

The Battle for Men's Minds: How Politics, Science, and Secrecy Sustained MKULTRA

Introduction

In the early years of the Cold War, the battleground between the United States and the Soviet Union was initially defined by territorial expansiveness, military capacity, and ideological influence. Yet by the early 1950s, this contest expanded beyond conventional domains into a far less tangible arena—the human mind.

The expansion into such a psychological frontier engendered significant anxiety within the U.S., largely because the threat could neither be seen nor measured. Growing reports described American prisoners of war adopting enemy rhetoric or confessing to fabricated crimes, eliciting great concern within U.S. intelligence.¹ And as the term “brainwashing” migrated from intelligence discourse into public and political consciousness, it came to signify not only a perceived Soviet capability but also a broader apprehension that how we think, act, and behave could become pieces on the chessboard of geopolitics.²

Under this renewed definition of national security, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) formalized Project MKULTRA in April 1953 under Director Allen Dulles. It was a covert research program that explored chemical, biological, and radiological materials capable of influencing human behavior in clandestine contexts.³ Just as its objectives suggest, MKULTRA was an expansive program, spanning eighty institutions and encompassing at least 149 subprojects.⁴ These subprojects ranged from the surreptitious dosing of unwitting Americans with lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD) in CIA safe houses under Subproject 3, to the “psychic driving” of depression or anxiety patients through prolonged sleep “treatment” and intensive electroshock at McGill University’s Allan Memorial Institute under Subproject 68, to experiments in the remote control of animals through implanted electrodes under Subproject 94 for use in “direct executive action”—the Agency’s internal euphemism for assassination.⁵ As such, MKULTRA and its successors stood among the most extensive covert scientific initiatives of the Cold War, in scale and ambition.⁶

At first glance, MKULTRA’s scale gives it the aura of terrible competence: millions of dollars, dozens of institutions, hundreds of researchers, and a seemingly legitimate political mandate. However, the surviving records reveal instead an expanding machinery of frustration. By 1960, Sidney Gottlieb, who had overseen the program since its founding, acknowledged that its substances had been used operationally only on several occasions and had proved too erratic to manipulate human behavior.⁷ Its first major test, the 1953 dosing of Army biochemist Dr. Frank Olson, ended nine days later with Olson’s fatal fall from a New York hotel.⁸ The episode was concealed within the Agency for twenty-two years and surfaced only through the 1975

Rockefeller Commission.⁹ CIA Inspector General John Earman confirmed its scars in 1963: MKULTRA was “expensive and often unpredictable in results,” and its premises were widely regarded as “distasteful and unethical.”¹⁰ By the Agency’s own standards—utility, reproducibility, coherence, and reliability—the program had given little reason to trust it. Even before the full ethical weight of its human experimentation is considered, termination might have been expected. Yet, MKULTRA and its successors survived for nearly twenty years.¹¹

Few clandestine research enterprises attain such longevity, and, because negative results build pressure, narrow hypotheses, redirect funding, and eventually bring the project to an end, even fewer could persist for so long without pragmatic or significant findings. MKULTRA stands among those exceptionally rare cases. Its failures never consolidated into a single institutional verdict; they were softened into inconclusiveness and converted into a pretext that the next test, the next compound, or the next subject might yield success where the last had not. Hence, interpreting MKULTRA as a conventional story of scientific progress or institutional misconduct would likely render its sustaining mechanisms incomplete. While Cold War urgency supplied the imperative and contemporary science supplied the plausibility, it was the CIA’s meticulous architecture of secrecy that supplied the endurance. By restricting information circulation, fragmenting responsibility, and limiting oversight, it prevented failure from crystallizing into actionable knowledge and transformed uncertainty itself into an administrative resource, holding the question open, the funding defensible, and the search alive. Ultimately, MKULTRA is less a story of political or scientific abuse committed in the name of national security than an illumination of how the two were calibrating each other all along within contemporary institutional architecture, allowing failure to enter as evidence and leave as permission.

Cold War Fear and the Making of a Cognitive Battlefield

What compelled the CIA into laboratories for psychological experiments was fear—a fear that the Soviet Union and its Chinese ally had already won the contest for the brain, and that unless the United States competed with comparable urgency and ruthlessness, the Cold War could be lost not on the battlefield but inside the skulls of soldiers, diplomats, and citizens.

By the early 1950s, having observed both Ivan Pavlov’s conditioning experiments and the performative confessions of Stalinist show trials, Americans had long associated the Soviet Union and Communist China with a form of psychological coercion that the U.S. did not yet possess or understand.¹² The former demonstrated that external stimuli could manipulate involuntary biological responses in dogs.¹³ And in humans, Soviet researchers reportedly conditioned a young boy to salivate “at the thought of the number four” by asking him to divide eight by two.¹⁴ Such exotic and visceral reports fed a growing anxiety inside American

intelligence. Compounded by the Soviet Union's nuclear parity, American anxiety was inflamed as the stakes of the ideological contest over maintaining its spheres of influence increased. But no one could say by how much. Darker questions were raised when senior party official Yuri Pyatakov prostrated himself before Stalin, begging for the honor of personally shooting his fellow defendants. Analysts suspected arcane strategies.¹⁵ Hypnotism? Drugs? The CIA analysts found it difficult to square the defendants' capitulations with any conventional theory of human motivation, so everything remained speculative. The defendants were committed Bolsheviks, the venue was Moscow, and the spectacle could still be dismissed as the peculiar pathology of a closed ideological world. With this premise, the phenomenon appeared exceptional, even dismissible.

But the complacency soon proved to be an illusion in February 1949, when the show trial of Cardinal József Mindszenty demonstrated that the phenomenon was not coincidental. The leader of the Catholic Church in Hungary and the loudest voice against the country's nascent Communist regime, Mindszenty had been arrested on December 26, 1948, on manifestly false charges of treason, espionage, and currency speculation.¹⁶ Before his arrest, the cardinal had taken the precaution of circulating a written notice to his clergy: any future confession, he declared, "would be a consequence of human frailty, and in advance I declare it null and void."¹⁷ Still, on February 3, the man who had refused to bend before Hungary's wartime Arrow Cross fascists, who had been one of the only Hungarian prelates to denounce the deportation of the Jews, rose before a five-man Stalinist tribunal and confessed that he was guilty "in principle and in detail of most of the accusations made."¹⁸ Foreign correspondents filed into a tightly managed courtroom, passing guards and repeated credential checks before witnessing a confession that seemed disturbingly theatrical.¹⁹ Later, American journalist Stephen Kinzer summarized the impression Mindszenty made on observers as a man speaking "in a monotone," with eyes "a little bit glazed."²⁰ When the verdict of life imprisonment was declared on February 8, the cardinal spoke only once, to ratify his attorney's appeal.²¹

Immediately, Washington became ever more alarmed. Given the Soviets' early dominance in behavioral science, such alterations in Mindszenty's appearance, behavior, and speech were taken as evidence that Mindszenty had been subjected to mind-control strategies—drugged, hypnotized—putting him "beyond the reach or realm of human help."²² Inside the CIA, the verdict was simpler: "Somehow," one intelligence officer remarked, "they took his soul apart."²³ To the Agency, the implication was difficult to resist. If a technique existed that could disassemble a man like Mindszenty in six weeks, ideology had nothing to do with it, and no Western subject—diplomat, soldier, or citizen—was safer or more determined than the Cardinal had been.

Driven by such uncertainty and anxiety, the institutional response became active before its public language existed. On April 20, 1950, Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) Roscoe

Hillenkoetter authorized Project BLUEBIRD, the CIA's first formal mind-control program.²⁴ Sheffield Edwards, head of the Office of Security, framed it as an investigation of whether "the polygraph, drugs, and hypnotism" could be used "to attain the greatest results in interrogation techniques."²⁵ Although the framing was modest, the underlying questions were not. Polygraph expert Morse Allen, who took operational command as the project's Security Supervisor, posed four foundational questions whose ambition foreshadowed the scope the Agency was already contemplating in 1950: whether accurate information could be extracted from unwilling subjects; whether Agency personnel could be conditioned to resist foreign interrogation; whether the CIA could obtain control of any individual's future actions, "willing or unwilling"; and whether it could prevent hostile powers from doing the same to American agents.²⁶ Evidently, these were not questions of an Agency seeking better lie detectors. They presupposed the possibility of a technology of total psychological control and treated its development as a legitimate object of state investment.

Into this institutional ferment, in September 1950, came a single word that would do more to shape the next two decades of American behavioral science than any laboratory finding. On September 24, the *Miami Daily News* published "'Brain-Washing' Tactics Force Chinese Into Ranks of Communist Party," a feature by foreign correspondent Edward Hunter. He claimed that the Chinese word *hsi nao*, meaning literally "to cleanse the brain," described a systematic Pavlovian technique which the Chinese Communist Party was using to remake the political identities of recruits and dissenters alike.²⁷ The article arrived at a moment of maximum cultural receptivity. The Korean War had just begun, Mao Zedong's Communist forces had driven Nationalist leader Chiang Kai-shek from the mainland only months earlier, and the U.S. was still processing the psychological shock of the Soviet atomic bomb test in August 1949. Hunter's allegations helped transform a Chinese thought-reform and reeducation practice into evidence of a totalitarian science.

What Hunter's audience could not know—and what he would not publicly acknowledge until his 1959 testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee—was that he had served in the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) from the time of Pearl Harbor through its dissolution, had "helped close up shop" at war's end, and had continued intelligence work under successor organizations including the Strategic Services Unit and, after 1947, the CIA itself.²⁸ His article therefore occupied an ambiguous position. It appeared to the broader American press that picked up his framing within weeks as a dispatch from a freelance observer. But it was in fact the public-facing voice of an intelligence community that had authorized Project BLUEBIRD five months earlier and was actively investigating the very phenomenon Hunter claimed to be exposing.²⁹ This allowed the word "brainwashing" to organize scattered anxieties into a single explanatory category; show trials, prisoner confessions, the Chinese reeducation

campaign, and Communist interrogation successes could no longer be interpreted as coincidences within this climate.

This was the power of one word. As Timothy Melley argues in his *Grey Room* article “Brain Warfare,” brainwashing began as “an [O]rientalist propaganda fiction created by the CIA to mobilize domestic support for a massive military build-up,” mobilizing support for the authorization of the covert mind-control research.³⁰ Even if one accepts that formulation only in part, Hunter’s language made the imagined threat socially legible before it was scientifically established. Once the American press and, increasingly, the American public came to believe that Communist regimes possessed a science of mind capable of remaking captured personalities, BLUEBIRD acquired a layer of political insulation it had not previously enjoyed. The CIA had not built the spectacle, but it had supplied the lens through which the spectacle would be viewed. Through it, doubt acquired coherence, coherence acquired urgency, and urgency imperceptibly paved the way for the CIA’s decades-long exploration.

While Hunter’s vocabulary was earning its cultural ground in the American press through the autumn and winter of 1950, the CIA was escalating on a parallel, largely invisible track. The Korean War had begun three months before Hunter’s article appeared, and by the winter of 1950-51 Chinese forces had crossed the Yalu and pushed United Nations troops south of the 38th parallel; American POWs were being captured in significant numbers, and the war had become the first major American military engagement of the Cold War in which captured servicemen were subjected directly to Communist interrogation.³¹ Under additional pressure of persistent American casualties, BLUEBIRD was renamed Project ARTICHOKE and substantially expanded on August 20, 1951.³² ARTICHOKE brought the Army, Navy, and Air Force into joint participation and grew beyond hypnosis and interrogation strategies, encompassing gases and aerosols, electroshock therapy, bacterial agents, and even contemplated psychosurgery.³³

These two tracks—the cultural and the institutional—converged in the winter of 1952-1953, and their convergence is what gave the Korean POW confessions their interpretive force. By the time U.S. Air Force pilots Kenneth Enoch and John Quinn were shot down in North Korea in January 1952, Hunter’s vocabulary had been circulating in the American press for almost a year and a half.³⁴ Such vocabulary helped Americans interpret the disturbing news coming from the Korean War. It helped them understand Enoch and Quinn’s elaborate, seemingly voluntary confessions, as printed in the *China Monthly Review* in July 1952, to having dropped anthrax, typhus, cholera, and bubonic plague on Korean civilians. It helped them interpret reports that roughly five thousand American POWs had either signed confessions or petitioned their own government to end the conflict.³⁵ Hunter’s vocabulary had already prepared Americans to interpret evidence in a certain way. What might once have been understood through the older grammar of torture, fatigue, and political pressure was read as something more modern and more frightening—science and mind control. Consequently, the confessions seemed

to vindicate, at scale, the worst-case implications of Pyatakov and Mindszenty. By the spring of 1953, what changed was not the nature of the evidence so much as the expanding endorsement through which it was interpreted, growing large enough to absorb each new event as confirmation.

The CIA was caught in the same tide. On April 10, 1953, DCI Allen Dulles delivered a speech on “Brain Warfare” at a Princeton University alumni conference.

Dulles, who had assumed the directorship only two months earlier and who had been briefed extensively by Richard Helms, then Assistant Deputy Director for Plans in the CIA’s clandestine service, described an ongoing “battle for men’s minds” in which the Soviet Union was subjecting people to treatments that deprived them of “the ability to state their own thoughts,” becoming phonographs, “merely repeat[ing] the thoughts which have been implanted in their minds by suggestion from outside.”³⁶ With this visceral imagery, Dulles officially brought politics into psychology and neuroscience and their fusion in public discussion. By framing the problem in the language of warfare—the same metaphorical register that had been used to describe the nuclear arms race—Dulles was arguing implicitly that the U.S. had no choice but to compete in this domain, and to compete by any means necessary. The phrase “battle for men’s minds” converted a question of policy into a question of survival. Moreover, Dulles’s announcement that, while the Soviets were experimenting on political prisoners, the United States had “no human guinea pigs, ourselves, on which to try out these extraordinary techniques,” also acknowledged a structural asymmetry that would become the fuel powering MKULTRA’s ethical violations.³⁷ Together, his remark amounted to a promissory note. Three days after the Princeton speech, at the urging of Helms, Dulles authorized a new project to pioneer new ways of “discrediting individuals, eliciting information, and implanting suggestions.”³⁸

What Dulles authorized was not a single research project but an administrative architecture designed to absorb, expand, and conceal the behavioral research that BLUEBIRD and ARTICHOKE had been conducting since 1950. It was an extensive “umbrella project” of extreme secrecy and the CIA’s principal study of behavior modification through chemical, biological, and psychological means.³⁹ The four foundational questions from BLUEBIRD had grown into a research empire whose participants often did not know they were working for the CIA, or that they were participants in one of the world’s most destabilizing clandestine operations. The official cryptonym was MKULTRA.

The project’s name itself evinces its nature and scale. While “MK” indicated the project’s sponsorship by the Agency’s Technical Services Staff (TSS), “ULTRA” was a double entendre—a designation for the most secret classification of intelligence and the reflection of the “ultra-sensitive nature” of the human behavior modification and mind-control program.⁴⁰ Fittingly,

MKULTRA had no cover story, no public face, and no congressional oversight; the bulk of its records would be destroyed in 1973 on the orders of Helms, who then was the CIA Director, leaving investigators four years later with only the financial paperwork that had been misfiled in budgetary records and overlooked during the purge.⁴¹ Throughout its existence, the program reported to one man.

Sidney Gottlieb, a Bronx-born chemist with a PhD from Caltech and a club foot that had kept him out of military service in World War II, was the architect of MKULTRA.⁴² He had joined the CIA in 1951 as a research chemist in the TSS. By the time the project was authorized, he had risen to head the TSS Chemical Division and directed the program from its founding until his retirement in 1973. Under his direction, the program expanded to include the surreptitious dosing of unwitting civilians with LSD, CIA safe houses where prostitutes lured men for agents to observe, hallucinogen experiments on prisoners and patients at the Lexington Narcotic Farm, and psychiatric experiments that erased the memories of patients admitted for ordinary depression. The program produced at least one confirmed death—that of Frank Olson.⁴³ In the end, after wrestling with the exploitative experiments for two decades, Gottlieb finally supervised the destruction of the program's records on the orders of Helms, rendering a complete reconstruction of MKULTRA permanently impossible.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, the few surviving documents depict the steady administrative output of someone who appears to have been a sincere participant in the institutional conviction his program embodied. And that sincerity made him an epitome of contemporary patriotic intellectuals concerned about national security.

The brainwashing panic was not a cynical confection deployed by officials who privately doubted it; the internal record suggests that figures like Dulles, Helms, and Gottlieb were, to varying degrees, genuine believers in the threat they were responding to. Gottlieb's own depositions convey the disorientation of a man who had acted in full conviction and later found himself unable to recover the context that had made conviction possible. "All of this might seem farfetched now," he told his interrogators, "but I would beg you to try to live in another context, namely that of 30 years ago, when it was—things were thought possible then."⁴⁵ Not things were true, he remarked, but things were thought possible—an acknowledgment, however inadvertent, that the program had been built as much on the architecture of imagination as on that of evidence.

In fact, a partial reckoning with the scientific reliability of mind control came in 1956, only three years after the authorization of MKULTRA. The Wolff-Hinkle report, drawing on interviews with Soviet defectors and former KGB officers, concluded that the enemy possessed no occult technology—only hunger, isolation, and sleep deprivation, the unchanged toxins of fatigue of every prior century.⁴⁶ The POW confessions had been produced by what Louis J. West, then chair of psychiatry at the University of Oklahoma, called "prolonged, chronic loss of sleep," not Pavlovian programming.⁴⁷ Cardinal Mindszenty had been broken by fatigue and

torture, not drugs or hypnotism. But between 1948 and 1953, nobody in the CIA knew this for certain. In the absence of certainty, worst-case assumptions hardened into institutional conviction through Hunter's lens.

Nonetheless, Hunter's lens cannot explain MKULTRA's direction or duration. It accounts for the urgency of a mind-control program, but not why the CIA pursued LSD rather than language training, electroconvulsive therapy (ECT) rather than counter-propaganda, or sensory deprivation rather than diplomatic resistance protocols. Nor does it explain why the program persisted after its premise began to collapse. By 1956, the Wolff-Hinkle report had found no novel Soviet mind-control technology; the Korean War had ended; Stalinism had begun to fracture under Khrushchev's denunciation; and even Mindszenty, the founding symbol of the brainwashing panic, had been freed and granted asylum at the U.S. embassy in Budapest.⁴⁸ By the early 1960s, Gottlieb had conceded that MKULTRA's materials had only been used in nine operations and remained too unpredictable to control behavior.⁴⁹ The evidence supporting its most urgent claims had thinned, yet the laboratories, equipment, and funding multiplied.

Fear, packaged in Hunter's term, gave MKULTRA its initial mandate. The erosion of its premise could not easily dislodge it, particularly after emergency became investment and professional identity. Even with that, Cold War pressure only rendered the mind a battlefield and behavioral control a national security necessity, but neither determined the program's experimental form nor explained its two-decade survival after the dwindling evidence. The CIA required another force to translate fear into LSD, electroshock, and sensory deprivation. It was the postwar science that imagined the mind as a fully manipulable system. If politics made mind control urgent, science rendered it conceivable.

Behavioral Science and the Absorption of Failure

Converging with the American behavioral-science community, contemporary scientific paradigms supplied the program's techniques, legitimacy, and the epistemic framework by which negative findings could be reframed as warranting further research rather than grounds for termination.

When Dulles authorized MKULTRA in 1953, the specific menu of methods the program would pursue had no necessary connection to the Korean POW confessions or to Cardinal Mindszenty's Budapest trial. What determined that the program would investigate LSD, hypnotically induced amnesia, perceptual isolation, and high-voltage electroconvulsive depatterning was the state of behavioral science in the years shortly before the program's authorization. MKULTRA did not choose its methods so much as adopt the ones already lying at hand, in part to deny potential weapons to adversaries.

First synthesized by the Swiss chemist Albert Hofmann at Sandoz Laboratories in Basel in 1938 and recognized as psychoactive in 1943, LSD had already generated more than one hundred academic articles and clinical trials as a tool for inducing experimental psychosis.⁵⁰ By 1951, it came with a literature, a supply chain, and a community of practitioners that the CIA could repurpose. In 1953, Dulles authorized Gottlieb to spend \$240,000 to purchase what the Agency believed was the pharmaceutical firm Sandoz's entire ten-kilogram stock of LSD.⁵¹ Given that the quantity was sufficient for roughly 100 million doses, this was less a research investment than a strategic procurement decision to prevent a potential warfare substance from circulating.⁵²

Sensory deprivation, ECT, and hypnosis followed the same path, from psychologist Donald Hebb's perceptual-isolation experiments at McGill University to the Canadian-American psychologist George Estabrooks's wartime claims about hypnotic couriers and assassins.⁵³ Through this perspective, MKULTRA's originality lay not in discovery but in assembly: it compiled existing knowledge, willing investigators, and institutional resources, then bent them toward clandestine ends both to match the mind-control capabilities it attributed to the Soviets and to deny them a monopoly on lethal tools.

Gottlieb's importance also lay less in scientific originality than in brokerage. A Caltech-trained chemist with a limited publication record, he was adept at identifying existing lines of behavioral research with operational promise and connecting them to CIA objectives.⁵⁴ On his desk at the TSS sat a small wooden carving of a turtle bearing the inscription: "Behold the turtle—it never advances unless it sticks its neck out."⁵⁵ In its self-conscious valorization of transgression, the epigraph captures what the Agency had purchased in him, a chemist whose patriotism, intensified by his exemption from service in World War II, converted a preexisting menu of scientific techniques and tools into a portfolio of operational possibilities.⁵⁶

But to turn the paranoia into such ambitious research, the CIA needed more than one intelligence officer—it needed the mediating authority of a series of credentialed experts. When Dulles delivered his rhetoric, he was not merely informing his audience; he was epistemically laundering political objectives through the scientific diction.⁵⁷ By invoking jargon such as "research," "experimentation," and "behavioral modification," the CIA borrowed the legitimacy science conveys to justify operations that, had they been described in plain language, might have been harder to approve given MKULTRA's ambition and morally dubious methods. The scientists who subsequently participated became nodes in such a credibility network. Their institutional affiliations at Cornell, Harvard, Georgetown, and McGill veiled the program behind a respectable public face, signaling to anyone who might examine the enterprise that it was driven by professional goals rather than espionage imperatives.⁵⁸

No figure illuminates this mediating authority more sharply than Dr. Ewen Cameron. By the mid-1950s, he was the founding chairman of psychiatry at McGill; the director of the Allan Memorial Institute in Montreal; and the president of the American Psychiatric Association (1952-53), the Canadian Psychiatric Association (1958-59), and, shortly thereafter, president of the World Psychiatric Association (1961-66).⁵⁹ He had even evaluated Hitler's former deputy Rudolf Hess at Nuremberg, standing near the legal reckoning that produced the Nuremberg Code's insistence on voluntary consent.⁶⁰ When CIA psychologist John Gittinger encountered Cameron's 1956 article on "psychic driving"—the use of repeated auditory stimuli to induce behavioral regression—what impressed him was not merely the method but Cameron's titles.⁶¹ In a later deposition, Gottlieb claimed that his responsibility in overseeing the grant from the Society for the Investigation of Human Ecology (SIHE) to Cameron was specifically to ensure that the investigator was "serious and reputable."⁶² The CIA was purchasing prestige as much as research. Once attached to an investigator of Cameron's stature, speculative research acquired a presumption of legitimacy in the name of science, rendering funding defensible even when the resulting work became destructive, inconclusive, or scientifically untenable.

From 1957 to 1964, Cameron used psychiatric patients who had sought treatment for depression or anxiety at the Memorial, including Velma Orlikow, Jeannine Huard, and Mary Morrow—work the CIA funded through Subproject 68 during its first years and that Canadian government grants sustained thereafter.⁶³ He kept some in chemically induced sleep for as long as two months, waking them only for food and the bathroom.⁶⁴ He paired this with intensive Page-Russell electroshock—six successive shocks per session at voltages up to forty times the standard clinical dose—and psychic driving messages played through padded helmets for as long as twenty hours a day, sometimes in the voice of a patient's husband or mother.⁶⁵

When Huard first encountered psychic driving, it arrived as an apparatus she did not understand: "They had this machine on top of the bed and I said, 'What is that?' The nurse said, 'You have to listen to that.' I said, 'No, no, no! I'm not in Russia! I'm not going to listen to anything!'" Cameron nevertheless forced her to listen, looping the prescribed message:

*"Jeannine, you are running away from responsibility!
Why? You don't want to take care of your husband!
Why? You don't want to take care of your children!
Why? Why, Jeannine? Why?"*⁶⁶

When she managed to turn the device off, she was given nitrous oxide and forty pills a day to subdue her. Once, she escaped, running away from her room. But Cameron soon caught up to her, put his arm around her shoulders, and coaxed, "Don't you *want* to get well?" Eventually she was transferred, while pregnant, to an isolated dormitory called the "Sleep Room," where, along with the haunting psychic driving, patients underwent chemically induced

comas. Peggy Mielke's nursing notes recorded Sleep Room patients with "only babbles" and "infantile responses," and one "unable to say her own name."⁶⁷

The methods themselves should have been disqualifying. Taken at face value, none of the techniques resembled treatment, and little of it resembled research. Cameron conceded in his 1963 presidential address that despite testing psychic driving during chemical sleep, under hallucinogens and hypnosis, and immediately after electroshock, his team was never able to overwrite patients' existing thoughts, symptoms, or behaviors.⁶⁸ A later follow-up study of seventy-nine former patients treated under Cameron's depatterning program found no superior long-term clinical outcome compared with patients who had received alternative treatments. And among the twenty-seven respondents who completed a detailed memory questionnaire, sixty percent bore cognitive damage, including severe retrograde amnesia lasting from six months to ten years.⁶⁹ Still, Cameron converted even his own misgivings into proof that he stood at the frontier: "I even noticed in myself a reluctance to do this," he wrote of his early psychic driving sessions, "I felt that I was being unkind, insensitive, imperceptive... Yet only those who dared to go where nobody had gone before would discover anything new."⁷⁰

Such rhetorical convergence with the inscription on Gottlieb's desk is not coincidental. Both men inhabited a postwar scientific culture in which the willingness to transgress was understood as operational rigor. What allowed the disturbing "treatments" to proceed for seven years, across dozens of patients without consent, funded by a foreign intelligence agency and conducted inside a McGill teaching hospital, was the fact that the man administering it had three times been elected to lead his profession. His institutional prestige was the credential that licensed such transgression. Opportunistically, the CIA did not have to construct this disposition; it had only to identify and fund the practitioners in whom it was already developed.

Similarly, at Cornell Medical School, neurologist Harold Wolff—a Harvard-trained, former student of Pavlov, and "the father of modern headache research"—and prolific physician Lawrence Hinkle lent their reputations to the SIHE.⁷¹ The CIA placed them atop a funding apparatus that resembled an ordinary scientific foundation while quietly distributing Agency money across universities. As Gittinger later admitted, their names and Cornell affiliation served as "figureheads to give it an air of legitimacy," even though Wolff and Hinkle had spent decades on work that bore no relationship to behavioral modification.⁷²

That legitimacy worked because scientific prestige condensed an entire social ideal into a credential. In the sociologist Robert Merton's conception, authority signaled disinterested inquiry, communal verification, and organized skepticism; an institutional affiliation implied that claims had passed through systems designed to expose error.⁷³ The CIA purchased that implication wholesale. Reputations earned in legitimate fields became a substitute for scrutiny, enabling SIHE to fund Cameron's depatterning and psychic-driving experiments at McGill, as

well as drug-and-hypnosis tests involving twenty-six court-committed patients at Ionia State Hospital.⁷⁴ Wolff and Hinkle did not need expertise in behavioral science; their names were the expertise the program needed. This is the economy of scientific prestige operating at its most efficient.

While Cameron, Wolff, and Hinkle shielded the program before and during experimentation, scientific and institutional authority could also absorb catastrophe. Only seven months after MKULTRA's authorization, Gottlieb's deputy Robert Lashbrook surreptitiously administered seventy micrograms of LSD to Army biochemist Frank Olson and several colleagues at a CIA retreat.⁷⁵ Nine days later, Olson fell to his death from a tenth-floor window of the Statler Hotel in New York.⁷⁶ The response was a chain of credentialed institutions performing ostensibly ordinary functions. Inspector General Lyman Kirkpatrick reduced the affair to three pages and recommended mild reprimands; Dulles told Gottlieb only that he had exercised "poor judgment."⁷⁷ A medical examiner, relying on CIA officers' account, ruled the death a suicide after a cursory autopsy.⁷⁸ Subsequently, the episode was concealed within the Agency for twenty-two years, and the Rockefeller Commission disclosed it without naming either Olson or MKULTRA.⁷⁹ Only after Olson's son Eric exhumed the body in 1994 did forensic pathologist James Starrs find injuries "rankly and starkly suggestive of homicide."⁸⁰

The force of the episode lies less in any one deception than in the cumulative legitimacy of the chain. None of these men were lying in any prosecutable sense. Each action appeared procedurally defensible in isolation. But together, they converted a lethal experiment into a personnel matter. The professionals presumed to interrogate evidence instead authenticated the Agency's account. So long as catastrophe could be classified as individual instability, poor judgment, or an isolated accident in the name of science and decorated with the researchers' affiliation, it could not serve as evidence for termination.

Finally, the contemporary scientific paradigms served as an epistemic buffer themselves. The conviction that human cognition and behavior were lawful objects available to systematic intervention was the regnant assumption of American experimental psychology and pharmacology by 1953; B.F. Skinner's *Science and Human Behavior* appeared that same year, articulating the behaviorist confidence that the variables governing observable behavior could in principle be controlled.⁸¹ Within this framework, the failure of any specific experiment did not impugn the hypothesis; it indicated that the variables relevant and strong enough to condition one's response had not been fully excavated yet. Each null result generated by MKULTRA was assimilable as a methodological problem internal to the paradigm rather than as evidence against the paradigm itself.

MKULTRA's drug-based experiments followed such a pattern. Even after Gottlieb had concluded that LSD's effects on uncontrolled subjects were too erratic to support reliable

interrogation, he nevertheless authorized the expansion of drug testing, particularly LSD testing, to unwitting Americans because the capabilities of MKULTRA substances “cannot be established solely through testing on volunteer populations.”⁸² Accordingly, the CIA contracted George Hunter White, a Bureau of Narcotics agent who had worked under Stanley Lovell at the OSS during the war, to operate multiple CIA safe houses, most notoriously the San Francisco site, where sex workers were paid to help dose LSD and marijuana while CIA observers watched from behind one-way mirrors. White himself crudely christened the operation—“Operation Midnight Climax.” When attorney James Turner asked Gottlieb in 1983 what the operation had ultimately demonstrated about LSD’s interrogation potential, Gottlieb’s vacillation itself spoke louder than any of his defenses.⁸³ White had, as historian John Lisle puts it, “simply reinvented the wheel.”⁸⁴ Espionage had always relied on the postcoital disclosures of vulnerable men, and the LSD had added nothing to this technique that had not been available since antiquity. Even so, the program commissioned new subprojects, as the CIA leaders simply believed they needed to go “where nobody had gone before” to discover anything new.⁸⁵

When the prominent neurosurgeon Maitland Baldwin’s CIA-funded extension of Hebb’s sensory-deprivation work produced subjects who broke down within two to three days, the Agency’s response was to redirect Baldwin toward non-human primates and continue the human trials at the National Institute of Mental Health under cover, even when Baldwin himself testified that one Army volunteer had “an apparent breakdown” after forty hours and that the Office of Security advisor had warned the experiments were “terminal” if extended further.⁸⁶

Even when Cameron’s depatterning produced cognitive catastrophe in patients seeking treatment, Gittinger’s 1960 site visit described the work as a “continuing source of useful research data” rather than as evidence that the underlying theory was false.⁸⁷ When the Agency’s hypnotic interrogation experiments under MKULTRA struggled to produce the absolute “hypnotic couriers” Estabrooks had promised, it was the same motto of the need to tolerate uncertainty that compelled the CIA to simply absorb the result and shift resources toward other chemical methods.⁸⁸

At each wall the CIA hit, the empirical disconfirmation of the program’s hypothesis was metabolized as a methodological problem rather than a verdict against the paradigm. Scientific ambition had already trained participants to read failure this way. Hence, the scientific community not only provided experiments with cover for the program’s excesses, but also supplied the program with an ethical buffer that obscured the evidence that should have ended it.

Taken together, the scientific community constituted both the program’s hard and soft power. It supplied the apparatus and techniques, lent its prestige, and established an epistemic structure through its methodological preconceptions, allowing MKULTRA to absorb its own failures as warrants for continuation. Still, programs are ordinarily sustained by success.

Inconclusive findings should have bled it of researchers, participants, and funding. Why would the scientists and CIA waste two decades on a dead end? While all this sounds reasonable, the CIA's own internal memoranda raise a different question that, perhaps, offers a better answer—what if no one knew it was failing?

Secrecy and the Sealed Rooms

In MKULTRA, secrecy did more than conceal; it constructed a systematic and operationally enforced regime for governing knowledge, denying the program a full view of itself.

MKULTRA's secrecy rested first upon a legal and fiscal architecture that insulated CIA activity from ordinary external scrutiny. The Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 authorized the DCI to spend “unvouchered” funds for purposes of a “confidential, extraordinary, or emergency nature,” exempting such expenditures from the standard accounting requirements and congressional auditing procedures applied to other federal agencies.⁸⁹ The Act thereby removed the external fiscal visibility that might have otherwise compelled it to produce, preserve, and justify a coherent record of its activities, despite the provision not itself prohibiting documentation. CIA officials then converted that discretion into an administrative regime of restricted knowledge, using the rhetoric of information to justify it. “The life blood of intelligence is information,” one memorandum documented, while Helms, signing as Acting Deputy Director for Plans, similarly instructed Dulles that, “Even internally in CIA, as few individuals as possible should be aware of our interest in these fields and of the identity of those who are working for us.”⁹⁰ By the time Earman examined MKULTRA in 1963, only two officials in the Technical Services Division possessed full knowledge of the program; much of that knowledge remained unrecorded, and the accepted practice for its most sensitive activities was to maintain “no records.”⁹¹ This legislative and administrative scaffolding ensured that MKULTRA always operated within such a negative epistemic space—that it generated almost no official documentation, in an Agency legally exempted from financial transparency, under conditions where normal procedures for research oversight were deliberately waived. With this outlook, the secrecy was not a reactive cover-up of an embarrassing accident like Olson's. It was built into the program from the first memorandum of authorization.

However, the negative epistemic space secrecy fostered only obtained its longevity through compartmentalization, or the deliberate restriction of each participant's knowledge to the task right in front of them. Although ubiquitous in wartime clandestine practices, this principle acquired unusual epistemic significance within MKULTRA. Its 149 subprojects were strictly administered as self-contained units, and investigators were managed “unilaterally,” meaning that each specialist “is not witting of Agency support of parallel MKULTRA research in his

field.”⁹² A neurologist might receive funding, conduct experiments, and submit reports entirely unaware that a psychiatrist two corridors away was pursuing related work under the same CIA program. Compartmentalization completely severed the horizontal connections through which isolated findings occupied liminal space, preventing their accumulation into terminating evidence.

As Admiral Stansfield Turner later testified in 1977, MKULTRA produced chiefly independent financial paperwork—“approvals for the advance of funds, vouchers, and accountings”—rather than “overall status reports” assessing operational progress across its subprojects.⁹³ Without such synthesis, neither researchers nor administrators possessed the comparative vantage point required for institutional self-correction. A single failed trial, such as Cameron’s, could be interpreted as a local methodological setback, warranting another dose, another protocol, or another subject. Dozens of parallel investigations producing the same indeterminate or destructive result would have supported a different inference altogether—not that his trial had not yet succeeded, but that the program had not, did not, and likely could not. By ensuring that almost no participant could perceive that pattern, compartmentalization converted repeated disconfirmation into indefinitely renewable uncertainty.

Turned inward, secrecy also dissolved MKULTRA’s authorship. Across the 185 non-governmental researchers and eighty institutions identified in the surviving financial records, participation was divided into categories that tended to exculpate nearly every actor. Unwitting researchers could disclaim knowledge, while knowing participants were characterized as acting “in good faith and in the belief that they were aiding their government in a legitimate and proper purpose.”⁹⁴ Along with the mass destruction of records that could have restored the program’s panorama, this framing, which the Senate committee largely accepted, dispersed the capacity to be held responsible for the consequences of one’s decisions so widely as to make accountability nearly impossible, as no recruited researcher possessed the amalgam of intention, knowledge, and authority conventionally required for responsibility to attach. In this sense, compartmentalization and cutouts rendered MKULTRA not merely covert but morally authorless, illustrating a “near-total impunity at the institutional and individual levels for countless abuses committed across decades.”⁹⁵

Interwoven with compartmentalization was a funding architecture designed to separate CIA sponsorship from the institutions and investigators it supported. Through intermediary organizations, or “cutouts,” Agency money entered universities and hospitals bearing the appearance of ordinary scientific patronage, creating what Lisle describes as a “degree of plausible deniability.”⁹⁶ Frequently, the foundations were unaware of their role as conduits, their titles serving shields, much as the scientists did. By interrupting the documentary and institutional chain between CIA headquarters and the laboratory, the cutouts ensured that even visible research could remain detached from the covert program directing it.

The Geschickter Fund provided the most tangible form of this insulation. A nominally private foundation associated with Georgetown University, it channeled over two million dollars to outside investigators and received an additional million dollars for its own programs.⁹⁷ Through Charles Geschickter, a non-CIA pathologist at the University, the CIA contributed to the construction of a new research wing at Georgetown Medical Center. In turn, the Agency obtained one-sixth of the building's laboratory space and professional cover for three employees.⁹⁸ The Fund's chartered purpose—research into cancer, hypertension, psychosomatic disorders, and other chronic diseases—bore little relation to the compounds and techniques the Agency sought to develop, including compounds intended to produce amnesia, paralysis, confusion, and heightened suggestibility.⁹⁹ Its grants supported work ranging from Baldwin's experiments on concussive amnesia, which involved rocking the heads of primates to induce concussion and beaming microwaves into their brains until it risked “injur[ing] the heat center of the brain the way you cook meat,” to West's proposal to replace “true memories” with “false ones.”¹⁰⁰ In this light, the Fund's principal role was architectural rather than experimental. It embedded covert research within the physical and financial infrastructure of a civilian medical institution, allowing laboratories, personnel, and even federal matching funds to appear as components of conventional biomedical inquiry, fostering the very disjunction the program's secrecy required.

The primary cutout, however, was an organization of the CIA's own construction, performing the same function in a more portable form. Fronted by Wolff and Hinkle, the SIHE appeared to the public like an independent philanthropic foundation with the face of the Ivy League, consisting of respected academic directors, a board, and a budget. To reinforce that appearance, the SIHE funded irrelevant “smoke screens,” including the Turkish clinical psychologist Gökçe Cansever's study on the psychological effects of circumcision.¹⁰¹ This was formalized as Subproject 74, whose nominal purpose was to fund “small grants in order to permit exploitation of this material previously collected at great expense.”¹⁰² In this way, the grants were the CIA's direct investments in institutional credibility, establishing a record of legitimate scholarship against which the cutout's more sensitive sponsorship would appear unremarkable. Through this façade, the SIHE financed projects including Cameron's psychic-driving experiments and psychiatrist Martin Orne's research at Harvard on hypnosis, a state which “relieve[s] the individual of a feeling of responsibility for his own actions and thus lead[s] him to reveal information,” while leaving numerous “innocent people” unaware that their support originated with the CIA.¹⁰³

The two cutouts therefore orchestrated plausible deniability by concealing sponsorship in complementary ways. The Geschickter Fund rooted the Agency within a medical complex, translating covert objectives into laboratory space and capital, while SIHE was geographically untethered, extending CIA patronage across more than thirty projects and at least eight

universities, at roughly \$150,000 a year, through the portability of a foundation's name and letterhead.¹⁰⁴ One provided a building, the other an identity. Together, this architecture effectively exploited a postwar university culture increasingly dependent on external grants, where well-funded proposals aligned with a researcher's interests were difficult to refuse.¹⁰⁵ They made the CIA an absent sponsor, able to direct research while severing the routes through which scrutiny, responsibility, and adverse findings might return. When exposure came, the cutouts absorbed the institutional blame, while the CIA hid behind the fiction of ignorance.

Nevertheless, by the early 1960s, MKULTRA's failure to achieve predictable control over human cognition and behavior was substantial enough to be internally acknowledged and produced a limited restriction of the operation's methods. Earman's 1963 report proclaimed that, as of 1960, "no effective knockout pill, truth serum, aphrodisiac, or recruitment pill was known to exist."¹⁰⁶ Gottlieb likewise conceded that LSD was too situation-dependent to extract information reliably and that psychochemical materials had not produced the finely calibrated control the program sought.¹⁰⁷ At the November 1963 meeting convened to consider Earman's findings, Earman, Kirkpatrick, and Army Lieutenant General Marshall Carter opposed the continuation of unwitting testing, while Gottlieb and Helms argued for its preservation.¹⁰⁸ This sparked a measurable constriction. The officials agreed to revise the charter and testing procedures, with the unwitting testing remaining in abeyance pending a possible decision by DCI John McCone.¹⁰⁹

Even so, the changes addressed methods, not goals. Reconstituted as MKSEARCH, the program remained authorized to develop biological, chemical, and radioactive techniques engendering "predictable human behavioral and/or physiological changes" for sensitive operations.¹¹⁰ Georgetown researchers studied drugs designed to induce unconsciousness and erase memory.¹¹¹ The joint CIA and Department of Defense (DoD) program MKCHICKWIT, also born from MKULTRA, gathered foreign drug developments and samples from Europe and Asia.¹¹² Meanwhile, its testing wing MKOFTEN tested incapacitating compounds. Although revised protocols prohibited unwitting human experimentation, a CIA summary later indicated that prisoners and military personnel were exposed to EA-3167—a long-acting anticholinergic deliriant producing hallucinations and memory impairment—and suffered "after effects" enduring up to six weeks.¹¹³ The Agency's demand for mind-control capabilities and the scientific assumption that such control remained possible continued to power ethically dubious experiments outside the oversight of public, congressional, or independent scientific judgment in the MKULTRA child programs. Officials debated unwitting testing, not whether years of erratic results had discredited the search itself. Political demand and scientific possibility thus remained protected as premises, while criticism only attached to the methods through which they had been pursued.

Moreover, the contraction did not dismantle the architecture of secrecy. Acquisition, experimentation, funding, and oversight were divided across MKSEARCH, MKCHICKWIT, MKOFTEN, military laboratories, and cutouts. Only when these fragments were assembled did their continuity become visible. And the evidence required for that synthesis remained classified, incomplete, or disputed, so thoroughly that the CIA and DoD later contested responsibility for the EA-3167 tests.¹¹⁴ Consequently, while the de-escalation of MKULTRA was legible at individual levels, continuity remained illegible at the level of the enterprise, precluding the program's termination. Therefore, secrecy's ultimate success lay in its ability to preserve both the initial goals and the plausible deniability, even when inspection reached the program.

Eventually, secrecy did not preserve MKULTRA unchanged, but it sustained the pursuit of psychological manipulation through similarly disputable experiments, lasting for another decade. While politics supplied the imperative and science the possibility, secrecy prevented failure from crystallizing into a verdict against the imperative and possibility themselves. Only when MKULTRA's remnants entered the public did administrative uncertainty become political scandal, setting the stage for reform, cultural reaction, and enduring skepticism.

Exposures, Reforms, and MKULTRA's Limits

Among the candid entries in Earman's 1963 report, one observation has received comparatively little attention. Listed plainly among the program's "sensitive aspects" was the prediction that "public disclosure of some aspects of MKULTRA activity could induce serious adverse reaction in U.S. public opinion, as well as stimulate offensive and defensive action in this field on the part of foreign intelligence services."¹¹⁵ Stated at the height of the program and buried under the same apparatus of compartmentalization it describes, the sentence evinces a strange act of self-recognition—the CIA foresaw that what it was doing could not survive exposure and that its work depended on a public that could not be told what its government was doing in its name.

By the 1970s, disclosure finally came. It began with American journalist Seymour Hersh's December 22, 1974, *New York Times* exposé, whose revelations of domestic spying set the investigations in motion, then the Rockefeller Commission's 1975 report, the Church Committee's 1976 finding that MKULTRA exhibited "a fundamental disregard for the value of human life," and the 1977 joint hearing.¹¹⁶ These revelations entered a research-ethics landscape already transformed by the 1972 exposure of the Tuskegee Syphilis Study, in which the Public Health Service had withheld treatment from hundreds of Black men for decades.¹¹⁷ Public outrage contributed to the National Research Act of 1974, which mandated institutional review boards (IRBs) for federally funded research.¹¹⁸ However, MKULTRA posed a further question: could national-security secrecy substitute for consent and review?

The disclosures' most immediate effect was to strip the intelligence community of its presumed exemption from that regime of consent and review. After the Rockefeller Commission urged the CIA never again to test drugs on unsuspecting people, President Ford's Executive Order 11905 created the Intelligence Oversight Board and required written, witnessed informed consent for intelligence-agency drug experiments.¹¹⁹ President Jimmy Carter then extended federal human-subject rules and documented consent across intelligence-sponsored research.¹²⁰ In tandem, the 1979 Belmont Report articulated the principles of respect for persons, beneficence, and justice that still structure the Common Rule and IRB review across federally conducted or supported human-subject research today.¹²¹ The reforms made research of the kind the CIA had funded far more difficult to conduct without traversing an oversight apparatus.

These reforms, however, rendered MKULTRA's conduct impermissible without making similar conduct impossible to conceal. Secrecy remained the ordinary condition under which intelligence research was funded, conducted, and reported. The 1949 Central Intelligence Agency Act, whose unvouchered-funds provision had made the program legally possible, remained in force, and the intelligence community preserved compartmentalization as an operational necessity. In this sense, enforcement of the new rules would depend on the same closed machinery that had concealed the program for twenty years—inspectors general, compliance offices, committees briefed behind closed doors—an apparatus the public could not verify but only trust. Admiral Stansfield Turner's August 1977 testimony captured the settlement precisely: he placed MKULTRA firmly in the past, denying any ongoing drug testing or behavioral modification experiments, while briefing the committees on the Agency's continuing behavioral-science interests only in classified session.¹²² For instance, the CIA's post-9/11 interrogation program was designed by contract psychologists, authorized through classified legal memoranda, and revealed to the public only by the Senate committee's 2014 executive summary.¹²³ But unlike MKULTRA's covert dosing of civilians, the post-9/11 program operated on detainees held in U.S. custody. Nevertheless, the Senate found that some techniques exceeded legal or CIA authorization and oversight bodies received inaccurate or incomplete information.¹²⁴ Thus, the program had ended; the mode had not.

By contrast, MKULTRA's cultural aftermath is usually told as a story of irony. Unspooling through the program's own channels, the instrument of control became a sacrament of liberation. At the federally funded hallucinogen study at Menlo Park, young Ken Kesey volunteered and emerged as the counterculture's first evangelist. Beyond Menlo Park, dozens of cognate projects seeded the compound and helped release it into the population.¹²⁵ American poet and political activist Allen Ginsberg, dosed in 1959, later wondered in bewilderment: "Am I, Allen Ginsberg, the product of one of the CIA's lamentable, ill-advised, or triumphantly successful experiments in mind control? Had they, by conscious plan or inadvertent Pandora's Box, let loose the whole LSD fad on the US and the world?"¹²⁶ John Lennon of the Beatles made

the same point more tersely: “We must always remember to thank the CIA and the Army for LSD...They invented LSD to control people and what they did was give us freedom.”¹²⁷ But the counterculture’s appropriation of a weaponized pharmacology as a tool of liberation also demonstrates that once scientific knowledge has been generated, even in service of instrumental political aims, it cannot be kept within the purpose that generated it. The compound the Agency hoped would make an agent compliant became, in a 1967 college dormitory, a sacrament of refusal.

Yet, this refusal did not remain confined to the cultural left. It is the epistemic response that further exposes the reform regime’s limits. Because MKULTRA had certainly occurred, the post-1975 disclosures made a whole class of claims newly plausible. If the CIA had dosed men in San Francisco brothels, what else had it done? Gottlieb’s destruction of the entire documentary record in January 1973 created a perfect epistemological object—an absence designed exactly to resist interpretation. The Church Committee could conclude that the record was “incomplete,” but it could not say what was missing, leaving the population of plausible missing content unbounded. Into that vacuum flowed a parallel MKULTRA mythology, in which political assassin Sirhan Sirhan, cult leader Charles Manson, and heiress-turned-radical militant Patricia Hearst became products of CIA mind control and the reforms themselves became cover rather than correction. Much of this was, and remains, false. But its structure is more revealing than its falseness: the conspiracy theorist and the reform-minded citizen share the same premise—that the state had operated, for twenty years, on terms the public could not have consented to had it known—and differ only in what they make of it.

That premise landed amid the Pentagon Papers, Watergate, the FBI’s COINTELPRO surveillance of civil rights and antiwar leaders, and the slow public recognition that the Johnson and Nixon administrations had systematically misrepresented the trajectory of the war in Vietnam. Public confidence in the federal government, which had stood near seventy-seven percent in 1964, had fallen to roughly twenty-five percent by 1980 and has never returned on a sustained basis to its mid-1960s level.¹²⁸ But MKULTRA furnished a dimension the other disclosed secrets did not, which was the revelation that the state had recruited the medical and academic professions as its instruments. Notably, public confidence in the scientific community did not plummet in parallel; the General Social Survey records it holding remarkably stable from the early 1970s onward, even as faith in nearly every other institution eroded.¹²⁹

This asymmetry underscores that what the disclosures damaged was not trust in science as a method, but trust in the political custodianship of science, specifically the proposition that research sponsored by the state, conducted through universities and teaching hospitals under national security covers, would honor the ethical commitments those institutions professed everywhere else. It is in this seam, where political authority borrows the legitimacy of scientific

knowledge, that MKULTRA's signature on the post-Watergate trust collapse remains most legible.

In the end, the three aftermaths are not separate legacies but three responses to a single Cold War arrangement, one the program had assumed since Dulles's 1953 Princeton address: that, in an existential contest, open democratic debate must yield to national security prerogative, and that scientific and institutional authority could be enlisted to make the public's exclusion appear not as silencing but as expertise. From this perspective, the reforms did not so much repair the relationship between Cold War science and the public as institutionalize a management of its breakdown. They addressed procedural violations while leaving intact the deeper arrangement in which a government may classify the objects of its own research, pursue them through academic and medical intermediaries, and invoke national security against the disclosure that would permit democratic judgment. Once exposed, the founding assumption could be disavowed—the reforms wrote its disavowal into law—but it could not be unmade. The cultural and epistemic aftermaths are the residue of twenty years in which American scientific institutions had served an agenda they could not openly describe, and that residue has proved far less tractable to procedure.

The most unexpected inversion, however, was failure itself. Failure usually functions as a terminating force in scientific experiments. Encountering a failure often prompts correction or simply an abandonment of the pursuit. Ironically, within MKULTRA's political urgency, scientific potential, and compartmentalized structure, failure was neutralized; the continuation occurred not without but through it. Each unsuccessful subproject fed back into the system as another discrete experiment rather than as evidence of caution—perhaps, the sample was biased; perhaps, variables need to be better controlled. Thus, MKULTRA's design serves as a valuable case study for the institutional relationship between evidence and judgment. When structures of accountability are sufficiently weakened, institutions become self-perpetuating, operating independently of both empirical success and their original political rationale.

Conclusion

Ultimately, neither the Cold War national security impetus to match Soviet mind-control technology nor the scientific paradigms alone explains the tenacity of the CIA mind-control enterprise. The image of a novel Soviet technology had collapsed by 1956, and, by the early 1960s, MKULTRA generated a record of null results sufficient for Gottlieb to concede that predictable psychological manipulation remained out of reach. What converted these separately exhausted rationales into a self-sustaining enterprise was the institutional architecture of secrecy in which they were embedded—an architecture whose compartmentalization, the laundering of

identity, and the unvouchered-funds provision prevented failure from becoming a verdict and made it fuel for continuation.

Nearly thirty years before her deposition in the federal lawsuit against the CIA, the MKULTRA psychic driving survivor Jeannine Huard lay in a sealed room at the Allan Memorial Institute, listening to a recorded voice instructing her to retrieve a paper from the floor. She later recalled the conundrum the instruction posed:

“There is nothing but a little waste basket. And I hear, you pick it up, you pick it up, if you see a paper. So, I look all around, because it gets in my mind and I don’t see any paper... Why in the world would they tell me to pick up a paper on the floor, when there is no paper?”¹³⁰

Huard’s question is the question MKULTRA was structurally incapable of asking itself. Each researcher saw only his own floor; none could see the “paper” that the CIA was insisting could be found.

For twenty years, the Agency, too, lay inside a sealed room. It listened to its own looping instructions. It searched its own floor for the “paper,” an artifact of its own imagination constituted by Cold War anxiety, furnished with techniques by paradigms then held in high esteem within American behavioral science, and kept in existence by the inconclusiveness of the search for it, failing to register that the object it sought—mind control—was simply not there. In this respect, politics and science did not merely converge within MKULTRA; sealed from scrutiny, they became each other’s echo.

This was the battle for men’s minds, and here it was won. MKULTRA set out to learn how a mind could be made to believe against the evidence. But it only succeeded on one mind—its own.

Endnotes

1

Foreign and Military Intelligence: Final Report of the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, United States Senate, Senate Report No. 94-755, Book I (U.S. Senate, Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, 1976), 392–93,

https://www.andrew.cmu.edu/user/rp3h/lansberry/Church_Committee_I.pdf; *Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification: Hearing before the U.S. Senate, Select Committee on Intelligence; Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research of the Committee on Human Resources*, 95th Congress, 1st Session (1977), 68–72.

² Paul Betts, “Religion, Science and Cold War Anti-Communism: The 1949 Cardinal Mindszenty Show Trial,” in *Science, Religion and Communism in Cold War Europe*, ed. Paul Betts and Stephen A. Smith (Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2016), 275–307, https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-54639-5_12; Robert Jay Lifton, *Thought Reform and the Psychology of Totalism: A Study of “Brainwashing” in China* (University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 3–5, 414, https://ia601405.us.archive.org/18/items/ThoughtReformAndThePsychologyOfTotalism/Thought_Reform_and_the_Psychology_of_Totalism.pdf.

³ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 69–70.

⁴ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 5, 12.

⁵ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 15, 35, 79–83, 150–52; John Marks, *The Search for the “Manchurian Candidate”* (Times Books, 1979), 133–136, <https://archive.org/details/searchformanchur00john/mode/2up>; John Lisle, *Project Mind Control: Sidney Gottlieb, the CIA, and the Tragedy of MKULTRA* (St. Martin's Press, 2025), 116.

⁶ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 5, 12, 69–70.

⁷ John S. Earman, *Report of Inspection of MKULTRA/TSD*, Inspector General report (Central Intelligence Agency, Office of Inspector General, 1963), 16–18, <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/document/32731-document-16-john-s-earman-inspector-general-us-central-intelligence-agency-report>.

⁸ *Foreign and Military Intelligence*, 394–98.

⁹ United States President's Commission on CIA Activities within the United States, *Report to the President by the Commission on CIA Activities Within the United States*, Presidential

commission report (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975), 226,
<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.b4621686&seq=1>.

¹⁰ Earman, *Report of Inspection of MKULTRA/TSD*, 2.

¹¹ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 9, 72, 169.

¹² *Foreign and Military Intelligence*, 392–93; Allen W. Dulles, “Brain Warfare,” National Alumni Conference of the Graduate Council of Princeton University, Hot Springs, VA, April 10, 1953, 1–3, <https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP80R01731R001700030015-9.pdf>.

¹³ Ivan P. Pavlov, “Conditioned Reflexes: An Investigation of the Physiological Activity of the Cerebral Cortex—Lecture II,” trans. G. V. Anrep, with Christopher D. Green, *Classics in the History of Psychology*, 1927, 22–27, <https://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Pavlov/lecture2>.

¹⁴ Central Intelligence Agency, “A/B, 1, 38/8,” November 10, 1955, MORI 184428, quoted in Lisle, *Project Mind Control*, 10.

¹⁵ People's Commissariat of Justice of the U.S.S.R., *Report of Court Proceedings in the Case of the Anti-Soviet Trotskyite Centre: Heard Before the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R., Moscow, January 23–30, 1937* (Moscow, 1937), 59–60, <https://archive.org/details/reportofcourtpro0000piat/page/n7/mode/2up>; Donald Rayfield, *Stalin and His Hangmen: The Tyrant and Those Who Killed for Him*, 1st U.S. ed. (Random House, 2004), 271, <https://archive.org/details/stalinhishangmen00dona>.

¹⁶ János Kovács, *Documents on the Mindszenty Case* (1949; Athenaeum, n.d.), 3, accessed June 28, 2026, <https://redstarpublishers.org/Mindszadda.pdf>.

¹⁷ József Mindszenty, *Memoirs* (Macmillan, 1974), 127.

¹⁸ Mindszenty, *Memoirs*, 31–34; Emanuel Geltman, “Trial by Confession Sentences Cardinal; Aimed at Opposition,” *Labor Action*, February 14, 1949, 1, <https://www.marxists.org/history/etol/writers/garrett/1949/02/mindszenty.html>.

¹⁹ Edward M. Korry, “Mindszenty Is Sentenced to Life Term,” *Decatur Daily Democrat*, February 8, 1949, 1, Hoosier State Chronicles; British United Press, “Treason Trial: Life Imprisonment,” *Kalgoorlie Miner* (Western Australia Kalgoorlie), February 9, 1949, 5, Trove, National Library of Australia.

²⁰ Ben Brock Johnson and Amory Sivertson, hosts, *Madness, Part 3: Subproject 68*, Endless Thread, WBUR, May 8, 2020, Audio podcast, 35:38, <https://www.wbur.org/endlesstthread/2020/05/08/madness-part-three-subproject>.

²¹ British United Press, “Treason Trial: Life Imprisonment,” 5.

²² “Foreign News: REBELLION TO TYRANTS...,” *Time*, February 14, 1949, <https://time.com/archive/6785493/foreign-news-rebellion-to-tyrants/>.

²³ David Seed, *Brainwashing: The Fictions of Mind Control: A Study of Novels and Films since World War II* (Kent State University Press, 2004), 53.

²⁴ Marks, *The Search for the “Manchurian Candidate,”* 22.

²⁵ Central Intelligence Agency, Inspection and Security Staff, “Project Bluebird,” Memo, April 5, 1950, 2, National Security Archive / CIA CREST, <https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/document/cia-rdp83-01042r000800010003-1>.

²⁶ Central Intelligence Agency, “Special Research, Bluebird,” 1952, 1–2, CIA CREST / Public Intelligence, <https://info.publicintelligence.net/CIA-Bluebird.pdf>.

²⁷ Edward Hunter, “‘Brain-Washing’ Tactics Force Chinese Into Ranks of Communist Party,” *Miami Daily News*, September 24, 1950, 2A.

²⁸ *Effect of Red China Communes on the United States: Hearing before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and*

Other Internal Security Laws, 86th Congress, 1st Session (1959), 2,
<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=umn.31951d020924661&seq=4>.

²⁹ *Effect of Red China Communes on the United States*, 2; Timothy Melley, “Brain Warfare: The Covert Sphere, Terrorism, and the Legacy of the Cold War,” *Grey Room* 45 (October 2011): 30–31, https://doi.org/10.1162/GREY_a_00048.

³⁰ Melley, “Brain Warfare,” 30–31.

³¹ Bruce Cumings, *The Korean War: A History*, A Modern Library Chronicles Book 33 (The Modern Library, 2011), 68–86.

³² Marks, *The Search for the “Manchurian Candidate,”* 29; *Foreign and Military Intelligence*, 388.

³³ Central Intelligence Agency, “Project ARTICHOKE: Evaluation of I&SO Role,” January 25, 1952, 5, CIA Reading Room, <https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/PROJECT%20ARTICHOKE%2C%20%28DELET%5B16016913%5D.pdf>; Marks, *The Search for the “Manchurian Candidate,”* 22–24.

³⁴ Conrad Crane, “Lessons from the First Time Russia Accused the United States of Biowarfare,” *War on the Rocks*, March 23, 2022, <https://warontherocks.com/lessons-from-the-first-time-russia-accused-the-united-states-of-biowarfare/>; Kenneth L. Enoch and John S. Quinn, *Statements by Two Captured U.S. Air Force Officers on Their Participation in Germ Warfare in Korea, with Supplementary Material* (Peking, 1952), 25–36, Memorial University Digital Archives Initiative, <https://collections.mun.ca/digital/collection/radical/id/37853/>.

³⁵ Marks, *The Search for the “Manchurian Candidate,”* 60–63.

³⁶ Dulles, “Brain Warfare,” 1–3.

³⁷ Dulles, “Brain Warfare,” 9.

³⁸ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA’s Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 71–72.

³⁹ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA’s Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 6–10.

⁴⁰ Stephen Kinzer, *Poisoner in Chief: Sidney Gottlieb and the CIA Search for Mind Control* (St. Martin’s Griffin, 2020), 76–77.

⁴¹ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA’s Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 6–8.

⁴² Marks, *The Search for the “Manchurian Candidate,”* 55.

⁴³ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA’s Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 68, 76–81; Marks, *The Search for the “Manchurian Candidate,”* 62–64, 93–110, 131–39.

⁴⁴ Kinzer, *Poisoner in Chief*, 215–16.

⁴⁵ Deposition of Sidney Gottlieb, September 25, 1980, 11–12, Box 243, Folder 7, Joseph L. Rauh Jr. Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC, quoted in Lisle, *Project Mind Control*, 11.

⁴⁶ Lawrence E. Hinkle and Harold G. Wolff, *Communist Control Techniques: An Analysis of the Methods Used by Communist State Police in the Arrest, Interrogation, and Indoctrination of Persons Regarded as “Enemies of the State”* (Central Intelligence Agency, Technical Services Division, 1956), 105–13, National Security Archive, <https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/torturingdemocracy/documents/19560400.pdf>.

⁴⁷ Marshall Berges, “Louis J. and Kathryn West: Probers of the Mind, Dedicated Activists : He Is Director of the Neuropsychiatric Institute at UCLA,” *Los Angeles Times*, October 27, 1985, <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1985-10-27-vw-12459-story.html>.

⁴⁸ Hinkle and Wolff, *Communist Control Techniques*, 105–13; “Korean War Armistice Agreement,” *Armistice Agreement*, Panmunjom, Korea, July 27, 1953, para. 12, Record Group 11, General Records of the United States Government, National Archives, <https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/armistice-agreement-restoration-south-korean->

state; Nikita S. Khrushchev, "On the Cult of Personality and Its Consequences," Speech, February 25, 1956, 9–10, <https://text-message.blogs.archives.gov/2020/12/03/khrushchevs-secret-speech-1956/>; Edward C. Keefer et al., eds., *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957: Eastern Europe*, vol. 25 (United States Government Printing Office, 1990), 359, 387, <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1955-57v25>.

⁴⁹ *Report of Proceedings: Hearing held before the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, testimony of Sidney Gottlieb: Hearing before the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities*, United States Senate 94th Congress, 1st Session (1975), 63, 66, <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/document/33563-document-4-us-senate-report-proceedings-hearing-held-select-committee-study>; Earman, *Report of Inspection of MKULTRA/TSD*, 2, 17.

⁵⁰ Albert Hofmann, *LSD: My Problem Child: Reflections on Sacred Drugs, Mysticism and Science*, 4th ed. (Multidisciplinary Association for Psychedelic Studies, 2022), 9–13, 24–26; Erika Dyck, "Flashback: Psychiatric Experimentation with LSD in Historical Perspective," *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* 50, no. 7 (2005): 381–82, <https://doi.org/10.1177/070674370505000703>.

⁵¹ Marks, *The Search for the "Manchurian Candidate,"* 66.

⁵² Marks, *The Search for the "Manchurian Candidate,"* 67.

⁵³ D. O. Hebb, "The Mammal and His Environment," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 111 (May 1955): 826–31, <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.111.11.826>; Marks, *The Search for the "Manchurian Candidate,"* 13–15.

⁵⁴ Marks, *The Search for the "Manchurian Candidate,"* 39–47.

⁵⁵ Lisle, *Project Mind Control*, 82.

⁵⁶ Sidney Gottlieb, "Deposition of Sidney Gottlieb, PhD, Mrs. David Orlikow, et al. v. United States of America," Culpeper, Virginia, May 17, 1983, 253, 273–78, <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/document/32736-document-20-deposition-sidney-gottlieb-phd-civil-action-no-80-3163-mrs-david-orlikow>; H. P. Albarelli, *A Terrible Mistake: The Murder of Frank Olson & The CIA's Secret Cold War Experiments* (Trine Day, 2009), 109.

⁵⁷ Dulles, "Brain Warfare," 1–5.

⁵⁸ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 10, 15.

⁵⁹ "Donald Ewen Cameron Fonds - Archival Collections Catalogue," accessed July 7, 2026, <https://archivalcollections.library.mcgill.ca/index.php/donald-ewen-cameron-fonds>; "D. Ewen Cameron, M.D.," APA Foundation, accessed July 7, 2026, <https://www.apaf.org/library-archives/president-s-of-the-apa/d-ewen-cameron-m-d/>; Marks, *The Search for the "Manchurian Candidate,"* 132–33.

⁶⁰ "Nuremberg - Document Viewer - Tribunal Order Concerning a Medical Evaluation of Rudolf Hess's Mental Health and Capacity to Stand Trial, Reports by the Doctors Who Examined Hess, and Notice of a Hearing for Prosecution and Defense to Present Arguments on the Issue," accessed July 7, 2026, <https://nuremberg.law.harvard.edu/documents/450043-tribunal-order-concerning-a-medical>; "The Nuremberg Code," Holocaust Encyclopedia, accessed July 7, 2026, <https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/the-nuremberg-code>.

⁶¹ D. Ewen Cameron, "Psychic Driving," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 112 (January 1956): 502–9, <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.112.7.502>; Gottlieb, "Deposition of Sidney Gottlieb, PhD, Mrs. David Orlikow, et al. v. United States of America," 80; Marks, *The Search for the "Manchurian Candidate,"* 141.

⁶² Gottlieb, "Deposition," 321.

-
- ⁶³ Canada, Department of Justice, "Allan Memorial Institute Depatterned Persons Assistance Plan," 1992, <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/trans/atip-aiprp/infosource/p5.html>; Lisle, *Project Mind Control*, 84–94.
- ⁶⁴ Gottlieb, "Deposition," 325–26.
- ⁶⁵ Lisle, *Project Mind Control*, 81–82; Marks, *The Search for the "Manchurian Candidate,"* 135.
- ⁶⁶ Dominic Streatfeild, *Brainwash: The Secret History of Mind Control* (Picador, 2007), 220–21, quoted in Lisle, *Project Mind Control*, 84.
- ⁶⁷ Gordon Thomas, *Journey into Madness: Medical Torture and the Mind Controllers* (Bantam Press, 1988), 207, quoted in Lisle, *Project Mind Control*, 86.
- ⁶⁸ D. Ewen Cameron, "Adventures with Repetition: The Search for Its Possibilities," in *Psychopathology of Perception*, ed. Paul H. Hoch and Joseph Zubin (Grune & Stratton, 1965), 316–18, https://archive.org/stream/ADVENTURESWITHREPETITIONTHESEARCHFORITSSPOSSIBILITIESPresidentialAddressByD.EWENCAMERONM.D./ADVENTURES%20WITH%20REPETITION%2C%20THE%20SEARCH%20FOR%20ITS%20POSSIBILITIES%20-%20Presidential%20Address%20by%20D.%20EWEN%20CAMERON%2C%20M.D._djvu.txt.
- ⁶⁹ A. E. Schwartzman and P. E. Termansen, "Intensive Electroconvulsive Therapy: A Follow-Up Study*," *Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal* 12, no. 2 (1967): 217–18, <https://doi.org/10.1177/070674376701200219>.
- ⁷⁰ Cameron, "Adventures with Repetition," 314–17.
- ⁷¹ Helen Goodell et al., "Harold G. Wolff," Cornell University Medical College, 1962, Cornell University Faculty Memorial Statements; David H. Price, "Buying a Piece of Anthropology Part One: Human Ecology and Unwitting Anthropological Research for the CIA," *Anthropology Today* 23, no. 3 (2007): 9–10, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8322.2007.00510.x>; David H. Price, "Buying a Piece of Anthropology Part Two: The CIA and Our Tortured Past," *Anthropology Today* 23, no. 5 (2007): 18–19, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8322.2007.00537.x>.
- ⁷² Lisle, *Project Mind Control*, 76.
- ⁷³ Robert K. Merton, "The Normative Structure of Science," in *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*, ed. Norman W. Storer (1942; University of Chicago Press, 1973), 267–78.
- ⁷⁴ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 54–56; Marks, *The Search for the "Manchurian Candidate,"* 154–55.
- ⁷⁵ United States President's Commission on CIA Activities within the United States, *Report to the President*, 226–28.
- ⁷⁶ Lisle, *Project Mind Control*, 49.
- ⁷⁷ Albarelli, *A Terrible Mistake*, 217–18; Lisle, *Project Mind Control*, 55.
- ⁷⁸ United States President's Commission on CIA Activities within the United States, *Report to the President*, 226–28; James E. Starrs and Katherine M. Ramsland, *A Voice for the Dead: A Forensic Investigator's Pursuit of the Truth in the Grave* (Berkley Books, 2006), 117–19, https://frankolsonproject.com/james_starrs/.
- ⁷⁹ United States President's Commission on CIA Activities within the United States, *Report to the President*, 226–28.
- ⁸⁰ Albarelli, *A Terrible Mistake*, 849–50.
- ⁸¹ B. F. Skinner, *Science and Human Behavior*, First Free Press Paperback edition (1953; The Free Press, 1965), 6–7, 35–36.
- ⁸² Earman, *Report of Inspection of MKULTRA/TSD*, 10.

-
- ⁸³ Gottlieb, "Deposition," 404–5.
- ⁸⁴ Lisle, *Project Mind Control*, 67.
- ⁸⁵ Lisle, *Project Mind Control*, 82; Earman, *Report of Inspection of MKULTRA/TSD*, 11–13.
- ⁸⁶ Marks, *The Search for the "Manchurian Candidate,"* 138.
- ⁸⁷ Gottlieb, "Deposition," 340–44.
- ⁸⁸ "Hypnotic Experimentation and Research," February 10, 1954, CIA Reading Room document 00190691 / MORI 190691, pp. 2–3, CIA Reading Room, https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/DOC_0000140394.pdf; Lisle, *Project Mind Control*, 96.
- ⁸⁹ Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, Pub. L. No. 81–110, 63 Stat. 208 (1949), at 212, <https://govtrackus.s3.amazonaws.com/legislink/pdf/stat/63/STATUTE-63-Pg208.pdf>.
- ⁹⁰ Wallace L. Chan, "Establishing and Substantiating the 'Bona Fides' of Agent and/or Staff Personnel Through Techniques and Methods Other than Interrogation," Memorandum for the Record, Central Intelligence Agency, n.d., Record Group 220, Records of Temporary Committees, Commissions, and Boards; Entry A1 42100-H, Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments, Research Document Library, 1994–1995; Container 143; folder "CON-121094-A through CON-030795-A [3 of 9]," 1, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland; Richard Helms, "Two Extremely Sensitive Research Programs," April 3, 1953, C06767515; appended as Tab A in Report of Inspection of MKULTRA, 29–33, CIA Reading Room / CIA CREST, https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/sites/default/files/documents/1963-07-26%20JM%20Box%208%20F2%20MKUltra-IG_Report-ocr.pdf.
- ⁹¹ Earman, *Report of Inspection of MKULTRA/TSD*, 2, 6, 14, 23.
- ⁹² Earman, *Report of Inspection of MKULTRA/TSD*, 7–8.
- ⁹³ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 5, 9–10.
- ⁹⁴ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 7, 12.
- ⁹⁵ Michael Evans, "CIA Behavior Control Experiments Focus of New Scholarly Collection," National Security Archive, December 23, 2024, <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/briefing-book/dnsa-intelligence/2024-12-23/cia-behavior-control-experiments-focus-new-scholarly>.
- ⁹⁶ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 7–8; Shayla Love, "Project Mind Control: 5 Questions with Historian John Lisle," *The Microdose*, March 23, 2026, <https://themicrodose.substack.com/p/project-mind-control-5-questions>.
- ⁹⁷ *Human Drug Testing by the CIA, 1977: Hearing before the Senate Committee on Human Resources, Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research*, 95th Congress, 1st Session (1977), 80, 94, https://archive.org/stream/CiaCongressionalHearingsOnHumanDrugTesting/CiaCongressionalHearingsOnSecretChemicalsAndDrugs_djvu.txt.
- ⁹⁸ Central Intelligence Agency, Technical Services Staff, "Memorandum for Director of Central Intelligence, 'Project MKULTRA, Subproject 35,'" November 15, 1954, James Srodes Collection, Box 8, Folder "AWD [Allen Welsh Dulles]: Mind Control 1953–1961," 1, 4, 6–8, National Security Archive / George C. Marshall Research Library, <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/document/32726-document-11-memorandum-director-central-intelligence-project-mkultra-subproject-35>.
- ⁹⁹ Central Intelligence Agency, Technical Services Staff, "Memorandum for Director of Central Intelligence, 'Project MKULTRA, Subproject 35,'" 4; *Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 123–25, 129–31, 137.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Human Drug Testing by the CIA, 1977*, 90; Maitland Baldwin et al., "Effects of Radio-frequency Energy on Primate Cerebral Activity," *Neurology* 10, no. 2 (1960): 178, <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.10.2.178>; Tom O'Neill, *Statement for the Record*, Written

testimony (U.S. House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Task Force on the Declassification of Federal Secrets, 2026), 5,

<https://oversight.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/ONeill-Written-Testimony.pdf>.

¹⁰¹ Price, “Buying a Piece of Anthropology Part One,” 11; Gökçe Cansever, “Psychological Effects of Circumcision*,” *British Journal of Medical Psychology* 38, no. 4 (1965): 321, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8341.1965.tb01314.x>.

¹⁰² Central Intelligence Agency, “MKULTRA Subproject 74,” n.d., MKULTRA Subproject 74; 27[12884442], 32, CIA Reading Room, accessed July 8, 2026, <https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/MKULTRA%20SUBPROJECT%2074%20%2827%5B12884442%5D.pdf>; Price, “Buying a Piece of Anthropology Part One,” 10–11.

¹⁰³ Gottlieb, “Deposition,” 328; Martin T. Orne, “The Potential Uses of Hypnosis in Interrogation,” in *The Manipulation of Human Behavior*, ed. Albert D. Biderman and Herbert Zimmer (John Wiley & Sons, 1961), 207–8,

<https://www.psych.upenn.edu/history/orne/orne1961inbidermanzimmerbc.html>; *Project MKULTRA, the CIA’s Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 59.

¹⁰⁴ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA’s Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 60.

¹⁰⁵ Committee on Criteria for Federal Support of Research and Development, *Allocating Federal Funds for Science and Technology* (National Academy Press, 1995), 41–43, <https://doi.org/10.17226/5040>; Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University* (Harvard University Press, 1963), 20, 42–43, <https://raley.english.ucsb.edu/wp-content/uploads/Reading/Kerr.pdf>.

¹⁰⁶ Earman, *Report of Inspection of MKULTRA/TSD*, 17.

¹⁰⁷ *Human Drug Testing by the CIA*, 1977, 187.

¹⁰⁸ John S. Earman, “MKULTRA Program,” November 29, 1963, John Marks Collection; Document 17, 2, National Security Archive,

<https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/sites/default/files/documents/1963-11-29%20Box%204%20Document%20Indexes%2C%20Abstracts%2C%20and%20Documents-ocr.pdf>.

¹⁰⁹ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA’s Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 4; Earman, “MKULTRA Program,” 2.

¹¹⁰ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA’s Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 169.

¹¹¹ *Project MKULTRA, the CIA’s Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 39.

¹¹² U.S. Department of Defense and Office of General Counsel, *Experimentation Programs Conducted by the Department of Defense That Had CIA Sponsorship or Participation and That Involved the Administration to Human Subjects of Drugs Intended for Mind-Control or Behavior-Modification Purposes*, Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense no. 02-A-0846 (U.S. Department of Defense, 1977), 3–4, Department of Defense FOIA Reading Room.

¹¹³ Central Intelligence Agency, “Influencing Human Behavior,” Internal program summary, n.d., FOIA Collection, document no. C01435043, 3, Central Intelligence Agency FOIA Electronic Reading Room, accessed July 23, 2026, <https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/document/01435043>.

¹¹⁴ U.S. Department of Defense and Office of General Counsel, *Experimentation Programs*, 5.

¹¹⁵ Earman, *Report of Inspection of MKULTRA/TSD*, 2.

¹¹⁶ Seymour M. Hersh, “Huge C.I.A. Operation Reported in U.S. Against Antiwar Forces, Other Dissidents in Nixon Years,” *The New York Times*, December 22, 1974, 1, CIA-RDP77-00432R000100340001-9, CIA Freedom of Information Act Electronic Reading Room, <https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP77-00432R000100340001-9.pdf>; United States President’s Commission on CIA Activities within the United States, *Report to the President*, 225

–29; *Foreign and Military Intelligence*, 386; *Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 1–3.

¹¹⁷ Tuskegee Syphilis Study Ad Hoc Advisory Panel, *Final Report of the Tuskegee Syphilis Study Ad Hoc Advisory Panel* (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, 1973), 11–12,

<https://biotech.law.lsu.edu/cphl/history/reports/tuskegee/complete%20report.pdf>.

¹¹⁸ National Research Act, Pub. L. No. 93–348, 88 United States Statutes at Large 342 (1974), at 352–53, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-88/pdf/STATUTE-88-Pg342.pdf>.

¹¹⁹ Executive Order 11905—United States Foreign Intelligence Activities, 41 Federal Register 7703 (1976), § 5(d), 5(g), 6(a), <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/executive-order-11905-united-states-foreign-intelligence-activities>.

¹²⁰ Executive Order 12036—United States Intelligence Activities, 43 Federal Register 3674 (1978), §§ 2–302–2–303, <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/executive-order-12036-united-states-foreign-intelligence-activities>.

¹²¹ National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, “Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research,” *Federal Register* 44, no. 76 (1979): 23192, 23193–23195.

¹²² *Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification*, 15–16, 20–21.

¹²³ U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, *Committee Study of the Central Intelligence Agency's Detention and Interrogation Program: Executive Summary*, Senate Report S. Rep. 113–288 (U.S. Government Publishing Office, 2014), 5, 11, <https://www.intelligence.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/sites-default-files-press-executive-summary-0.pdf>.

¹²⁴ U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, *Committee Study*, 5–6, 11–12.

¹²⁵ Marks, *The Search for the “Manchurian Candidate,”* 120–22.

¹²⁶ Martin A. Lee and Bruce Shlain, *Acid Dreams: The Complete Social History of LSD: The CIA, the Sixties, and Beyond* (Grove Press, 2007), xix.

¹²⁷ David Sheff, *The Playboy Interviews with John Lennon and Yōko Ono*, ed. G. Barry Golson (Playboy Press, 1981), 191.

¹²⁸ Peter Bell, “Public Trust in Government: 1958–2025,” Trust in Government, *Pew Research Center*, December 4, 2025, <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2025/12/04/public-trust-in-government-1958-2025/>.

¹²⁹ Cary Funk and Brian Kennedy, “Public Confidence in Scientists Has Remained Stable for Decades,” *Pew Research Center*, August 27, 2020, <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2020/08/27/public-confidence-in-scientists-has-remained-stable-for-decades/>.

¹³⁰ Deposition of Jeannine Huard, June 25, 1986, 74–75, Box 224, Folder 3, Joseph L. Rauh Jr. Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC, quoted in Lisle, *Project Mind Control*, 85.

Bibliography

- Albarelli, H. P. *A Terrible Mistake: The Murder of Frank Olson & The CIA's Secret Cold War Experiments*. Trine Day, 2009.
- Baldwin, Maitland, Sven A. Bach, and Shirley A. Lewis. "Effects of Radio-frequency Energy on Primate Cerebral Activity." *Neurology* 10, no. 2 (1960): 178–87.
<https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.10.2.178>.
- Bell, Peter. "Public Trust in Government: 1958-2025." Trust in Government. *Pew Research Center*, December 4, 2025. <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2025/12/04/public-trust-in-government-1958-2025/>.
- Berges, Marshall. "Louis J. and Kathryn West: Probers of the Mind, Dedicated Activists : He Is Director of the Neuropsychiatric Institute at UCLA." *Los Angeles Times*, October 27, 1985. <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1985-10-27-vw-12459-story.html>.
- Betts, Paul. "Religion, Science and Cold War Anti-Communism: The 1949 Cardinal Mindszenty Show Trial." In *Science, Religion and Communism in Cold War Europe*, edited by Paul Betts and Stephen A. Smith, 275–307. Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2016.
https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-54639-5_12.
- British United Press. "Treason Trial: Life Imprisonment." *Kalgoorlie Miner* (Western Australia Kalgoorlie), February 9, 1949. Trove, National Library of Australia.
- Cameron, D. Ewen. "Adventures with Repetition: The Search for Its Possibilities." In *Psychopathology of Perception*, edited by Paul H. Hoch and Joseph Zubin, 312–22. Grune & Stratton, 1965.
https://archive.org/stream/ADVENTURESWITHREPETITIONTHESEARCHFORITSSOISSIBILITIESPresidentialAddressByD.EWENCAMERONM.D./ADVENTURES%20WITH%20REPETITION%2C%20THE%20SEARCH%20FOR%20ITS%20POSSIBILITIES%20-%20Presidential%20Address%20by%20D.%20EWEN%20CAMERON%2C%20M.D._djvu.txt.
- Cameron, D. Ewen. "Psychic Driving." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 112 (January 1956): 502–9. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.112.7.502>.

Canada, Department of Justice. "Allan Memorial Institute Depatterned Persons Assistance Plan." 1992. <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/trans/atip-aiarp/infosource/p5.html>.

Cansever, Gökçe. "Psychological Effects of Circumcision*." *British Journal of Medical Psychology* 38, no. 4 (1965): 321–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8341.1965.tb01314.x>.

Central Intelligence Agency. "Influencing Human Behavior." Internal program summary. n.d. FOIA Collection, document no. C01435043. Central Intelligence Agency FOIA Electronic Reading Room. Accessed July 23, 2026. <https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/document/01435043>.

Central Intelligence Agency. "MKULTRA Subproject 74." n.d. MKULTRA Subproject 74; 27[12884442]. CIA Reading Room. Accessed July 8, 2026. <https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/MKULTRA%20SUBPROJECT%2074%20%2827%5B12884442%5D.pdf>.

Central Intelligence Agency. "Project ARTICHOKE: Evaluation of I&SO Role." January 25, 1952. CIA Reading Room. <https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/PROJECT%20ARTICHOKE%2C%20%28DELET%5B16016913%5D.pdf>.

Central Intelligence Agency. "Special Research, Bluebird." 1952. CIA CREST / Public Intelligence. <https://info.publicintelligence.net/CIA-Bluebird.pdf>.

Central Intelligence Agency, Inspection and Security Staff. "Project Bluebird." Memo. April 5, 1950. National Security Archive / CIA CREST. <https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/document/cia-rdp83-01042r000800010003-1>.

Central Intelligence Agency, Technical Services Staff. "Memorandum for Director of Central Intelligence, 'Project MKULTRA, Subproject 35.'" November 15, 1954. James Srodes Collection, Box 8, Folder "AWD [Allen Welsh Dulles]: Mind Control 1953–1961." National Security Archive / George C. Marshall Research Library. <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/document/32726-document-11-memorandum-director-central-intelligence-project-mkultra-subproject-35>.

Chan, Wallace L. "Establishing and Substantiating the 'Bona Fides' of Agent and/or Staff Personnel Through Techniques and Methods Other than Interrogation." Memorandum for the Record. Central Intelligence Agency, n.d. Record Group 220, Records of Temporary Committees, Commissions, and Boards; Entry A1 42100-H, Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments, Research Document Library, 1994–1995; Container 143; folder "CON-121094-A through CON-030795-A [3 of 9]." National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

Committee on Criteria for Federal Support of Research and Development. *Allocating Federal Funds for Science and Technology*. National Academy Press, 1995. <https://doi.org/10.17226/5040>.

Crane, Conrad. "Lessons from the First Time Russia Accused the United States of Biowarfare." *War on the Rocks*, March 23, 2022. <https://warontherocks.com/lessons-from-the-first-time-russia-accused-the-united-states-of-biowarfare/>.

Cummings, Bruce. *The Korean War: A History*. A Modern Library Chronicles Book 33. The Modern Library, 2011.

"D. Ewen Cameron, M.D." APA Foundation. Accessed July 7, 2026. <https://www.apaf.org/library-archives/president-s-of-the-apa/d-ewen-cameron-m-d/>.

"Donald Ewen Cameron Fonds - Archival Collections Catalogue." Accessed July 7, 2026. <https://archivalcollections.library.mcgill.ca/index.php/donald-ewen-cameron-fonds>.

Dulles, Allen W. "Brain Warfare." National Alumni Conference of the Graduate Council of Princeton University, Hot Springs, VA, April 10, 1953. <https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP80R01731R001700030015-9.pdf>.

Dyck, Erika. "Flashback: Psychiatric Experimentation with LSD in Historical Perspective." *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* 50, no. 7 (2005): 381–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/070674370505000703>.

Earman, John S. "MKULTRA Program." November 29, 1963. John Marks Collection; Document 17. National Security Archive. <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/sites/default/files/documents/1963-11-29%20Box%204%20Document%20Indexes%2C%20Abstracts%2C%20and%20Documents-ocr.pdf>.

Earman, John S. *Report of Inspection of MKULTRA/TSD*. Inspector General report. Central Intelligence Agency, Office of Inspector General, 1963. <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/document/32731-document-16-john-s-earman-inspector-general-us-central-intelligence-agency-report>.

Effect of Red China Communes on the United States: Hearing before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws. 86th Congress, 1st Session (1959). <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=umn.31951d020924661&seq=4>.

Enoch, Kenneth L., and John S. Quinn. *Statements by Two Captured U.S. Air Force Officers on Their Participation in Germ Warfare in Korea, with Supplementary Material*. Peking, 1952. Memorial University Digital Archives Initiative. <https://collections.mun.ca/digital/collection/radical/id/37853/>.

Evans, Michael. "CIA Behavior Control Experiments Focus of New Scholarly Collection." National Security Archive, December 23, 2024. <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/briefing-book/dnsa-intelligence/2024-12-23/cia-behavior-control-experiments-focus-new-scholarly>.

Foreign and Military Intelligence: Final Report of the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, United States Senate. Senate Report No. 94-755, Book I. U.S. Senate, Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, 1976.
https://www.andrew.cmu.edu/user/rp3h/lansberry/Church_Committee_I.pdf.

Funk, Cary, and Brian Kennedy. "Public Confidence in Scientists Has Remained Stable for Decades." *Pew Research Center*, August 27, 2020. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2020/08/27/public-confidence-in-scientists-has-remained-stable-for-decades/>.

Geltman, Emanuel. "Trial by Confession Sentences Cardinal; Aimed at Opposition." *Labor Action*, February 14, 1949.
<https://www.marxists.org/history/etol/writers/garrett/1949/02/mindszenty.html>.

Goodell, Helen, Lawrence E. Hinkle Jr., and E. Hugh Luckey. "Harold G. Wolff." Cornell University Medical College, 1962. Cornell University Faculty Memorial Statements.

Gottlieb, Sidney. "Deposition of Sidney Gottlieb, PhD, Mrs. David Orlikow, et al. v. United States of America." Culpeper, Virginia, May 17, 1983.
<https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/document/32736-document-20-deposition-sidney-gottlieb-phd-civil-action-no-80-3163-mrs-david-orlikow>.

Hebb, D. O. "The Mammal and His Environment." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 111 (May 1955): 826–31. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.111.11.826>.

Helms, Richard. "Two Extremely Sensitive Research Programs." April 3, 1953. C06767515; appended as Tab A in Report of Inspection of MKULTRA. CIA Reading Room / CIA CREST. https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/sites/default/files/documents/1963-07-26%20JM%20Box%208%20F2%20MKUltra-IG_Report-ocr.pdf.

Hersh, Seymour M. "Huge C.I.A. Operation Reported in U.S. Against Antiwar Forces, Other Dissidents in Nixon Years." *The New York Times*, December 22, 1974. CIA-RDP77-00432R000100340001-9. CIA Freedom of Information Act Electronic Reading Room. <https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP77-00432R000100340001-9.pdf>.

Hinkle, Lawrence E., and Harold G. Wolff. *Communist Control Techniques: An Analysis of the Methods Used by Communist State Police in the Arrest, Interrogation, and Indoctrination of Persons Regarded as "Enemies of the State."* Central Intelligence Agency, Technical Services Division, 1956. National Security Archive. <https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/torturingdemocracy/documents/19560400.pdf>.

Hofmann, Albert. *LSD: My Problem Child: Reflections on Sacred Drugs, Mysticism and Science*. 4th ed. Multidisciplinary Association for Psychedelic Studies, 2022.

Holocaust Encyclopedia. "The Nuremberg Code." Accessed July 7, 2026.
<https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/the-nuremberg-code>.

Human Drug Testing by the CIA, 1977: Hearing before the Senate Committee on Human Resources, Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research. 95th Congress, 1st Session (1977). https://archive.org/stream/CiaCongressionalHearingsOnHumanDrugTesting/CiaCongressionalHearingsOnSecretChemicalsAndDrugs_djvu.txt.

Hunter, Edward. “‘Brain-Washing’ Tactics Force Chinese Into Ranks of Communist Party.” *Miami Daily News*, September 24, 1950.

“Hypnotic Experimentation and Research.” February 10, 1954. CIA Reading Room document 00190691 / MORI 190691. CIA Reading Room. https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/DOC_0000140394.pdf.

Johnson, Ben Brock, and Amory Sivertson, hosts. *Madness, Part 3: Subproject 68*. Endless Thread. WBUR, May 8, 2020. Audio podcast, 35:38. <https://www.wbur.org/endlessthread/2020/05/08/madness-part-three-subproject>.

Keefer, Edward C., Ronald D. Landa, and Stanley Shaloff, eds. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955–1957: Eastern Europe*. Vol. 25. United States Government Printing Office, 1990. <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1955-57v25>.

Kerr, Clark. *The Uses of the University*. Harvard University Press, 1963. <https://raley.english.ucsb.edu/wp-content/uploads/Reading/Kerr.pdf>.

Khrushchev, Nikita S. “On the Cult of Personality and Its Consequences.” Speech. February 25, 1956. <https://text-message.blogs.archives.gov/2020/12/03/khrushchevs-secret-speech-1956/>.

Kinzer, Stephen. *Poisoner in Chief: Sidney Gottlieb and the CIA Search for Mind Control*. First St. Martin’s Griffin Edition. St. Martin’s Griffin, 2020.

“Korean War Armistice Agreement.” Armistice Agreement. Panmunjom, Korea, July 27, 1953. Record Group 11, General Records of the United States Government. National Archives. <https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/armistice-agreement-restoration-south-korean-state>.

Korry, Edward M. “Mindszenty Is Sentenced to Life Term.” *Decatur Daily Democrat*, February 8, 1949. Hoosier State Chronicles.

Kovács, János. *Documents on the Mindszenty Case*. 1949; Athenaeum, n.d. Accessed June 28, 2026. <https://redstarpublishers.org/Mindszadda.pdf>.

Lee, Martin A., and Bruce Shlain. *Acid Dreams: The Complete Social History of LSD: The CIA, the Sixties, and Beyond*. Grove Press, 2007.

Lifton, Robert Jay. *Thought Reform and the Psychology of Totalism: A Study of “Brainwashing” in China*. University of North Carolina Press, 1989. https://ia601405.us.archive.org/18/items/ThoughtReformAndThePsychologyOfTotalism/Thought_Reform_and_the_Psychology_of_Totalism.pdf.

Lisle, John. *Project Mind Control: Sidney Gottlieb, the CIA, and the Tragedy of MKULTRA*. St. Martin's Press, 2025.

Love, Shayla. "Project Mind Control: 5 Questions with Historian John Lisle." *The Microdose*, March 23, 2026. <https://themicrodose.substack.com/p/project-mind-control-5-questions>.

Marks, John. *The Search for the "Manchurian Candidate."* Times Books, 1979.
<https://archive.org/details/searchformanchur00john/mode/2up>.

Melley, Timothy. "Brain Warfare: The Covert Sphere, Terrorism, and the Legacy of the Cold War." *Grey Room* 45 (October 2011): 19–41. https://doi.org/10.1162/GREY_a_00048.

Merton, Robert K. "The Normative Structure of Science." In *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*, edited by Norman W. Storer, 267–78. 1942; University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Mindszenty, József. *Memoirs*. Macmillan, 1974.

National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. "Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research." *Federal Register* 44, no. 76 (1979): 23192–97.

"Nuremberg - Document Viewer - Tribunal Order Concerning a Medical Evaluation of Rudolf Hess's Mental Health and Capacity to Stand Trial, Reports by the Doctors Who Examined Hess, and Notice of a Hearing for Prosecution and Defense to Present Arguments on the Issue." Accessed July 7, 2026.
<https://nuremberg.law.harvard.edu/documents/450043-tribunal-order-concerning-a-medical>.

O'Neill, Tom. *Statement for the Record*. Written testimony. U.S. House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Task Force on the Declassification of Federal Secrets, 2026.
<https://oversight.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/ONeill-Written-Testimony.pdf>.

Orne, Martin T. "The Potential Uses of Hypnosis in Interrogation." In *The Manipulation of Human Behavior*, edited by Albert D. Biderman and Herbert Zimmer, 169–215. John Wiley & Sons, 1961.
<https://www.psych.upenn.edu/history/orne/orne1961inbidermanzimmerbc.html>.

Pavlov, Ivan P. "Conditioned Reflexes: An Investigation of the Physiological Activity of the Cerebral Cortex—Lecture II." Translated by G. V. Anrep. With Christopher D. Green. *Classics in the History of Psychology*, 1927.
<https://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Pavlov/lecture2>.

People's Commissariat of Justice of the U.S.S.R. *Report of Court Proceedings in the Case of the Anti-Soviet Trotskyite Centre: Heard Before the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R., Moscow, January 23–30, 1937*. Moscow, 1937.
<https://archive.org/details/reportofcourtpro0000piat/page/n7/mode/2up>.

Price, David H. "Buying a Piece of Anthropology Part One: Human Ecology and Unwitting Anthropological Research for the CIA." *Anthropology Today* 23, no. 3 (2007): 8–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8322.2007.00510.x>.

Price, David H. "Buying a Piece of Anthropology Part Two: The CIA and Our Tortured Past." *Anthropology Today* 23, no. 5 (2007): 17–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8322.2007.00537.x>.

Project MKULTRA, the CIA's Program of Research in Behavioral Modification: Hearing before the U.S. Senate, Select Committee on Intelligence; Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research of the Committee on Human Resources. 95th Congress, 1st Session (1977).

Rayfield, Donald. *Stalin and His Hangmen: The Tyrant and Those Who Killed for Him*. 1st U.S. ed. Random House, 2004. <https://archive.org/details/stalinhishangmen00dona>.

Report of Proceedings: Hearing held before the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, testimony of Sidney Gottlieb: Hearing before the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, United States Senate. 94th Congress, 1st session (1975). <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/document/33563-document-4-us-senate-report-proceedings-hearing-held-select-committee-study>.

Schwartzman, A. E., and P. E. Termansen. "Intensive Electroconvulsive Therapy: A Follow-Up Study*." *Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal* 12, no. 2 (1967): 217–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/070674376701200219>.

Seed, David. *Brainwashing: The Fictions of Mind Control: A Study of Novels and Films since World War II*. Kent State University Press, 2004.

Sheff, David. *The Playboy Interviews with John Lennon and Yōko Ono*. Edited by G. Barry Golson. Playboy Press, 1981.

Skinner, B. F. *Science and Human Behavior*. First Free Press Paperback edition. 1953; The Free Press, 1965.

Starrs, James E., and Katherine M. Ramsland. *A Voice for the Dead: A Forensic Investigator's Pursuit of the Truth in the Grave*. Berkley Books, 2006. https://frankolsonproject.com/james_starrs/.

Time. "Foreign News: REBELLION TO TYRANTS..." February 14, 1949. <https://time.com/archive/6785493/foreign-news-rebellion-to-tyrants/>.

Tuskegee Syphilis Study Ad Hoc Advisory Panel. *Final Report of the Tuskegee Syphilis Study Ad Hoc Advisory Panel*. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, 1973. <https://biotech.law.lsu.edu/cphl/history/reports/tuskegee/complete%20report.pdf>.

United States President's Commission on CIA Activities within the United States. *Report to the President by the Commission on CIA Activities Within the United States*. Presidential commission report. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.
<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.b4621686&seq=1>.

U.S. Department of Defense and Office of General Counsel. *Experimentation Programs Conducted by the Department of Defense That Had CIA Sponsorship or Participation and That Involved the Administration to Human Subjects of Drugs Intended for Mind-Control or Behavior-Modification Purposes*. Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense No. 02-A-0846. U.S. Department of Defense, 1977. Department of Defense FOIA Reading Room.

U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. *Committee Study of the Central Intelligence Agency's Detention and Interrogation Program: Executive Summary*. Senate Report S. Rep. 113-288. U.S. Government Publishing Office, 2014.
<https://www.intelligence.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/sites-default-files-press-executive-summary-0.pdf>.