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INTRODUCTION

Fear of electroshock therapy among persons who have undergone such treatment has long been considered universal or nearly so (1-3). Such fear is often described as intense even by patients who have received EST during drug-induced sleep after having had medication to reduce their fear while awaiting treatment (4, 5). I have heard a great many patients describe EST as one of the most fearsome experiences of their lives.

As a standard fear stimulus, and being applied in circumscribed conditions, the treatment provides a rare opportunity for study of stress and other reactions associated with strong fear. Qualitative examination of the patients' own oppressive feelings while awaiting EST should, in itself, be well worth the trouble.

Normal and Schizophrenic Reaction-Patterns in Fear and Stress

It is an accepted fact that strong fear or anxiety often affects realms of experience and functions far removed from the original stimulus. Dynamic psychologic theories assert that strong anxiety, especially when it is prolonged, is likely to be displaced in various ways to realms of experience that have no apparent connection with the real origin of the emotion. Lightening the burden upon the organism, the freudian "mental economy" is one function of the automatic regulatory mechanism underlying such shift. "Somatization" is one of the commonest manifestations of displacement or "spread" of anxiety. Theoretically, at least, the common psychologic stress-reducing functions operate more effectively in the intact person than in the schizophrenic. One should expect fewer indications of somatization and other shift or displacement in schizophrenics than in non-schizophrenics exposed to strong fear stimuli.

Traditionally, the state of fear has been regarded as one in which pulse...
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persons who have undergone such treatment or nearly so (1-3). Such patients who have received EST during application to reduce their fear while experiencing a great many patients describing their lives.

Patterns in Fear and Stress

or anxiety often affects realms different from the original stimulus. Dynamically, especially when it is prolonged, realms of experience that have no part of the emotion. Lightening the “mental economy” is one function underlying such shift. "Somatizations of displacement or "spread" among psychologic stress-reducing mechanisms in the intact person than in the schizophrenics exposed to the original stimulus. Dynamic and somatizations of somatization and other mechanisms are regarded as one in which physiological responses are induced. Whitmore (12) measured the plasma hydrocortisone concentration in 27 healthy subjects before and during hypnotically induced anxiety. In accordance with Wilder’s Law (13, 14), subjects whose initial hormone levels were low tended to respond to the anxiety suggestion with a rise in hormone level, whereas subjects whose levels were high tended to react with little or negative response. The correlation (r) between the initial hormone level and the change in level was minus .66, with a confidence level in excess of .01. Large increases in the subjects’ feelings of anxiety after the anxiety suggestion reflected in a variety of common "scales" and clinical devices.

Schizophrenics fail to react normally to a variety of physiologic stressors— for example, extremes of temperature, thyroxine, insulin, and pituitary hormones (15). Lucy (16) observes that “the tolerance of some of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laboratory measures</th>
<th>Anger</th>
<th>Fear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blood pressure</td>
<td>mild increases in systolic and diastolic pressure</td>
<td>marked increases in systolic pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse rate</td>
<td>lowered</td>
<td>raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomic activity</td>
<td>parasympathetic ascendancy</td>
<td>sympathetic ascendancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrenals</td>
<td>release of norepinephrine</td>
<td>release of adrenaline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, a person’s reaction to a threatening situation depends largely on his conception of it—that is, whether he feels defeated or not (6, 8).

It is commonly agreed that healthy persons and schizophrenic patients respond in different ways if subjected to stressors (alarming stimuli) under seemingly identical conditions. Furthermore, the reactions of healthy persons to the impact of distressing stimuli differ from those of persons who are already under stress—for example, under the stress of psychosomatic disorders. Fischer and Agnew (9, 10) take such different responses as the starting point for their concept of a “hierarchy of stressors” (which they present as an effort to describe the very same phenomena as those Wilber’s Law is concerned with [11]).

Levitt, et al. (12) measured the plasma hydrocortisone concentration in 27 healthy subjects before and during hypnotically induced anxiety. In accordance with Wilber’s Law (13, 14), subjects whose initial hormone levels were low tended to respond to the anxiety suggestion with a rise in hormone level, whereas subjects whose levels were high tended to react with little or negative response. The correlation (r) between the initial hormone level and the change in level was minus .66, with a confidence level in excess of .01. Large increases in the subjects’ feelings of anxiety after the anxiety suggestion reflected in a variety of common “scales” and clinical devices.

Schizophrenics fail to react normally to a variety of physiologic stressors—for example, extremes of temperature, thyroxine, insulin, and pituitary hormones (15). Lucy (16) observes that “the tolerance of some of the

TABLE I
[schizophrenic] patients for a substance as toxic as histamine can only be described as 'staggering.' Wilder (17) describes abnormal reaction of schizophrenics to atropine.

The reactions of schizophrenics to psychologic stressors are perhaps less well documented than are their reactions to physiologic ones, but their tendency to underreact is common knowledge.

The results reported by Williams (18) in his well-known experimental study are consistent with those reported by various other observers. He presented his “early chronic” schizophrenia patients with three psychologic stress situations: (1) A three-minute motion picture entitled Killing the Killer (selected from a large number of films previewed for stress reaction), a film showing a close-up death struggle between a cobra and a mongoose; (2) The Rapaport-Shafer word-association list (which contains many emotionally toned items), presented with the instructions that the purpose was “to look for personal problems in you”; (3) Serial subtraction by 7 (from 100), aloud.

Measuring respiration and pulse rates and galvanic skin responses, Williams found that reaction-tendencies of the schizophrenic patients differed noticeably and often statistically significantly from those of his normal controls. His schizophrenic subjects had a greater than normal background physiologic activity level at rest, with a tendency for the high level to continue during psychologic stress. The patients showed less variability than normals in physiologic background level, under varied and changing conditions. The patients showed less arousal than normal subjects in personal and interpersonal stress situations and less physiologic recovery than the normal subjects.

Wilder’s Law of Initial Value (LIV)

The Law claims: The extent and the direction of a response of any function of the organism to any standard stimulus during a standard period of time depends to a very large extent upon the pre-experimental initial (basal) level of that function. The higher the initial level, the smaller the effect of a function-raising and the larger the effect of a function-lowering stimulus. Beyond a certain medium range of initial values, the effect of stimuli is a reversal, the paradoxical reaction (13, 14).

The reactions of schizophrenic patients to alarming stimuli, indeed to emotional stimuli in general, are diminished, owing in part to the fact that these patients are already under stress, a condition of the schizophrenic process during at least a part of its course. An apathetic attitude or withdrawal from reality may be quite logically a self-explanatory basis for the apparent pain tolerance of the physiologically abnormal.

If the tendency to underreact is already a common characteristic of the general schizoid child, the patient’s reaction to stimuli may merely be a reflection of the physiologically abnormal state of his organism. For example, his initially high reaction level may have been produced during the initial illness and have become deeply rooted.

The reactions of schizophrenic patients to alarming stimuli, indeed to emotional stimuli in general, are diminished, owing in part to the fact that these patients are already under stress, a condition of the schizophrenic process during at least a part of its course. An apathetic attitude or withdrawal from reality may be quite logically a self-explanatory basis for the apparent pain tolerance of the physiologically abnormal.
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drawal from reality might be plausible as an explanation for the failure of
schizophrenic patients to react normally to emotional stress-stimuli. But it
not quite sufficient to account for their failure to react normally, physio-
ically and psychologically, to various physiologic stressors (15). A plausible
planation for their under-responsiveness lies in the LIV. Wilder (14)
akes pains to show how the principle holds in the psychologic as well as in
the physiologic realm.

If the response-patterns of active schizophrenics in stressful conditions
generally conform to the LIV, their reactions to stress-reducing measures
should also reflect Wilder's principle.

Lesse's observations (11) in several studies indicate that this is indeed so.
For example, he found, in general, that the patients whose anxiety was
initially highest responded well to chlorpromazine, whereas those with low
initial anxiety ratings attained the least satisfactory improvement ratings
during the treatment. Only four per cent of 66 schizophrenic patients with
low or no anxiety at the outset showed excellent or good improvement. In
striking contrast, 34 per cent of 133 patients rated initially as severely or very
seriously anxious reached an improvement rating of excellent or very good.
Intravenous injection of chlorpromazine ameliorated wild panic reactions in
30 per cent of 61 very disturbed patients, but was of no avail in eight patients
who showed few or no anxiety signs at the outset.

Lesse observed 43 markedly anxious schizophrenics during what might be
considered extreme stress: craniotomies lasting from one and a half to three
hours, under local anesthesia in all but four cases. Seven of these patients,
who for various reasons had received small intravenous doses of secobarbital
odium, showed a paradoxical increase in anxiety. Given amphetamines,
they became calmer. Several of the patients who had a history of uncontr
rolled catatonic excitement withstood the psychosurgery in a state of relative
m. The fact that 79 per cent of the patients required only local anesthesia
in itself paradoxical.

Experimental Procedure

Hypothesis. The general hypothesis was that psychologic (emotional)
and physiologic measurements of autonomic activity taken on schizophrenics
a relatively nonstressful and in a stressful situation (for example, while
waiting EST), would differ from each other in accordance with the LIV.
It is assumed that the level of general autonomic activity is heightened
most schizophrenics and almost invariably so in the patients chosen for
EST. Chronic patients with clinical signs of limited capacity for affective
response, that is, with the clinical picture of "deterioration flatness," are very
frequently chosen for the treatment.

Changes in blood pressure are taken as a fair index of autonomic activity.
The fact that schizophrenics have a tendency toward below-normal blood
pressure does not destroy the significance of their blood pressure changes or changes in autonomic activity. It is the direction and amount of change that are important.

The more specific hypotheses were these: (1) On a fear-symptom scale the scores of the subject would be comparatively high in both the "neutral" and the "fear-stress" conditions; (2) The blood pressures in the fear-stress condition would not be markedly higher than they had been on admission and would show a trend toward reversal (downward); (3) Patients showing the lower pulse rates at admission would tend to show the greater difference upward, and vice versa, while awaiting EST.

Subjects. The patients in the subjective fear-symptom study were 31 men and 20 women whose ages ranged from eighteen to sixty years. All were quite actively psychotic. Twenty (40%) had been admitted for the first time; 13 (26%) had been admitted for the second time; 11 (22%) had been admitted for the third time; and six (12%) had been admitted more than three times. All but four patients carried a diagnosis of schizophrenia. Of the four exceptions, three had been classified under the heading of oligophrenia with psychosis (schizophreniform). The remaining one, diagnosed as having a depressive reaction with schizoid features, had been classified in the past as schizophrenic.

The subjects in the blood pressure and pulse rate study, 46 in number, came from the above-described group of 50. It included 27 men and 19 women, whose ages ranged from 18 to 60 years, with an average age of 46.3. Forty-two had been diagnosed as having schizophrenia. The remaining four patients were the same ones described above as being non-schizophrenic at the time of the fear-stress study.

The group as a whole seemed to be in most particulars much like usual EST patients; most had active psychotic symptoms. Careful search of their records revealed that about 80 per cent of them had had EST at some time prior to the present course of treatment.

Since these subjects served in two studies at the same time, it is necessary to digress from the present one in order to outline what happened to them as subjects in the other. It was a double-blind study of the effect of meprobamate in alleviating at patients' fear of EST, reported by Mitchell (4). He found meprobamate medication to be effective in reducing the subjects' anxiety. Although the reduction was not marked, it was statistically significant.

Although the effect of the drug was not great, we could afford to go on with the present report only if evidence could be shown that the medication had not seriously altered the broad patterns of the obtained differences. Medicated and non-medicated patients showed strictly comparable average blood pressures and pulse rates at the outset and insignificant differences in
these: (1) On a fear-symptom scale preparatively high in both the "neutal" (downward); (3) Patients should tend to show the greater difference.

The blood pressures in the patient than they had been on admis. EST.
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Psysologic Measurements. Initially, an experienced interviewer talked each patient privately and informally until rapport had been established. The patient was then asked to give his subjective impressions concerning 24 feelings or sentiments commonly associated with fear and anxiety. He should answer "None" for absence of the feeling, "Little" for slight or intensity, and "Much" for a troublesome degree of discomfort. The items included: headache; dizziness; abdominal pain; fatigue; chest pain; pulsation in ears; nausea; nervousness; difficult breathing; miserable or restless feeling; pain in eyes; smothering feeling; tremulous feeling; bitter cold spells; choking feeling; need to weep; helplessness; felt danger to numbness; weakness; anger; sadness; dryness of mouth; sweating; and other complaints the patient might report. It should be mentioned that a high degree of refinement of the scale was neither sought nor attained. An assessment of immediate feelings and sentiments was the objective.

The subjects answered the fear-symptom questionnaire privately on their wards two or five days before the first EST application—and presumably before they had learned they were to have it. They received the scale in 15 to 45 minutes before the second EST (40 patients) or the third iapplication (six patients), again being interviewed in private. The of this timing were to ensure the patients' acquaintance with the electro experience and to avoid all but minimum EST residual effects.

it order to test roughly the fear-symptom scale itself, the answers of 50 ably well persons—registered nurses, psychiatric aides, and psychiatric nures—were recorded. The subjects answered anonymously a self- administer form of the inventory.

Physiologic Measurements.† Readings of blood pressure and rate of heart taken during the fear-stress period, that is, while awaiting the measurements at the maximum fear-stress point chosen for the present study. We scheduled fear-symptom scale presentations and examined physiologic measurements in this study to circumvent the effects of the usual medication directly preceding EST. Statistical analysis and close inspection of the data revealed the same major patterns in both the group receiving probanthine and in the group receiving no medication. Hence the patients should be treated as one group in the present investigation.

We are indebted to W. A. Mitchell, M.D., whose generosity made this inves possible. He was responsible for the drug study (4) which included the phys data he made available to me. Moreover, his informal personal communica have been helpful in the preparation of this paper.
second or third EST, were compared to those taken at times presumed
much less stressful: (1) at the physical examination on admission, dome-
late afternoon or early evening, and (2) about two hours before the first
application and before the patient had left his home ward.

We assumed that the half hour just before the second EST would be
the patient the time of greatest stress. Accordingly, we used blood pres-
and pulse readings taken at that interval whenever they were avail-
The exceptions: in six cases the measurements were taken an hour be-
the third treatment, and in 12 they were done an hour, rather than half a
hour, before the second treatment.

RESULTS

Fear Symptoms, Quantitative. Two-thirds of the patients had high-
scores at the second testing (while awaiting EST) than at the first (in
“neutral” condition). The difference is significant to a degree exceeding
.01 level of confidence: Wilcoxon’s z-value, 3.8. Although statistically
icient, the difference is small in terms of average scores (Table II).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Average Score (Points)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patients Stress (awaiting EST)</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients Neutral</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normals Neutral</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The similarity of the patients’ scores in the two conditions is empha-
d by the high correlation between them: rho,.77. Their answers imply
they were considerably less comfortable in the neutral condition than in
the normal subjects. Impending EST did not increase their scores mark-
This finding brings to mind Williams’ report (18) of heightened back-
ground physiologic activity in schizophrenics in a non-stress condition;
their less-than-normal response in certain psychologic stress condi-
Explanation by way of the LIV is plausible in his study and in ours.

Fear Symptoms, Qualitative. In the neutral condition, the patients’
most frequent complaint was that of fatigue (29 cases). Internal nerv-
ness took second place (28 cases), while numbness, miserable or restless
ing, and weakness tied for third place (26 cases).

In the fear-stress condition, dryness of mouth was first in terms of fre-
quency (28 cases), with miserable or restless feeling in second place and
ness in third place (26 and 25 cases, respectively). Close behind were
blood vouxness, tremulousness, and weakness, which were reported by 24 patients in this condit
In terms of points on the fear-symptom scale (intensity), patients’
miserable or restless feeling in first place in both the neutral and stress con-
tions (45 points each). They described the intensity of internal nervou
those taken at times presumed examination on admission, done about two hours before the first shift his home ward.

Before the second EST would be accordingly, we used blood pressure whenever they were available whenever they were available at times presupposed the examination on admission, done about two hours before the first shift his home ward.
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Systolic Blood Pressure. The average pressures on admission and at
7 hours before the first EST were 132.3 and 117.7 mm Hg, respectively. 
while awaiting EST, generally half an hour before the second applica
the average pressure was 116.6 mm Hg. With a z-value of 4.9 for
(ranked) differences between the systolic pressures at admission and while
awaiting the second EST, the level of confidence exceeds by far the .01
level. There was also significantly higher than those recorded while patients awaited the
second treatment. The z-value is 2.52, with a z of 2.58 being required to
While awaiting EST, only five patients had systolic pressures exceed
by 10 or more points the level recorded on admission. In contrast, 21
patients had pressures that were lower by 10 or more points than the level recorded.

Lowered pressure was greatest among patients whose systolic pres
at admission exceeded the median (127.3 mm Hg). Eighteen of the
patients with pressures above the median showed downward differences, suffi
sufficiently so to reach statistical significance in excess of the .01 level. Using 16 m
confidence, from Tate and Clelland [19]. Twelve patients in the lower half of the range showed negative (downward) statistically in
significant differences. The patterning of these differences is in accord with the LIV.

Diastolic Blood Pressure. The direction of the differences was the same as that for systolic blood pressure. Eighteen patients had a diastolic pres
sure 10 or more points below the admission level as they awaited EST at a point
half an hour later. In only four of the eight patients showing a higher statistical signifi
cant difference while awaiting EST than at admission was the difference 10 points or more. Diastolic pressures were significantly lower in the stress condition than at the post-admission examination; the confidence level exceeds .01. There were two EST

Pulse Rate. The average rate of heart beat per minute was 89.0 on ad
mission, 94.4 at a point two hours before the first EST, and 104.3 at
30-minute or 60-minute interval before the second (or third) EST. There was a steady upward trend in rate from one condition to the next. The absence of dramatic reversal in direction, of paradoxical reaction and failure to accelerate in the face of added stress might at first pass for lack of evi
dence of the LIV in these particular measurements. Before inconsistent
and other variabilities can be assumed, however, one must remember that the Law applies to c
single function separately. For example: "While a high blood pressure drops, the slow pulse may go up at the same time in response to one and
the same stimulus." There need not be any paradoxical or other dra
changes at all. The essence of the Law is this: The higher the initial level for the depressing stimulus (14).
The pulse rate patterns in this study conform to the LIV in that, in general, patients who had rates below the median (87.5) on admission showed increased rates, and to a very highly significant degree collectively, while awaiting the second EST. Consistent with the same principle, the difference (rise) in those above the median was of no statistical significance.

There was a significant difference between pulse rates two hours before the first EST and those taken while awaiting the second EST. It was smaller than the difference between the reading on admission and that while patients were awaiting EST, but is statistically highly significant: z-value, 11.2, with 1.38 being required for .01 level.

The physiologic measurements examined in this study were taken before the conventional drug injection given the patients directly before administration of the EST. Such timing circumvented immediate effects of these drugs. Blood pressure was measured just before the atropine injection, given half an hour before the EST, in order to avoid contamination of the patterns by atropine-induced changes (4, 21). Some of the patients, however, did complete the fear-symptom scale after having received atropine.

Using 16 more EST patients, taken consecutively, we replicated the procedures used in the larger study to record blood pressure changes. In each case measurements of pressure were made half an hour prior to the treatment, just before the injection of atropine. The pattern of differences is exactly the same as that observed in the 46 original subjects. Only three showed a higher systolic pressure 30 minutes before the second EST than at the physical examination on admission. The average difference was 16.7 mmHg in the patients who changed in the opposite direction (downward). Statistical significance of the difference between the two readings is a little better than the .05 level.

There was no way of avoiding possible residual effects of one or, in a few cases, two EST applications, given two or more days earlier, upon the physiologic and other measurements analyzed in this study. A patient’s fear of EST cannot be studied until he has experienced the treatment. Perrin and Michule (20) and Mitchell (4, 21), who studied aggregate reaction patterns of patients before treatments, report that the blood pressures of their subjects did not tend to fall before an EST application. Perrin and Michule observed a general trend toward increase, while Mitchell noticed general variability and inconsistency in blood pressure changes among patients who had received meprobamate and a small increase among those who had received no medication. It is to be noted that these studies use a series of observations to capture trends extending over a number of treatments. In the present study, only a few subjects had had more than the first EST of the series. The aim was to get a basal or near-basal level and a maximum level for each subject while keeping EST residual effects at a minimum.
SUMMARY

Fifty actively psychotic patients received a fear-symptom scale, and in this same group, blood pressure and pulse readings in a "non-stress" baseline condition and again while awaiting EST. In each part of the study, schizophrenics accounted for all but four patients, who showed clear schizophrenic-like features.

The patients' fear-discomfort scores, while statistically significantly different in the two conditions, were remarkably alike: rho, .77. Their average fear-discomfort score in the non-stress condition was three times the average score of a group of 52 nursing service employees and students who took the test anonymously. The failure of the schizophrenic patients to show markedly different scores in the two conditions is consistent with the claims of the LIV. Generally heightened basic levels of autonomic activity as a corollary of active schizophrenic symptoms have been reported by various observers. The reaction-patterns (changes) in the present patients support the likelihood of very similar heightening in their levels of autonomic activity—predictable abnormalities in their responses to stress. Primary anxiety-complaints predominated over somatic and ideational symptoms, as had been predicted.

Systolic blood pressures and diastolic pressures were lower while patients awaited EST than they were at the physical examination on admission (as well after actual reception). In 65.2 per cent of the patients the systolic pressure, and in 79.2 the diastolic pressure, was lower half an hour before EST than at the physical examination. Significance of the difference exceeds the .01 level. A careful replication study of the systolic pressure in 16 more EST patients yielded differences significant beyond the .05 level. Pulse rates below the median in the neutral condition rose significantly in the stress condition whereas above-median rates did not.

Explanation of the findings by way of the LIV is offered as provisional.
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