

Relations Committee, whose approval is essential before a floor vote can be taken. The Foreign Relations Committee will not begin formal consideration of the treaty until it is submitted by the White House, probably early next year. In August, however, the committee plans to hold extensive hearings

on U.S.-Soviet relations in general and arms control agreements in particular.

In the meantime, Senator Kennedy and other signers of the June letter (including Maine Democrat Edmund S. Muskie, chairman of the foreign relations subcommittee on arms control)

are inclined to withhold final judgment on the treaty until further negotiations clarify its application to peaceful nuclear explosives. At present, Kennedy added in an interview, "It is not clear that this treaty is better than nothing."

—LUTHER J. CARTER and
ROBERT GILLETTE

Butner: Experimental U.S. Prison Holds Promise, Stirs Trepidation

In the flat, muddy little town of Butner in North Carolina, the Federal Center for Correctional Research, the government's flagship for modern criminal rehabilitation, is slowly taking shape. Scheduled for completion last April, it will probably open sometime in 1975.

The Butner facility, originally (and unfelicitously) christened the Center for Behavioral Research, has been a gleam in the eye of the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) for over a decade. But it was not until 1969, when President Nixon asserted that something had to be done about crime in America and directed BOP to become the model for corrections on all levels, that money became available for construction of the \$13.5 million complex.

If the stated plans for treatment of inmates in the new prison become a reality, Butner could indeed be an unprecedented breakthrough in "corrections," a much-used term which so far has proved to be of little substance in this country's penal system. At best, Butner could supply a humane and noncoercive environment where prisoners would learn interpersonal and vocational skills that would reverse patterns of self-destructive behavior and set them on the track to satisfying and socially acceptable lives. But at worst, some say, Butner could become a place where novel forms of punishment and repression could be carried on under the name of treatment.

The plans for Butner, largely formulated by psychiatrist and warden-to-be Martin G. Groder, have aroused considerable skepticism among those concerned with prison reform and the rights of institutionalized individuals.

The envisaged programs sound benign enough, but for people who are familiar with the way the prison system can subvert good ideas, they may sound too good to be true. Butner is coming online at a time when technologies for the manipulation of human behavior have been flowering. In the past few years there have been alarming reports of the use in prisons of psychosurgery; the administration of drugs for purposes of aversive conditioning; and other punitive techniques, ranging from shock treatments to solitary confinement, that now commonly go under the rubric of "behavior modification." BOP officials have many times affirmed that none of these practices will be used in Butner. Nor does it bear any relation to project START, an "institutional adjustment" program for antisocial inmates, that was recently terminated at the Springfield, Missouri, federal penitentiary. Nonetheless, any activities in the penal system that go under the name "research" are regarded with suspicion by civil libertarians, and with downright fear by the increasing number of prisoners who see themselves as victims of political and racist oppression.

What's more, the fact of the Butner facility highlights conflicting philosophies in the field of corrections, which is now in a state of massive confusion. A major current trend is toward deinstitutionalization. People who are down on jails believe that the institutional setting is too dehumanizing for any meaningful rehabilitation to take place, and that any experimental programs should be carried out in communities. Others say that institutions are not necessarily bad, and point out that so long as it is necessary to incarcerate some people

there must be some way to make the experience useful. Groder belongs to the latter school.

The original idea for Butner sprang from a long-standing need, as perceived by the BOP, for more federal inpatient psychiatric facilities to supplement the only unit now in existence, the Springfield Medical Center in Missouri. (Another one is planned for the West.) Subsequently, as various rehabilitation programs made their way into federal prisons, it was decided that the Butner facility should have another component, a unit to evaluate these programs on regular federal prisoners. Butner will therefore comprise two institutions in one complex. The inpatient facility, divided into three sections, will house a total of 140 short-term psychiatric patients.

The research part, which has been the focus of all the controversy, is designed to house 200 prisoners drawn from various federal prisons in the eastern United States. They will be randomly assigned to four separate communities called "correctional program research units," each of which is devoted to conducting a program which combines in various ways group therapy, individual counseling, educational instruction, vocational skills training, and physical education. Each program will offer a way—in the terms of transactional analysis, of which Groder is a student—to turn an individual from a "loser" into a "winner." "Different roads to the mountaintop," explains Groder.

Groder has settled on five programs as candidates for the four program slots. They are as follows:

- Asklepieion. This is a group therapy technique which Groder himself devised in his previous job as psychiatrist at the Marion penitentiary in Ohio and will be run by an ex-prisoner, a transactional analysis counselor trained by Groder. It combines Eric Berne's transactional analysis, techniques of Synanon therapy (otherwise known as "attack therapy"), and primal therapy. Prisoners will work out a "life plan"

with counselors and get into appropriate courses of educational and vocational training. The program managers are to be individuals (ex-"losers") who have been through such a program, and it is believed that this "prevents the formation of the traditional We/They relationships so prevalent in traditional correctional institutions."

- **Human resources development unit.** This is a model developed by Robert G. Carkhuff, a psychologist who runs a private consulting firm in Massachusetts. As Carkhuff (who has no formal relationship to the Butner program) explains it, the program is designed to expand options available to an individual by increasing his repertoire of responses to life's problems and challenges and expanding his skills—inter-

personal, vocational, and physical. "Living, learning, and working" is what it's all about. The philosophy draws on that of Carl Rogers—that people, like plants, are basically good and their natural tendency is to grow. There is an emphasis on individual counseling; in this as in other programs, inmates will get increasing responsibility and privileges, such as going into town for courses, as they progress. Carkhuff claims that the program, when tried out in Kalamazoo County jail, brought the recidivism rate down to 10 percent.

- **Psychodrama.** This proposal, developed by Norman Zinger of the Psychodrama Training Institute in Washington, D.C., is based on altering people's concepts of their roles in society. Since criminality is a person's

reaction to the institutions, people, and values a person grows up with, the idea is to create a healthy environmental setting where a constructive role can be developed. There is supposed to be much egalitarian interaction with the staff and "a therapeutic milieu where everyone is both therapist and patient to everyone else." This unit will actually have a stage for the dramas.

- **Rational self-counseling.** This program, based on the thinking of Albert Ellis, was developed by a Jesuit priest from Kansas City, Robert T. Costello. This is a "didactic, Aristotelian" program, says Groder, with large classes and emphasis on rationality. The idea is that bad decisions (and anyone who ends up in prison must have made some bad ones somewhere along the line) are based on irrational beliefs. The rational man is the man who has control over himself and thus over his destiny.

- **Yoga.** As envisioned by Bo Lozoff, a local yogi, this is probably the most novel of the proposals. Newcomers to the program will be given a choice of being in a hatha-kundalini yoga program, where emphasis is on physical exercises and practices channeling physical energies, or in jnana yoga, a more intellectual version which focuses on meditation, breathing, reflection, and study. One thing prisoners will discover is how, through meditation, to alter consciousness without the use of drugs. That is especially relevant to this population, about one-third of whom will be drug addicts if they reflect the federal prison population. Biofeedback training is included. Both groups will participate in karma yoga, the yoga of worldly activities, which includes cultivating a vegetable garden.

Groder says he hasn't yet decided which program to leave out. While all the programs overlap and have common goals, some are expected to be more effective than others; the least effective will be phased out in 2 to 4 years and replaced by new programs.

The purpose of all these schemes is to help inmates develop the self-esteem, resourcefulness, and skills that will enable them to find rewarding and socially acceptable employment and get established in a stable interpersonal setting, or, as Groder puts it, "a job and a woman." He says statistics show very low recidivism among ex-convicts who have gotten into the job-and-woman pattern (about 10 to 15 percent, as opposed to an estimated national recidivism rate of two-thirds). But there are no hard data which show that pris-

Butner's Psychiatrist-Warden

Despite an appearance reminiscent of a prematurely retired heavy-weight, Martin G. Groder, warden-designate of the new federal correctional research facility in North Carolina, is widely regarded as one of the brainier and more enlightened members of the federal prison establishment.

Prison work holds few attractions for mental health professionals: The pay and status are low, the rewards are few, the environment is not pleasant, and many professionals prefer to avoid the ethical bind involved in working for an institution they regard as being devoted to dehumanization and degradation of inmates. Groder is one of the few who appear to relish the challenge of trying to improve things.

Groder got into prison work more or less by chance. Following completion of his psychiatric residency at Langley-Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute in San Francisco in 1968, he was sent to the Marion, Ohio, federal penitentiary to fulfill a 2-year obligation to the Public Health Service. In keeping with his history of precocity (documented in his 13-page curriculum vitae) he promptly set about organizing a therapeutic community based on his 2 years of association with Eric Berne, founder of transactional analysis, and the Synanon Foundation. He named the resulting amalgam Asklepieion. He believes the program has been a success and boasts 20 "graduates" (meaning they stuck out the program, which is voluntary, for 2 years), most of whom are now trainers for other Asklepieion groups. The program remains controversial—as witness a letter sent by the Prisoners' Coalition to the United Nations denouncing it as a brainwashing exercise—but Groder pooh-poohs the critics as being "political."

Here is how Groder describes a "Synanon game" he played when he felt a therapy group at Marion was getting nowhere: "Eight of them walked into the room and sat down—and I proceeded to rip them off, one after the other. I just shit all over them about all the things that had come to my attention that were so obvious to me about the trickiness, the lies, the misrepresentations, their attempts to get negative strokes by playing Kick Me, their inane dedication to stupidity, their tremendous fear of breaking any of the rules of the so-called 'convict code,' while at the same time being busily engaged in breaking them and covering up the fact—just the whole ball of dirty wax." This is pretty rough, but then most prisoners have a somewhat different set of problems than the average middle-class neurotic.—C.H.

oners who participated in rehabilitation programs fare better in the free world than those who didn't. Groder says this is because rehabilitation programs have been pursued in a piecemeal and half-hearted manner, with nonsupport or outright undermining by prison administrations. Butner will be unique in that the entire population will be in programs, and the warden will be with them all the way.

"At the very least, a closely integrated program reduces the detrimental effects of incarceration," says Groder. But he is out to prove much more—he believes the programs can be tuned up to the extent that anyone who completes two years at Butner can walk out with a 90 percent chance of being a "success."

The facility will employ a central research staff composed of six professionals with doctorates who will evaluate the programs, drawing on the resources of universities in the nearby Research Triangle area which includes Duke University and the University of North Carolina. Groder emphasizes that the research will be on the programs, not on the people. While this may be merely a semantic distinction, it means at least that no effort will be made to categorize personality types or label inmates with psychiatric diagnoses such as "sociopathic."

Scientific Approach Claimed

Groder believes his method of selecting candidates for Butner holds up to standards for valid scientific research. A computer will randomly select the names of 1200 "eligible" prisoners. The eligibles will be males between 18 and 55 who will have a "release destination" within 400 miles of the facility so they have better opportunities for job seeking and seeing their families while in prison. Since attendance at Butner is not to be tied up with promises of parole, all candidates will have an estimated 18 months to 3 years remaining to their sentences (end of treatment is supposed to coincide with end of sentence). Omitted will be special offenders such as Mafiosi, government informers, and politicians, and some people with a history of serious psychiatric disorders. Otherwise it is hoped prisoners will represent a cross section of the total eligible population. Only those prisoners who want to will be transferred to Butner. Of the 1200, some 500 will be invited (about 40 percent are expected to accept) and the rest will be regarded as controls. This will in-

clude 200 non-invitees whose careers vis-à-vis the law will be followed by computer, 200 who turned down their invitations, and 200 who will be asked to cooperate to some extent with the Butner program by filling out questionnaires. Groder believes some of the selection bias will be ironed out by the fact that a portion of the control population will be individuals who wanted to come to Butner but weren't asked (he says he already has about 50 letters from inmates who want to participate). The research design is a long-term one, and no definitive findings are expected until the end of the decade.

On paper, including the blueprints, Butner looks great. Its 42-acre "campus" will abound with baseball fields, handball and volleyball courts, and a miniature golf course. There will be a "community green," barber shop, gymnasium, chapel, theater, and classrooms. Most prisoners in the research part (as well as in the psychiatric facility) will have their own rooms with impermeable plastic and glass windows instead of bars. As a medium-security facility it will have a double fence, but instead of guard towers there will be underground sensing devices and vehicular patrols. Since Butner has a "big commitment" to work with families of prisoners where available, there will also be a playground for the children.

Although the ratio of staff to prisoners will be high—211 employees (half of them directly involved with treatment) for a total of 340 residents, the costs are low considering the potential benefits, says Groder. Per capita daily cost of maintaining federal prisoners in fiscal 1974 will be \$16.71. At Butner the figure is estimated at \$27.30. But this figure includes the high costs of the inpatient facility as well as support for the research staff. The costs of the research facility alone are actually less than those involved in maintaining a traditional armed fortress with no rehabilitation programs, says Groder.

People concerned with prison conditions in America are withholding judgment on Butner, but they feel that mechanisms to ensure that the project is conducted as the plans say are seriously lacking. Arpiar Saunders, attorney with the National Prison Project of the American Civil Liberties Union, says of any treatment innovation: "If it can be abused, it'll be abused in prisons." Ned Opton, chief psychologist at the Wright Institute at the University of California, Berkeley, says a

program such as Asklepion "can easily be distorted into a very dangerous and evil thing." As an example, he describes an incident at a California women's prison where a similar program is in operation. During an all-night marathon the group concentrated a lengthy attack on a political radical which ended in the group beating her up.

Opton and others contend that prisons, like other institutions, have as their first priority self-perpetuation, and if the interests of an individual (even if that individual is the warden) conflict with those of the institution, the latter always wins. Since the programs envisioned for Butner, while already in piecemeal use around the nation's prisons, are not of proven effectiveness, these observers would prefer to see their preliminary large-scale application done on a community basis, with probationers, rather than in prisons.

But this leaves prisons in the same sorry shape they've always been, as Lee Bounds, former director of North Carolina prison system, remarks. "What do you do for a person not suited for the community because he is currently incapable of functioning in a law-abiding way?" asks Bounds. If no attempt is made to use prison as an agent of positive change, "How will you ever get him prepared for a community program?"

Future Unclear

The future of the Butner facility is especially unpredictable because it represents something of a departure for the BOP. Not only is this its first major investment in corrections research, but the responsibility for designing and carrying through the program rests almost solely in the hands of Groder. Three advisory panels originally set up to help formulate the programs have been allowed to fall into disuse, and several of their members say they now know no more about Butner than what they read in the papers.

Groder, at 34, already has an impressive array of professional credentials, and his ability and dedication to helping people in prisons sort their lives out are not seriously questioned. But Groder has demonstrated some arrogance and naiveté about the political implications of his project, which is one reason it has gotten so much bad publicity. A major question, as voiced by the National Prison Project and the American Friends Service Committee, is what will happen at

Butner if Groder disappears? As Saunders says, "In the prison system, one can not rest on the goodwill of one particular person."

So the chief concern is not what Groder plans, but what, given the institutional pressures of the prison system, the Butner facility will evolve into. Many reporters and critics who have questioned Groder find him to be distressingly vague on such matters as research protocols, selection methods for prisoners, and ethical guidelines. Groder appears to be deliberately trying to keep things flexible and open-ended. On ethics, for example, he says the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other bodies are busy formulating guidelines for research involving humans, so "we'll wait and see what settles out and looks sensible."

Observers agree that continued outside surveillance of activities at Butner is a must. Groder says he intends to run an "open institution," and he believes there exist adequate oversight mechanisms within Congress and federal agencies. An independent monitoring board would be "destructive . . . given the climate of opinion" among those who have an interest in destroying prisons altogether, he says. Bounds disagrees. "The only way to obviate the dangers inherent in a total institution is to have total exposure," and neither the institution nor its supporting establishment can be relied on to ensure openness. But Bounds is a rare voice among corrections officials, most of whom feel that having anyone looking over their shoulder will interfere with doing the job.

Butner's PR problems aren't over yet—most recently, Angela Davis, who now heads a group called the National Alliance Against Racism and Political Oppression, staged a demonstration in Raleigh to protest what she assumed would be psychosurgery and brainwashing of political radicals at the center. More moderate critics fear that even if all goes well at Butner it may open the way elsewhere for the involuntary commitment of prisoners to rehabilitation and therapy, as well as expansion of programs into the touchy and ill-defined area of behavior modification.

Groder remains confident that the fears are unfounded. And they may be, if Butner continues to be the focus of the kind of attention it has so far attracted.—CONSTANCE HOLDEN

National Research Act: Restores Training, Bans Fetal Research

It is presently against the law of the United States to experiment on any "living" human fetus, before or after induced abortion, unless the purpose of the experiment is to save the life of that particular fetus—an unlikely circumstance. The law does not say what it means by "living," which, in this case, is not easily defined, but one minimum rule of thumb appears to be that, if the fetus has a beating heart, hands off.

The controversial moratorium on fetal research, which will be in effect at least until early next year, is a provision of the National Research Act, better known as H.R. 7724, which deals with both the training of biomedical and behavioral researchers and the ethics of human experimentation. The bill passed both houses of Congress by overwhelming majorities, and President Nixon signed it on 12 July, but it is virtually impossible to find anyone who thinks it is very good legislation. Nevertheless, no one, including its opponents in the scientific community and in the Administration, lobbied very hard against it.

In subtle and not so subtle ways, certain provisions of H.R. 7724 circum-

scribe the freedom of scientists to manage their professional lives as they alone see fit. The most conspicuous example of this is the ban on fetal research, but a provision regarding the awarding of training money could prove to be equally restrictive.

The new law says, "Effective July 1, 1975, National Research Service Awards may be made for research or research training in only those subject areas for which . . . there is a need for personnel." The National Academy of Sciences (NAS) is asked to decide which disciplines are needy, and which are more needy than others. The act calls upon the academy to conduct a continuing study to establish several things: the nation's overall requirement for researchers in the biological and behavioral sciences, the subject areas in which they are needed, and the "number" of persons necessary in each area. One fantasizes an academy proclamation next spring declaring that what the country needs in 1975 is precisely 73 more neurobiologists. The academy, which in all likelihood will agree to undertake the study of research training,

probably never will be that specific, though it is not clear, to the academy or anyone else, just how it will go about its job.

The National Research Act traveled a long and tortuous course through the halls of Congress, and what has been brought forth as law is the product of controversy and compromise. The first step occurred a year ago when Representative Paul G. Rogers (D-Fla.), persuaded that the Administration's move to kill the National Institutes of Health's (NIH) training program was a bad one, introduced training legislation in the House. That House bill provided for training grants and fellowships, contained a provision for providing some support directly to institutions in which researchers trained, and required everyone receiving support to provide "public service" upon completing his training. Researchers could either engage in health research or teaching for 2 years for each year of support received or serve in the National Health Service Corps for 2 years for each year of training received. The House bill also contained a paragraph saying, in effect, that research must be conducted according to ethical standards.

In the Senate, there were two separate bills, each introduced by Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.). One dealt with training, the other with the ethics of human experimentation. They were not related to each other. The Senate training bill differed from the House version in a couple of key re-