In Memorium

Martin T. Orne
1927-2000

Expert on Hypnosis, Psychotherapy, and Research Methodology

Martin T. Orne, a psychologist and psychiatrist at the University of Pennsylvania, died of cancer on February 11, 2000. Orne, who retired from Penn in 1996, was Professor Emeritus in the Department of Psychiatry and Adjunct Professor in the Department of Psychology. Beginning in 1964, he was Director of the Unit for Experimental Psychiatry at the Institute of the Pennsylvania Hospital, which moved to the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine in 1995. In that position, he became one of the leading figures in the modern era of hypnosis research, made classic contributions to research methodology, promoted the field of behavioral medicine, and struggled to put, and keep, psychotherapy on a firm scientific base.

Orne was born in Vienna on October 16, 1927, the son of Frank Orne, a surgeon, and Martha Brunner-Orne, a psychiatrist. The Ornes left Austria for the United States in 1938, living first in New York City and then in Boston. Orne attended the Bronx High School of Science, and graduated from Harvard in 1948 with a degree in social relations. He received his medical degree from Tufts in 1955, and his PhD in psychology from Harvard in 1958. Before taking up his position at Penn, he completed a medical internship at the Michael Reese Hospital in Chicago, and a psychiatric residency at the Massachusetts Mental Health Center in Boston; he was also Senior Research Psychiatrist at MMHC from 1960 to 1964.

Orne’s first and last papers were on the subject of hypnosis, and it was as a hypnosis researcher that he was most widely known among psychologists. Along with Ernest R. Hilgard, Theodore X. Barber, and Theodore R. Sarbin, he brought new status to the scientific study of hypnosis, and helped to re-introduce the technique to medicine and psychotherapy. Many of Orne’s papers on hypnosis had a debunking flavor, leading some colleagues to count him as a skeptic. However, Orne’s view of hypnosis was subtle and nuanced, and he was primarily concerned with distinguishing the “essence” of cognitive changes associated with hypnosis from “artifacts” introduced by the social context in which hypnosis took place. In his experimental research, he developed experimental paradigms, such as the “real-simulator” design, that were sensitive to subjective experience as well as overt behavioral responses. In a clever adaptation of the double-blind paradigm familiar from drug research, he and his colleagues were able to show that hypnotic analgesia was not merely a placebo response.

From 1961 to 1992 Orne was editor in chief of the International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis, shepherding its transition from house organ of a small professional society to the leading venue for hypnosis research, with a citation count that would be the envy of more general journals in psychology and medicine.

He was a devoted and tireless editor. He involved his whole laboratory in the editorial process, and he contributed his own financial resources to making the journal succeed. Whereas other editors would give a paper a discrete thumb’s up or down, Orne worked with the author for draft upon draft, ensuring that each paper was as good as it could possibly be before it went to press. He had a better eye than many authors for what was significant about a study. His editorial letters are classics of the form, going beyond critiques of the paper at hand to detailed suggestions for improvement, and ideas for follow-up research. He hated to reject papers, and he took it as a personal defeat when he was unable to whip into shape a study whose ideas were good but whose execution or exposition was flawed.

In recognition of his career contributions to the field of hypnosis, as both researcher and editor, Orne received several awards from the Society for Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis, and the Benjamin Franklin Gold Medal of the International Society of Hypnosis.

It was in the course of his hypnosis research that Orne developed his view of experimental subjects as intelligent, sentient beings who, inside the laboratory as outside it, were constantly seeking to understand the situation they were in and to behave in accordance with that understanding, as it interacted with their own personal goals.

From Orne’s point of view, experimental settings had special features that are not necessarily found in the world outside the laboratory: therefore, researchers always had to be concerned with the “ecological validity” of their experiments, and not assume that findings obtained in the laboratory would generalize smoothly to the world outside. For example, a series of experiments conducted with Frederick J. Evans showed that antisocial and self-injurious behavior, apparently produced by hypnotic suggestion, was actually a response to the demand characteristics of the experimental setting in which the suggestions were given, and had nothing to do with hypnosis per se. Orne’s argument that proper interpretation of research required the investigator to view the experimental setting from the subject’s point of view is seen as a precursor to the establishment of the cognitive point of view in social psychology generally.

Orne’s focus on the objective study of subjective states such as hypnosis stimulated a lifelong interest in psychophysiology. He studied the physiological correlates of hypnotically-suggested
emotions, and physiological responses to painful stimuli during hypnotic analgesia. He and his collaborators studied the role of cognitive, personality, and interpersonal factors in the physiological detection of deception. When alpha-wave biofeedback was touted as a means of altering consciousness, Orne and his associates showed convincingly that contingent feedback played a relatively small role in EEG changes, compared to visual activity and ambient lighting, and cast doubt on the association between EEG alpha and any particular state of mind. An early interest in cognition and behavior during sleep led to an extensive program of research on the nature of napping, and the effects of short and long periods of sleep on human performance.

While primarily devoted to research, Orne also maintained a limited private practice as a psychotherapist. He never acquiesced to the "split" between science and practice, and his many contributions to clinical practice were firmly grounded in empirical research. Through his hypnosis research, he hoped to enable physicians and therapists to use hypnosis more appropriately and effectively. Here, as in his research, his position sought to balance enthusiasm and reservation. A staunch advocate of the use of hypnosis to control pain, he was cautiously optimistic about the psychosomatic effects of hypnotic suggestion, and vigorously critical of the use of hypnosis to recover lost forgotten, repressed, or dissociated memories.

Orne’s view that forensic hypnosis is unduly suggestive, and could lead witnesses to confabulate—or, at least, to have undue confidence in their memories—was favorably cited in more than 30 state supreme court decisions, as well as by the United States Supreme Court. He led a committee of the American Medical Association, which established standards for the forensic use of hypnosis; subsequently, the "Orne Guidelines" were essentially adopted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Orne repeated his warnings when clinical practitioners began to use hypnosis to recover ostensibly repressed or dissociated memories of traumatic experiences. To the end of his life, he was actively involved in the debate over the validity of recovered memory therapy.

Orne’s contributions to clinical practice went far beyond hypnosis. Early in his career, he was a member of the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, which sought to bring the theories and findings of the behavioral and social sciences to bear on mental illness and its treatment. His view of demand characteristics led him to propose that “anticipatory socialization”—teaching patients how their treatment would proceed and what was expected of them—would facilitate progress in psychotherapy. His positive view of placebo effects in medicine, and nonspecific factors in psychotherapy, led him to propose that effective hope, or patients’ beliefs that they would get well, was an active ingredient in successful psychotherapy. Much of his early work on hypnosis was motivated by an interest in self-regulation techniques that could counteract stress and fatigue. His sleep research demonstrated that “prophylactic napping” could be an effective countermeasure for sleepiness and fatigue. Based on his extensive program of laboratory research, he argued convincingly that standard physiological methods of lie detection were unreliable, and should not be considered as evidence in the courtroom.

As an expert witness, Orne had a prominent role in the trial of
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how those stereotypes affect the individual. Given these strides, how disappointing it is that we have next to nothing on understanding and dealing with the stereotyping associated with mental illness. What would it take to lure effective basic behavioral scientists into the realm of mental illness to explore the generalizability of theories and findings about stereotyping to the problems of stigma?

In other areas, given the impressive progress of cognitive science in recent years, there are enormous gaps in what we know about the cognitive deficits of schizophrenia, which ultimately may be more disabling than symptoms such as hallucinations. Our attempts at translating the fruits of cognitive science to the attentional problems in attention deficit disorder are equally in need of revitalization. Regrettable gaps exist, too, in the extent to which we have failed to apply basic behavioral science to the issue of treatment adherence problems in individuals with depression or with psychotic disorders.

The NIMH Council Workgroup identified at least five minimal requirements of basic researchers that must be met if we are to address effectively these and other needs. These requirements include: 1) intrinsically interesting research questions; 2) a clinical partner in the translational effort; 3) new venues for conducting the research; 4) an expectation of a fair and expert peer review, and 5) a sense that NIMH will remain committed to investing in this area over a sustained period.

---

NIMH staff is ready to act on the Council Workgroup’s ideas. Examples of steps that the Institute is considering include research centers focused on translation of basic behavioral science; specific RFAs; new programs that would provide support needed specifically to gain access to clinical populations and collaborators; workshops where basic researchers can explore the interface with public health issues and form relationships with clinical investigators; and, finally, peer review procedures that ensure representation of expertise from both clinical and basic perspectives.

The Workgroup also was quite straightforward in telling NIMH how to incorporate the best behavioral principles into our own business practices. Workgroup members encouraged us not to take their recommendations on faith but to monitor and assess whether areas targeted for reinvigorated attention to behavioral science areas actually demonstrate more progress in the future than areas not so targeted by our staff.

While much pathbreaking research will continue to be conducted within one discipline at one level of analysis, there are many important problems at the core of the NIMH mission that cannot be addressed without bringing together disciplines concerned with behavior, brain research, clinical investigation, health services research, and the field of public health. Clearly, the ultimate success of this strategy will demand the full and enthusiastic participation of multiple disciplines, including all of those that comprise the broad field of behavioral science. Working effectively together, I am confident that we will conquer the challenge of mental illness and enhance the potential of public mental health for all people.

---
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Patty Hearst, testifying as an expert in brainwashing and coercive control. His evaluation of Kenneth Bianchi, the accused "Hillside Strangler," impeached Bianchi's defense that he suffered from multiple personality disorder. Orone broke new ground for patients' rights and professional ethics when, he released tapes of the poet Anne Sexton's psychotherapy sessions to her biographer, Diane Middlebrook. Orone's encouragement was an important element in what Middlebrook called Sexton's transition "from housewife to poet;" Sexton's poem "KE6-8018" referred to her office telephone in Boston. The tapes had been made with Sexton's knowledge, for therapeutic purposes, and when treatment terminated she encouraged Orone to use them in a way that might help other people. Even though Orone had the consent of Sexton's daughter and literary executor, some colleagues (and The New York Times) worried that he had compromised the assumption of patient-therapist confidentiality. Orone argued that patients had a right to control their own therapeutic records, and his view ultimately prevailed.

During his career, Orone received several awards recognizing his lifetime contributions to psychology and psychiatry: the James McKeen Fellow Award in Applied Psychology from the American Psychological Society, the Distinguished Scientific Award for Applications of Psychology from American Psychological Association, and the Seymour Pollack Award from the American Academy of Psychiatry and the law. He established the Institute for Experimental Psychiatry Research Foundation, a public charity promoting research on the role of mind and behavior in health, well being, and safety. He was executive director from 1961 until 1999.

Orone is survived by his wife, Emily Carota Orone, a research psychologist who was his longtime collaborator at the Unit for Experimental Psychiatry; their son Franklin and daughter Tracy; and his brother Peter and family. Donations in Martin’s memory may be made to the Institute for Experimental Psychiatry Research Foundation, 1955 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19103.

John F. Kihlstrom
University of California, Berkeley
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A conference on Models of Intelligence for the Next Millennium, organized by Robert J. Sternberg, Jacques Lautrey, and Todd L. Lubart, and sponsored by APA will be held at Yale University from June 14, to June 18, 2000. The conference will be organized around four themes on intelligence: re-interpretation of the concept of intelligence within cognitive science, the expansion of the concept of intelligence, the development of intelligence, and the education of intelligence. The invited speakers will come from Europe (England, France, Germany, Holland, Russia, Switzerland), North America (Canada, United States) and Australia. We are inviting posters from interested attendees. We can accommodate a maximum of 60 posters, so if you are interested, please let us know at once. Registration forms and Poster submission applications can be found at http://www.yale.edu/~rsjernberg/conference.htm. Please contact Yale University Conference Services at (203) 432-0465 for questions regarding registration, accommodations, and travel. Questions about the conference program and applications for poster submission should be directed to Sai Duvvula at (203) 432-4632.