Chinese methods, certainly not ‘mind control’ in a technical sense, despite alarm arising from terms derived from China.
* The engineering model of human nature was a very bad as scientific theory.
* The notion that human mentality is initially a *tabula rasa,* on which is written life’s experiences, implies that differences in adult personality are entirely the products of that experience, not of any intrinsic features of individual constitution. This is incorrect
* Assumptions about cold war adversaries were not entirely correct; but the error was shared on both sides, in a spiral of mutual distrust, with no-one willing to risk breaking the cycle.

By 1953, confessions of POWs in Korea and China referred to US waging biological warfare. This had to be strenuously denied yet was partly true: By early 1951 the US almost certainly *had* deployed bacteriological weapons, planned from late 1950, or earlier. By May 1951, China raised allegations about bacteriological warfare.

*Specific Objectives*: In this subsection, I identify ***eleven*** specific objectives of CIA’s clandestine research. By 19 March 1951, three objectives for ‘special interrogation’ had already been proposed, all apparently defensive:

(i) *Can accurate information be obtained from willing or unwilling individuals?*

(ii) *Can we prevent any outside power from gaining control of future activities (physical and mental) of agency personnel by any known means?*

(iii) *Can Agency personnel (or persons of interest to this Agency) be conditioned to prevent any outside power from obtaining information from them by any known means?*

A fourth objective seemed to include offensive capability:

(iv) *Can we obtain control of the future activities (physical and mental) of any given individual, willing or unwilling by application of SI* [Special interrogation] *and H* [hypnotism] *techniques.*

On 1 June 1951, a secret meeting was held at the Ritz-Carlton hotel in Montreal of five high-level US, Canadian and British scientific experts, to discuss research on special methods of interrogation. All had intelligence or defence links, and two (as we now know) were CIA staff. Donald Hebb, Professor of Psychology at McGill University, was the only one with expertise in behaviour modification (which might equate to ‘mind control’). He it was who raised the idea of sensory isolation/deprivation.He suggested that ‘experimental isolation in various forms for the production of sensory isolation’ might produce a state of mind in which subjects ‘would be susceptible to implantation of new or different ideas.’ The two parts of this statement, separately italicised, bear close scrutiny.

Hebb was an accomplished scientist in a relevant discipline. The scientific background to his proposal is interesting. In the late nineteenth century German-speaking world, a few leading psychiatrists contemplated how infants develop the sense of being a person. Carl Wernicke (following a lead from his mentor Theodor Meynert of Vienna), suggested that an infant develops an idea of him/her self as a continuing entity by noting regularity of patterned signals it gets from its own body, by contrast with the ever-changing signals from the outside world. Signals from its own body include those of touch (as it explores its own body), vision (as it sees the effect of its volition on movement of parts of its own body), and sensations of its body in movement. From such correlations an infant develops a concept which Wernicke called ‘The primary ego’[[36]](#footnote-36). With similar reasoning we may infer that throughout our lives we are continually reassured by such sensory feedback of the continuity of our body – in a primary sense, of our ‘self’. Extending the argument, by preventing all forms of sensory input, notably feedback from a person’s own body, a person may lose, temporarily or permanently, their sense of being a person, so carefully constructed over the years. That person thereby becomes thoroughly disoriented. This may have been Hebb’s reasoning. If we assume that the human mind/brain is initially a tabula rasa, then, even in an adult, sensory deprivation might equate to ‘wiping the slate clean’.

The second statement in Hebb’s proposal was that a person so disorientated ‘would be susceptible to implantation of new or different ideas.’ If the slate could genuinely be ‘wiped clean’, it should be possible to rebuild personhood ‘a la carte’ so to speak. From this, two further objectives could be added to those formulated at the CIA meeting on 19 March:

(v) To erase personhood in adults, and

(vi) To rebuild or replace personhood with a new version

We see in a later section of this chapter that the first of these was accomplished by Hebb and colleagues, as planned, and with frightening effectiveness. It also had some similarity to the approach of Alexander Kennedy (mentioned in Chapter 3, and earlier in this chapter) while not embracing the complexity and subtlety of Kennedy’s approach. The second of Hebb’s objectives was attempted by Ewen Cameron, profiled above. While also similar to objectives of Hebb and Kennedy, what he did was incredible, absurd and brutalising. It was a disaster.

As attempts were made to fulfil these objectives, they were incorporated into supposed methods of mind control. They did not mimic what intelligence agencies saw as practices used in China or Russia: ‘Sensory isolation’ was ‘home-grown’, to be used more, it seems, for offensive purposes, than to train military personnel to resist Soviet or Chinese methods.

Later in 1951 (20 August) project Bluebird had matured, with reports of actual trials. Objectives were spelt out in more detail in a list of 23 ‘specific problems’. The full list, as originally formulated, and in my re-classification is contained in Supplementary Document no 1 to Chapter 4. Six of the 23 were peripheral to my purpose here. Of the rest, in my judgement, two corresponded to item [i] of the March 19 list (’obtaining accurate information be obtained from willing or unwilling individuals’). None corresponded to item [ii] (‘preventing any outside power from gaining control of agency personnel etc’) and just one matched item [iii] (‘Can Agency personnel [or persons of interest to this Agency] be conditioned to prevent outside power from obtaining information from them)? The rest (11 items) corresponded to item [iv] (‘Can we obtain control of the future activities [physical and mental] of any given individual, willing or unwilling by application of SI and H techniques’), the only one in the list with mainly offensive potential. They included:

* *‘Could we seize a subject and in the space of an hour or two by post-H control have him crash an airplane, wreck a train, etc.?’[[37]](#footnote-37)*
* *Can we by SI or H technique force a subject (unwilling or otherwise) to travel long distances, commit specified acts and return to us or bring documents or materials? Can a person acting under post-H control successfully travel long distances?*

These aims suggest use in sabotage or terrorism.

Three further items which went beyond item (iv) suggestive of items (v) and (vi) arising from the discussion in Montreal (‘erasing’ or ‘rebuilding/replacing’ personhood). These were:

* *Can we use SI and H to combat fatigue, produce extreme mental effort?*
* *Can we guarantee total amnesia under any and all conditions?*
* *Can we ‘alter’ a person’s Personality? How long will it hold?*

The discussion in Montreal introduced ideas apparently from Hebb, not hitherto on Bluebird agenda, on which he could elaborate. There is a clear shift in emphasis towards offensive use. This shift appears to have been one of overall policy (defensive to offensive) as well as of specific technique. On overall policy, I have been unable to find clues of how and when the shift occurred. It is an important question.

Regarding the shift in methods to be used, there are several possible answers: News about confessions by POWs in Korea or China could have motivated a search for methods to condition US personnel from ever revealing what they knew, if captured. However, this is unlikely to have motivated the shift, since such news only came early in the next year (1952).

A person of interest is Dr Kurt Plötner. As already mentioned, in 1942, in Dachau he had conducted experiments on prisoners with mescaline. A prisoner’s nurse there stated that the goal had been: ‘*to eliminate the will of the person examined’*[[38]](#footnote-38). In 1946, the French sought to prosecute him. The Americans administration in the Munich region, replied that he could not be found, and was probably in the Soviet sector. This was incorrect: He was living under an assumed name in Schleswig Holstein (northern part of what became ‘West Germany’). He was never tried, never relocated to USA under Operation Paperclip, yet he *was* protected in Germany, outside the American zone, but by US administration.

One year before meetings just mentioned (on 9 May 1950), a Bluebird report states that the Surgeon General of the US Army was arranging a search of the Nuremberg Trials files, for anything on narcoanalysis, drugs and special interrogation methods. The search may also have provided detail on Plötner’s wartime activities. His concentration camp work also came to the attention of one Boris Pash, an American intelligence officer who went on to work in the CIA at the time of Operation Bluebird. One way or another, Plötner’s objective seems to have been introduced into Operation Bluebird, although LSD soon replaced mescaline. The notion of ‘eliminating the will’ became part of what developed in later projects of the CIA

The six objectives enumerated above seem to have been aims of clandestine CIA research in the bio-psycho-medical areas as envisaged on 20 August 1951. On this date, Project Bluebird became Project Artichoke with expanded objectives, now mainly offensive. At this stage, the CIA was collaborating with intelligence wings of each branch of the armed forces. On 13 April 1953, further expansion of Project Artichoke occurred under the name MKULTRA. Much of its research was contracted out to external bodies such as universities (the funding source concealed). Project Artichoke continued as the operational wing, in collaboration with branches of the armed forces. However, beyond those six, further objectives emerged at this time:

(vii) After the start of MKULTRA, methods continued in Project Artichoke including developing states of dependency to drugs of addiction, the withdrawal phase then being a time of special vulnerability, when interrogation might be most successful.

(viii) The CIA was becoming a large organization, with some parts pursuing objectives not in line with those of other parts, at least in the research area. One employee recruited by the CIA in 1950 – John Gittinger – had an interest in human personality variation, an interest which, for him, went back before the CIA’s establishment. His work, like that of Pavlov and CG Jung, assumed that personality was partly intrinsic, partly modifiable by the environment. From this he developed the Personality Assessment System[[39]](#footnote-39), which was to some degree opposed to the Tabula Rasa assumption of Hebb and others. His initial publications appeared to come from academia. In fact from about 1955, he was supported by one of the CIA’s shell funding agencies. His work, like that of Hebb, was one of the more robust developments resulting from CIA research, at least in scientific terms, and with enduring impact. For the CIA, it was used in interrogating captives, and in controlling and guiding agents in the field. At the time of the Cuban missiles crisis, Gittinger advised President Kennedy on how Khruschev might respond to any moves of the President.

(ix) MKULTRA was ended in 1963. After 1964, parts of continued under the name MKSEARCH, one of whose objectives was to explore substances which could be used as incapacitating agents.

(x) In late stages of the Vietnam war, when Richard Helms Directed the CIA, the agency under his command implemented and coordinated Operation Phoenix (see Chapter 5). It involved electrical torture of captives on a massive scale and killing of thousands of Vietnamese civilians. Much of this was perpetrated by Vietnamese collaborators, but under CIA instruction. After Operation Phoenix ended, similar atrocities continued in Latin America, under CIA guidance.

(xi) *Rendition’*: It was mentioned earlier in this chapter that, during the second World War, secret rendition of prisoners for purposes of interrogation in Londontook place. In the 1950s, in the heat of the early Cold War, and British colonial insurgencies, rendition also occurred[[40]](#footnote-40), almost certainly as collaborative operations between US and British intelligence agencies. Relocation was now achieved by air travel. There were no long-haul flights, and several stopovers for refueling or change of flights might be needed. It was necessary to keep a captive subdued or unconscious (by drugs), but nonetheless safe throughout the process. Prolonged heavy sedation or light anaesthesia of prisoners might have been a more pressing need than it is today. Sometimes rendition took captives away from, rather than towards ‘home territories’ (UK, USA, or perhaps commonwealth countries), that is, to ‘black sites’ overseas.

The best-known case of an individual rendered from one country to another was the Nazi war criminal, Adolf Eichmann. For many years after the World War, Eichmann had been living in Argentina. When his location was known, Israeli secret service captured him and, on 1 May 1960, escorted him to a waiting plane at Buenos Aires, which transported him, via a refueling stop in Senegal, and then to Israel to face trial. On the internet there is the profile of the doctor who collaborated in rendition of Eichmann to Israel[[41]](#footnote-41). It is likely that he was given an injected dose of a barbiturate. This is not free from risk (notably of respiratory depression). This doctor had tried the same method on a previous occasion; the person so rendered died from the injection (perhaps in combination with the fact that pressurized cabins were not properly operational). It is said that later, at an advanced age, this doctor committed suicide, perhaps overcome with remorse at how he had betrayed the Hippocratic Oath – a sensitive matter in Israel for historic reasons. This case suggests another motive for later CIA research – to develop safer means of rendition.

***Synopsis*:**

This chapter began with a summary of questions arising in earlier chapters and continued as a historical survey covering preceding decades parts of the twentieth century, up to the early years of the Cold War. Topics reviews including development of relevant scientific understanding, its use in psychiatry, interrogation methods by police, and, during the world war, methods of interrogation by intelligence service. After the war was over, hostilities continued as the British empire collapsed, and the US intelligence agencies developed their own distinctive methods for processing captives. The chapter ended with a list of objectives of the latter research, as general aims, and then as a list eleven specific objectives.

Some of the material surveyed sounds like science fiction, and much of it certainly seems like a travesty of proper scientific development, so say nothing of the hideous implications in the context of principles of medical ethics. Sadly, those eleven objectives were not fiction. They were to become fact, as we see in the next chapter.

In essence, if not in technical detail, Shakespeare had explored this dark territory three hundred and fifty years earlier:

***Come you spirits that tend on mortal thoughts, unsex me here; and fill me, from the crown to the toe, top-full of direst cruelty.***

***Make thick my blood, stop up th’access and passage to remorse,***

***That no compunctious visitings of nature shake my fell purpose. . . .***

***Wherever in your sightless substances, you wait on nature’s mischief***

***Come thick night, and pall thee in the dunnest smoke of hell,***

***that my keen blade see not the mark it makes,***

***nor heaven peep through the blanket of the dark***

***To cry Hold! Hold!***
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