

Resolution Regarding Extended Solitary Confinement and Torture Supporting Documentation

(submitted to the LA in November 2013 per the Public Policy Statements Platform requirements)

Approved by the Legislative Assembly of the National Communication Association, November 16, 2010, by a Two-Thirds Vote

This Resolution is being submitted to NCA's Resolutions Committee for consideration by the 2013 Legislative Assembly, in accordance with the Procedures for Submission and Review of Public Statement Proposals (hereinafter "Procedures"). This Resolution was approved by the Legislative Assembly on November 16, 2010, by a two-thirds vote. The new Procedures require this resubmission.

a., g. Rationale for Legislative Assembly Consideration and the Resolution's Relationship to the Current Public Policy Platform

The Resolution condemns extended solitary confinement and torture, using what we as communication scholars know about the effects of these methods. The Resolution is well within the framework of NCA:

- The Resolution is tied to our expertise as communication scholars.
- The Resolution is consistent with NCA's Constitution, By-Laws, and policies regarding resolutions.
- The Resolution is no more political than prior resolutions that have been approved by NCA.
- Other associations, such as the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Psychological Association, and the American Sociological Association have, over the years, passed resolutions regarding war, violence in the media, gay marriage, and other matters of broad public concern, and these organizations are highly respected for their involvement, based on their expertise, in public policy debates.

NCA's Constitution states that "the purpose of the association is to promote study, criticism, research, teaching, and application of the artistic, humanistic, and scientific principles of communication" (from Article II, Section 1 of the NCA Constitution, found at <http://www.natcom.org/nca/Template2.asp?bid=140>).

NCA describes itself as a scholarly society that "works to enhance the research, teaching, and service produced by its members on topics of both intellectual and social significance" (from NCA's mission, <http://www.natcom.org/nca/Template2.asp?bid=10088>).

NCA's "Credo for Ethical Communication" states that "we promote communication climates of caring and mutual understanding that respect the unique needs and characteristics of individual communicators," and that "we condemn communication that degrades individuals and humanity

through distortion, intimidation, coercion, and violence, and through the expression of intolerance and hatred” (found at <http://www.natcom.org/nca/Template2.asp?bid=514>).

NCA's “Credo for a Free and Responsible Communication in a Democratic Society” states that NCA “criticize[s] as misguided those who believe that the justice of their cause confers license to interfere physically and coercively with speech of others” (found at <http://www.natcom.org/nca/Template2.asp?bid=513>).

NCA's “Policy Opposing Campus Speech Codes” states that “NCA urges all members of the academic community to use their freedom of expression to counter any and all expressions of hate, and to promote a manner of communication that seeks for greater clarity and understanding among those with different opinions” (found at <http://www.natcom.org/nca/Template2.asp?bid=525>).

These NCA statements do not merely support and promote the well-being of the discipline and its members but compel us to apply our scholarship, in the form of service, for the well-being of the ordinary person, for opposition to coercion and interference with the speech of others, for humane values, and for civil discourse. The Resolution applies our understanding of the “artistic, humanistic, and scientific principles of communication.” The Resolution “enhance[s] the . . . service produced by [NCA's] members” on a topic “of social significance.” The Resolution is absolutely consistent with the view that it is “misguided” to “believe that the justice of [a] cause confers license to interfere physically and coercively with speech of others.”

The Resolution demonstrates that extended solitary confinement and torture are indeed applications of communication principles, and rather than enriching the human condition, these techniques aim to isolate, confuse, frighten, humiliate, disrupt, and terrorize individuals. However, the Resolution is carefully drafted: It indicates that, under certain circumstances, short-term solitary confinement may be reasonable.

The Preamble of the Public Policy Platform specifies that

This policy platform contains the positions officially endorsed by the researchers, teachers, and practitioners allied as the National Communication Association on issues vital to human communication. The Association is committed to include within this document only positions: (1) upon which the organization and membership have engaged in ample and careful deliberation; (2) upon which a substantial consensus of supporting knowledge has been developed; (3) addressing issues which have attracted the concerted inquiry of an acknowledged segment of the discipline, and (4) central to the contribution of communication to the health and richness of the human condition, or to the commitments of the membership to the study, teaching, or practice of communication.

In light of this Preamble we note that

- This resolution was passed in 2010 with the support of more than 2/3rds of the Legislative Assembly and was submitted with the support of more than 100 Communication scholars.

- As the references included in the footnotes to the Resolution and other references included here indicate, there is a wealth of scholarship directly or indirectly demonstrating the effects of torture and extended solitary confinement on both its victims and perpetrators.
- Torture, extended solitary confinement, and related issues have been researched by social scientists in communication as well as by those in cognate disciplines, such as psychology, sociology, anthropology, political science, and psychiatry. Communication scholars have been generators and users of this research: This research includes scholarship on communication and social support, communication ethics, constructivism and social identity, communication and psychopathology, and communication and emotion.

b. Background Regarding the Issue to be Addressed

According to the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (1984; put in force in 1987), torture means "any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him (or her) or a third person information or a confession, punishing him [or her] for an act he [or she] or a third person has committed or is suspected of having committed, or intimidating or coercing him [or her] or a third person, or for any reason based on discrimination of any kind, when such pain or suffering is inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity" (bracketed material added).

The Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (in force in 1950) states that persons taking no active part in hostilities "shall in all circumstances be treated humanely" and that for such persons "outrages upon personal dignity, in particular, humiliating and degrading treatment" is always prohibited.

The following is taken from the Executive Summary on Solitary Confinement in U.S. Prisons (Rev. Sala W. J. Nolan Gonzales, April 9, 2009, prepared for the National Religious Campaign Against Torture, found at (http://www.nrcat.org/storage/documents/nrcat_u_s_prisons_-_think_piece.pdf):

Prolonged isolation is identified worldwide as a form of psychological torture with enduring effects. In the United States solitary confinement is often used as punishment in general prison populations, but in addition, tens of thousands of people are housed in prisons where the entire facility is designed to isolate prisoners from human contact. They are generally known as Supermax or Special Housing Units, and currently operate in 40 states.

Solitary confinement takes the form of incarceration in a small cell, often windowless, for 23 hours per day, 7 days per week. Prisoners are generally given a one hour exercise period, but exercise is confined to a small, caged area, where there are no other prisoners, so that the isolation extends to movement outside the cell. Prisoners are under constant surveillance, sometimes under artificial lighting for 24 hours each day (also noted as a form of psychological torture and associated with sleep deprivation). Human contact is

forbidden except by permission of authorities. Visits, phone calls and mail from others are severely restricted, as are educational, recreational, and religious services. Solitary confinement has been associated with strip searches (including searches of women by male guards), rape, sensory deprivation, forced idleness, strap-downs and hog-tying, beating after restraint, and forced confessions. Most testimonies on the use of devices of torture in U.S. prisons come from men, women, and children who have been in isolation units where there are few visitors. Many U.S. political prisoners have been placed in isolation, most notably three former Black Panthers who were released recently after more than 30 years of solitary confinement at Angola, Louisiana. They had been convicted in 1972 of the murder of a prison guard, convictions that were widely criticized because there was no physical evidence linking them to the crime and claims against them were recanted.

Prolonged periods of isolation, even for a week, are known to be associated with severe mental consequences, including depression and anxiety, suicide, and other forms of mental breakdown. EEG studies going back to the nineteen-sixties have shown that brain waves of prisoners diffuse after a week or more of solitary confinement. In 1992, examinations of 57 prisoners of war who had been held for an average of 6 months in Yugoslavian detention camps revealed brain abnormalities for months after their release; the most severe were found in prisoners who had been rendered unconscious from head trauma, and those who had been placed in solitary confinement. Without sustained social interaction, the human brain becomes impaired. These studies of the enduring physical and psychological effects of social isolation are consistent with primate research, which has shown life-long consequences in the ability to function following early and/or short-term separation from other primates. Terry Kupers, MD, a psychiatrist and expert witness on civil rights, has called prisons “the largest mental asylums in the United States,” and noted “the degree of psychosis . . . the likes of which I have never seen anywhere else in 25 years of clinical practice.”

Despite this evidence, and despite widespread identification of the practice as a standard form of torture, solitary confinement is often used because it leaves those who are isolated without outward physical marks, making it more difficult to prove that they were tortured.

The use of solitary confinement has become commonplace in United States prisons. It has been institutionalized as short-term punishment, frequently visited upon incarcerated persons for institutional infractions. It has also resulted in solitary confinement of prisoners for long terms (often a decade or more) in facilities specifically designed for isolation, as with Supermax prisons. Countless men, women, and even children in our juvenile facilities have experienced short-term isolation, but by 2005, more than 40 states and the federal government operated prisons specifically designed for solitary confinement and housing in excess of 25,000 people in isolation for the duration of their terms. According to the U.S. Department of Justice, some states maintain more than 20% of their prison populations in solitary confinement. The current population of incarcerated adults in the United States is 2.38 million, representing 25% of people in prison world-

wide in a country with 5% of the world's population. More than 1 in 100 adult Americans is currently in prison and subject to solitary confinement at the determination of the state.

The history of international attention to U.S. prison issues is compelling. In 1995, the U.N. Human Rights Committee stated that conditions in certain U.S. maximum security prisons were incompatible with international standards. In 1996, the U.N. Special Rapporteur on Torture reported on cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment in U.S. Supermax prisons. In 1998, the Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women took testimony in California on the ill treatment of women in U.S. prisons. In 2000 the United Nations Committee on Torture roundly condemned the U.S. for its treatment of prisoners, citing Supermax prisons and the use of torture devices, as well as the practice of jailing youth with adults. The use of stun belts and restraint chairs were also cited as violating the U.N. Convention against Torture. In May of 2006, the same committee concluded that the U.S. should "review the regimen imposed on detainees in supermaximum prisons, in particular, the practice of prolonged isolation."

. . . . Torture has been clearly stated as a violation of human rights through the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, and the Third and Fourth Geneva Conventions. In 1987, the Inter-American Convention to Prevent and Punish Torture, ratified by 17 nations of the Americas, said, "Torture shall be understood to be the use of methods upon a person intended to obliterate the personality of the victim or to diminish his physical or mental capacities, even if they do not cause physical pain or mental anguish." Finally, the 8th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution prohibits the use of cruel and unusual punishment. In 2006, the Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture (OPCAT) came into effect to establish regular visits by independent bodies to places where people are deprived of liberty, in order to prevent torture and other cruel and inhumane treatment.

c. Demonstration of the Relationship of the Issue to Existing Communication Scholarship

As cited in the Resolution (complete citation in Resolution footnotes), a sample of relevant communication scholarship includes:

Burleson, B. R. (2003). Emotional support skills. In J. O. Greene & B. R. Burleson (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills*.

Ewbank, H. L., & Auer, J. J. (1951). *Discussion and debate*.

Johannesen, R. L. (Ed.). (1951). *Ethics and persuasion: Selected readings*.

McCann, D., & Segrin, C. (Eds.). (1996). Communication and psychology. Special issue of *Communication Research*, 23(4).

Segrin, C. (2001). *Interpersonal processes in psychological problems*.

In addition, within the discipline there are volumes that speak to the issues involving communication, solitary confinement, and torture. As examples:

Andersen, P. A., & Guerrero, L. J. (Eds.). (1997). *Handbook of communication and emotion: Research, theory, applications, and contexts*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Burleson, B., Albrecht, T. L., & Sarason, I. G. (1994). *The communication of social support: Messages, interactions, relationships, and community*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Goldsmith, D. J. (2004). *Communicating social support*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gronnvoll, M. (2010). *Media representations of gender and torture post-9/11*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Segrin, C. (1988). *Interpersonal communication, cognition, and depression*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Segrin, C. (1990). *Interpersonal responses to social skill deficits associated with depression*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Segrin, C. (1998). Disrupted interpersonal relationships and mental health problems. In B. H. Spitzberg & W.R. Cupach (Eds.), *The dark side of relationships* (pp. 327-365). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Furthermore, the notions of coercion and persuasion, central to the ideas of torture and extended solitary confinement, have a long history in the communication discipline. The following is taken from <http://commconcepts.wikispaces.com/Coercion> (references for the included communication scholarship may be found in original source):

Aristotle . . . addressed the question of an agent's motivations in the Nicomachean Ethics, in which he distinguished voluntary causes of behavior from "those things [that] are thought involuntary which take place under compulsion . . . which the moving principle is outside, in which nothing is contributed by the person who is acting (Aristotle, bk III, sec.1110)." Hence, coercive forces are seen to act upon an agent from an external source of power and authority, while internal and uncoerced acts are voluntary and therefore indicative of an agent's 'true' motivations.

. . .

Coercion in Communication Scholarship:

Looking beyond the fields of history, politics and the law, one finds that coercion is also an important term in communication scholarship, particularly in the sub-fields of rhetoric and argumentation, and organizational communication.

Coercion in Rhetoric and Argumentation:

The concept of coercion offers rhetoricians insights into the reasons an orator might have to speak under certain circumstances, with the force of coercion making up the “rhetorical situation” (Bitzer, 1968) or one of the exigencies necessitating a speech or persuasive appeal of some sort. . . . Scholars of argumentation are familiar with the *argumentum ad baculum*, literally meaning “an argument on a stick” in which an argument “turns on a threat or reference to dire consequences” (Woods, 1998, p 493). The coercion inherent in the *ad baculum* renders it a fallacious argumentative device in which speakers commit “the blunder of concluding the truth of a proposition on the basis of an appeal to force, for it is the “fear of force [which causes] acceptance of a conclusion” (Carney & Scheer, 1980, p 390) and the “abandonment of reason” (Copi & Cohen, 1990, p 130). Hence, coercion is seen to invalidate statements and conclusions because of its “appeal to force” and “abandonment of reason,” suggesting that a more legitimate form of influence would be one that is less forceful.

Nonetheless, although coercion is often placed opposite to its less forceful cousin, persuasion, other scholars of rhetoric have argued that the two concepts are more closely linked than might appear at first sight. In 1969 James R. Andrews suggested that persuasion and coercion [were] part of the total rhetorical process, and that “rhetoric becomes less persuasive and more coercive to the extent that it limits the viable alternatives open to the receivers of communication” (Andrews, 1969, p 10). Coercion, instead of being defined only by the manner in which it presents alternatives (forcefully, violently), can thus also be defined by whether it presents audiences with alternatives at all and how feasible these alternatives are. Naturally, because what is feasible or acceptable differs with every situation and set of actors, coercion is also highly contextual.

Coercion in Organizational Communication:

Scholars of organizational communication have used the concept of coercion to study types of bureaucracies and administrative structures, as well as to examine relations between employers and workers. For example, Adler and Borys distinguished between “enabling” and “coercive” bureaucracies, arguing that coercive bureaucracies demonstrated greater degrees of abrogation of individual autonomy and power asymmetry between managers and employers than did enabling bureaucracies (Adler & Borys, 1996, p 62).

Coercion in Health Communication:

Within the context of health communication, coercion has been studied at both the provider-patient level as well as the health campaign level. Traditionally, doctors hold a great deal of power over patients (patients themselves may use coercion as a means of leveling this power) (Beiseker, 1990, p 106). However, scholars who follow in the footsteps of philosophers such as Habermas believe that the provider-patient relationship should be free of coercion (Barry et. al, 2001). Furthermore, some scholars argue that doctors should not use coercion even when it may result greater public health (Goodyear-Smith & Buetow, 2001, p 458).

In the context of health campaigns, many tout persuasion as being more advantageous than

coercion (Cassell et. al, 1998, p 73). Snyder (2007) argues that health campaigns that use the mass media and avoid coercion have an affect size of 5 points. However, other scholars, while they acknowledge that coercion can sometimes be highly effective, still believe that coercion within health campaigns is a concept that is fraught with ethical dilemmas such as whether the patients have the right to autonomy and to make their own choices (Guttman, 1997, pp. 160-162).

Finally, NCA divisions whose research and teaching are relevant here include but are not limited to the following (parenthetical information is from <http://www.natcom.org/interestgroups/>):

- Applied Communication (“Members build and test communication theories, often in naturalistic settings, to better examine a wide range of diverse issues, including . . . effective social interaction, . . . implementation of behavioral interventions, training to improve communication, and activist efforts to achieve social change.”)
- Communication and Law (“Areas of membership interest include . . . interaction within the courtroom and/or the law office, interviewing, alternative dispute resolution, [and] negotiation. . . . It welcomes membership from academics, attorneys, trainers, consultants, and others with interest in the communication processes underlying law and litigation philosophy and practices.”)
- Communication Apprehension and Competence (“ . . . dedicated to the study of communication anxiety and avoidance constructs (e.g., communication apprehension, reticence, unwillingness to communicate). . . . The purpose of the division is to promote scholarship and pedagogy relevant to the nature, causes, and consequences of communication anxiety and communication competence, as well as treatments, techniques, and practices to alleviate communication anxiety and enhance communication competence.”)
- Communication as Social Construction
- Communication Ethics (“[Promotes] research and teaching related to ethical issues and standards in all aspects of human communication, and . . . [encourages] educational programs that examine communication ethics. . . . We share the belief that communication ethics plays a significant role in the process of communicating, in democratic processes, and in human development.”)
- Communication and Social Cognition (“Relevant topics might include, but are not limited to, cognition, emotion, social influence, social perception, listening, information processing, affective processes, message effects, brain function, and personality and individual differences in communication.”)
- Critical and Cultural Studies (“Our members privilege studying languages of knowledge, power, and disciplinarity, questioning how these components shape cultural and social practices across historical contexts [and] in “everyday life” We champion work that scrutinizes how discourses and practices impact individuals and communities [and] embodies insightful interpretation [W]e are committed to the premise that teaching and scholarship are powerful tools for fostering social justice and promoting social change, in the academy and beyond.”)
- Ethnography (“We focus on how people meaningfully express their experience and interpret the expressions of others. In this process, we believe, people create, maintain, and transform their identities, their relationships, and their communities.”)

- Feminist and Women’s Studies (“We encourage and support research, action, and understandings of the profession that address intersections of power, such as race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, technology, nationality, and transnationalism, and challenge existing theoretical paradigms that have excluded the voices of marginalized groups, especially women.”)
- Freedom of Expression (“welcomes papers and panels on the legal tug-of-war surrounding the First Amendment. We encourage papers on topics such as recent Supreme Court decisions affecting First Amendment law, laws passed by Congress (such as the Patriot Act), and recent actions of the Department of Justice with regard to the Freedom of Information Act, for example.”)
- Group Communication (“The division is interested in processes related to decision making, deliberation, coordination, face and identity, collaboration, conflict, and leadership, as well as the functions, effects, technologies, and structures of groups”)
- Health Communication (“plays a significant role in representing the discipline as it works to advance theory, research, teaching, and practical applications of human and mediated communication to health care and health promotion.”)
- International and Intercultural Communication (“Essential questions investigated by scholars tend to focus on the dynamics of culture and communication and the impact on identity, contact, adaptation, representation, inequality and empowerment, transition, competence, and other factors.”)
- Interpersonal Communication (“exists to . . . stimulate research and scholarship on interpersonal communication”)
- Language and Social Interaction (“provides a home to those who study how social life is produced and organized through situated conversation, language use, and embodied interaction. Members . . . investigate the collaborative practices that shape our social worlds in a wide range of interactional settings . . . , well as interactions between and across cultural borderlines.”)
- Nonverbal Communication (“We promote the study of nonverbal communication in interpersonal, . . . , political, and health communication The division also encourages research of nonverbal communication related to . . . persuasion, emotion, [and] cognitive processing”)
- Organizational Communication (“Members are concerned with the creation of meaning, the production of messages, and the processing of information that makes organizing possible. . . . Members of the unit also support community engagement that promotes open dialogue and participative, ethical, and inclusive practices.”)
- Peace and Conflict Communication (“promotes the teaching, scholarship, and practice of conflict management and peace communication at all levels, such as interpersonal, intergroup organizational, community, national, and international contexts.”)
- Spiritual Communication

The issues involving torture and extended solitary confinement are central to the contribution that communication has made and continues to make to the health and richness of the human condition. The techniques involved in extended solitary confinement and torture violate basic tenets of human rights and decency as well as fundamental principles of ethical communication.

d, e, h. Specific Actions Already Taken by NCA as a Result of this Resolution Being in Effect, Proposed Future Actions, and Resources Required to Implement the Resolution

The actions to situations be taken in accordance with this Resolution involve publicizing the Resolution and calling upon governments—local or national—to cease any use of torture or extended solitary confinement under any and all circumstances at anywhere and anytime, including in any place of confinement or detainment for which said government has de jure or de facto control, including for which said government or its agents can be reasonably expected to exercise such control. (The latter point is referred to as the "Medina standard," which holds "that a commanding officer, being aware of a human rights violation or a war crime, will be held criminally liable when he does not take action" (see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yamashita_Standard).

Because NCA policy states that "The Executive Director shall have primary responsibility for implementing each resolution, and shall serve as the official link between the Association and all affiliate organizations, governmental agencies, and private foundations" (located at <http://www.natcom.org/index.asp?bid=511> at the time of the Resolution's passage), the Executive Director reported (on November 7, 2011) sending copies of the Resolution along with a letter of introduction to:

The U.S. Attorney General
The U.S. Secretary of Defense
The U.S. Director of National Intelligence
The chairs and ranking members of the House Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security and the Judiciary
The chairs and ranking members of the Senate Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, and the Judiciary
The State Attorneys General of all 50 U.S. states
The Council of Communication Associations
The four regional communication associations
The American Civil Liberties Union
The National Religious Campaign Against Torture
The Center for Victims of Torture
Rabbis for Human Rights—North America
The Justice Policy Institute
Human Rights Watch
Amnesty International—USA
The SAVE Coalition
Solitary Watch
American Friends Service Committee: STOPMAX Campaign
The Association for the Prevention of Torture
The Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prisons
The Center for Constitutional Rights
Top tier media: ABC World News Tonight, Arizona Democrat-Gazette, Arizona Republic, Boston Globe, CBS Evening News, Charlotte Observer, Chicago Tribune, Denver Post, Detroit Free Press, The Early Show, Good Morning

America, Houston Chronicle, Kansas City Star, NBC Nightly News, New York Times, Omaha World-Herald, San Francisco Chronicle, San Jose Mercury News, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, St. Petersburg Times, The Today Show, Wall Street Journal, Washington Post

We commend the Executive Director for taking this action.

This action places the National Communication Association, along with other major scholarly associations, at the forefront in the campaign against extended solitary confinement and torture.

As a result of the passage of this Resolution, specific actions the Association will be expected to take in the future includes continuing to inform government officials about NCA's stand, especially as the issues in the Resolution continue to be actively discussed in the public sphere and instances of extended solitary confinement and torture continue to be publicized in the media. NCA is not expected to investigate these matters but only to express the stand reflected in the Resolution and to provide information concerning this stand as appropriate.

If it would be useful, a committee can be appointed to assist the Executive Director in proactively sharing the Resolution with government agencies, legislative bodies, nongovernmental organizations, and the public; many of the one hundred Resolution submitters would be quite willing to do so if this was deemed to be helpful. Furthermore, consistent with the Resolution but *not required by it*, NCA can choose to go further, including filing *amicus curiae* briefs in relevant court cases and speaking to various publics about communication matters related to extended solitary confinement and torture.

The Resolution by itself does not require additional resources. The suggestion that a committee assist the Executive Director would alleviate the Executive Director of any tasks that could be considered burdensome, and the Executive Director has already done an excellent job of disseminating the Resolution. Any additional efforts or expenditures would be the result of opportunities that the NCA leadership might take advantage of, which would have the effect of putting NCA in the spotlight on these issues. At a minimum, NCA should be able to respond to inquiries regarding the Resolution from within and from outside the association.

The NCA states ("What is NCA," found at <http://www.natcom.org/about/>) that "the NCA promotes the widespread appreciation of the importance of communication in public and private life, the application of competent communication to improve the quality of human life and relationships, and the use of knowledge about communication to solve human problems." This Resolution aims to do precisely those things.

f. The Resolution, as Approved by the Legislative Assembly, is Attached

The names and affiliations of the submitters represent the information at the time this resolution was submitted to the Resolutions Committee (June 18, 2010).

Suggested Additional Resources

American Friends Service Committee, www.afsc.org.

Amnesty International, www.AmnestyUSA.org.

Angola Prison information: <http://www.sfbayview.com/2009/torture-at-angola-prison/>.

Danner, Mark (2009, February). The Red Cross torture report: What it Means. *New York Review of Books* (56).

Gawande, Atul (2009, March 30). Hellhole: The United States holds thousands of inmates in long-term solitary confinement. Is this torture? *The New Yorker*.

Human Rights Watch. www.hrw.org

on attack dogs used against U.S. prisoners, see:

<http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2006/10/09/us-attack-dogs-used-against-prisoners>; on number of mentally ill in prisons quadrupled, see

<http://www/hrw.org/en/news/2006/09/05us-number-mentally-ill-prisons-quadrupled>; on rape, <http://www/hrw.org/en/news/2001/04/30/rape-us-prisons-documented> and

<http://www/hrw.org/en/news/2007/12/15/us-federal-statistics-show-widespread-prison-rape>

Kerness, Bonnie (1998). Solitary confinement torture in the U.S.

Available from <http://sonic.net/~doretkk/Issues/98-09%20FALL/solitary.html>

Kupers, Terry A (1999). *Prison madness: The mental health crisis behind bars and what we must do about it*. San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass.