Dear Border/Lines,

All that M. NourbeSe Philip argued ("How White is your White?" 36/39) is paralleled by the trial here in England of Frederick and Rosemary West. The Wests were notycle they were seulement middle class decentes of Gloucester in central, sold England. Nowhere in the trial was the threat of white middle class crime raised because here there is also an evocation of all this. Instead, it is called "evil." The Wests were "evil," she of course a sort of which, he demon, satanic and so on. Meanwhile, there are unmentionable deaths of non-whites in prison, non-whites expelled as inadequately brutalized refugees, non-whites creating "no" all sorts of problems, and the long, constant dialogue about the "Dangerous黑夜," the "Threatening Asians," etc.

Within a wider symptomology of the "New Middle Ages" we are supposed to be creating, what is happening is the creation of wider and wider categories of the dispose, able, the "unnamed." The majority of human beings alive are defined by their NOT-ness (and I recognize that we have joined in this with all our "Other" talk: the non-white, the non-male and the non-normal however you measure this.

The Wests, an "ordinary" man and an "ordinary" woman, kidnapped, tortured, violated, killed and discarded interred many young women over a very long time period. Nobody noticed, despite the screams and the bodies. Turn the dial a little - as Laurie Anderson wisely suggests - and you might Listen to the Seabian (much mentioned) and Creation almost unmentioned genocide in Bosnia-Herzegovina. And what of the almost wholly unmentioned fourth or fifth world peoples, whose genocide routinely goes unremarked? because they can be blamed on the group-Xenics with no unnamable perpetrator.

None of this is a criticism of Northouse Philip, but in a reminder to your readers that there are so many deaths and that it is hard to know which is an avoidable death. To "map" the geography of death is to recognize that more "certain people" die needlessly. As you read this, 300 million people in Africa alone are hungry, more than ten times the population of Canada. Today, tonight, some of them will die. That too will go unremarked.

Philip Corrigan, Bristol, England.

Letters to the editor

Dear Border/Lines,

Perhaps against my better judgment, I felt compelled to respond to Jay Pannu's letter to the editor in the last issue because it seems to me to be all too emblematic of the current crisis of the "left" (a term I use here loosely). It is indicative of the manner in which a certain self-defeating spleen-venting takes the place of engaged, critical dialogue which, in the face of the current neo-conservative onslaught, is more necessary than ever amongst marginalized communities.

There are several issues raised by Pannu's letter.

1. While I didn't see the issue in question, it does seem to me that Pannu is justified in raising the question of the relation between her texts and the visual images to which she strongly objects. Rather than conjuring false demons of racism and sexism, however, Pannu should have addressed herself to these important issues in a constructive way. Anything short of such a discussion contributes to an unfortunate trivialization of these same issues.

2. Pannu seems to think that the collective consciousness of the "left." If she had taken the time to glance at the mast head she would have learned otherwise. For Pannu's information, Julie Jenkinson, the managing editor, is also the designer.

3. Pannu most emphatically has the right not to participate in LSM. She does not, however, have the right to cast racially tinged aspersions on people who do. Pannu seems to think that only the "Children of Columbus" engage in such "morally degenerate" behaviour. Living in San Francisco, in which there are many racially diverse sexual subcultures, I can assure Pannu that it ain't just white people who like to tie each other up. Where, moreover, does this type of knee-jerk denunciation leave Mestiza peoples who are quite literally "Children of Columbus"?

4. While Pannu apparently values B.L. as a place which "provides a forum for those people whose voices are seldom heard in the mainstream media," she doesn't stop to consider the potentially devastating effects her allegations of racism and sexism might have on the magazine and, by extension, on those same people for whom it serves as a forum. Has it completely escaped Pannu's notice that, in an era of globalization, governments at all levels are hungrily looking for ways - unsubstantiated charges of racism and sexism, for instance - to legitimate their slash and burn policies?

In the face of such neo-conservative cynicism we can either stand together or fall apart.

Sandra Bandeela, San Francisco

G.B. Chesteron
The Mistake of the Machine

On January 30th, 1985, not long after O.J. Simpson had released his book I Want to Tell You, the TV show Hard Copy told their viewers that they had subjected Simpson to a lie detector test. The former football star and murder suspect had recorded himself on tape, reading aloud various passages from his book. "I want to state unequivocally that I did not commit those horrible crimes," he declared. Hard Copy hired Ernie Ribito to use the Psychological Stressor Package, a stress analysis. According to the show's Hollywood reporter Diane Diamond, the Psychological Stressor Package can "separate fact from fiction" because there is "no checklist for this kind of test." Used by the police, the military and big business,
The examiner is preferably unseen and laconic, the suspect observed and verbose.

she told us, this type of lie detector has been shown to be "95 percent accurate." As a result of her analysis, Emie Rizzo concluded that O.J. was "one hundred percent deceitful." "He is one hundred percent lying," said Rizzo, pointing to the graphical evidence as it flashed forth from his machine.

One week after the Hard Copy deception test, the supermarket tabloid the Globe also subjected Simpson's voice to stress analysis. "Veteran investigator" Jack Hanwood used "Vestanetics," a high-tech lie detector test, to analyze the very same tape according to Simpson's that the TV show had used (Globe, 7th Feb., 1995). "After painstakingly reviewing the results of his subliminal lie test, which is also favored by police investigators," said the Globe, Hanwood proclaimed Simpson "absolutely truthful": the lie test showed O.J. didn't do it!" 

Then we have one type of lie detector, a single suspect, but two equally vehement yet contradictory verdicts. When he said, "I would take a bullet for Nicole," "the former football hero was being completely honest," said Jack Hanwood; but according to Emie Rizzo he was "absolutely lying." How can two experts both claim scientific validity for their respective instruments, yet simultaneously reach completely different conclusions based on their analyses of exactly the same material? Am we simply dealing with a classic "pseudo-science," whose legitimacy must be exposed, and whose scientific credentials must be disputed? Or do we have before us a scientific instrument — a "truth-telling machine" — for which the task of telling the truth is in fact only a minor concern? After all, as the story of these lie detector tests given by the tabloids to O.J. Simpson suggests (O.J.'s lessons. F. Leo Bailey and Johnnie Cochran), despite their media savvy, did not insist their client take a polygraph test, here is an instrument whose cultural presence is so assured that it can afford to expose itself to potentially embarrassing invasions with impunity — invasions which might well up in demands for its censure and prohibition. But, as Nintchick suggested, "it is certainly not the least charm of a theory that it is refutable; it is with precisely this charm that it endures subtle minds." (Beyond Good and Evil.) This article will leave the choice of refuting the theory of the lie detector to more subtle minds — a task embraced admirably and consistently by psychology — and will instead explore some of the machine's other additions. My ambition is to present a feel for the history of the lie detector that, following Nietzsche, attempts to scrutinize this institution using the words "beyond good and evil.

Despite constant criticism, ridicule, government prohibition, legal denunciations, and a widespread belief that it can be beaten, the lie detector just won't go away. It was recently seen on The Jenny Springer Show, "You're a Lie!" Among others, viewers were introduced to Rosanne, who suspected husband Walter of marital infidelity; and Sean,accusing his girlfriend Tiffany of being a pornographic movie star. The lie detector expert whose task it was to discern the truth of the various allegations was none other than Hard Copy's Emie Rizzo, "Emie, you are the holder of truth," said a somewhat melodramatic Sean, as Emie prepared to make public his assessment of the validity of Walter's denials, "If he's lying, he's out the door!"

Luckily, Walter was pronounced truthful by Emie and his machine, and the marriage was saved, although Rosanne's response — "How much you pay him?" — suggested that she was unconvinced of the lie detector test's outcome. Psychopaths could be forgiven for believing that Emie's admirable attempt to solve marital problems with the lie detector was a novel historical development, a well-intended but illusory cure from the overzealous "polygraph to the stars." But this was clearly the case to which the lie detector was put by one of its most enthusiastic early pioneers over half a century ago.

In 1930, an article in a popular magazine began with the following words:

From the field of crime, the "Lie Detector" has entered the fields of love. It now tells whether or not your wife or sweetheart loves you—or you, her. Dr. William Moulton Marston, the inventor, reports success with his device in solving marital or other domestic problems, and adds that it will disclose subconscious secrets of which the subject is utterly unaware...In the hands of a psychologist these instruments become disinterested truth-finders (Look, 6th Dec., 1938).

The magazine described the psychologist's successful resolution of two difficult cases: "the neglected wife and her roving husband," and "the boy and the girl who were in love, but were engaged to other girls." The article concluded: "Dr. Marston believes the course of true love would run much more smoothly if more detection tests were applied in such 'triangle cases.'" In his book, The Lie Detector Test, Marston expanded on his ideas about the role the machine could play in discovering the truth about relations between the sexes.

Women, agree masculine sagas, are the worst liars. But are they? Treatises have been written—by men—to prove that women lie more frequently because they are the weaker sex and must deceive continually to protect themselves...The Lie Detector now supplies a method for scientific comparison between male and female truthfulness.

Blondes lose out in film love test; Brunettes far more emotional, psychologist proves by charts and graphs.
The examiner is preferably unseen and laconic, the suspect observed and verbose.

she told us, this type of lie detector has been shown to be "95 percent accurate." As a result of his analysis, Ennio Rizzo concluded that O.J. was "one hundred percent deceitful." He is one hundred percent lying," said Rizzo, pointing to the graphical evidence as it buzzed forth from his machine.

One week after the 1984 Olympic defeat, the supermarket tabloid The Globe also subjected Simpson's voice to stress analysis. "Veteran investigator" Jack Hanwood used "Votametrics," a high-tech lie detector test, to analyze the very same tape according to Simpson that the TV show had used (Globe, 7th Feb., 1985). "After painstakingly reviewing the results of his sophistiicated lie test, which is also favored by police investigators," said the Globe, Hanwood proclaimed Simpson "absolutely truthful"; the "lie test showed O.J. didn't do it!"

Then we have one type of lie detector, a single suspect, but two equally unimportant contradictions. When he said, "I would take a bullet for Nicole," the former football hero was being completely honest," said Jack Hanwood, but according to Ennio Rizzo he was "absolutely lying." How can two experts both claim scientific validity for their respective instruments, yet simultaneously reach completely different conclusions based on the analysis of exactly the same material? Are we simply dealing with a classic "pseudo-science," whose legitimacy must be exposed, and whose scientific credentials must be disputed? Or do we have before us a scientific instrument -- a "truth-telling machine" -- for which the use of telling the truth is in fact only a minor concern?

After all, as the story of these lie detector tests given by the tabloids to O.J. Simpson suggests (O.J.'s lessons F. Lee Bailey and Johnnie Cochran, despite their media savvy, did not insist their client take a polygraph test, lest he be an instrument whose cultural presence is so strong that it could not be used to potentially embarrassing insinuations with impunity -- insinuations which might well incline demands for its censorship and prohibition. But, as Nietzsche suggested, "it is certain not the least charm of a theory that it is refutable; it is with precisely this charm that it entices subtle minds." (Beyond Good and Evil.) This article will leave the choice of refuting the theory of the lie detector to more subtle minds -- a task embraced admirably and conscientiously by psychology -- and will instead explore some of the machine's other seductions. My ambition is to present a brief history of the lie detector that, following Nietzsche, attempts to scrutinize this instrument "beyond good and evil."

Despite constant criticism, ridicule, government prohibitions, Populism, and a widespread belief that it can be beaten, the lie detector just won't go away. It recently was seen on The Jerry Springer Show, "You're a Lie!" Among others, viewers were introduced to Renannie, who suspected husband Walter of marital infidelity; and Seid, accusing his girlfriend Tilly of being a pornographic movie star. The lie detector expert whose task it was to disprove the truth of the various allegations was none other than Hond Cop's Ennio Rizzo. "Ennie, you're the holder of truth," said a somewhat melodramatic Jerry, as Leis prepared to make public his assessment of the validity of Walter's denials, "if he's lying, he's out the door!"

Luckily, Walter was not proclaimed truthful by Ennie and his machine, and the marriage was saved, although Rosemarie's response -- "How much you pay him?" -- suggested that she was unconvinced of the lie detector test's accuracy. Populism could be forgiven for believing that Ennie's admirable attempts to solve marital problems with the lie detector was a novel historical development, a well-intended but illusory cure for the overzealous "polygraph to the stars." But this was exactly the use to which the lie detector was put by one of its most enthusiastic early pioneers over half a century ago.

In 1988, an article in a popular magazine began with the following words:

From the field of crime, the "Lie Detector" has entered the fields of love. It now tells whether or not your wife or sweetheart loves you—or you her. Dr. William Houdson Marston, the inventor, reports success with his device in solving marital or other domestic problems, and adds that it will disclose subconscious secrets of which the subject is utterly unaware...In the hands of a psychologist these instruments become disinterested truth-finders (Look, 6th Dec., 1938).

The magazine described the psychologists' successful resolution of two difficult cases: "the neglected wife and her loving husband," and "the boy and the girl who were in love, but not engaged to other."
The article concluded: "Dr. Marston believes the course of true love would run much more smoothly if more detection tests were applied in such 'triangle cases.'"

In his book The Lie Detector Test, Marston expanded on his ideas about the uses the machine could play in discovering the truth about relations between the sexes.

Women, agree masculine vague, are the worst liars. But are they? Treatises have been written—by men—to prove that women lie more frequently because they are the weaker sex and must deceive continually to protect themselves...The Lie Detector Test now supplies a method for scientific comparison between male and female falsehoodfulness.
HAVING pursued his experimental data, Merton concluded that "men are more dishonest in business and women in society." Thus when it came to "money, or important and valuable property, women appear to be more honest than men.

Although members of "the more losing sex," however, felt innumerable ties to "enlive social conversations and to manipulate other people for various petty purposes or advantages just for the fun of it." Thus although Merton advocated the lie detector as a tool for challenging the myths of female untrustworthiness, his work merely reinforced the stereotypic roles of lie detection.

After graduating from Harvard with a Ph.D. in 1921, Merton claimed to have "discovered" the lie detector six years later. Merton took various university teaching jobs before accepting a position in Hollywood at Universal Pictures as Director of Public Service. His task was to ascertain audience emotional reactions to movies and to advise the producers accordingly. His "lie detector" was perfectly suited to this research. One experiment, appropriately conducted in New York's Embassy Theater, involved testing the emotional reactions of blon dees, brunettes, and redheads to various movies clips. The results were reported in the New York Times.

**BLOOMDES LOSE OUT IN FILM LOVE TEST: BRUNETTES FAR MORE EMOTIONAL, Psychologist Proves by Charts and Graphs, THEATER A LABORATORY (31st Jan, 1928).**

Although Merton's research was eccentric from the standpoint of psychology, it was not original as far as the developing science of the detection of deception was concerned. Science and sex, technical theater, and movies have been consistent constants to the lie detector throughout its short but igno-

ble career. A 1935 New York report on a Chicago psychology exhibition was illustrated with a photograph of a young woman performing a lie detector test on another. "It really understands women," explained the caption: "when a girl submits to the Tomer phenomenon, her psychology becomes an open book.

Newspaper articles about the lie detector habitually featured a picture of a female subject being interrogated by a male examiner. A 1933 New York Times report on Leonard Keeler's latest poly-

graph successes depicted the criminalist attaching his device to a young woman. While Keeler fiddled with his instrument, watching the woman from behind her back, she herself gazed impassively into the distance. "The polygraph test has been applied to 4,000 suspects in criminal cases," the piece claimed.

Son of a Hollywood scriptwriter, Keeler had built his first lie detector under the supervision of the energetic Boston police officer, August Vollmer, in 1921. After securing the position of chief polygrapher at Chicago's Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory — which had been set up in response to a St. Valentine's Day massacre — Keeler went on to have a widely cele-

brated career. He supervised the Gestapo's interrogators in the concentration camps, helped to train Nazi interrogators, and was a high ranking member of the National Socialist Party in Germany.

In September 1943, Keeler was one of the few civilians to have survived the Battle of the Bulge. After the war, he was a member of the team that reconstructed the Nuremberg trials.

In his early work, he devised a lie detector test that could be used to detect lies in a subject's voice. This test was later refined and perfected by his son, Leonard Keeler, who went on to become one of the leading experts in the field of lie detection.

**A FOR WORKING for many years at the Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory, Leonard Keeler went on to establish his own lie detector training school, and a polygraph practice basing his name still operates in Chicago today. His biography, The Lie Detector Man, was published in 1936 by his sister Elise. This is a memoir of an extraordinary rain, she wrote in the foreword, "my brother, Leonard Keeler, developer and pioneer of the polygraph." Now having found enough time between numerous cases and celebrity parties to write the definiti-

ve polygraph handbook he had always desired, he died in 1949, two years after his great rival William Marston.

Whereas Marston created Wonder Woman, the alter ego of Keeler's Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory inspired the creation of Dick Tracy. Although Marston was the first to present the lie detector on American television (probably to illustrate the legal condition of admissibility for scientific evidence in the press), it was Keeler who secured the first patent on the instru-

ment. The professional careers of the two men coincided when the convicted Lindbergh baby kidnapper, Bruno Hauptman, pleaded for the opportunity to take a lie detector test in 1935.

Hauptmann's was ruled Keeler to give him a test, to see if the instrument could help in his husband's case. Keeler insisted with the State Governor about the possibility of testing Hauptmanna.

\"Nobody who matters in and against giving the safety that the resulting hostile pub-

lic Hauptmann's chances of"

\"At the same time, the Clovis lie detector has been con-

\"Some\

\"This is the test Whitney and race. A lie detec-

\"The lie detector was a tool for challenging the myths of female untrustworthiness, his work merely reinforced the stereotypic roles of lie detection.\n
\"When a girl submits to the Tomer phenomenon, her psychology becomes an open book.\n
\"He devised a lie detector test that could be used to detect lies in a subject's voice. This test was later refined and perfected by his son, Leonard Keeler, who went on to become one of the leading experts in the field of lie detection.\n
\"Now having found enough time between numerous cases and celebrity parties to write the definitive polygraph handbook he had always desired, he died in 1949, two years after his great rival William Marston.\n
\"Whereas Marston created Wonder Woman, the alter ego of Keeler's Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory inspired the creation of Dick Tracy. Although Marston was the first to present the lie detector on American television (probably to illustrate the legal condition of admissibility for scientific evidence in the press), it was Keeler who secured the first patent on the instrument.\n
\"The professional careers of the two men coincided when the convicted Lindbergh baby kidnapper, Bruno Hauptmann, pleaded for the opportunity to take a lie detector test in 1935.\n
\"Hauptmann's was ruled Keeler to give him a test, to see if the instrument could help in his husband's case. Keeler insisted with the State Governor about the possibility of testing Hauptmann.
HAVING nurtured his experimental data, Monson concluded that men are more dishonest in business and women in society. Thus when it came to "money, or important and valuable property, women are more honest than men." Although members of "the more loving sex," well-ardonnable either to "enlist social conversations and to man of the more people in various petty purposes or to make a little for the joy of it." Thus although Monson advocated the lie detector as a tool for challenging the myth of female untruthfulness, his work merely substantiated the stereotype of it rather than lending it scientific credibility.

After graduating from Harvard with a Ph.D. in 1921 (claiming to have "discovered" the lie detector six years earlier) Monson took over various university teaching jobs before accepting a position in Hollywood at Universal Pictures as Director of Public Service. His test was to ascertain audience emotional reactions to movies and to advise the producers accordingly. His "love detector" was perfectly suited to this research. One experiment, appropriately conduced in New York's Embassy Theater, involved testing the emotional reactions of bladies, brutes, and redheads to various movie clips. The findings were reported in the New York Times.


Although Monson's research was eccentric from the standpoint of psychology, it was not atypical as far as the developing science of the detection of deception was concerned. Science and sex, technology and theatre, and movies and music have been consistent constituents to the lie detector throughout its short but ignoble career. A 1923 newspaper report on a Chicago psychology exhibition was illustrated with a photograph of a young woman performing a lie detector test on another. "It really understands women," explained the caption: "when a girl submits to the Dormer procedure, she becomes an open book." Newspapers article about the lie detector habitually featured a picture of a female subject being interrogated by a male examiner. A 1923 New York Times report on Leonard Keeler's latest polygraph success described the criminal investigator attaching his device to a young woman. While Keeler fiddled with his instrument, watching the woman from behind her back, she herself gazed impensively into the distance. "Keeler polygraph tests have been applied to 4,000 suspects in criminal cases," the piece claimed.

Son of a Hollywood scriptwriter, Keeler had built his first lie detector under the supervision of the energetic Police detective, Reverend August Vollmer, in 1921. After securing the position of chief polygraph at Chicago's Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory — which had been set up in response to the St. Valentine's Day massacre — Keeler went on to have a widely celebrated career. He assisted in the capture of Al Capone's gangsters and received a medal in 1951 for making a most outstanding civic contribution (Chicago Tribune, a confession printed during one of his examinations in 1948 led to the recovery of a heard of priceless jewels and historical relics looted by the Nazis during the war. By 1947 he had so few cases he could play himself alongside Jimmy Stewart in Cell No.777, a movie which told the story of a newspaper reporter who employed the new sciences of polygraphy and forensic photography to help free a wrongly convicted man from jail.

The classic image of a male examiner observing a female suspect, employed by Monson, Keeler and many others, has become a standard feature of many polygraph text books. It can be found in Williams and Burns: Lie Detection with Electrodermal Response (1934); Reid and Infante: The Art of Fraud and Deception (1929), a key text widely regarded as the polygrapher's "Bible"; and James Mattis's The Art and Science of the Polygraph Technique (1969). Representing ideal testing situations for trainee polygraph operators, each image depicts the ideal suspect-examiner relationship. The examiner should be masculine, rational, technical and objective, while the suspect should be feminine, emotional, human and subjective. The examiner is presumably unbiased and the suspect observed and observed. The device constructed by lie detection is therefore designed by virtue of the fact that she is feminine; because femininity is itself suspicious, as far as polygraphy is concerned, femininity signifies ideal suspect characteristics.

If femininity is the subject of the polygraph examination, then it must be supervised by a masculine officer. The text is subject to a check of a series of suckling. Subjects are noted both before and after the test is performed; every gesture and nuance of expression is recorded by cameras behind two-way mirrors and by mechanical characterization detectors (see below). In recognition of his earlier work with the machine, he equipped Wonder Woman with a portable lie detector of her very own: a golden lasso of truth. Like the scientific instrument, the golden lasso also provided leverage through the discovery of the truth. But freedom came at a price: the lie detector, like Wonder Woman's bracelets of submission, and her golden lasso of truth were instruments of bondage.

A Working for many years at the Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory, Leonard Keeler went on to establish his own lie detector training school, and a polygraph practice bearing his name still operates in Chicago today. His biography, The Lie Detector Man, was published in 1894 by his sister Edna: "This is a memoir of an extraordinary man," she wrote in the foreword, "my brother, Leonard Keeler, developer and pioneer of the polygraph." Never having found enough time between numerous cases and celebrity parties to write the definitive polygraph handbook as he had always hoped, he died in 1949, two years after his great rival William Monson.

While Monson continued to advise Wonder Woman of the secrets of Keeler's Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory inspired the creation of Dick Tracy. Although Monson was the first to present the lie detector to an American court (indeed establishing the legal soliciation of admissibility for scientific evidence in the present), it was Keeler who secured the first official recognizance. The professional careers of the two men coincided when the convicted Lindbergh baby kidnapper, Bruno Hauptmann, pleaded for the opportunity to take a lie detector test in 1935. Hauptmann's wife asked Keeler to give her test, to see if the instrument could help in her husband's case. Hauptmann confessed to the State Governor about the possibility of testing Hauptmann's everybody who mattered in and against giving the safety. "The resulting hotline pub- lished Principal's chances of

Considering the potent mixture of fact, fiction, and fetishism that is the lie detector, it should come as no surprise to learn that one of the instrument's early advocates, the psychologist William Moulton Marston, was responsible for creating and developing the comic book character Wonder Woman. Crippled with polio, Monson detected the last years of his life to psychoplastic and his self-innoculated feminist icon. In recognition of Keeler's earlier work with the machine, he equipped Wonder Woman with a portable lie detector of her very own: a golden lasso of truth. Like the scientific instrument, the golden lasso also provided leverage through the discovery of the truth. But freedom came at a price: the lie detector, like Wonder Woman's bracelets of submission, and her golden lasso of truth were instruments of bondage.

The polygraph technique is neither simple, nor easy... it is extremely useful, and far away from the breed of the tests of the power known to man. Three words were written by none other than E. Lee Bailey. TV show host, polygraph expert, and publisher, and most recently, one of O.J. Simpson's lawyers. Given his belief in "the best test of credi- bility known to man," he has written, and how is it by the very fact that the attorney need not insist on an attorney to take a lie detector test. But perhaps after forty years of intimate experience of the lie detector, E. Lee Bailey understands it only too well what Nietzsche meant when he warned of "the hazards of the will to truth."