

**What Impact Will Psychotronic Weapons Have on Crisis Negotiation
Teams by the year 2020?**

By

**Matthew Basgall
Clovis Police Department**

April 2013

Command College Class 52

The Command College Futures Study Project is a FUTURES study of a particular emerging issue of relevance to law enforcement. Its purpose is NOT to predict the future; rather, to project a variety of possible scenarios useful for strategic planning in anticipation of the emerging landscape facing policing organizations.

This journal article was created using the futures forecasting process of Command College and its outcomes. Defining the future differs from analyzing the past, because it has not yet happened. In this article, methodologies have been used to discern useful alternatives to enhance the success of planners and leaders in their response to a range of possible future environments.

Managing the future means influencing it—creating, constraining and adapting to emerging trends and events in a way that optimizes the opportunities and minimizes the threats of relevance to the profession.

The views and conclusions expressed in the Command College Futures Project and journal article are those of the author, and are not necessarily those of the CA Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST).

America has always been a society infatuated with guns and weapons. The Wild West era illustrated that American history full of good versus bad, and accounts are replete with stories about cowboys, Indians, armies, and lawmen that tried to establish order for society. This was an era where disputes were often resolved with the use of a pistol. Actors from John Wayne and Clint Eastwood became famous for their portrayal of heroes in Westerns that usually sought to glorify the Wild West and the taming of an unlawful society. The good guy always won and the American pistol was the “peacemaker” of an era.

Since that time, American society has continued to be a society where disputes are sometimes settled with weapons. The handgun still seems to be the weapon of choice for criminals and officers alike. For officers, the emphasis on training and how to survive has never been better. They spend many hours training on the range to become proficient with a weapon to ensure survival, while providing safety to our citizens against harm on American streets. Based on our Country’s past, one thing is certain; gun control alone will not work in a society where guns have had such an influence. What if, though, a tool that is essentially a weapon could be used effectively by law enforcement to ultimately change the way police would resolve violent confrontations and endings?

There just may be such a tool in the very near future that all police agencies will be clamoring to equip their forces. Interestingly, while it could dramatically lower the level of violence, and the need to use lethal force by the police, there are strong social norms that could preclude its use. We will look at what it is and what it does, and the emerging controversy that may leave it unused by the police. The tool is psychotronic weapons.

The psychotronic weapon is described in many different forms. Which ever form is presented it relies on controlling the psyche of another through technology. Psychotronic weapons are in an infancy state when it comes to potential use in the public. While historically allegations of use date back to the 1970's there is very little information pertaining to current day concepts and potential. This also includes manufacturing and development by the private sector. For law enforcement the potential to have a tool, which, helps saves lives and control dangerous situations should be explored.

Psychotronics and Policing

Imagine the future of law enforcement where a potentially violent situation can be handled peacefully. Picture in your minds eye... The police are dispatched to a bank robbery in progress. Officers arrive on scene and set up a perimeter. They learn there is a suspect armed with a handgun inside the bank with 5 hostages. The supervisor on scene calls for a crisis negotiator, who arrives shortly thereafter with a new form of technology. In the hand of the trained crisis negotiating officer is a tool that looks like a miniature satellite dish. The negotiator points the tool towards the bank; through the unseen pulsing of radio wave, the suspect is soon asleep on the floor without a shot being fired. Officers enter the bank, arrest the suspect, and rescue the hostages from within. All of this is accomplished without one person being injured. Far fetched? Maybe not.

The "satellite dish" used by the negotiator was a first-generation psychotronic weapon designed to render an opponent immobile without injury. Far from being science fiction, this device is in research and development today. Psychotronic weapons are any technology that affects the psyche of a person for the purpose of modifying their

consciousness, behavior or health to influence to user's control of that person (Cherkova pg.1). They encompass a variety of means and methods, technological to pharmacological devices. For law enforcement's purposes, psychotronic using lights, radio waves, or sound could produce a significant advance in work to defuse potentially life threatening situations.

In California we are faced with the continual release of prisoners onto the streets, an overburdened justice system, and budget cuts resulting in fewer police officers on the streets. This storm of activity has resulted in more violent encounters for our officers. Officer involved shooting are happening way too frequently and there doesn't appear to be any relief for law enforcement in the near future. This swing to allow more criminals in society has us all looking for answers to protect those working the streets and the citizens of our communities in what is now a more crook friendly environment.

Psychotronic weapons provide the potential for a tool to be developed that subdues a criminal long enough for an arrest to be made or rescue to occur which be an extraordinary benefit to both law enforcement and our communities. If developed and used as intended, it would no doubt save lives and prevent violent confrontations. Who, then, would ever object to it? As it happens, there is a significant body of controversy over the creation or use of any of these tools.

The History of Psychotronics

The history of psychotronic weapons can be traced back several decades. The first alleged use of psychotronics was by a scientist in the former Soviet Union in the 1970's. (Psychotronic Weapon Brain Manipulation from a Distance 1). This Soviet Union study focused on the term "radiosleep." This technique was successfully tested with a military

unit in Novosibirsk, inducing the sleep on test subjects by means of radio waves.

(Psychotronic Weapon Brain Manipulation from a Distance 1) According to author Gary Rea, in the 1991 Gulf War, Silent Sound Spread Spectrum was used by the US Department of Defense to convince thousands of Iraqi troops to surrender. (Rea 1).

Another example of American military development is the device known as “Voice to Skull”. The Federation of American Scientists defined this as a; *Nonlethal weapon which includes a neuro-electromagnetic device which uses microwave transmission of sound into the skull of a person or animals by way of pulse-modulated microwave radiation; and (2) a silent sound device which can transmit sound into the skull of persons or animals* (Weinberger 2). The US Army formerly hosted a website that included a section related to a “Voice to Skull device”. That site has since been removed. (Weinberger 2) Interestingly, United States Patent 4,877,027 was issued in 1989 for Voice to Skull technologies (United States Patent 4,877,027, Brunkan October 31, 1989). That patent it as sound induced in the head of a person by radiating it remotely with microwaves. (Patent for Microwave Voice to Skull Technology 1) More recently, a story surfaced that Russia has continued with its research from the 1970’s into psychotronics and their use as weapons beyond that of the Voice to Skull device.

In 2010, a man named Serguei Serykh (along with his wife and stepson) was a Russia asylum seeker in the United Kingdom. On March 7, 2010 they were alleged to have committed suicide when they fell from their apartment in Red Road flats in Glasgow, Scotland. According to the Daily Mail, Serykh was alleged to have been a former agent of the FSB, and previously discussed psychotronic weapons to the MI6, which is one of Britain’s secret intelligent agencies (Pakalert Press 3). He said he had

been a victim of these weapons, and that they were many more times powerful than mind control as depicted in movies such as the “Matrix” films. According to the Pakalert Press, one would be foolish not to believe that Russia could be continuing their pursuit of advanced psychotronic weapons. (Pakalert Press 3).

Some assert the United States has continued to pursue psychotronic weapons. US Representative Denis Kucinich introduced a bill in the American Congress in 2001 to oblige the American President to engage in negotiations to ban psychotronic weapons. This was part of an effort involved in the ban of space-based weapons that included all forms of psychotronic weaponry. Congress did not authorize the legislation, so the USA and other countries may still pursue the development of psychotronics without any form of international law governing it. (Psychotronic Weapons Brain Manipulation From a Distance 1).

An expert group weighs in

Even as they might appear as futuristic, the use of psychotronics is plausible, so their development was queried to an expert group. Members of the panel were; a SWAT Sergeant, Clinically Licensed Social Worker, Doctor of Education, Computer Information and Technology Supervisor, a Public Information Officer and a Retail Sales Manager. The group study suggested that public trust, complete buy-in from stakeholders such as police command staffs, and understanding the social and political outcomes associated with a psychotronic weapon need to be established and fully understood before such means could be employed in a civilian setting.

The overwhelming sentiment of the group regarding the potential of psychotronics was its potential to stop a threat before it occurred. One could easily

imagine its use in disturbances such as a prison riot. Guards could stop the violence before it occurred. The properly trained crisis negotiator could defuse any situation where potential violence is about to occur. Law enforcement would not have to expose SWAT officers to a potential encounter that resulted in the use of gunfire.

The expert panel felt the overwhelming factor for the success or failure of this weapon was the public. Stakeholders would have to positively support the program and educate the public from the very beginning as to the capabilities and use. This would include involving the media and garnering its support. While the group concluded that psychotronics in theory would be beneficial to law enforcement, there was a strong sentiment this was not something the general public would accept. The group concerns were on constitutional issues, government control, and unlawful use. Many articles located on the Internet have voiced these same concerns that psychotronics would be used for purposes that are both dangerous and unlawful. One internet article authored by Mojmir Babacek states, “It is therefore essential that we not only take cognizance of these findings, but we mobilize nationally and internationally against the use of brain manipulating technologies” (Babacek 1)

Opposition to Using Psychotronics

Socially and politically, there are many concerns and questions as to whether society would see this as a benefit or detriment. There are several blogs and groups on the Internet who are adamant against the production of such weaponry. For instance, blogs such as *Big Brother is Watching You*, which specifically follows what is perceived as government intrusions, has referenced psychotronics in their resources. The sentiment is a concern that government could gain too much control over its citizens through these

means. While this sentiment is mostly seen in anti government blogs and publications, it is nonetheless a cause for concern.

There is a strong contingent that believes that the development of psychotronic weapons and brain manipulating technology will take, or is taking, freedom and democracy away from United States citizens (Babacek 8). They believe we must expose the nature of this totalitarian control, its technologies and its agents. (Keith 245) Author Jim Keith states, “With the advent of advanced technology for mind control and people control we stand at the edge of an abyss. We are at that moment in history where the controllers can do away with what little freedom the human race still possesses.” (Keith 244) Another negative was the potential for this weapon to get in the hands of the wrong person. Criminal organizations such as drug cartels and organized crime could use it to further their criminal enterprises. Since illegal crime rings like cartels and gangs always seem to gain access to weapons as they are developed, it could be a definite detriment to society.

The psychotronic weapon, in theory, has the potential to be a great tool for law enforcement. However, it would require complete public support to be successful. Based on the expert panel opinion and the research performed, the public may be strongly adverse to its use by law enforcement due to its extremely intrusive nature. There are a number of concerns with psychotronics, and such technology could be as dangerous as nuclear power if in the hands of the wrong person. It also conceivably violates the fourth amendment’s provision that protects persons against unreasonable searches without a warrant (U.S. Constitution). One could argue seizing the psyche of another is a violation of this right.

Conclusion

The psychotronic “tool” could alleviate some of the violent issues facing law enforcement today. If developed for civilian use, with proper training, and complete transparency with the public, this tool could be successfully employed. Through the use of sounds and or microwaves such as described in the Voice to Skull, law enforcement would have the ability to stop violent actions. But, at what cost? In the hands of the wrong person, or in the hands of an unscrupulous government employee or institution, the outcome would be devastating. Even in the hands of the right people, would our freedoms as Americans be compromised? Since the technology has moved from theory to possible development, the time to answer that question is now.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cherkova. “Psychotronic Experiment” *Angelfire: Welcome to Angelfire*. N.p., n.d.

Web. 29 Mar. 2012

http://www.angelfire.com/pro2/dchakrab/cherkova_sum.htm.

Rea, gary. “the ppj gazette.” *Psychotronic weapons*. N.p., 5 Feb. 2009. Web. 7

Jan. 2012. <ppjp.wordpress.com/2009/02/05/psychotronic-weapons/>.

“Putin Reportedly Confirms that Russia is Actively Working on

Psychotronic Weapons Pakalert Press.” *Pakalert Press-What’s REALLY*

going on in the world. N.p., n.d. Web Nov. 2012.

http://www.pakalertpress.com/2012/04/08_putin-reportedly-confirms-that-russia-is-actively

“Psychotronic Weapons-Brain Manipulation From a Distance.” *Incio*. N.p., n.d.

Web. 7 Jan 2012.

http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/ciencia/ciencia_psychotronicweapons10.htm.

Lindstrom, martin. “peddling panic. And paranoia.” *Brain World* Winter 2012: 52-55. Print

Keith, Jim. *Mass control: engineering human consciousness*. Liburn, GA:

IllumniNet Press, 1999. Print.

Patent For Microwave Voice-To-Skull Technology.(n.d.)*rense.com*. Retrieved

February 20, 2012, from <http://www.rense/general37/skull.htm>

Weinberger,S. (2007, June 5). Sonic Projectors. *A Voice Only You Can Hear:*

DARPA’S Sonic Projector. Retrieved February 20,2012, from www.the-livingmoon.com/45jack_files/Sonic_Projection.html

The Bill of Rights and Other Amendments - U.S. Constitution. (n.d.). *The*

Constitution of the United States of America - U.S. Constitution. Retrieved

February 4, 2013, from <http://usconstitution.com/bill-of-rights>

Babacek, Â. (n.d.). Mind control technologies could be use to create a fake

democracy - NO LIES RADIO. *NO LIES RADIO*. Retrieved February 17,

2012, from <http://noliesradio.org/archives/9148>