

ocean newsletter
Overcoming Corruption Encouraging All Nations

In this 10th issue of the ocean newsletter we inform the public of the gulags attempt to censor us from telling the world about the injustices of this preventative detention scheme. Then we will explain how moral panic triggered the punitive state. Then we will look at the farce of "treatment" that is a lie to the public. We will then look at the difference between coerced psychotherapy and volunteer psychotherapy. We will look at what a "stakeholder" is and how the gulag manipulates their language to include the wrong people. Our detainee interview comes from a 77 year old man from North Carolina who went to "treatment" to get help, and never returned. We conclude with a thanks to our many supporters.

If you have questions or comments, write to the ocean founders:

Daniel A. Wilson [daw] & Russell J. Hatton [rjh] *judicium dei* at:

ocean
PO Box 582
Pelican Rapids, MN 56572.

You can also leave a voice message at:

(218) 351-1900
Ext. 106021 for daw
Ext. 70887 for rjh.

👤 A Call to Action! 👤 Overcoming Censorship

Ocean authors Daniel A. Wilson and Russell John Hatton are “Muckrakers.” Muckrakers are journalists who expose social ills as well as corporate and political corruption.

Julius Chambers of the *New York Tribune*, is considered by many to be the original Muckraker. Chambers undertook a journalistic investigation of Bloomingdale Asylum in 1872, having himself committed with the help of some of his friends and his newspaper’s city editor. His intent was to obtain information about the alleged abuse of inmates. The publication of a series of articles led to the release of 12 patients who were not mentally ill; a reorganization of the staff and administration of the institution; and eventually resulted in a change in the lunacy laws. This later led to the publication of Chamber’s book *A Mad World and Its Inhabitants* (1976). From this point onward, Chambers was frequently invited to speak about the rights of the mentally ill and the need for facilities for their proper accommodation, care and treatment. Therefore, we see our role as Muckrakers as very important and we hope to encourage everyone to shed light on corruption.

Our friend and ocean drop, Pete, made the following comment about ocean:

ocean is pushing some buttons with those in authority at ocean, by bringing to light many of the injustices perpetrated by them. It is much like opening up the door to a very dark room, and exposing the deeds of the monsters hiding there. The monsters don’t like their deeds being exposed, they’ve been at it for over 20 years, and they’re terribly afraid of the light.

On January 21, 2020, four copies of the 9th issue of the ocean Newsletter, were confiscated from Daniel and deemed “Counter Therapeutic.” When asked why, he was told that they are “offensive.” The newsletter were routed to clinical staff.

On January 29, 2020 ocean editor Russell Hatton printed the 9th issue of the ocean Newsletter and it was confiscated by 1E cellblock security counselor Sabrina Search and routed to Property for review. What the MSOP Property department has to do with media content is unknown. On January 31, 2020 Mr. Hatton’s 1E Clinical Primary therapist, Ross Peterson, provided a written reply:

The unit staff reported that the newsletter had “questionable content.” It was secured and being sent for “media review.” I suggest you review the media policy to see what appeals you can make.

Upon speaking with Mr. Peterson, Russell asked what specifically was the “questionable content.” Mr. Peterson indicated to the article “How msop keeps the Murder Machine Running: Big Money & a Little Nepotism Goes a Long Way.” Stating he understands staff wages are public information, he seemed to be more concerned about the comments about nepotism.

Any and all material used by ocean editors is vetted, fact-checked through multiple research methods and double checked to be accurate. The material used in the ocean article: “How msop Keeps the Murder Machine Running: Big Money & a Little Nepotism Goes a Long Way,” was taken from multiple newspaper articles and other credible sources, as referenced in the article itself.

The ocean Newsletter in question covered the nepotism at msop, ridiculous staff salaries, and citations of sexual misconduct on the part of some staff. All of the information was either cited from public sources or considered common knowledge at msop. We were told that it could potentially “incite a riot” even though what we wrote is daily talk among the clients. None of it is new, and the newsletter is not intended for MSOP peers anyway. It is written for the public.

Our newsletters inform why msop, and many other civil commitment centers across the nation, need reformation immediately. ocean believes that msop staff should be accountable to the tax payers that pay them. MSOP staff seem to disagree. We hope the fact that they are trying to censor us makes our case even stronger.

Although we were not the first to do so, we were also targeted for comparing msop to Nazi death camps, and msop staff to SS officers. One security guard got on my case about it after she briefly “skimmed the first page.” The comparison was “offensive” to them, (not necessarily inaccurate, just “offensive”) and for this reason they need to stop us from writing... See the irony? One of the very first things the Nazi’s did when they took over Germany was they censored the media and people of Germany. Those who fought for freedom of speech often faced the concentration camp, torture, or death. Similarly, Japan and Italy did away with free speech, free assembly and free press because they knew that abolishing these fundamental rights were the first steps to achieving their goals.

The 8th issue of the ocean newsletter, the one heavily focused on the Nazi and msop comparison, was inspired by a friend of ours who wrote the following:

There may be guys at the Minnesota Sex Offender Program (M.S.O.P.) who are very dangerous and should never get out. Perhaps I am one of them. There are assaults that happen here. Most of them are emotional or mental. Rarely are they physical. These assaults have happened to staff and clients alike. I should know, because I have seen and experienced them myself. The assaults are being perpetrated by both clients and staff. Having said that, we should also know that there are hundreds of men in here that could be let out, who are not dangerous, and do not belong in this Concentration Camp. I am not associating M.S.O.P. to the Nazis Germany Concentration Camps of WW II. However, I do want to expose the truth about the real life Concentration Camps of the 21st Century. I encourage you to get your dictionary and look up the definition of “Concentration Camp.” I have done this with many different dictionaries and Encyclopedias. We ought not ignore the fact that by definition, the U.S. has modern day Concentration Camps that you, as Minnesota taxpayers, have built.

We are not at MSOP because of the crimes we committed. Most of us already have done prison time in the Department of Corrections, (D.O.C.) and even completed real sex offender treatment. Instead, we are all here because of what we might do. There are even about 90 guys here who have no criminal record at all. This is a political ploy, which violates our rights to be free from preventive detention. Of course, there are some individuals here that should probably never get out. However, most men in here do not have a mental illness recognized by the psychiatric community. Generally, MSOP residents are no more dangerous than felons being released from prison every day of the week. But the political scare tactics you see on the news are hyping up the lies just to get the public to look away from what they are doing here at in this Concentration Camp.

The Webster’s Third New International Dictionary from 1993 said the following about Concentration Camps: “A camp where persons (as prisoners of war, political prisoners, refugees, or foreign nationals) are physically and mentally abused.” The World book Encyclopedia Volume 4 from 1986 defined Concentration Camps as: “...a place where political enemies, real or assumed, are imprisoned, usually without trial. The term was first used by Great Britain for prison camps it set up during the Boer War in Africa around 1900. Russian secret police imprisoned millions of persons in labor camps after 1928, during Joseph Stalin’s dictatorship. During World War II, the United States and Canada held thousands of persons of Japanese ancestry in special camps (also see WWII Internment of Aliens). But the best known Concentration Camps were those set up in Nazi Germany before and during WW II.”

The American Heritage Student Dictionary from 2007 defined Concentration Camp as: “An area or group of buildings where civilians, political prisoners, and sometimes prisoners of war are confined, usually under harsh conditions.” The Webster’s Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary from 1996 defined Concentration Camps as: “A guarded compound for the detention or imprisonment of aliens, members of ethnic minorities, political opponents, etc., esp. any of the camps established by the Nazis prior to and during WW II for the confinement and persecution of prisoners. (1900-05)...”

So as you can see there are many levels of the same thing, and just because we are not in Germany and the Nazi’s are not in charge here at MSOP, doesn’t mean that MSOP is not a Concentration Camp.

Similarly, there are also many different levels of prisons today. Some prisons kill their prisoners with lethal injections, some just warehouse individuals until they die of old age, while other prisons lock them up 23 hours a day in a cell, letting them out only for an hour a day to shower and exercise. Yet, some institutions allow inmates free roaming visits. Other prisons have swimming pools, baseball fields and barbecue picnics. But they are all still penitentiaries where they have Supervised Release Dates (S.R.D.). Similarly, although M.S.O.P. does not treat their captives in the same horrifying, shocking and appalling ways as the Nazi's did, this does not make M.S.O.P. any less a Concentration Camp.

So I ask you, "Are you OK with paying for Concentration Camps here in this modern day U.S.A.?" Don't let the media fool you in to thinking that this is a treatment center. If you just take some time and do some research you can find the real facts about what your tax money is really paying for. The taxpayers are paying millions and millions of dollars each year. Did you know it costs \$393.00 per person, *per day* and there are close to 740 men (and one female) here? This money is used just to house us in this Concentration Camp with their fake treatment. They are now asking for additional money to make room for more men. Do you think there is something wrong with all these people committed in Minnesota?

I also want to reveal some of the ways M.S.O.P. is similar to other Concentration Camps. We are housed in buildings with two man prison cells that is surrounded by two layers of barbwire fencing and patrolled by guards. No one has an out date. This is a life sentence. We are constantly being told that we are the "worst of the worst" and that we will never get out unless we follow every little rule they have, which has proved to be nearly impossible and those that have followed all the rules, are still here. The "therapists," the lawyers, Judges, and the politicians are told that if we complete the "treatment," we can go home. Even when the Governor stood up and said on record that "As Long as I am in office NO ONE from M.S.O.P. will EVER get out on my watch!" Mr. Berg, the associate clinical director of M.S.O.P. was asked under oath in court during the *Karsjens v Jesson* trial, if anyone could ever complete the treatment at M.S.O.P. his answer was, "No" and he went on to explain that the program is not designed to be completed.

Within the last 25+ years of M.S.O.P.'s commitment, only a few men ever got out and the ones who did, got out through technicalities in the law and fighting their case in court. Not from completing M.S.O.P.'s "treatment." We are being deprived living with our families, friends and loved ones.

They try to force us to do "treatment" if we want a job and/or any privileges. They lie and twist everything we say and do. The only reason they push treatment is to train everyone into the Stockholm Syndrome so they can control us and get us to obey with all these impossible rules. Like I already stated, there is no real releases from this Concentration Camp.

I believe that the psychological abuse is a whole lot worse than physical abuse. But that is just my opinion. I know others who say the physical is worse and I can't argue with them, everyone is different and has different experiences

If MSOP is not psychological abuse, psychological starvation, and psychological torture, then I don't know what is.

This friend, also said, "I only wait and pray for the day I get to die. I have intentionally over-dosed on meds 2 times now to speed it up, but with no success." For this friend, his freedom to express this was important and we knew his story had to be told.

After doing more research, we realized that his concerns that msop closely resembles a concentration camp are valid, even if they are not yet as egregious as those of Nazi Germany.

Our friend is still with us today, thank God, but he is still struggling. I hope ocean helped him find some purpose by telling his story.

We are not saying that msop is just like Nazi Germany. We are saying it is heading in that direction. We are saying that humans, left unchecked, always have the potential to display cruel and abusive actions towards

others – especially if they have an opportunity to abuse a class of people that they think are despised by the masses – like “sex offenders.” Besides the media propelled stigma, there is no objective oversight at msop. The reason msop doesn’t have an incinerator is not because they *can’t* have one, it’s because they don’t want one. However, one day they will.

msop gets away with a lot. ocean hopes to change that by exposing them. We are not surprised that they now want to snuff us out by censoring us.

To date, we are not allowed to print the 9th Issue of the ocean Newsletter. Currently, as I write this, I have no idea if I will be able to print it. The guards at the desk are reading everything we print. But if you are reading this right now, consider it a miracle.

We have not printed much in the last 2 weeks. We are waiting for things to cool down a bit. We are curious as to what other kinds of retaliation msop is capable of. Although ocean operatives are willing to make personal sacrifices for justice, we are not willing to make unnecessary and arrogant risks that do nothing to support our cause. We are obviously considering a lawsuit, but rubbing it in their faces by printing 50 copies of the 9th newsletter right now is simply not productive.

We will keep our readers informed, hopefully. [DAW/RJH]

Stop Them! They're Offensive!

1st Amendment freedoms are most in danger when the government seeks to control thought or to justify its laws for that impermissible end. The right to think is the beginning of freedom, and speech must be protected from the government because speech is the beginning of thought.¹

The Constitution protects the right to receive information and ideas, regardless of their social worth, and to be generally free from governmental intrusions into one's privacy and control of one's thoughts.

The First Amendment states, in relevant part, "Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech." Although this language specifically targets *federal Congress*, the First Amendment has been held applicable to the states by virtue of selective incorporation² and most state constitutions have a similar provision protecting freedom of speech.³

Freedom of speech has been the focus of countless judicial opinions. To summarize, US Supreme Court precedent, the word *Speech* has been interpreted to cover virtually any form of expression, including verbal and written words, pictures, photographs, videos, and songs. First Amendment speech also includes expressive conduct such as dressing a certain way,⁴ flag burning,⁵ and cross burning.⁶

Although the First Amendment protects peaceful speech and assembly, if speech creates a clear and present danger to the public, it can be regulated. This includes fighting words, "those which by their very utterance inflict injury or tend to incite an immediate breach of the peace."⁷ However, any criminal statute prohibiting fighting words must be narrowly tailored and focus on imminent, rather than future harm. Modern U.S. Supreme Court decisions indicate a tendency to favor freedom of speech over government's interest in regulating fighting words, and many fighting words statutes have been deemed unconstitutional under the First Amendment or void for vagueness and over breadth under the Fifth Amendment and Fourteenth Amendment due process clause.⁸

An example of an Unconstitutional "fighting words" statute comes from *Gooding v. Wilson*, 405 U.S. 518 (1972). Georgia enacted the following criminal statute:

Any person who shall, without provocation, use to or of another, and in his presence...opprobrious words or abusive language, tending to cause a breach of the peace...shall be guilty of a misdemeanor (Ga. Code §26-6303).

The US Supreme Court determined that this statute was overbroad, void of vagueness, and unconstitutional under the First Amendment. Similarly, *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, an incitement to riot statute must prohibit *imminent* lawless action.⁹ Statutes that prohibit simple advocacy with no imminent threat or harm cannot withstand the First Amendment's heightened scrutiny.

Another example of an unconstitutional incitement to riot statute is from Ohio. The state legislature enacted a statute that criminalized:

advocat[ing]...the duty, necessity, or propriety of crime, sabotage, violence, or unlawful methods of terrorism as a means of accomplishing industrial or political reform" and "voluntarily assembl[ing]" with any society, group or assemblage of persons formed to teach or advocate the doctrines of criminal syndicalism (Ohio Rev. Code Ann. §2923.13).

This was also found to be unconstitutional.

A Ku Klux Klan leader was convicted under the statute after the media broadcast films of him leading a KKK meeting. The US Supreme Court held:

Accordingly, we are here confronted with a statute which, by its own words and as applied, purports to punish mere advocacy and to forbid, on pain of criminal punishment, assembly with others merely

to advocate the described type of action. [Footnote 4] Such a statute falls within the condemnation of the First and Fourteenth Amendments.¹⁰

ocean questions how our newsletter can be determined to contain “questionable content” when the document is leaving msop —via United States Postal Service—not being distributed here or entering the facility?

Nothing in the ocean newsletters threatens the safety and security of the facility for clients, staff or the public. MSOP’s argument that what we write is “offensive” just isn’t good enough to bar ocean from writing—especially if the comparison is accurate.

[RJH/DAW]

Footnotes

1. *Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coalition*, 535 U.S. 234, 253 122 S.Ct. 1389, 152 L.Ed.2d 403 (2002).
2. *Gitlow v. New York*, 268 U.S. 652 (1925), <http://supreme.justia.com/us/268/652/case.html>.
3. Minn. Const. art. I, §3, Sec. 3. Liberty of the press. The liberty of the press shall forever remain inviolate, and all persons may freely speak, write and publish their sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of such right.
4. *Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District*, 393 U.S. 503 (1969), <http://supreme.justia.com/us/393/503/case.html>.
5. *Texas v. Johnson*, 491 U.S. 397 (1989) <http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=us&vol=491&invol=397>.
6. *R.A.V. v. St. Paul*, 505 U.S. 377 (1992), <http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=us&vol=505&invol=377>.
7. *Sable Communis. Of California, Inc. v. FCC*, 492 U.S. 115 (1989) <http://supreme.justia.com/us/492/115/case.html>.
8. *Schenck v. U.S.*, 249 U.S. 47 (1919) <http://supreme.justia.com/us/249/47/case.html>.
9. *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, 395 U.S. 444 (1969), <http://supreme.justia.com/us/395/444/case.html>.
10. *Ibid.*

Minnesota Exploited a Scheme of Moral Panic

Ronald Sullivan from Harvard Law School says:

The right to be free from confinement is “of the very essence of a scheme of ordered liberty.” *Palko v. Connecticut*, 302 U.S. 319, 325 (1937). It forms the basis of other rights deemed fundamental in this country—the right to earn a living, to have children—and it prevents this nation from devolving into tyranny. The government must tread lightly when it intrudes on that freedom, enacting safeguards to prevent it from overreaching.

That is not what occurred in Minnesota. Rather than carefully develop a sexual civil commitment scheme that confines only “a small segment of particularly dangerous individuals,” (*Kansas v. Hendricks*, 521 U.S. 346, 369 1997), Minnesota enacted the broadest scheme in the country after just ninety minutes of discussion. They did so in the midst of a moral panic over one inmate’s potential release. Minnesota then failed to provide resources so that those confined could receive treatment, and it did not enact procedures to ensure that those no longer posing a risk are released.¹

This comment came from the Summary of the *Amicus Brief for Criminology Scholars and The Fair Punishment Project*. The Fair Punishment Project (FPP) is a joint project of the Charles Hamilton Houston Institute for Race and Justice and the Criminal Justice Institute, both at Harvard Law School. The mission of The Fair Punishment Project is to address ways in which our laws and criminal justice systems contribute to the imposition of excessive punishment. In the Amicus Brief cited above, Ronald Sullivan commented:

FPP believes that the Minnesota civil commitment statute is a punitive scheme that responds excessively to moral panic rather than in a narrowly tailored way to a compelling government interest.²

Ronald Sullivan and four other Criminology Scholars—Tusty ten Bensel (University of Arkansas at Little Rock), Robert D. Lytle (University of Arkansas at Little Rock), Christina N. Mancini (Virginia Commonwealth University), and Lisa L. Sample (University of Nebraska at Omaha), believe that the Court has relied on faulty statistics about recidivism—the same faulty statistics ocean has consistently reported on—as a basis to uphold the durational limits of institutionalization and physical liberty.

FPP and the four criminology scholars further went on to say:

When Republican institutions pass laws in response to moral panics and popular passions, with little thought, deliberation, and scrutiny, the rights of the most vulnerable and unpopular suffer. When “prejudice” against unpopular groups curtails “the operation of those political processes ordinarily to be relied upon to protect minorities,” “more searching judicial inquiry” is required. (internal citations omitted)³

Ronald Sullivan continues:

Forty years of research has showed that “moral panics” can have profound and devastating effects on vulnerable populations. Moral panics are outsized public reactions to “a condition, episode, person or group of persons” that prominent stakeholders in society, and the public at large, view as “a threat to societal values and interests...”

A moral panic often begins with a real and disturbing event which is disseminated through the popular media... The response is disproportionate, exaggerating “the extent of the conduct, or the threat it poses,” and the individual case is portrayed as symptomatic of greater societal woes.⁴

One of the most recent moral panics in our present history involved fear over same-sex marriage in which led to the passage of thirteen referenda barring same-sex marriage in 2004, which led to harmful infringements on the right to physical liberty, free speech and association, as well as the right to marry.⁵

ocean asks, where is the compelling state interest of those subjected to pre-crime preventive detention laws and registry? It is the Minnesota Legislatures responsibility to ensure this comprehensive standard is met through abolishing the DHS- msop variances and enforcing our Constitution's broad provisions designed to safeguard individual freedom and to preserve human dignity. This protection is accomplished through our Constitutions Eighth or Fourteenth Amendment:

Those whom we would banish from society or from the human community itself often speak in too faint a voice to be heard above society's demand for punishment. It is the particular role of courts to hear these voices, for the Constitution declares that the majoritarian chorus may not alone dictate the conditions of social life."⁶

For the past twenty-five years, msop has relied heavily upon the public's moral panic to maintain its functioning as a pseudo-treatment program. Case in point, msop does not operated on the ethics of transparency and has intentionally mislead the public to believe that the recidivism rate for men involuntarily civilly committed to msop is high. However, A 2003 Department of Justice study of nearly 10,000 released sex offenders found that only 5.3% were arrested for a sex crime within three years of release.⁷ This is a relatively low rate of recidivism, and a far cry from the hysteria that recidivism rates are "as high as 80%."⁸

Minnesota's SPP/SDP scheme is arguably the broadest sex offender civil commitment scheme in the country. The facts underscore how restrictive the preventive detention scheme is. Nontraditional legislative deliberation has created laws that have cost tax payers millions each year, has cemented the careers of legislatures who claim to be "tough on crime," and has permitted the courts to rely on unsubstantiated empirical support.

In over 25 years, only 9 men committed had have achieved full discharge through legal technicalities and NOT by completion of the treatment program. With 731 men still languishing behind its walls, and nearly 80 lost lives, many are still waiting for the Minnesota legislature to correct this horrific, deliberate injustice. [RJH]

Footnotes

1. Ronald Sullivan, FAIR PUNISHMENT PROJECT, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, MA 02138, (617) 496-2054, rsullivan@law.harvard.edu, *Amicus Brief for Criminology Scholars and The Fair Punishment Project*, June 22, 2017, p. 1, 2
2. Ibid. at 1
3. Ibid. at 2
4. Ibid. at 3
5. See Michael Klarman, *From the Closet to the Alter: Courts, Backlash, and the Struggle for Same-Sex Marriage*, 106 (1st ed. 2012)
6. See *United States v. Carolene Products, Inc.*, 304 U.S. 144, 153 n.4 (1938); *McCleskey v. Kemp*, 481 U.S. 279, 343 (1987) (Brennan, J., dissenting)
7. Ibid. 11, also see Patrick A. Langan, PhD et al., Bureau of Just. Stat., *Recidivism of Sex Offenders Released from Prison in 1994* (2003), <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/rsorp94.pdf>.
8. *McKune v. Lile*, 536 U.S. 24, 33 (2002) (Kennedy, J., opinion for the Court).

What Treatment? People Die Here

There is only one thing that attests to the indifference of the msop organization more blatantly than the absence of a basic procedure for a fire drill: they seem to revel in the death of each sex offender.

An msop clinician is like a surgeon who leaves her patient on the operating table to die (but not before she gets her paycheck from the tax payers). No client ever gets rehabilitated at msop. They just die. To date, almost 80 men have died here in 25 years. That's more than 3 deaths a year. However, it may be rising.

Since January, 2017 there have been 12 deaths here at msop. In contrast, there have only been 9 full discharges from msop in the last 25 years. Of those 9 full discharges, the majority were juvenile offenders, so msop was forced to let them go (although there are still many juvenile offenders still here). Of the 9 that have gotten out of msop, the remaining clients are left to guess and sift through rumors to figure out HOW they got out. Until the public raises a fuss, msop will continue to hold as many people as they can until they are all dead.

Every new client in msop treatment is shown a movie called, *What About Bob*. This movie is allegedly meant to illustrate the importance of boundaries between the client and clinician. Before the movie is played the clinician will tell the clients that "Bob" represents the msop client and "Dr. Leo Marvin" represents msop staff.

In the movie Dr. Marvin tries to kill Bob by tying him to a chair and strapping him with explosives. When that fails, Dr. Marvin acquires a gun and goes after his client.

This analogy eerily communicates msop's true intentions. msop clinicians explicitly tell clients that the movie is meant to be an analogy of the client/staff relationship. It should not surprise anyone that people at msop are dying left and right. They were fairly warned.

Ironically, Dr. Marvin ends up getting civilly committed to a state hospital and Bob marries the doctor's sister and lives happily ever after. This part of the analogy we like, because it illustrates how the msop saga will hopefully end.

msop administration only recently started to announce when clients get released. This is at least in part due to ocean's willingness to point out their hypocrisy. However, msop has always been quick to tell us when clients have died and has their way of acknowledging these "msop graduates" with their ad hoc meetings, emergency community meetings, and "Celebration of Life" events. Sometimes, we even get details as to how they died and if they suffered or not. We only wish we received as much information about how the 9 released were able to survive MSOP and finally receive their long-overdue freedom.

[DAW]

Coerced Psychotherapy

On January 29, 2020 I (Daniel) was asked to have a meeting with my primary therapist, her supervisor, and a psychologist.”

Before the meeting, I asked if I could have Russell with me in the meeting as a “support peer.” My therapist first said that they could not allow someone from a different unit to come onto our unit. When we pointed out that we know this is not true, she changed her reason to, “we are going to talk about more than just the newsletter.” So, I let it go, too a risk, and went into the meeting. The meeting was centered on whether or not the ocean Newsletters were “therapeutic.” At one point I was told, “we can stop you from writing these.” However, they knew the only way they could take away my 1st Amendment right to free press, was to use psychology to convince me to agree to stop, by claiming that it was somehow “counter-therapeutic.” Towards the end of the conversation, and in a desperate attempt to get me to stop publishing the newsletter, one of the clinicians leaned in, looked me in the eye, and said, “Daniel, how can we help you get through this treatment?” I responded, “are you offering me treatment progression if I agree to keep my mouth shut?” She desperately recanted what she had just said, and I terminated the meeting.

Most of the individuals participating in “treatment” do so under duress. In his book, *If you Meet Buddha on the Road, Kill Him!*, Sheldon Kopp, explains:

[In Coerced Psychotherapy]... the patient does not freely choose to seek out the therapist’s services. He comes instead under the duress of threatened sanctions by the court... or because “therapy” may be his only hope of regaining his political and social freedom. The social power of the therapist is inherent in his role. The inequality of the participants comes closer to that of warden and prisoner than the one man being paid to help another. The real client seeking relief is the family or the community who sees to it that the patient is vulnerable to the expert, and who pays the latter’s fees. The goal is not the relief of the patient’s suffering, but rather the re-establishment of social control. Consequentially, as the community’s agent (rather than his own or the patient’s), the therapist does not value or protect his patient’s privacy and confidentiality. (pp. 112-113)

msop detainees are “encouraged” to participate in treatment with many incentives and discouraged from quitting with many negative consequences. To encourage msop clients to participate in treatment, including the new tier system, msop offers:

1. The privilege of more work hours and thus more money.
2. The privilege of lounging in certain rooms that are not allowed to the “other” clients.
3. The privilege to buy an X-Box
4. The privilege to buy fast food more than the “others.”
5. The privilege to go to the chow hall and eat meals before the “others.”
6. The privilege to lock down at night later than the “others.”
7. The privilege to sit anywhere in the chow hall that you want.
8. The privilege to wander around the facility more than the “others.”
9. The privilege to go to the music room and play guitar drums or keyboard.
10. The privilege to use the legal computer to exercise whatever rights you still have.
11. The privilege to plant in the garden.
12. The privilege to use certain vending machines.
13. The privilege to share food and media.
14. The privilege to exercise in the gym when you want.
15. The privilege to participate in extra social activities.
16. The privilege to go to extra therapeutic recreational events

17. The privilege to participate in therapeutic based unit-to-unit visiting.

This is text book coercion. Some may argue, “but you wouldn't do treatment if you didn't have an incentive.” But we do have incentive: CHANGE. The only incentive should be a changed heart and mind. msop doesn't offer that though. They don't even suggest that it is possible that we can actually change and that it would be personally rewarding if we did. Instead they use coercion to create the illusion that guys are actually learning something. The irony of it all is that, by their own admission, most of the clients at msop are not even mentally ill, so many of them are pretending that they are “getting better” so that they can get the rewards. The reality is that there was never anything wrong with them to begin with.

The big problem with coercion is that it is inherently corrupt. There is no way to know who is participating genuinely, and who is not.

In addition, therapists, psychologists, psychiatrists, clinicians, social workers, and the like are not objective. They are human beings and are subject to bias like anyone else. The indefinite preventive detention of the MSOP's detainees and others nationwide solely relies upon “expert witnesses” and in the context of civil commitment, this is usually a psychologist or psychiatrist whom our clinicians work under.

Dr. Joel Dvoskin, Ph.D., ABPP immediate past President of the American Psychological Association, discloses what should be known by all:

... We come to each other and every case with pre-existing values, learning histories, experiences, and prejudices, some of which are beyond our awareness. Some of us—not me, thank goodness—are members of political parties. We have different beliefs about social justice, personal responsibility, and the exculpatory effects of poverty, youth, or mental illness.

... we do this for a living. (Some of you may cling to the belief that money has no effect on you, but if I paid you enough, I could get you to say that you like Barry Manilow.) Most people are influenced by money. There is no reason to believe that we are exceptions.

... most of us want to be praised. There is a plethora of research to support the proposition that people will almost always do more of what brings them praise. To pretend that we are immune to this apparently core human characteristic is self-serving and indefensible.

... we are biased by the fact that the case gets initially “sold” to us by lawyers, many of whom are skillful and persuasive advocates of their client's point of view.

... many of us are competitive. Most people prefer to win rather than lose, and it is not by accident that our legal system is called adversarial.

I know that we are not supposed to talk about these things. With a wink and a nod, we all claim to be objective arbiters of wholly truthful opinions, and yet the plain folks who serve on juries are not fooled. They know that it is never even a challenge to find one of us on either side of each and every question. How is it, they wonder, that lawyers are seemingly never unable to find a psychologist or psychiatrist to have an opinion that helps this particular client?

... It is only by acknowledging our blind spots, biases, and prejudices that we can take sensible steps to correct for them.

This lack of objectivity on the part of clinicians and psychologists is not lost to most clients. MSOP detainees know that they must pacify and impress clinicians to gain their freedom. However, the wise are not convinced that it will ever pay off.

ocean continues to be baffled at what to call the “clients” at msop so if you have any ideas, let us know. We are not actually clients, because there is no service being provided to us. “Detainees” just sounds negative. We are not sex offenders or ex-offenders or even the new label giving to break the stigma: “Registrants” (many of us do not have to register). Let's try “Defender” for a while. However, not all offenders are Defenders, if they are not willing to change their ways. As Defenders, we have cultivated empathy and atonement and have

become genuinely remorseful for past behaviors. As Defenders we have gained a portion of understanding of how we have affected others and now we defend the perspective of those we have harmed, and strive to bring light to the dark.

msop Stakeholders are not Legitimate

Just like at Coalinga State Hospital in California, the Per Diem is always conveniently going up, up, up. Per Diem Rates are updated each fiscal year to reflect the cost of operation:

- a. State Fiscal Year 2018=\$372 (July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018)
- b. State Fiscal Year 2019=\$373 (July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019)
- c. State Fiscal Year 2020=\$393 (July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020)

You'd think that some of the money would be going to helping detainees reintegrate back into the community. In fact, there have been meetings on "reintegration" for years, but with very little results. Actually between December 2, 2014 and July 15, 2019 they had 268 meetings concerning "reintegration." These are either the most incompetent people alive to have this many meetings for "reintegration" with no results, or they are lying through their teeth... or both. These meetings involve "stakeholders." msop administration invites these "stakeholders" to msop on a regular basis for tours. The msop policy for this uses Minn. Stat. § 246.014, sub. (d) (Services) as the authority for this policy, which states: "The commissioner of human services may establish policies and procedures which govern the operation of the services and programs under the direct administrative authority of the commissioner."

msop administration claims that the purpose of the policy is to:

outline the process for providing tours of DCT facilities to exchange information and establish relationships with community stakeholders in a manner ensuring safety, security, and privacy of staff, clients, and visitors while minimizing potential disruption to the therapeutic environment.

But this is clearly NOT what stakeholders are for according to Minn. Stat. § 246B.06 VOCATIONAL WORK PROGRAM, Subdivision 1. (b) Establishment; purpose, which says, in relevant part:

"...Prior to the establishment of any vocational activity, the commissioner of human services shall consult with stakeholders including representatives of business, industry, organized labor, the commissioner of education, the state Apprenticeship Council, the commissioner of labor and industry, the commissioner of employment and economic development, the commissioner of administration, and other stakeholders the commissioner deems qualified. The purpose of the stakeholder consultation is to determine the quantity and nature of the goods, wares, merchandise, and services to be made or provided, and the types of processes to be used in their manufacture, processing, repair, and production consistent with the greatest opportunity for the reform and educational training of the civilly committed sex offenders, and with the best interests of the state, business, industry, and labor.
[emphasis mine]

On September 25, 2017, detainees were told via "client memo" that "stakeholders" would be coming for a visit to the facility. ocean requested a list of those that would be attending. Noah Cashman, the Assistant Minnesota Attorney General, along with many lawyers, judges, and forensic examiners are on the stakeholder list. This seems like a clear conflict of interest, and these people are not the kind of people one would use for the purposes we pointed out in Minn. Stat. § 246B.06.

In summary, MSOP is supposed to consult with stakeholders, which should be experts from the labor industry to help with vocational programming. Instead, msop has a bunch of lawyers, judges and even the Attorney General – who represents and supports the counties that petitioned for our commitments – helping msop with security issues, and calling them "stakeholders".

[DAW]

Drop Interviews

Ocean newsletters have expanded across the states. One detainee in another hospital has replied to our article in Issue 6: "Correcting false information in your detainee charts VIA DATA CHALLENGE—It's your responsibility."

We received this letter from Jim Blessings in North Carolina and found it to be so imperative that we thought we would simply share his story word for word:

My name is Jim Blessing, I am 77 years of age and I have been civilly committed 11 years. I committed myself based on what an evaluator told me. It was obvious to her that I was heartbroken over hurting my family and I was in need of answers. She told me that if I committed myself, I would get all my questions answered and my family would be brought in to join me in treatment sessions, for rehabilitation. My attorney said I would only be looking at one year. It didn't take long after my arrival to learn I had been lied to. My family would not be joining me and I got no answers in group therapy because all they wanted was detailed disclosures of the past, nothing relating to the underlying issues for my offense. I went searching on my own and found my answers. Dr. Fred Berlin was a great help. I communicated with him over a 2 year period.

I was highly criticized for looking for answers outside of the program. Evaluators took it upon themselves to destroy my good character in annual reports and create false information to punish me. One evaluator even gave me a Narcissistic personality disorder for my contact with Dr. Berlin.

I appreciate the information you gave about false information in annual reports on page 3. I am looking into what I could do.

I am putting together a class-action lawsuit addressing a number of issues including having a recourse to challenge false information in our reports.

I received a copy of your ocean Newsletter when I received my December Legal Pad from Eldon Dillingham. I am so grateful he included a copy with his mailing.

Your ocean Newsletter is very much appreciated and I commend you on the great work you are doing. I share your newsletter with others.

I was told that California passed a law that requires the sex offender program there must have max out date. Is this true?

By the way, our case managers are social workers who know nothing about sex offending and they focus on detailed pornographic descriptions of one's offenses. I will address this in my lawsuit.

This program is controlled by a "for profit" company whose objective is to use us to make money. The company is "Wellpath Recovery Solutions" and they are a 1.5 billion dollar institute.

They treat us like slaves and the conditions are far more punitive than prison. We have no privacy. The staff comes by our rooms and looks in every 30 minutes and we cannot put anything on the window to indicate we are getting dressed or using the bathroom. They control the lights and there is a light that stays on 24-7 even when the regular lights are turned off and is bright enough to read by. The portions of food are small, to save money! We have had 2 people to die recently from a lack of good medical care. This is just a few things out of many that we deal with every day here in S.C.. I will close for now. Keep up the good work!

Signed, Jim Blessing

Thank you Jim, and we will continue the fight for our constitutional rights, liberty and reform. Let everyone in S.C. know they are in our thoughts and prayers.

Ocean Thanks You

We want to thank Eldon Dillingham, Garnett B., Pearl, Roy, James, Chris K., and everyone that participated in the civil Commitment Conference call on February 1, 2020.

It has been crazy trying to get the opportunity to be a part of the conference call. We are so glad that we were able to hear the stories and the encouragements from everyone on the phone.

One thing that we noticed is that there are some serious similarities between facilities across the nation. The punitive nature of civil commitment is consistently petty and harmful to detainees with absolutely no therapeutic value whatsoever. We are praying for everyone locked up in these places and don't forget that you are not alone.

ocean thanks Galen and Garnett B for collaborating with ocean to find new ways we can expand our reach. You are encouraging us to work harder and with more zeal than we could have conjured up alone.

Thank you again to Jim Blessings for your letter. We are sorry for your situation and although we are in a similar place, it does not make hearing about your struggles any easier to accept. We hope and pray for your peace of mind, even if it comes before our own.

A thousand blessings to everyone fighting for our constitutional rights.