**Food for thought**

In chapter seven (learning and behavior), we looked at classical and operant conditioning, next we looked at observational learning.

In chapter eight we examined Stanley Milgram's work on obedience and Philip Zimbardo's prison studies.

Below is a description of the Stockholm Syndrome. If you were to write an essay that tied the above elements into a theme that comments on the shaping (or making) of human behavior, what might you say?

How might you explain self-hatred (and a hatred of others like ones' self”) in terms of Stockholm like dynamics? Think back on chapter seven (aversive conditioning).

**Stockholm Syndrome**

"They weren't bad people. They let me eat, they let me sleep, they gave me my life"

- A hostage from Flight 847

One way of describing this site would be "strange beliefs people have and how they got them." A curious footnote that doesn't seem to fit in nicely on any of the other pages is a phenomenon known as the Stockholm Syndrome.

In 1973, four hostages were taken in a botched bank robbery in Stockholm, Sweeden. At the end of their captivity, six days later, they actively resisted rescue. They refused to testify against their captors, raised money for their legal defense, and one of the hostages eventually became engaged to one of her jailed captors.

This struck some folks as weird, and as a way of coping with this uneasiness, as they started seeing more examples they named this class of strange behavior the "Stockholm Syndrome."

Notorious in the United States is the case of Patty Hearst, who after being kidnapped and tortured by the Symbionese Liberation Army, took up arms and joined their cause, taking on the nom de guerre of "Tania" and helping the SLA rob banks.

The Stockholm Syndrome comes into play when a captive cannot escape, is isolated and threatened with death, but is shown token acts of kindness by the captor. It typically takes about three or four days for the psychological shift to take hold.

A strategy of trying to keep your captor happy in order to stay alive becomes an obsessive identification with the likes and dislikes of the captor which has the result of warping your own psyche in such a way that you come to sympathize with your tormenter!

The syndrome explains what happens in hostage-taking situations, but can also be used to understand the behavior of battered spouses, members of religious cults, Holocaust victims, household pets, and perhaps even users of Internet Explorer. I think it may also help explain the popularity of government and of the mass institutionalization of young people. From --

http://www.syntac.net/hoax/stock.html
Stockholm Syndrome is common in survivors of humanly perpetrated trauma, particularly battering (emotional, mental or physical), sexual assault, kidnapping, ritual abuse, and govt. mind-control experimentation and slavery. Stockholm Syndrome develops when a victim is in a situation where he or she is in the presence of -- and cannot escape -- a person who is at least temporarily stronger or more powerful, and seems or is threatening. The victim has no choice but to focus on the face, voice and mannerisms of the captor or abuser. The victim begins to find ways, at least on a subconscious level, of pleasing and appeasing the captor or abuser. The victim does this as a natural, inbred means of surviving the trauma, with the hope of not being hurt. The victim, by focusing on the captor or abuser, begins to find and focus on "good" things about the perpetrator.

This is also called "identification with the aggressor." In extreme cases, the victim may develop alter-states that are based on the captor's or abuser's face, voice and mannerisms. While focusing on the captor or abuser, the victim avoids his or her own pain and terror, by trancing and thereby dissociating from these unpleasant sensations and emotions. Dealing with Stockholm Syndrome is a problem when a victim becomes a recovering survivor. He or she may still be sympathetic towards, or may still identify with, the perpetrator. If the survivor has M.P.D. (Multiple Personality Disorder) or D.I.D. (Dissociative Identity Disorder), he or she may also discover that he or she has perpetrator alter-states based on the former captor's or abuser's perceived personality.

If the survivor is severely dissociative and has such alter-states, the survivor must learn not to judge or be harsh or dismissive towards those alter-states. By learning how the alter-states were originally created, and by understanding their original purposes -- to keep the survivor from feeling pain and expressing and rage and terror, and to stay alive and possibly unharmed -- the survivor can begin to accept those alter-states as part of his or her original whole personality. Understanding the motivations and belief systems of a former abuser or captor can also help the survivor understand why he or she was targeted and terrorized or hurt. This analytical process, however, should always be done away from the presence of the former abuser or captor, unless the confrontation is done in a safe and therapeutic setting. To be in the presence of the perpetrator once again can be dangerous, because the survivor may revert to "Stockholming" and may again try -- at least on a subconscious level -- to appease and gain the approval of the perpetrator. Such analytical work is best done in the presence of a safe therapist or counselor.

Stockholm Syndrome is an inborn dynamic that subconsciously develops in us when we are in danger of being hurt by a person we cannot physically remove ourselves from. This human dynamic is nothing to be ashamed of. Trauma survivors should, however, seek help if they find themselves unable to break free of the mental and emotional trap of identifying with the perpetrators. The deepest emotions -- terror and anger -- that survivors have suppressed to stay alive in the potentially dangerous situations, will need to be discovered and expressed to begin full healing. Once survivors are able to feel their anger at the aggressors, the survivors are less likely to be entrapped in the same type of abusive or dangerous dynamic with their former abusers or captors, again. The bonus of such recovery work is that we also will be more likely to discover, and avoid, abusers and dangerous people who are similar in personality to those who already terrified and/or harmed us. We will recognize the perpetrators' type of personality, and will be able to walk away more quickly, if that is possible. Severely dissociated survivors will also be able to therapeutically convert perpetrator alter-states into helper alter-states, which can further help protect us from being harmed as much, or as quickly, again.

From - http://www.angelfire.com/tn/parcvramc/

Food for thought

Game theory points to some important dynamics in human behavior, particularly as it relates to self preservation and protection of self interest. Question? Can self exist without other?
Page 273 makes mention of Self Serving bias, how might this notion relate to the Prisoner's dilemma?

Prisoner's Dilemma

Tanya and Cinque have been arrested for robbing the Hibernia Savings Bank and placed in separate isolation cells. Both care much more about their personal freedom than about the welfare of their accomplice. A clever prosecutor makes the following offer to each. "You may choose to confess or remain silent. If you confess and your accomplice remains silent I will drop all charges against you and use your testimony to ensure that your accomplice does serious time. Likewise, if your accomplice confesses while you remain silent, they will go free while you do the time. If you both confess I get two convictions, but I'll see to it that you both get early parole. If you both remain silent, I'll have to settle for token sentences on firearms possession charges. If you wish to confess, you must leave a note with the jailer before my return tomorrow morning."

The "dilemma" faced by the prisoners here is that, whatever the other does, each is better off confessing than remaining silent. But the outcome obtained when both confess is worse for each than the outcome they would have obtained had both remained silent. A common view is that the puzzle illustrates a conflict between individual and group rationality. A group whose members pursue rational self-interest may all end up worse off than a group whose members act contrary to rational self-interest. More generally, if the payoffs are not assumed to represent self-interest, a group whose members rationally pursue any goals may all meet less success than if they had not rationally pursued their goals individually. Puzzles with this structure were devised and discussed by Merrill Flood and Melvin Dresher in 1950, as part of the Rand Corporation's investigations into game theory (which Rand pursued because of possible applications to global nuclear strategy). The title "prisoner's dilemma" and the version with prison sentences as payoffs are due to Albert Tucker, who wanted to make Flood and Dresher's ideas more accessible to an audience of Stanford psychologists. Although Flood and Dresher didn't themselves rush to publicize their ideas in external journal articles, the puzzle attracted widespread attention in a variety of disciplines. Christian Donninger reports that "more than a thousand articles" about it were published in the sixties and seventies. A bibliography (Axelrod and D'Ambrosio) of writings between 1988 and 1994 that pertain to Robert Axelrod's research on the subject lists 209 entries. Since then the flow has shown no signs of abating. The sections below provide a variety of more precise characterizations of the prisoner's dilemma, beginning with the narrowest. 'Prisoner's dilemma' is abbreviated as 'PD'. Future editions of the entry will also survey some applications in philosophy, and attempts to "solve" the PD by showing that remaining silent is individually rational after all. From - http://www.spectacle.org/995/