

Eyes That Do Not Wish To See:

APA's Hoffman Report and Some Implications for Consulting Psychology

An Essay

By Richard R. Kilburg

**A Very Short Vignette**

Combat boots tread carefully and quietly on cold, stony ground. A squad of U.S. special forces troops wearing their uniforms with appropriate insignia, equipped with light arms, infrared eyes, helmet mounted cameras, and more than a century of fighting experience between them flit from shadow to shadow on the way to the target house. It nests among others in a small village in remote mountainous country.

26,000 miles above, in geostationary orbit a Department of Defense satellite aims cameras and antennae to the spot orchestrating the mission with local, regional, and global command centers. At 400-600 miles up, another satellite has real time infrared video of the positions of the troops relative to the target house. The lieutenant leading the raid along with his two sergeants receive real time feedback on their positions in meters. That global positioning system comprised of 24+ satellites circling at about the same height but in different orbits provides instantaneous updates of their movements. At 5000 feet, unmanned drones providing air cover circle overhead. Specially equipped and noise suppressed Blackhawk helicopters wait for a signal from the lieutenant to extract the team in the valley below.

After a long, quiet walk and an even more silent stalking of the house, a simple hand signal launches the home penetration from three sides by six soldiers. Four others stand watch around the house. Everyone in the house sleeps silently. The surprise is

complete. Men, women, and children are quickly and quietly separated into different rooms. The men are examined carefully by flashlight. Two are selected. Their hands are bound, eyes covered, mouths taped. They are quickly led outside.

Fifty yards away, the two helicopters touch down lightly. The troops sprint with captives in tow. Screams now erupt from the village. Lights flash everywhere as people rush into the night. Twelve men scramble onto the copters and fly away before anyone in the village realizes they were there. Four hours later, the two men from the village have been fed and allowed to use the bathroom. They are on a plane to an unknown destination. Eight hours after that, the eldest of the two men, a distinguished looking person with a long beard and deep tan on his face and hands is led into a small room. He is seated in a reasonably comfortable chair and restrained lightly. Monitors for all of his major biological rhythms are attached by two guards. Sound and video systems are double-checked and started. The guards withdraw to the corners of the room. The door opens and a trained interrogator enters carrying a thick binder. He sits down, introduces himself by his first name, and calls the other by his full formal name. The process begins.

Outside of the room in a monitoring booth a small team of specialists assess everything that happens. One of them, a psychologist with very special training in these forms of interrogation, leans forward, watching the screens. Beside him is a translator. The beginning is very important. It starts with a declaration of the legal framework and auspices under which he had been captured and the purposes of the proceedings. Simple, direct questions spoken with respect begin.

“Is this your name?”

“Were you born in ...?”

“Did you attend Madras in...?”

Simple questions, easy to answer yes or no to them. Easy to remain silent as well. So much of the story can be read in just this way. Chapter two begins, the first day after capture.

### **Psychologists in National Security Interrogations: A Very Quick Review**

On Friday, August 7, 2015, the Council of Representatives of the American Psychological Association voted 156 to 8 – seven abstentions and one no – to prohibit their members from participating in National Security Interrogations. It took approximately thirteen years for this vote to take place. The purposes of this essay are not to tell this story in detail. It has and will be told repeatedly elsewhere.

I am a psychologist member of APA and have been since 1973. I have worked in the central office of the Association, as a faculty member in three universities, as a privately and institutionally practicing psychotherapist, as a consultant to a wide variety of organizations, including several branches of the Federal Government, and have over forty years of management and leadership experience. I am widely published in several areas of psychology and perhaps best known for my work on leadership and executive coaching. The purposes of this essay are to examine a number of issues related to the passage of the Resolution by APA using various methods including: metahistorical deconstruction, decision making and cognitive biases, great power analysis, the contemporary views of terrorist warfare of Philip Bobbitt, and the psychodynamics of shame and sado masochism to raise a series of questions about the potential long term consequences for the nation if psychologists are withdrawn from these positions at the

penetrating edges of the security operations of the U.S. armed and intelligence services. Finally, I will examine briefly several possible implications of the Resolution and its anticipated aftermath for consulting and other domains of general applied psychology.

The opening case vignette is an attempt to create a visceral example of the type of geopolitical and geo-military operations in which the government of the United States has increasingly found itself managing after the Korean war in the 1950's. During the past seventy-five years, the boundaries between nation states and other politically active organizations have substantially blurred and differentiated (Bobbitt, 2001, 2009). Allies change sides depending on the circumstances. Protracted military operations are very often conducted without formal declarations of war or the engagement of the associated international legal frameworks within which warfare is supposed to be engaged. Terrorist organizations participating in all manner of mayhem, including institutionalized slavery, bombings of non combatant populations producing mass casualty events, and uses of chemical and biological weapons are owned and operated by governments or are supported by corporations, wealthy private interests, criminal enterprises, or entrepreneurially driven radical and anarchist groups seeking to have impacts on various aspects of the global society and economy. Private corporate armies are now formally employed by many nations as extenders of their political and military policy initiatives and infrastructures. These organizations are almost too numerous to count.

Against this backdrop of increasing global anarchy, the attacks of 9/11 on the United States, the subsequent military and covert operations conducted around the world by the Department of Defense and the various security branches of the U.S. Government and its allies, the wholesale capture and imprisonment of governmentally denied

combatants and supporters, and the vast global network of dark or black combatants, operational psychology slowly came into existence. It should come as no surprise to any of us. As one of my dear APA colleagues, Meredith Crawford, one our discipline's best military psychologists, put it to the Board of Professional Affairs back in the early 1980's, "psychology does its best work when it sticks its nose into other peoples' business."

### **The Hoffman Report**

The Hoffman Report is named after a partner of the Sidley Austin Law Firm headquartered in Chicago, Illinois. It has offices in eighteen other cities, including Washington D. C. The Sidley firm was hired by APA's Board of Directors and a small Special Committee it appointed to lead this effort subsequent to a resolution adopted on November 12, 2014. The Special Committee Members were Drs. Nadine Kaslow, Susan McDaniel, and Bonnie Markham, all three trained in clinical psychology. The Report was delivered to them on July 2, 2015 after approximately eight months of effort by the seven members of the Sidley team. The document was 542 pages long and was accompanied by six binders of associated information documenting some of the footnotes and other items referenced in body of the narrative. To be fair, at the outset, APA's Special Committee chose to call this document the Independent Report. In reality, it was no more independent than a research project sponsored by any corporate entity. The Hoffman team was directed in each and every measure it took by the Special Committee. In this essay, I have chosen to call it the Hoffman Report for those reasons.

According to the Executive Summary of the Report, the purpose was to review the events associated with decisions made by the Association concerning the Ethical

Code of the organization as it was applied to national security interrogations of non uniformed detainees held in various sites around the world by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the U. S. Department of Defense (DoD). Allegations had been made by members of the Association as well as James Risen, (2014), a New York Times reporter, that the CIA, DoD, and other government entities wanted “permissive ethical guidelines so that their psychologists could continue to participate in harsh and abusive interrogation techniques being used by these agencies after the September 11 attacks on the United States. APA member critics pointed to alleged procedural irregularities and suspicious outcomes regarding APA’s ethics policy decisions and said they resulted from this improper coordination, collaboration, or collusion. Some said APA’s decisions were intentionally made to assist the government in engaging in these enhanced interrogation techniques. Some said they were intentionally made to help the government commit torture....The specific question APA has asked us to consider and answer is whether APA officials colluded with DoD, CIA, or other government officials “to support torture” (Hoffman, 2015), (P.1).

The Report’s principal findings were based extensively on the Hoffman Team’s close examination of the activities of the 2005 APA Presidential Task Force on Ethics and National Security or “PENS” and subsequent related policy deliberations by APA governance. The PENS Report contained 12 clarifications of the guidelines that were adopted by APA’s Council of Representatives in August of 2005 as additions to the Ethics Code. The Hoffman team’s “investigation determined that key APA officials, principally the APA Ethics Director joined and supported at times by other APA officials, colluded with important DoD officials to have APA issue loose, high-level ethical

guidelines that did not constrain DoD in any greater fashion than existing DoD interrogation guidelines. We concluded that APA's principal motive in doing so was to align APA and curry favor with DoD. There were two other important motives: to create a good public-relations response, and to keep the growth of psychology unrestrained in this area." (P. 9). The findings of the Hoffman Team were extensive in many related domains. Of special interest to consulting and other general applied psychologists was the emphasis on Ethical Standards 1.02 and 1.03, repeatedly and deliberately referred to in the Report as the Nuremberg defense. Those standards provide guidance to psychologists about how to proceed when they perceive that the APA Ethics Code may conflict with laws, in the case of 1.02, and organizational policies, procedures, and processes, in the case of 1.03.

The Hoffman Team provided several caveats to their Report and findings including: their lack of psychological knowledge and comprehension of how APA is organized and works, their limited powers of investigation, their lack of appropriate security clearances to obtain crucial information, the length of time that had passed between the key events and their inquiry, and how more information could have been obtained. They then stated their report simply reflected a summary of their knowledge on the topic at that moment in time, and that their descriptions of the actions and potential motives of government officials could "be seen not as necessarily complete, definitive descriptions, but as a summary of our best effort to find facts and draw conclusions based on the time we have been provided and the evidence we have been able to review." (pps. 5-6). Despite these caveats, the Hoffman team then stated, "after actively investigating this matter for nearly eight months with a team of six attorneys and conducting

investigative activity that we think is fairly characterized as thorough, we have been able to reach conclusions about most of the key issues under dispute based on the extensive evidence we have reviewed” (P. 6).

Although it might be possible to word these statements in an even more paradoxical fashion, the juxtaposition of the caveats with the definitive statement of the clarity of their findings imposes on any critical reader of the full document a heavy burden of managing a state of substantial disbelief and simultaneously embracing the professional encouragement that the Hoffman team was really able to determine the exact factual nature of what had transpired on these matters within the APA over the previous thirteen years. Like all historical or fictive narratives, the Report requires a type of suspension of disbelief in order to enter into an extended dialogue with it. Unfortunately, I believe most readers forgot the caveats and accepted the Hoffman Team’s description of their investigation as thorough and their declaration that the conclusions they drew were accurate.

Of additional historical note, as of this writing, the 2016 APA Board of Directors has recently re-contracted with Mr. Hoffman to determine whether their deliberations and findings had fallen short in three explicit areas:

- (1) the extent to which he considered the DoD policies at issue in writing  
his *Independent Review*;
- (2) the extent to which those DoD policies are relevant to the issues, findings,  
and/or conclusions addressed and reflected in the *Independent  
Review*; and
- (3) whether any modifications of the *Independent Review* are warranted in light of



the DoD policies. (APA, 2016).

### **The Hoffman Resolution**

As a result of first leaking the Report to “Critics” and probably through them to James Risen of the New York Times and then publishing it on line, APA’s Board of Directors, in consultation with an undetermined and largely undisclosed number of confidants, proposed a Resolution to the Council of Representatives at its August, 2015 meeting (APA, 2015). The document contained nine statements of rationale, conventional Whereas findings that have historically often provided the substantive explanation for the organization’s formal adoption of positions, policies, initiatives, or principles. Without going into the details of the nine declarations, of crucial concern to the rest of this essay is the fact that eight of the nine statements of rationale either directly reference United Nations declarations and policies or actions of the government of the United States in response to those documents. Ironically, the second Whereas states, “APA policy dating back to 1985 “condemns torture wherever it occurs” and “supports the UN Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (UN Convention against Torture” (APA. 2015). That statement of historical fact alone makes any critical reader wonder about the true motivations, goals, and desired outcomes of the critics of the PENS Report and their allies in APA Governance.

The Resolution then went on to rescind the fifth and sixth paragraphs of APA’s 2013 “Policy related to psychologists work in national security settings and reaffirmation of the APA position against torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment.” as follows:

APA defines the term "cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment" in accordance with the UN Convention Against Torture as "other acts of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment which do not amount to torture as defined in article 1, when such acts are committed by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity" or with the U.S Constitution or other domestic law.

This definition continues to evolve with international legal understandings of this term as defined by the UN Committee Against Torture, UN and regional human rights tribunals (e.g., the European Court of Human Rights and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights), or other international legal bodies (e.g., the International Criminal Court) based on legal findings and jurisprudence. When legal standards conflict, APA members are held to the highest of the competing standards.

In addition, this definition extends to all techniques and conditions of confinement considered torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment under the UN Convention Against Torture; the Geneva Conventions; the Principles of Medical Ethics Relevant to the Role of Health Personnel, Particularly Physicians, in the Protection of Prisoners and Detainees against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment; the Basic Principles for the Treatment of Prisoners; or the World Medical Association Declaration of Tokyo.

A number of other specific changes were made to the 2013 Resolution as well and commitments were made to have APA communicate immediately and routinely to various agencies of the Federal Government about the resolution and APA's ongoing commitments to expose and oppose any violations of the UN Convention Against Torture. In addition, commitments were made to review and revise the procedures related to the conduct of Ethics Investigations and other operations by the APA Ethics Committee. By implication, another significant revision of the entire APA Code of Ethics and Standards (APA, 2010) may well be set in motion.

This very brief overview of the Report and the Resolution is provided for readers who may be unfamiliar with those documents. I can only urge everyone to read the originals for a fuller comprehension of what happened in the Summer of 2015 and to draw your own conclusions. From this point on, I would like to assume that readers have at least a passing familiarity with those artifacts and with the actions undertaken by APA and others. In the remainder of this essay, I would like to focus on the primary purposes and levels of analysis I outlined above and on their implications for the country, consulting, and other general applied psychologists.

### **Meta-Historical Analysis**

The Hoffman Report (2015) which the Sidley team labeled as "Report to the special committee of the Board of Directors of the American Psychological Association: Independent review relating to the APA ethics guidelines, national security interrogations, and torture," began with an abbreviated effort to selectively outline what the Sidley team clearly thought were aspects of APA's history relevant to the charge they were given. Specific sections were provided covering the early history of psychology,

the world wars of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, psychology and national security during the cold war of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, psychology and the military after the cold war, and a short overview of APA's advocacy efforts to attain prescriptive authority for licensed psychology. Not included was any mention of the extraordinarily complex, subtle, and extensive relationships with perhaps the majority of the other branches of the U.S. government. Anchoring the opening of the Report in these historical explanations, the authors then explored the history of the 2002 Ethics Code revision, APA interactions with the CIA and DoD: 2001-2004, APA's initial counterterrorism response: September -November 2001, relationships with government agencies: December 2001-February 2002, etc. The organization of the Report is justifiably seen by any objective reader as an effort to place a number of selected events and detailed exchanges by members of the APA Central Office staff and APA governance in a chronological order with the specific intent to create a narrative that supported the conclusions that the Sidley team had reached as a result of its 8 months of effort.

The Introduction to the Report described the documents that were available and reviewed, the fact that 167 interviews were conducted (although no formal records of those interviews were kept or made public and only highly selective statements and conclusions were presented in the Report based on those interviews), and six associated volumes of emails, memos, and other correspondence were released on line with the Report itself. In short, I think it is safe to conclude that the Report can be critically examined through the conceptual lens of history because its structure, narrative voice, supporting documentation, and conclusions all depend on the reader's acceptance of the Sidley team's rendering of this material in such terms.

Thus, the history itself is essential to understanding what the Report was intended to do by APA's Board of Directors and Special Committee. This rendering of history by the seven attorneys, none of whom was or is a trained historian, cannot be differentiated from any other forms of evidence or argument presented in the documents. Note then from the outset, that this is by definition a limited history of APA and certain events, activities, and actions of members of APA. Kilburg (2015) also pointed out that the majority of the attorneys who prepared the Report had extensive experience in criminal prosecution and defense, an issue to which this essay will return subsequently. At the outset of this examination of the Report, it is therefore clear that it was embedded in a limited assessment of APA history, conceived, constructed, and written by seven lawyers who are mostly experts in criminal law, who had been instructed by APA's Special Committee to search for evidence of and reasons for collusion. This is a term of legal significance implying at a minimum illicit action and at its worst criminal conspiracy.

After reading and writing about the Report through the summer of 2015 and noting that the form and substance could be considered as a history of sorts, I asked a client of mine, now a senior executive in a major research university but trained as a professional historian who had achieved significant stature in that discipline, whether there were any standard tools or methods that had been developed by that discipline to analyze histories as an intellectual product. Our conversation referenced the well-known work of Kuhn (1970, 1977) who noted the prevalence of "conceptual, theoretical, and operational paradigms" that guided the conduct of most research activities in human affairs. After some discussion, my client referred me to the work of Hayden White (1973, 1987). What follows in this section of my essay is based on my interpretations of

some of the major aspects of White's incredibly complex and rich frameworks for analyzing and understanding histories as texts with narrative intentions, structures, and motives. I am applying this framework to help illuminate aspects of the Hoffman Report that are deeply imbedded in its narrative forms and structures but were never made explicit for its readers by its authors or any element of APA governance.

In this matter, the Hoffman Report is no different than virtually any other text that is presented to an audience. These underlying and foundational elements of any narrative are left to the author(s) to select and use and then up to the readers to determine first, whether they are effective – does the text do its stated job(s) – second, whether they were chosen and used appropriately – entirely up to the reader to discern and determine – and, third, whether they deliberately and intentionally biased the reader's reactions and conclusions – also entirely up to the reader to examine. It goes without saying that most histories, indeed, most texts themselves go completely unexamined from these points of view (Anderson, 1995; Gergen, 1991, 1999; McAdams, 1993; White & Epston, 1990). In a global sense, readers most often either agree or disagree with what they read. When asked why they have these responses, they very often struggle to provide extensive explanations.

According to White (1973, 1987), histories begin with a chronicle that comprises all of the available information about the people, events, circumstances, trends, conditions, etc. that occurred during a particular period of time. Historians then arrange the chronicle in a form appropriate to their explanatory and descriptive purposes. Most often this structure takes a chronological form. The historian then selects and chooses to tell one or more stories that have beginnings, middles, and ends that arrange the data into

a comprehensible narrative that defines/creates meaning for readers. Finally, s/he constructs a hierarchy of meaning and significance out of the data elements selected for the stories that includes as a minimum:

- What happened first?
- What happened next, etc.?
- How, when, and where did those things happen, and who was involved?
- Why did they happen in that way to those people in that time?
- How did it end for those involved?
- What did/does it all mean? What is or was the point?

It should be clear from this summary how useful White's analytic framework might be to examine virtually any type of narrative or text and that it could help anyone who seeks to further analyze the Hoffman Report in such a manner. However, White did not stop there. He further delineated four additional domains within which such a narrative could be examined. This includes: Frye's (1957) emplotment schema (the underlying plot of the narrative); Pepper's (1966) paradigms that discursive arguments about the nature of the world usually take; Mannheim's (1946) typology of ideologies; and, various types of major rhetorical tropes-figurative words or expressions that describe people, things, events, or places in a non literal fashion. Exhibit 1 presents a succinct summary of this framework.

---

Insert Exhibit 1 About Here

---

## **Emplotment**

---

A deeper historical analysis then begins with the question, what type of plot did the Hoffman team use to structure their Report. Frye (1957) suggested five broad forms: romance, tragedy, comedy, satire/irony, and epic. Even a cursory reading of the Report strongly suggests that this document was created as a romance. From the outset, the “Critics” of APA, rarely mentioned by name in the Report itself, were described in heroic terms. They fought the power structures of an entrenched staff bureaucracy, battled corrupt elected officials in regime after regime, and refused to let their energies or efforts slack despite defeat after defeat at the hands of those nefarious adversaries. The critics wrapped themselves and their initiatives in conceptual and ideological terms that would appeal to many, if not most, of the members of the Association and its policy-making body, the Council of Representatives (CoR). The Report told many different short stories of these efforts and focused extensive attention on the work of Dr. Jean Marie Arrigo, as seemingly the lone voice of reason during the PENS Report proceedings. As reported by Clay (2016), Dr. Arrigo won a national award from the American Association for the Advancement of Science for speaking out against psychologists/ involvement in national security investigations, thus confirming her status and stature as one of the most visible heroes in these matters.

In and as a result of the Hoffman Report then, the “Critics” meet the full definition of heroes who transcended the difficult, often delicate, and sometimes personally dangerous situations they faced in order to achieve victory. The adoption of the 2015 Resolution by the Council of Representatives and the subsequent steps taken by APA to enact those recommendations provide detailed evidence of at least the partial success they accomplished. There were other aspects of the victory including the



termination of five senior employees of the Association, successful efforts to deny employment of others they identified by name in correspondence and emails, as well as the removal of a number of psychologists from elected and appointed positions in other prestigious psychological organizations. The ambitions of the critics were substantial indeed and the breadth of their successes as of this writing very impressive. The Hoffman team's use of the heroic plot structure thus largely supported their efforts and how APA's Board of Directors and Council of Representatives received and perceived them as people and as members.

The discharged members of the central office staff, the sullied reputations and disabled career aspirations of those identified in the Hoffman Report as the perpetrators of the schemes to thwart the heroes are automatically cast in opposition as the villains. Close reading of many sections of the Report provide ample evidence for this characterization, particularly the treatment of the work and relationship of Stephen Behnke and Morgan Banks, both of whom were very frequently mentioned by name and in extensively negative terms more than any others in the document. Close behind came Drs. Russ Newman, Deborah Dunivin, and Gerald Koocher.

### **Form of Truth**

White's second level of analysis concerns the form of truth predominately used by the Hoffman team in their work. Pepper (1966) identified four types of theory from which historical truth can be derived – see Exhibit 1. In their introduction to the Report, the authors more or less eschew any claim to historical experience or expertise, even though they spend virtually the entire document creating a history of APA on the limited matters to which they were directed to examine by the Board of Directors. Then, in a

classic reversal, they reverse that position by formally declaring that they have engaged in “our historical task” (p.2). On close reading, the instructions of the Board’s Special Committee, examined by Kilburg (2015), illustrate the well-known problems of experimenter and instruction bias that plague every known type of research investigation. The written instructions pointed Mr. Hoffman and his team in particular directions with specifications of what to find. They were not asked to pursue the null hypothesis.

They were not directed to provide an annotated overview of staff or governance behavior and actions regarding torture during the Bush administration – 2001-2009. And in Pepper’s framework, they were not asked to provide an integrated historical story, to examine, prove, or disprove laws of history, or to place the data they reviewed into any understandable sociocultural gestalt – Pepper’s descriptions of organicist, mechanist, and contextualist theory. By default and by definition then, the Hoffman Reports stands as an exemplar of formist theory in and through which a limited set of unique actors, sequences of events, and other data elements were used to explain those pieces of history that were selected for them to study. And the attention of that formist inquiry was specifically structured in a deliberately limited way at the outset by the Special Committee. The instructions included permission to seek any sources of data in support of their defined mission, but those instructions by exclusion, did not encourage the Hoffman team to consider other hypotheses or directions in any detail. Kilburg (2015) provided several alternative paths that the investigation could have been taken if it had been designed differently by the Special Committee or enacted more broadly by the Hoffman team. These are revisited later in this Essay.

## **Ideologies**

---

Exhibit 1 describes White's third category for exploring the structures of histories, involving an assessment of the ideological positions that served another integrative force for the Hoffman team's construction. White used Manheim's (1946) framework to illuminate this component of analysis. Manheim suggested that there are four principle ideologies that animate the psychosocial, political, economic, and religious lives of humanity. Conservatism advocates a reliance on natural rhythms for social changes and expresses strong preferences in defense of the status quo. Liberalism advocates a more idealistic, even utopian view of both the present and future. It pursues changes more actively and largely through the use of peaceful, negotiated, and democratic means. Radicalism advocates goals for various types of deeper change that appear achievable more directly and not necessarily through democratic channels. Finally, anarchism typically vilifies the present as corrupted by forces, people, and events in history. It pursues utopian views and goals immediately through conscious acts of willful destruction of the current social establishment. It is difficult to accurately place the Hoffman Report within Manheim's framework because of the selectivity with which the authors chose their material for inclusion, their editorial decisions to exclude a wide variety of highly relevant events, processes, and activities by a large number of people, and the narrowness of the charge given to them by the Special Committee.

Perhaps the easiest conclusion about the embedded ideology of the Hoffman Report that can be reached is that military psychologists of every stripe, the members of APA Central Office staff who worked with them in a variety of ways at the direction of APA's various Boards and Committees through time, and those members of APA governance who supported those activities were described as conservative in every form.

Indeed, in the formation of their major findings, the Hoffman team concluded that members of the staff and governance colluded to keep loose ethical standards in order to curry favor with the government of the United States, in particular the Department of Defense.

“Critics” (p.1) was introduced as the term to describe those advocates for the positions that APA staff and governance had condoned and enabled loose ethical standards in the second paragraph of the Executive Summary of the Report. “Critics” as a term was used four times in the first ten paragraphs of the Report. Eight of the first ten paragraphs focus on and emphasize the accusations by the unnamed “Critics” that led to the Special Committee being formed and the investigation initiated. Paragraph 3 introduced the notion of how large this population of advocates were, stating, “numerous APA critics both within and without” (p.1). The conditioning of the attention of the reading audience regarding the size of the community engaged in criticism continued in paragraph 10 with the use of the phrase “have created widespread and intense controversy within APA and the broader psychological community” (p.2)

The specific term “defenders” (p. 2) was introduced in the eleventh paragraph of the Report, the only one of the first two pages of the Executive Summary devoted to any information or summaries of the positions and actions taken by those in APA governance who were supportive advocates of the policies that held sway with APA until August of 2015. No language was introduced to describe the size and extent of that group of people. That paragraph was the only one devoted to introducing the positions and populations that had supported APA’s policies until August of 2015 in those crucial first pages. The terms used, emphasis on the size and positions of the critics, and convictions expressed in

the first two pages and eleven paragraphs of the Report left no doubt that the Hoffman team had determined that those defenders so identified were guilty as charged by the heroic Critics.

In their terms, the heroic Critics were portrayed in almost glowing terms as strong advocates of the liberal ideology. Their accusations of loose ethical standards, inappropriate relationships, and various nefarious and non-transparent methods used to support the torture of detainees were repeatedly and vigorously presented in the Report. The document itself left out many of the other stances, activities, and advocacy positions of the “Critics” which can be found in various documents accumulated by APA’s Society of Consulting Psychology (See their web site to download the file). These included such actions as calling for criminal investigations and prosecutions of military psychologists and those who supported them, public calls for the complete expulsion of the psychologists involved from APA and from their ability to be licensed to practice, their discharge from their jobs in any organization in which they were employed, and changes in state licensure laws that would make it easier for anyone to attack military psychologists at that level of government, among other steps.

In addition, an examination of the Resolution adopted by APA’s Council of Representatives further illuminates the ideological underpinnings of those who initiated the efforts that culminated in the Report. A close reading of the Resolution clearly demonstrates the motivation to place APA as an organization and all of its members by direct action of the adoption of that set of statements in a clear line of institutional support for the United Nations and a wide variety of its policies. In the Resolution, there are no efforts to explicate a nuanced position through which APA members as individual

citizens of the United States could have differing views from those who voted for it on the Council of Representatives in August of 2015. There was no statement of clarification of the explicit conflicts the statements pose for employees of the U.S. Government and in particular those who serve in its armed and security services. For example, there are thousands of psychologists serving in various branches of the Federal Government and all of them swear an oath to uphold, defend, and protect the U.S. Constitution. The Report, if taken in this broader, policy and political context can readily be seen as the implementation of a radical set of ideological ideas. To my knowledge, there has never been a survey of APA's members to determine the extent they would support the policies of the United Nations over those of the U.S. Government. Yet, as a result of the Report and subsequent actions by APA's Board of Directors and Council of Representatives, everyone who pays dues to the Association can now be held accountable to the principles stated in the Resolution.

This was an enormous deviation from APA's historical path in these matters, yet, it has gone largely without public comment. And, if in fact, the "Critics" and advocates of such positions actually hold to the beliefs, attitudes, values, and biases that a global organization such as the United Nations is to be preferred above the government of the United States and its Constitution, then these actions and the implicit support of them in the Report can be viewed as subtly, but nonetheless clearly, anarchistic in their intents and consequences. It is highly unlikely that the average member of APA's Council of Representatives considered such matters in detail when they voted for the Resolution. But, as an implicit and deliberate effort to move the ideology of the Association in those

directions, compared to the conservative and even liberal positions, these actions were extraordinary in historical and policy terms.

### **Rhetorical Tropes**

The fourth category of analysis of histories provided by White emphasizes the use of types of major rhetorical tropes. Four specific subtypes are emphasized. Metaphors in which persons, places, or things are characterized by similarities or differences from something else by the use of similes or analogies. Metonymy, a technique that changes the name of a part can be used for the whole. Synecdoche, applies the name of a part to represent the whole. And finally, irony, in which words or expressions are used to figuratively negate literal meanings. Metonymy, synecdoche, and irony are in reality all specific subtypes of metaphor.

A complete analysis of the Hoffman Report in terms of the metaphors introduced and used is well beyond the scope of this analysis. Exhibit 2 presents a list of fifteen exemplars of metaphors used repeatedly throughout the Report. All of these metaphors were introduced in the Executive Summary. A careful reading of these tropes clearly demonstrates the extent to which the Hoffman Team carried through on the commitment described above to support the ideological positions advocated by the “Critics.” The work of the Hoffman team itself was repeatedly described as definitive, objective, and independent, thus trying to eliminate or reduce the possibility of any type of legitimate criticism of their efforts, findings, or implied suggestions. The consistent reinforcement of the position that legitimate psychological practice is only to be understood and conducted within the framework of healing is sustained throughout the document. The use of Nuremberg Defense, torture, loose ethical standards, collusion, criminal

conspiracy, criminal prosecution, currying favor, and special relationship as terms that repeatedly described and excoriated those individuals and their actions and ideas identified in paragraph eleven and the “defenders” are unmistakable in their intent, extent of utilization, and contribution to the emotional tone and underlying cognitive responses the Report obviously produced in the vast majority of the members of APA’s Council of Representatives during the summer of 2015.

---

Insert Exhibit 2 About Here

---

This effort to analyze the Report in terms of rhetorical tropes and metaphors could find no sustained or extensive equivalents to describe the work of APA staff, members of governance, and employees of the U.S. Government in the Department of Defense or its security services in constructive terms. Similarly, no consistent negative, rhetorical devices were consistently applied to the “Critics” by the Hoffman Team. The only pejorative terms that were repeated were those used by members of APA staff and governance in email passages referring either to individuals or groups that the Hoffman Team identified as “Critics.” The tone and pattern of those references used in the Report, upon even the most casual examination, demonstrates the significant differences in the approaches used by that group to construct their document.

As stated above, this analysis of the Hoffman Report as an effort to understand it as an historical document is quite justified since the Executive Summary specifically defined it as such. “And as we have engaged in our historical task, we have done our best to remember with clarity the feelings of these times” (p.2). The conclusions I reached



using White's framework for analysis were that the Hoffman Report was constructed as a formist romance in which the "Critics" of APA staff and governance worked in heroic ways over 13 years to ensure that their ideological and political positions would replace those advocated by the "defenders." Those positions can be understood as liberal and anarchistic in form and intent in that they consistently call for an ideal view of psychology as a healing profession taking no interest or having no role in matters of national defense, security, or public safety and corrections save those of a therapeutic nature. Implicitly and explicitly, through the adoption of a number of resolutions, especially the one passed at the August 2015 meeting of APA's Council of Representatives, the "Critics" place policies and positions adopted by the United Nations at the center of what members of APA are to obey in this area under threat of an Ethical complaint, investigation, and potential expulsion from membership, and in so doing, deliberately attempt to undermine the legitimate roles of the Constitution of the United States and the laws and regulations adopted by its government. Finally, the Report repeatedly and consistently reinforced those aspects of its structure and content through the use of a variety of negative and positive rhetorical tropes that elevated and praised the stature and positions of the "Critics" while simultaneously denigrating and demeaning those taken by those whom the Hoffman Team identified as "defenders."

### **Decision Making and Cognitive Biases**

Psychology's scientific and professional examination of decision making and its cognitive foundations has been a continuous part of its efforts since the earliest days of Wundt's associationism (Boring, 1950). Contemporary overviews of many aspects of the science are readily available (Kahneman, 2011), as are applications to therapeutic,

counseling, management, and other types of psychological work (Bazerman, 1998; Bernard, 1991; Corey, 2009; Klein, 1999, 2003; and O'Donohue & Fisher, 2009). At the risk of significant overgeneralization, I believe this literature can be very succinctly summarized in the following ways:

First, humans have at least two emotionally informed and influenced cognitive decision making systems. One is based on analytic analysis of various forms of data obtained through sensory and perceptual systems. The second rests on the ability to access various forms of long-term memory stores, including patterns of memories of actions, ideas, sensory experiences, etc. The first system takes more time, is iterative in nature, and at its best, seems guided by implicit and explicit cognitive algorithms, external sources of data and analysis, and supportive psychosocial processes. The second system is fast and based on rapid retrieval and processing of relevant long-term memories that are used to make choices based on the accumulation of related knowledge. It largely operates in the private domain of an individual's internal life and is often experienced as unpredictable, eerie, without any rational explanation, and can be extremely powerful.

Second, these systems are broadly informed by all of the sensory and perceptual information individuals can collect and process.

Third, the choices made by individuals and groups vary widely in their accuracy and success. A very large number of social, organizational, cognitive, emotional, and physical processes have been identified that interfere with and undermine decision-making processes. Cognitive and emotional beliefs and biases are among the most important and influential of these processes that degrade the quality, efficiency, and effectiveness of human information processing and choice.

---

Kilburg (2015) identified a number of specific biases that plagued the Hoffman Report. In October of 2015, he wrote to all of the major boards of APA calling for a scientific validation of the Report citing 9 specific biases he had identified (R. R. Kilburg, personal communication, October 14, 2015.) These were:

**a. Investigator bias** – the scope of the investigation as charged by the Board of Directors was deliberately formulated to narrow the range of the study and therefore the types of questions and the interpretation of evidence the Hoffman Team pursued and provided.

**b. Instruction bias** – similarly, the Board of Directors formally targeted areas and activities they wanted the Hoffman Team to focus upon. In the executive summary and body of the Report, the authors stated that they explicitly followed those instructions and produced exactly what the Board requested instead of conducting the kind of broadly useful investigation that would have informed policy, process, and procedures and not led to the kind of immediate political action taken by the Association's leaders.

**c. Anchoring bias and insufficient adjustment** – it is clear in the Hoffman Team's introduction to their report that they made no concerted effort to examine the charges they were given or determine alternative scenarios that could reasonably be hypothesized to explain the situations faced by the Association and adjust their methods accordingly (see analysis provide below). As was specifically stated in the Report, the Hoffman team was provided with a wide variety of alternative points of view and explanations of events, all of which they interpreted in terms of the charges given them by the Board of Directors. And in virtually every case in which the Hoffman Team interpreted the motives, means and contents of communication, and specific activities, they chose to

describe those sources of information in terms of the basic prosecutorial framework within which they had selected to operate.

It is equally clear from the preceding analysis, that the Hoffman team was specifically biased toward the “Critics” perspective as they conducted and wrote their Report. The Hoffman Report and subsequent communications (Recommendations to APA Council of Representatives and Board of Directors, Reisner & Stolz, July 21, 2015) were clearly influenced by the perspectives of the “Critics” who argued that APA Governance and Staff activities constituted illegal and unethical behavior. Since the Hoffman Report itself included virtually no information about such attitudes, beliefs, biases and how they may have influenced the actions of the Board of Directors, the Special Committee, or the subsequent processes that led to its publication, no one reading the Report or examining the actions of APA’s Board of Directors and Council of Representatives can deny the presence of the unstated nature of these biases.

**d. Overconfidence bias** – in their introduction to the Report, the Hoffman Team explicitly cited all of the aspects of the Association with which they were unfamiliar, the challenges of assimilating the huge archives of information they had to study, and the complexities of the situations the organization presented. Nevertheless, they stated with strong assurances that they had found the unqualified truth of the matters that they were asked to examine.

**e. Polarized thinking bias** – repeatedly in the body of the document, the Hoffman Team drove itself into a narrative form that had the “Critics” of the PENS Report and processes on one side of the events and military psychologists and their supporters (defenders) on the other. Within the first ten pages of the Report, it was clear to any reader within the

context of a-d above what the Team would report and that they had determined who were the heroes and who were the villains – see above specifications of examples in the first eleven paragraphs of the Executive Summary of the Report and the deconstruction of the Report in historic terms.

**f. Confirmation bias** – when any investigator starts to collect data and then integrates it with biases to form hypotheses, explanations, and findings, they most often become perpetrators of the active process of then looking for evidence in the available data to support those initial expectations rather than carefully screening all data for its relevance to the events and questions under investigation. In my first essay on the Report (Kilburg, 2015), I pointed out that there were literally dozens of specific places in the document in which the Hoffman team selected specific pieces of emails to support their views.

Even worse, data were often presented or alluded to as confirming their take on events and their interpretations of motives of various individuals based on the 167 interviews they conducted with individuals (See Exhibit 3 for Examples). Despite calls from others and myself, the actual summaries of those interviews were never included in the Report. Nor have they been made public since, so that the assertions and allegations of the Hoffman team could be correlated with what people actually said during the interviews. Even worse than that, a small survey of 8 of the interviewees by this author revealed that no one was invited to have an attorney help them during this extra legal process and there was no court reporter contracted to collect an accurate record of the proceedings. Instead, attorneys from the Hoffman Team “took notes” during the proceedings. Later the Board of Directors was told that the Hoffman Team met and carefully reviewed their collective notes to assure themselves of the accuracy of what the

interviewees actually said, despite the fact that they had no objective record of those remarks.

In addition, no interviewee that I talked to or corresponded with was allowed to review the notes from their meetings nor were they permitted to correct the record that was used to draw conclusions. They were also not permitted to see a draft of the Report in advance or asked to comment on what the Hoffman Team alleged that they said in advance. When several of the individuals who were interviewed asked whether they should be represented by counsel, the Hoffman Team members explicitly discouraged them from taking advantage of such resources. Several reported to me that they were told “it would look bad if you brought your own attorney to the meeting.” Any such process or procedure introduced into a psychological experiment would be identified immediately by reviewers as unusable because of the inability to attest to the reliability or validity of the information thus obtained. Yet, here the Association stands, defending a contracted Report by lawyers in which not only the accuracy of information contained in the document but also the very existence of such data can legitimately be called into question.

This is the same problem of the wholesale fabrication of research data that has repeatedly come to light over time and in many domains of science. When such processes and deliberate fabrications are brought to light, every scientific body takes immediate action to check and double check every aspect of such studies. And when errors and fabrications are discovered, those investigations and findings are rescinded and the professionals involved are sanctioned appropriately. The scientists who are so challenged are expected to immediately offer their raw data and every method and

process they used in the conduct of their research to public scrutiny. APA has moved systematically in the opposite direction. The data being questioned are being withheld deliberately from the members of the Association, the scientific community, and the public at large despite the specific requirement for making such documentation available provided in the APA Ethical Standard 6.01. Keep in mind that I am not accusing the Hoffman Team of fabrication. I am saying that in the absence of defensible record keeping, such questions cannot be factually answered either by the Sidley Law firm or by APA's leaders.

**g. Attribution bias** – in dozens of places in the Report, the Hoffman team used quotes from these alleged notes or quotes from selected emails to make specific attributions about the motivations of individuals. In the vast majority of these attributions made about the villains (defenders) identified by the Hoffman team, the worst possible interpretation of events was most often made, and it nearly always was in the direction of supporting the initial charge to the Hoffman Team by the Board of Directors to look for evidence of collusion as advocated by the “Critics.” A striking number of these attributions were tied to footnotes referencing the interviews described above, yet no specific data were ever provided from any of the interviews. And as stated above in fact, the Board of Directors, after consultations with Mr. Hoffman and their litigation lawyers, have explicitly declared that these notes and research records would never be made available under the dubious claim of client privilege and attorney work product. This also flies directly in the face of the APA Ethics Code (1210) governing research reports, findings, and record keeping, Standard 6.01 (2) allowing for the replication of research design and analysis.

---

**h. Demonization and Negative Labeling** - The Hoffman Team deliberately introduced and consistently utilized the most pejorative and negative terminology possible when referring to deliberations by the PENS group and subsequent reviews of various bodies within APA of Ethical Standards 1.02 and 1.03 dealing with conflicts psychologists experience in balancing the requirements of adhering to the Ethical Principles and Standards and those of laws, regulations, and governing legal authorities and organizational demands. Specifically, the Hoffman Team adopted the term “Nuremberg Defense” – a phrase introduced and consistently advocated by what the Hoffman Team repeatedly referred to as the “critics” of the PENS Report and processes - in virtually every comment or allusion to the challenges involved, thus invoking a conscious association between those individuals working as operational psychologists and in other roles in the Department of Defense and the Security Agencies of the U.S. Government and Nazi’s tried by the allies after the Second World War as war criminals. The use of that terminology was repeated deliberately and for effect and created in the mind of any reader the impression that the group of individuals who were identified as the villains (defenders) were every bit as guilty for what they had done as the Nazi’s leading up to and during the Holocaust. And this was done despite specific education of the Hoffman Team by any number of the people they interviewed about the complexity and difficulties faced by virtually every professional psychologist in trying to balance the demands of interpreting and enacting the APA Ethical Principles and Standards in such situations, including those who work as full time private practice psychotherapists, school psychologists, counseling psychologists who practice in institutional settings, consulting psychologists, and health service providers working in private and governmental



institutions. It was frankly one of the most remarkable and egregious types of bias introduced by the Hoffman Team.

**I. Deontological Ethics** - In a number of places in the document in which the Hoffman Team dealt further with the allegation that the PENS work group, APA staff, and members of APA governance were involved in detailed, complex, and nuanced considerations of the requirements of managing the commitments to the Ethics Code in national security interrogations, they introduced the terminology of deontologically based ethical principles (Jost & Wuerth, 2011; MacIntyre, 2008). This is highly technical language based in the ethics branch of philosophy. Its standard utilization is in the explanation of responsibilities according to the basic parameters of Immanuel Kant who called for increasingly clear and detailed specification of the duties of individuals to God, the Church, and their fellow humans.

External ethics consultants were interviewed and cited at several places in the document. Every one of these references and citations called for increased specificity of APA's Ethical Principles and Standards. In no place in the document could I find even a reasoned explanation of the opposite point of view – virtue ethics or reasonably derived and flexible, normative ethical principles – much of which serves as the bedrock for the current Code of Ethos. In addition, the Hoffman Team failed to explain that the deontological or Kantian School of ethical thought is but one point of view within the philosophy of ethics and duty. The Report thus specifically and deliberately introduced a unique kind of technical and philosophical prejudice into their arguments by the explicit exultation of tighter Kantian and Christian oriented standards with the simultaneous demonization of Standards 1.02 and 1.03 by consistently associating those standards with

Nazi terminology and imagery. At no point in those sections of the Report was the Introduction and Applicability section of the 2010 Ethical Principles referenced or even mentioned. In the next to the last paragraph of that section, the following guidance can be found:

---

The modifiers used in some of the standards of this Ethics Code (e.g., *reasonably*, *appropriate*, *potentially*) are included in the standards when they would (1) allow professional judgment on the part of psychologists, (2) eliminate injustice or inequality that would occur without the modifier, (3) ensure applicability across the broad range of activities conducted by psychologists, or (4) guard against a set of rigid rules that might be quickly outdated. As used in this Ethics Code, the term reasonable means the prevailing professional judgment of psychologists engaged in similar activities in similar circumstances, given the knowledge the psychologist had or should have had at the time.(p 2).

---

Unfortunately, that letter and call for scientific validation led to a response from APA's Board of Directors that did not speak specifically to that request. Rather than addressing the issues of bias, lack of scientific validity, and the publication of a Report in which significant gaps in documentary evidence had been identified, the Board, after consultations with two members of the law firm WilmerHale that they had contracted with for outside litigation counsel and with Mr. Hoffman himself, declared "While APA could ask Sidley to waive its interests in the notes and provide them to APA for disclosure and waiver of privilege, such action would be contrary to Mr. Hoffman's advice, as well as that of Wilmer Hale." (APA Board of Directors, personal

communication, October, 2015). This written statement thus demonstrated the Board of Directors deliberate choice to ignore their own Ethical Standards in favor of legal advice designed to protect them from litigation anticipated as a result of its own actions.

### **Some Missing Lines of Historical and Factual Importance**

Based on White's methodology and this assessment of significant biases, a number of alternative lines of research that the Board of Directors could and should have conducted can easily be seen. I suggested several of these in my previous essay (Kilburg, 2015). Clearly missing from the Hoffman Report were any systematic efforts to examine, analyze, and draw conclusions about are at least the following areas.

- 
1. The detailed history and analysis of documentation of the efforts of the "Critics" to influence APA, outside organizations, and members of the public media, especially James Risen of the New York Times. Without such information, it is virtually impossible to ascertain whether the pressure put upon APA's Board of Directors from 2002 until now was a reflection of legitimate, externally generated concerns or merely part of the concerted advocacy of a small group of APA members determined to pay any price to push APA in the directions they advocated (Stolz, personal communication, July 29, 2016).
  2. The detailed history and analysis of documentation of the communications between the "Critics" and members of the 2014 and 2015 APA Boards of Directors (Harvey, personal communication, July 29, 2016). This especially goes to the emails and phone records of the leadership of the organization titled *Psychologists for Social Responsibility* and members of

APA governance. The Hoffman Report provided samples of communications between some of those individuals and members of APA governance and staff. But, I could only find examples of such communications that fit nicely into the lines of narrative and legal argument specified by the Hoffman Team in their Executive Summary as constituting the truth of the matter. And keep in mind, that I make no claim that such contacts and advocacy efforts were in any way untoward or out of bounds. APA historically has always operated through such processes and procedures. However, the Hoffman Report specifically focused on and declared that such advocacy efforts by military and national security psychologists were both out of bounds and explicitly nefarious in their form, content, and frequency (Harvey, personal communication, July 29, 2016).

3. Systematic efforts by military and security psychologists to change the intent and content of the Bush administration's legal and policy frameworks for the conduct of interrogations were virtually undocumented by the Hoffman Team. Subsequent reports were provided by Banks, Dunivin, James, and Newman (2015) and Harvey, et. al. (2015). They noted that the Hoffman Team was specifically informed of these efforts during the interviews conducted during the investigation, but that the story was virtually ignored by that Team. Of particular note, the policy changes that military and security psychologists worked diligently to put in place were adopted in 2006 shortly after the PENS Report was filed and operated upon

by APA governance. Nine years later, the Hoffman Team deleted these accomplishments from their Report and through their selective use and analysis of data came to conclusions that were unsound at best and deliberately discriminatory at worst.

4. The absence of any detailed analysis of the conflicting ideologies in play within the APA and APA governance in general regarding the nature and causes of war, the policies and procedures or their absence for APA's involvement in the wars of the United States and in the defense of the nation, and a specification of the organizational and individual advocates of the different approaches. Instead, the Report offered a very abbreviated and succinct overview of some of those matters and an apology for not being able to go into any more depth.
5. The absence of any comparative analysis of staff efforts to support advocates of various perspectives on matters that have come before APA governance. The heart of the Hoffman Report's analysis and findings was that collusion occurred between members of APA staff and members of the Department of Defense during and after the PENS process. But, no comparisons were offered of other advocacy initiatives within APA in any historical sense. Thus, there is no reasonable way to draw a conclusion as to whether the efforts described in such detail in the Report were in any way special or significant in the history of APA staff supporting the work of APA governance.

6. The absence of any data or analysis concerning the supervision of APA Central Office Staff by the Executive Team, Board of Directors, or Chairs of important committees such as the Ethics group. The major focus of the Report hinged on the work of APA staff member Stephen Behnke, the APA Ethics Director during the time investigated. Much was made of his specific activities in drafting notes and summaries of meetings and various policies that were ultimately moved through APA Governance, and his email communications regarding these activities. The case was made repeatedly that these actions were motivated by goals and attitudes that were underhanded at best and malign at worst. Yet, we have no comparisons of his work with that of other Central Office staff members on other matters of significance. We have no evidence that the Hoffman Team even asked questions of APA Executive Leaders and committee and board members whether the Ethics Director undertook such activity on his own initiative, at the direction and delegation of governance or executive staff, or in collaboration with those individuals. Without such information, it is impossible for anyone to assess whether Dr. Behnke's efforts were in or outside of the organization's normal operating procedures.
7. There was no analysis of the history or policies of the United Nations regarding terrorism or the management of non-uniformed combatants as prisoners of war provided. There was no analysis of the Geneva Accords on those matters. There was no analysis of United Nations policies regarding the conduct of Israel or the Palestinians or any other conflict

around the globe in which terrorism was being confronted and combated by legitimate and sovereign nation states. In the absence of such analysis, APA's Council of Representatives adopted a Resolution almost wholly dependent on the status of the United Nations. In no place in that Resolution was any mention made that the United Nations can undertake no security operation or any other activity of importance without the support of the five permanent members of its Security Council. Two of those members, Russia and China are legendary in their consistent violation of international standards on human rights, yet, now, every APA member is obligated to observe the United Nations and its Security Council as the authority in these matters.

8. No analysis of the historical or contemporary policies and activities of the United States Government or of the applicable laws, rules, and regulations on terrorism or the conduct of war was even attempted. These are the actual laws, regulations, and rules that citizens of the United States are obligated to obey. Especially salient are the applicable sections of the United States Code of Military Conduct that governs the actions of all uniformed personnel of the Department of Defense and many of its civilian employees in regard to their treatment of prisoners of war and related detainees. As described above, those policies and procedures were modified in 2005 with the substantial involvement of military psychologists who were members of APA.

In summary, when any deep analysis of the Hoffman Report is undertaken it is easy to see what was put in and why, what was left out with no declaration of intentions, and the explicit, intended results that were thus achieved. Regardless of these flaws and despite many public calls for APA Governance to slow down, carefully examine itself and what had been undertaken on behalf of the entire membership, in August of 2015 the Council of Representatives leapt into action and its Board of Directors has conducted a whirlwind of activities following up on the Resolutions adopted at that meeting.

### **APA Ethics Code and Research**

If all of the above were not damning enough, one must only turn to the APA's Code of Ethics governing the conduct of research – Standard 8 – for additional perspectives on just how out of bounds the Hoffman Report and processes were and continue to be. Even a rudimentary review of those standards reveals just how aberrant the Board of Directors behavior has been from the very start. Briefly, it is fair to call into question whether the activities and decisions of the Board and their Special Committee following the actions taken at their December 2014 meeting to conduct an investigation were ever even considered to be subject to the Association's ethical policies regarding research. If the Board and Special Committee had declared that such was the case, it would be clear from their communications. They have been silent on such matters. One can only assume that this void is indicative of the fact that those individuals literally rushed to judgment and action repeatedly without even a thought about the ethical aspects of their own choices and behaviors. What follows are several specific ethical concerns about the Hoffman Report and associated processes that can be readily seen in light of Section 8 of the Ethical Code.



1. Standard 8.01 requires that institutional approval is required for research proposals. This is especially the case when the investigation requires human participation. APA conducts research routinely and its members are legendary for their involvement in the development and use of Institutional Review Boards to insure that those involved in investigations are protected. There is no evidence that anyone associated with the Hoffman Report thought that this should be done and no evidence that such an approval was sought or given.
2. Even worse, Standard 8.02 requires, in conformity with Standard 3.01, that psychologists inform participants on at least eight separate issues before any research effort is undertaken and that the participants explicitly give their consent to such activities. The number of violations of this standard by the Board and the Hoffman Team is simply extraordinary. No consent process was documented by the Board, their Special Committee, or the Hoffman Team. The Report itself provides no information on consent procedures, nor do the six volumes of supporting information provided when the Report was published. Most egregious is the explicit order by the Board that all staff members were required to be interviewed, to provide any and all material support to the Hoffman Team, and could not bring their own Counsel to the interviews. As documented above, when some of the staff and other interviewees asked whether they should be represented, they were deliberately deceived. They were told that it would not look good and were reassured about the “friendly” nature of the proceedings. History has proven that those communications were lies. Senior staff were fired based in part on the remarks that were attributed to them during their interviews.

- A number of members of APA governance had their public and professional reputations severely sullied as a result of their interviews. Several of them were required to step down from prestigious positions in the governance of other organizations as a result of their interviews. And still others had significant problems with their employment occur as a result of their interviews. The rhetoric flowing back and forth over the past year would appear to indicate that the “Critics” believe that these “defenders” have gotten their just deserts (see the Reisner and Stoltz Recommendations to the Board of Directors, July 21, 2015). However, Standard 8.02 specifically requires that anyone participating in any investigation be informed of such potential consequences and consent to them. APA’s Board and Special Committee simply did not do this. Standard 8.05 permits dispensing with informed consent under several conditions. The first states, “where research would not reasonably be assumed to create distress or harm” (p.10). It is completely unreasonable to suggest that the Board and Special Committee could not have foreseen that this effort would cause both distress and harm, yet they made no effort to prevent such from happening as Standards 8.02 and 3.01 explicitly require.
3. Standard 8.04 specifically requires psychologists to protect subordinates who participate in research from “adverse consequences of declining or withdrawing from participation” (p.10). This was not done. Staff were forced to participate and not told that they could be fired and their professional and personal reputations severely compromised as a result.

4. Standard 8.07 states explicitly, “psychologists do not deceive prospective participants about research that is reasonably expected to cause physical pain or severe emotional distress” (p.11). In addition, the standard requires that when “research efforts have harmed a participant, they take reasonable measures to minimize the harm.(p.11). The Hoffman Team, under the specific supervision of the APA Board of Directors and its Special Committee appears to have made no effort to follow this standard. More importantly, the Board and Council of Representatives have virtually ignored any and all calls for them to take ameliorative action or to hold themselves accountable for the impacts of what their actions have caused. They have hidden behind the external litigation firm that they have employed to protect them on these matters. The fact that the APA Ethics Committee reports to this Board of Directors raises serious questions about whether these leaders can and will be held accountable for their behaviors over the past two years
5. Standard 8.10 requires psychologists not to fabricate data and standard 5.01a requires them to avoid false or deceptive statements. If significant errors are discovered they are required to take reasonable steps to correct such errors. APA’s Board of Directors have not only ignored repeated calls to provide scientific validation of the Hoffman Report’s findings and conclusions, they have taken explicit and detailed steps to ensure that a significant portion of the data upon which that Report was based be withheld from any person or organization seeking to validate those results. Their letter declaring that the notes from the

- interviews conducted were confidential stands in glaring conflict with the requirements of their own Ethical Standards.
6. Standard 8.14 requires that “psychologists do not withhold the data upon which their conclusions are based from other competent professionals who seek to verify the substantive claims through reanalysis and who intend to use such data only for that purpose...”(p. 12). Psychologists who request such data may use it only for those purposes. My (2015) calls for independent scientific validation of the Hoffman Report was fully in keeping with this standard. Outside of one member of APA’s central office staff declining to support such a request, no one even bothered to respond to my letter (D. Graham, personal communication, November 24, 2015).

Any reasonable reading of the APA Ethical Code (2010) also requires an examination of the Principles that provide a generic behavioral framework within and through which the Code is intended to be taught, interpreted, and used. The five Principles are intended to be aspirational and to “guide and inspire psychologists toward the very highest ethical ideals of the profession” (p. 3). The Principles are beneficence and nonmaleficence, fidelity and responsibility, integrity, justice, and respect for people’s rights and dignity. The foregoing sections of this Essay logically and conclusively raise significant questions whether APA’s Board of Directors and its Special Committee can be said to have conducted this entire matter in full and complete compliance with these Principles. At its best, the Hoffman Report and related processes have proven to have been an expensive, controversial, and

incomplete effort by APA governance to solve a long standing ideological and political conflict within the organization and components of its membership.

Psychologists who practice as health service providers and those who study peace and human conflict as the centerpiece of their academic pursuits have every right to question their colleagues who are involved in matters of national defense and security, public safety, forensics, and corrections. They have the responsibility to challenge vociferously and advocate their perspectives. Their colleagues have an equal right to defend their work, their motivations, the scientific and professional foundations of same, and have the responsibility to do so. Both groups have the mutual obligation to do so in accordance with the historical traditions, culture, practices, and policies of the Association. The history of the Association over the past fourteen years demonstrates many efforts on the part of both groups to do this. Prior to 2014 and 2015, those efforts had largely been confined to the traditional processes and procedures of the organization. James Risen's book and those who may have contributed to its publication (Harvey, personal communication, July 29, 2016) shifted the political and psychological equilibrium that had held during those years. Even if that status was punctuated by frequent rounds of open and specific conflict, no unusual activities were pursued by APA governance prior to 2014. For its own and only partially documented reasons, the 2014 Board of Directors decided that what had been done was no longer sufficient. No complete documentation of their deliberations has been forthcoming. APA members have only the explanation provided by the Special Committee in their communication regarding the

employment of the Sidley Team. It was incredibly brief and one sided (see the opening sections of this Essay).

The previous Essay by Kilburg (2015) raised deep and serious questions about the Hoffman Report, the processes used, and what was missing. This Essay leads to a legitimate and what I believe will be an enduring question for the organization. Did the APA Board of Directors in 2014, 2015, and 2016 in its efforts to address these long standing ideological and political conflicts either intentionally or inadvertently violate every one of the Ethical Principles of the Association? The foregoing analysis provided in this Essay should raise significant concerns for every APA member regarding these matters. Here are some specific issues to contemplate.

A. Beneficence and nonmaleficence

- a. The Report and Processes have consumed millions of dollars of APA's reserves, significantly in excess of what was ever explicitly authorized by the Council of Representatives.
- b. Significant and extensive harm to a number of APA members and staff have been documented as a result of the Hoffman Report and processes and how they have been managed.
- c. The rights of APA members and staff were insufficiently protected throughout the process.
- d. No disclosures of the political or ideological positions of the members of the APA Board of Directors or of its Special Committee have ever been provided that may have influenced their judgment on all matters relevant to the conflict regarding psychologists involvement in interrogations and

other aspects of national defense and security, public safety, or corrections.

#### B. Fidelity and Responsibility

- a. The Special Committee contracted for and supervised the Sidley Team throughout the entire process. They managed the communication of the findings. The Board of Directors presumably provided oversight to their Committee. The number of procedural mistakes, oversights, and errors in judgment involved in these efforts have been documented by multiple sources. The management of this initiative has been amateurish at best and at worst profoundly incompetent.
- b. APA's Board of Directors and Special Committee were explicitly responsible to conduct any and every investigation that they initiated according to the Association's Ethical Standards for the conduct of research. As described above, many of those standards were explicitly violated by the Hoffman Team and the Special Committee. Those violations have been publicly ignored or worse, defended by the Board by the use of the most flimsy of legal defenses. APA owns any and all of the information generated by the Hoffman Team during its investigation. The Sidley organization does not own the privilege for this information. APA members do. This Principle requires psychologists to establish "relationships of trust with those with whom they work" (p.3). In situations in which there is intense, long term political, professional, and interpersonal conflict between members or groups of members, APA

governance is duty bound to provide everyone a fair hearing, open access to processes and procedures, equal levels of expenditures of resources designed to advocate, support, or defend one side or another, and to strive for reasonable, long-term solutions to such problems. Historically, APA governance has deliberately avoided any effort to regulate the efforts of specific groups of psychologists in how they choose to practice. APA's Board of Directors and Council of Representatives have broken this commitment, taken sides, and opened the doors for a virtually endless series of conflicts over what its members are permitted to pursue in the global marketplace. The Board and the Council have broken trust with military, security, forensic, public safety, corrections, and virtually all other groups of general applied psychologists through their actions and statements on these matters.

### C. Integrity

- a. The foregoing documentation in this essay that at a minimum raises significant and justifiable questions regarding the accuracy, honesty, and truthfulness of the Hoffman Report cannot be denied. APA governance cannot hide behind the legal fiction of privilege. APA is a scientific organization first and foremost. It was founded initially to promote the science of psychology. It publishes the premier psychological journals in the world. Through PsychINFO and its Board of Scientific Affairs, it is the keeper of the scientific and professional knowledge base of the discipline, representing the life work of going on nine generations of



psychologists around the world. In its efforts to adjudicate this conflict, APA governance has created profound public challenges to its integrity. Any effort to keep the data the Sidley team collected and reported on out of the hands of objective, scientific hands will only lead to even deeper problems in the future.

- b. It has been reported that individual members of APA's Board of Directors have already come under ethical scrutiny (Christina Harms personal communication, June 13, 2016). Without substantial and active efforts to evaluate and perhaps even retrace some of the steps they have taken, it may be inevitable that more leaders will face such challenges.

#### D. Justice

- a. If even a portion of the questions this and Kilburg's (2015) Essay are validated by independent observation and study, it will be clear that the Hoffman Team, the Special Committee, members of APA's Board of Directors and Council of Representatives, and other APA members have not treated many of their colleagues justly. From the way in which the investigation was formulated, to how interviews were not documented, to how APA staff were forced to participate, to the lies told by the Sidley team to interviewees that the process was meant to be a friendly effort to find out what really happened, to the leaking of the Report itself first to members of the "Critics" constituency and then to the press, to the unwillingness of the Board or Council to slow down the rush to judgment and action to permit APA's own Boards and Committees to examine and

comment of the Report, to the decision to declare the interview notes privileged, to the re-engagement of Mr. Hoffman to address serious questions about the reliability and validity of his Team's findings and conclusions, and the legal maneuvering to limit even the type and extent of conversations they are willing to have with military psychologists and others who have raised significant questions about what has transpired, APA governance has raised and will continue to raise significant and lasting concerns about its competency to lead these efforts. The three members of the Board's Special Committee were all clinical psychologists. Two of them work as faculty members in academic medical centers. One is a private practicing clinician. What experience any one of them has in designing and conducting complex, historically informed, politically and ideological charged studies of organizational processes and procedures that have profound legal and ethical importance for the discipline of psychology has not yet been either been called into question or explored publicly. Without substantial progress in exploring the scientific validity of the Hoffman Report, it may be inevitable that such inquiries are demanded.

E. Respect for people's rights and dignity

- a. This Principle requires psychologists to respect the dignity and worth of all people. It specifies that they must work at being aware of their biases and to eliminate the effect of them on what they do. Again, if only a portion of the biases of identified in this essay prove to be accurate, then it

may become clear that there has been no significant or sustained effort within APA's governance structure to openly question their biases with regard to various domains of practice by general applied psychologists. Many of the public statements and documents of the Association emphasize that the organization serves to advance and protect their health service provider members. The majority of the "Critics" who have identified themselves are health service psychologists, especially those from the Divisions of Psychoanalysis and Counseling Psychology. The vast majority of the members of APA's Council of Representatives who voted for the Resolutions in August of 2015 were health service providers. All three members of the Special Committee were health service providers. Just who has been asked or assigned to protect the rights and dignity of military psychologists or general applied psychology during these deliberations and procedures? No one! One of the biggest problems with bias is that it is often unconscious and based on preferences long conditioned into the individuals who possess it. This Principle commits every member of the Association to acknowledge the presence of such preferences and biases in themselves and to work assiduously to surface them. Only then can active steps be undertaken to prevent them from knowingly participating in or condoning activities based on these prejudices.

Kilburg (2012) made a significant distinction between the issue of what organizational and leadership strategy consists of and how it is pursued. This draws the

attention of any serious scholar or practitioner to the question of ends and means. It is clear that for whatever undocumented reasons they had, the 2014 APA Board of Directors believed that the organization faced a significant crisis in public relations and what one could consider as the credibility of the Association. Its decisions in these matters were therefore aimed at addressing these perceived problems. So much for the ends, the what, of the Hoffman Report and processes.

Everyone outside of the members of that Board remains in the dark regarding the details of those deliberations with the exception of the choice to appoint a Special Committee and to conduct an investigation of the allegations made by Risen (2014) and the aforementioned “Critics.” No one besides those three individuals and those whom they consulted know what alternatives were considered. We don’t know actually if anyone served as consultants to that small group or whether they themselves decided on an extra legal process. We don’t know if they consulted their own Ethics Committee regarding how such an initiative could be undertaken within the confines of APA policies on such matters. We don’t know if they consulted the Board of Scientific Affairs, their own research staff, or the wide variety of globally recognized experts in this type of investigation who are among the members of the Association. We do know what they did and how in some detail. And what we know raises profound and serious questions about the competence, motivations, and performance of these individuals in their leadership positions. If my assessment of the ethical implications of what has transpired is even a fraction of what has been described above, these senior leaders have some very, very serious matters to consider personally. It remains to be seen whether additional

efforts are undertaken to determine whether the judgment of other members of APA governance may be examined.

### **Implicit Models of Geopolitical and Ideological Belief at Issue and the Future of General Applied Psychology in APA**

The Hoffman Resolution in essence states that there is no legitimate role for psychologists to play in the interrogations of prisoners of war or non-uniformed detainees other than that of a health care provider. In so doing, the Association has taken a serious and extraordinarily significant direction in the history of the practice of psychology. As discussed elsewhere in this essay, this decision represents a total reversal of previous APA policies regarding professional practice. The total domination of APA's Council of Representatives by health service psychologists (HSPs) now means that there cannot and will not be any way for general applied psychologists (GAPs) or military psychologists to reverse this policy until and unless a significant number of the HSPs decide to change their minds. The size of the vote of the Council of Representatives masked this a vital change in direction, because rather than specify this as a one time and unique event, the formal statement of the Resolution unofficially declares that any group of critics can now legitimately and openly call into question the practices of another group. Anyone of a serious mind regarding these matters can only look at the ongoing historical controversies within psychology on standards for practice and see these consequences continuing to play out within clinical and counseling psychology and virtually every other domain regarding the scientific evidence and ideological beliefs supporting the specific activities of professional psychologists.

The ideological dominance of health service psychology is largely implicit and rests in the numbers of members of the Council of Representatives with such training, education, and economic interests. Ironically, this represents an historical reversal from the three decades prior to and following the Second World War during which academic psychologists of various types were in the majority. During those years, the HSPs often complained bitterly about this domination. The fights between those constituencies eventually led to the decision on the part of many academic psychologists to resign from APA membership and start a separate organization, the Association for Psychological Science, that now has thousands of members, publishes its own journals, holds its own professional meetings, and competes directly with APA on virtually every professional and scientific front. The constitution of the Special Committee of only HSPs, the fact that majority of the “critics” themselves are HSPs, and that the membership of the Council is completely skewed demonstrates the inherent political and ideological power of this dominant group of APA members. They have now used this dominance to outlaw an area of professional practice by military psychologists with not one shred of scientific evidence to support their positions. The “Critics” stand completely upon ideological ground that they can defend well with their political dominance of the Association. The question that naturally arises for any area of science and practice outside of the normal arenas of the HSPs is, “how long will it take until they turn their attention to us?”

As the metahistorical analysis suggested at the beginning of this Essay, there are many other levels of implicit and explicit beliefs that have been revealed. While claiming no unique expertise in the arena of geopolitics or political philosophy, I would like to raise a set of additional observations for consideration in this domain.

Mearsheimer (2001) provided an intense and dense overview of great power politics at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. He embedded his analysis in the long-term historical conflict between the liberal and the realist positions of scholars and practitioners of international relations. Liberals within their optimistic traditions believe that reason must be employed to improve the world thereby making it safer. The three core components of their approach are that nation states are the main structures in geopolitics, that the internal characteristics of states vary widely and that those aspects have very real effects on their external behavior, and that democratically organized states are inherently better than those operated in a different way. Good democratic states pursue collaborative and cooperative strategies for mutual improvement while bad other states tend to choose conflict between states and lean heavily on force to achieve their ends. The beliefs also include the ideas that strong economic interdependence makes fights less likely, that democratic states do not go to war against each other, and that calculations about power do not inherently explain the behavior of good states. Some liberals advocate consistently for the development of and commitment to international institutions as a means to increase collaboration and cooperation and thereby reduce the possibilities of war – see the foregoing analyses.

Realists are pessimists and see security-based competition and war as inevitable. Their beliefs also agree with liberals that states are the major players. However, they believe that great power, nation states are largely driven by the realities of their external environments not by their internal structures or beliefs and values. They tend not to draw major distinctions between good and bad states. Great powers - nation states - are primarily concerned with assessments of relative power between them and they compete

with each other in many ways. While collaboration and cooperation may be part of their relationships, the primary foundation for every consideration is that of the underlying competition between them for domination of the international scene. Realists see the world in terms of the will to power within and between leadership groups. If dominance cannot be achieved, then they naturally seek the relative security of a balance of power largely through alliances with similarly minded states.

Measheimer went on to suggest that America tends to lean hard in the liberal direction because its fundamental tenants align with many of the core beliefs of its citizens and the ideological principles enshrined in the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution. In such a state, power politics, the pursuit of national advantage over all other considerations is considered objectionable by most of the political elite and the population at large. He made clear the difference between what he calls offensive and defensive realism. He clarified that offensive realists believe that states are all inherently aggressive and must pursue power relentlessly in order to guarantee their security. Defensive realists do not believe that states are inherently aggressive. Rather, they must pursue such power as is necessary and however reluctantly to defend themselves as a means of survival.

Within this framework and that provided by the metahistorical analysis above, it is quite easy to see that the “Critics” of APA and its military, national security, public safety, forensic, and corrections members are profound and deep practitioners of the liberal tradition in international relations. Major parts of their historical advocacy in these matters have been based on their objections to the decisions of the Bush administration to invade both Afghanistan and Iraq. Impotent in their ability to change



those choices, their focus narrowed when the policies and practices of that administration came to light and revealed a slew of abuses in the treatment of prisoners of war and non-uniformed detainees, and the fact that some psychologists were involved in those situations in various ways. Their advocacy became loud, public, and long term.

Using Mearsheimer's analysis along with White's, it can be simply stated that the "Critics" position is clearly liberal in its intents and practices. The structure and content of the Hoffman Report is definitively supportive of these perspectives. If there was no doubt in anyone's mind, the Hoffman Resolution itself commits all of APA's members to the policies of the United Nations and other external groups, including those of organized medicine and makes the ideology unmistakable. There is nothing inherently wrong with an organization taking an ideologically informed position on any matter it deems important. However, it seems both wise and just that those ideologies should be debated publicly and members be given a choice as to whether they support or oppose such positions.

To my knowledge, APA has never undertaken an analysis of international politics, the relationships between nation states, what constitutes a just war, or how the members of the organization should conduct themselves or think about such matters as a matter of organizational policy. Prior to the Hoffman Report and Resolution, there had been some efforts to make explicit the commitment of the organization to the United Nations via the adoption of other policy statements and its working relationships with some of the units of that Institution. However, no member of the Association has to my knowledge pledged its allegiance to the U. N. nor have they been forced to do so as APA members as the Hoffman Resolution explicitly now requires. And in the absence of any

explicit policy guidance on the larger matters at hand, members cannot within reason comprehend what they are being asked to believe yet alone the proper way to behave as a matter of APA's now required political adherence to an explicitly liberal ideological stance. A logical extension of the Hoffman Resolution would be that all APA members now be require to take some sort of loyalty oath to its Council of Representatives in these matters and that such declarations would be made public.

When combined, the HSPs dominance of the governance of APA and the actions of the Council of Representatives regarding the Hoffman Report and Resolution now raise the explicit question as to whether the ideological foundations of the organization have shifted significantly. Specifically, the organization's leaders appear to have adopted a stance that implies that psychologists' primary role in the world of practice is that of a health care practitioner who takes no action in the conflicts affecting the United States other than that of healer. While that may well be a clear and accurate description of what other health care professions like medicine and nursing have traditionally embraced, it is neither historically accurate nor acceptable to thousands of current APA members who are not health service providers nor are they followers of a liberal ideology when it comes to the well being and status of the country. To such members, many of whom are GAPs. the beliefs, activities, and actions undertaken by the "Critics" and those who support them represent a primary challenge to their identities as psychologists and as citizens. This liberal, health care provider stance explicitly makes no room for much if not most of general applied psychology as it is currently practiced in defense, national security, public safety, forensic, and correctional roles. The haste and short sightedness of the deliberations of the summer of 2015 made such implications

hazy at best and deliberately hidden at worst. Subsequent advocacy statements by members of the PSR coalition and others have made their general intention clear. They seek to eliminate psychology's roles in such endeavors. If such intents and actions are not reversed, it is inevitable that even larger and more long-term conflicts will arise between HSPs and GAPs.

Two additional perspectives are useful here. First, the "Critics" offer no reasonable explanation of their ideology and underlying motives other than psychologists should not be engaged in torture. However, APA policy has been clear on that matter for three decades. What transpired last August was that APA went from declaring torture out of bounds to stating that any involvement in national security interrogations by its members other than providing health care services was now considered unethical. It is impossible to ignore this tremendous and successful extension of the advocacy efforts by the "Critics." Military and national security psychologists now must face the challenges of not just doing their work in dangerous and virtually impossible circumstances, they now know the reality that their national professional organization can declare that the lawful pursuit of their duties to the government of the United States is unethical with potentially long term consequences for themselves, their careers, and their families. Torture and interrogations are not synonymous. Yet, APA governance has now conflated the two.

Bobbitt (2002, 2009) offered a very comprehensive set of studies of the history of western warfare, international law and relations, and the current global conflicts in which the United States finds itself. There is no way to summarize his work succinctly.

However, there are several themes in his work that I believe can significantly illuminate APA's current travails.

First, Bobbitt narrated the major wars of the last five hundred plus years in the west. He asserted that the fundamental purposes of those wars were to reach a decision about the correct way for humans to govern themselves. Virtually every major war ended in a peace process in which the combatants reached a legally binding set of agreements, a peace treaty, that determined who won, who lost, who owed whom what, the territory to be exchanged, and the governance of those territories in dispute. The last great treaty was signed more or less quietly in Europe at the end of the Cold War between the members of the European Union in NATO at the time, the United States, and Russia.

Second, he contended that the terms and conditions of each peace treaty set the starting conditions for the competition between states and thus the war that resulted. Wars were of different durations and fought with many different technologies. The comparative power of the combatants and their allies most often determined the outcomes.

Third, the Cold War that ran from the end of the Second World War through the early 1990's introduced new and horrendous technologies that had never been seen or used before, weapons of mass destruction. The presence of those weapons in the arsenals of major powers significantly reduced the likelihood of direct conflict between the military forces of those nation states. These weapons did not end war. They changed it in such a way so that major powers learned to engage each other through surrogates. Minor nation states learned that they could serve in this capacity under certain ways in alliances with major powers. Minor nation states have also continued to engage in direct

conflict under some conditions, but many of the world's most recent wars have been between the citizens within a variety of nations. These have been among the most bloody and horrid in human history, but they pale in comparison to the scope of the two world wars of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.

Fourth, national and international terrorism have flourished in these circumstances. Bobbitt (2009) provided an extensive history lesson on the variety and effects of terrorism practiced by governments and non-state actors. Some non-state actors are in reality, performing at the direction and with the support of sponsoring nations. Some of these actors are well known such as Hamas and Hezbollah in the Middle East. Others operate much more clandestinely.

Like conventional warfare with the threat of weapons of mass destruction, 21<sup>st</sup> Century terrorism now raises the explicit threat that state sponsored groups or independent organizations may acquire such instruments of destruction. Whereas the purposes of conventional warfare are to destroy an adversary's means of defending themselves or of making war in any way, thereby enforcing one's national will upon the other; the purposes of terrorism are to target innocent civilians and to demonstrate that the national government of the population so targeted cannot protect its own citizens. The impact then is less about ending a dispute or war and more about inflicting sufficient damage so as to undermine a government, weaken its will to resist in a conflict, and to thus gain a victory in changing either a government itself or its policies and practices.

Bobbitt suggested that what emerged in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century and continues into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century is not only about the traditional competition between nation states, but about the economic models and political ideologies they espouse. Thus, the wars of the 20<sup>th</sup>

Century pitted communism, fascism, and liberal democracies against each other through the activities of those nation states advocating those positions. In the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, Bobbitt proposed that the competition was evolving to be between three forms of capitalism and their national champions. Those forms can be found in the practices of the United States and the United Kingdom, the European Union, and the emerging BRIC countries – Brazil, Russia, India, and China (and extending to some of the Gulf states as well.) He suggested that missteps in relations between these nations, while possibly leading to conventional wars, were real but unlikely because of the potential horrors of exchanges of weapons of mass destruction. However, extensive uses of surrogates virtually guarantees that wars will continue far into the future. And, with some nation states like North Korea and Pakistan actually supplying technology for atomic and even nuclear weapons and long-range missiles to some minor states, many other countries now have the possibility of arming themselves and their surrogates all out of proportion in historic terms.

Fifth, and finally, Bobbitt (2009) discussed the particular challenges presented by other forms of ideological conflict including those based on religion. Humanity history is full of examples of wars fought for religious purposes. Within Bobbitt's reasoning, those wars are similar to all others. They end when one side defeats the other and one religion comes to dominate new territories. Starting explicitly in the 1980's with the conflict in Afghanistan, the United States developed and used Islamic forces to fight and defeat Russia, ultimately forcing its departure from that country. That undertaking then created the conditions for a civil war in Afghanistan that produced a radical form of Islamic state led by the Taliban. Supported by Saudi Arabia and other Sunni Arab

nations, the Taliban proceeded to house and support even more radical Islamic based forces that eventually launched attacks on the territory and people of the United States, Western Europe, Russia, and other countries. Nothing further need be said about these matters because we continue to live with the political, economic, ideological, military, and security consequence.

Bobbitt (2009) explicitly suggested that the world of the early 21<sup>st</sup> Century was on the way to dividing itself between nation states of consent and those of terror. In other words, those nations that eschewed the use of surrogates for the purposes of inflicting major damage on unarmed civilians for political ends and those that funded, trained, supported, and used groups for those purposes. While guarded in his prognosis about this situation, he advocated for states of consent to ally themselves and actively fight those that sponsored terror. He made the distinction between preemption, the use of force when an attack is imminent; preventative war, launching an attack not when actual threat is perceived but because it is viewed as inevitable; and preclusive intervention which requires the nations involved to make a public finding that the target state has undertaken explicit actions that compromise its sovereignty and by such actions presents a clear and present danger to other nations. He stated:

The wars against terror can indeed be won, but only if we have the imagination to recognize their novelty – for there has never been a war against terror before – and the fortitude to adopt these preclusive measures at home and abroad that will buttress the human rights for which we have fought many other wars (pps. 551-552).

Why you may ask are these matters relevant to the recent actions of APA regarding the Hoffman Report and its associated processes? It is because the ideological biases and preferences described above, if carried to their logical conclusion, would limit the roles of psychological science and practice in these wars of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century to those of health care providers and academic studies and advocates of peace making efforts. There is little to no imagination or foresight in the positions taken by the “Critics” who have so significantly undermined APA’s abilities to play important and creative roles in these conflicts. And those conflicts matter as events in France, Germany, and the United States itself over the last year demonstrate dramatically. For the United States and its long-term allies in Europe are clearly and specifically under attack by surrogates of nation states who are funding and sponsoring acts of terror. In my personal view, limiting psychology’s roles in such conflicts is irresponsible at best and borders on treason at worst.

What the “Critics” and the majority of APA governance have refused to recognize, even verbalize, yet alone engage is the real and prolonged threat to our country, all of its citizens, and all of those countries and people around the world who do not share the desire to live under an Islamic state. Lewis (2002) in his imaginative and extensive assessment of much of the history of Islam and its encounters with the West, provided an explicit and graphic statement of what we collectively face. He quoted the ideological leader of the Islamic group that assassinated President Anwar Sadat of Egypt on October 6, 1981 years after he led the only Middle East Peace initiative that has proven its ability to prevent war between Israel and one of its neighbors as follows:



Fighting the near enemy is more important than fighting the distant enemy. In *jihad* the blood of the Muslims must flow until victory is achieved. But the question now arises: is this victory for the benefit of the existing Islamic state, or is it for the benefit of the existing infidel regime? And is it a strengthening of the foundations of this regime which deviates from the law of God? These rulers only exploit the opportunity offered to them by the nationalist ideas of some Muslims, in order to accomplish purposes that are not Islamic, despite their outward appearance of Islam. The struggle of *jihad* must be under Muslim auspices and under Muslim leadership, and concerning this there is no dispute.

The cause of the existence of imperialism in the lands of Islam lies in these self-same rulers. To begin the struggle against imperialism would be a work that is neither glorious nor useful, but only a waste of time. It is our duty to concentrate on our Islamic cause, which means first and foremost establishing God's law in our own country, and causing the word of God to prevail. There can be no doubt that the first battlefield of the *jihad* is the extirpation of these infidel leaderships and their replacement by a perfect Islamic order. From this will come release.

This was written in 1956. The actions of APA from 2014 to 2016 cannot be divorced from these geopolitical implications and roots. APA is the global leader of psychological science and a set of practices that now penetrate virtually every nation on the planet. Declaring that the practice of psychology in situations involving warfare and other types on non-interpersonal conflict must be limited to the provision of therapeutic interventions is not only on its face but, in reality, absurd. Yet, this is now the explicit and declared intention of the "Critics." APA's Council of Representatives and its entire

governance structure must be systematically confronted regarding the nature of its ideological intentions in matters of the nation's and the public's defense and security. Every member, no matter what stance s/he takes in such matters is now and will continue to be profoundly affected by what the organization decides. Such considerations cannot be undertaken by small groups of "Critics" and their allies any more than they can be by the members of divisions and their leaders in particular domains of science and practice. Our collective future as a nation is tied to the conduct of the wars in which we find ourselves not the peace that we advocate and so rightfully desire.

### **The Opening Case Vignette and Additional Implications**

I started this essay with an imaginary case vignette focusing on a specific military action designed to capture individuals suspected of being involved in terrorist activities. The members of the U.S. special forces were depicted as being in uniform, using the policies, rules of engagement, equipment, and methods approved by the legal chain of command within the Department of Defense. The targeted individuals were abducted from their homes in an unnamed, foreign country within which terrorist organizations had been allowed to operate without government interdiction. The purposes of the operation were to locate, identify, and safely extract two individuals and transport them to a secret location for the conduct of intelligence interrogations.

The assumptions underlying the vignette are straight-forward. The United States, the nation states comprising the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and many other countries around the world are in a formally declared war with international terrorist organizations supported and funded by unnamed governments. The war is being fought by elements of the legitimate armed and security forces of the United States and its allies

and the irregular surrogates funded and supported by other countries. Those countries have not made a formal declaration of war against the U. S. and its allies. Those countries are dominated by Muslims still emerging from the carnage of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century partially created by themselves and partially created by the great powers of the West, including the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and others (Lewis, 2002.) However, their surrogates have formally declared war against us, and the Congress of the United States has authorized the President in his role as Commander in Chief to defend the country.

The War on Terror, as the United States calls it, and the Islamic *jihad* as the surrogates identify it, is a formally declared conflict between our country and transnational military and terrorist organizations. As such, there are formal sides, formal and informal rules of engagement, real expenditure of money, and real casualties among the combatants and among innocent civilians. The Islamic *jihadists* specifically target civilian populations for mass murder in order to literally terrify them and thereby achieve their intermediate objectives which include: achieving small engagement victories over Western countries and their populations, increasing their visibility and importance among those who support them in Muslim countries and populations, solidifying their credibility as an existential threat to the democratic West, and supporting their long-term strategy of restoring the dominance of Sharia Law and the Muslim way of life to all Muslim countries and eventually to the entire world. The U.S. and their allies' objectives have been less clear and somewhat varied. To be sure, they include: opposing the *jihadists* in all military, security, and public communications and policy venues, continuing to promote the values, beliefs, principles, and methods of democratic governance, and

protecting civilian and strategic assets in all of the aligned countries. We need not go further into a description of the War to date.

The purpose of the Vignette was to frame the Essay in the context of a legally declared War by the Government of the United States. A declaration that was made after the events of 9/11/2001 which everyone knows and understands was the first truly successful military action that produced casualties and destruction on the continental United States since the war with Mexico in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. Thousand of U.S. citizens died and billions of dollars in damages were inflicted. As everyone knows, the United States has been involved continuously in military and national security action against those *jihadist* forces since that time. The war has now been fought across a number of national boundaries, cost trillions of dollars, and produced hundreds of thousands of deaths and other types of casualties on both sides. Recent events in the United States and Western Europe demonstrate that the *jihadists* have continued to be a determined, strategic, and deadly enemy.

It is against this background that the ideology and actions of the PSR coalition and their various supporters must be evaluated. For all of the rhetoric and arguments put forth by those individuals and their organizations have focused consistently on the use of torture by U.S. armed and security forces against non uniformed detainees captured on battlefields and related geographic zones where much of the explicit combat of the War has taken place. The criticisms have been extensive, vocal, and sustained. The success of their advocacy work can be seen clearly in the Hoffman Report, processes, Resolution, and follow on activities. What has been totally absent from virtually all of these deliberations is the actual reality that our country is involved with real, sworn enemies in

a shooting war. The strategic intent of our enemies is to destroy our country and its current form of governance. Bobbitt (2002) made explicit that this is the fundamental purpose of all wars fought at least over the past six centuries. A deeper study of medieval and ancient history would, I suspect, validate his thesis. In such a view, the Islamic *jihad* works every day to end the American democratic experiment.

APA's actions of the past two years have never once included an examination of the War that we are in together as citizens. APA governance has spent not one dollar to examine the causes, nature, strategies, tactics, costs, or impacts of the War despite the fact that it is now at least 20 years old. For the attacks of 9/11 were not the first conducted on U.S. soil. Without such considerations, APA governance has stumbled and then actually run into what one could consider as a cul de sac with its focus on intelligence and security interrogations. It has been in denial about the rest of the War. It has seemingly been determined to remain blind and ignorant of the larger realities in front of all of us.

This led me to the title of this essay. APA Governance has refused to see the War and take account of all of its implications. To the extent that any deliberations have occurred, they have largely been in the context of the treatment of non-uniformed detainees and the role of psychologists in their interrogation. The actions of the Council of Representatives in August of 2015 would lead one to believe that the role of psychology in the entire War should be limited to that played by physicians and nurses, that of healers. That position violates virtually the entire history of APA and psychology in its support of the country during wartime. To be clear, psychology and psychologists have and have had much more to contribute to the defense of the nation than merely

working to prevent psychological casualties or care for those whom the war traumatizes or destroys mentally and emotionally. As vital and important as that role is, the first rule of warfare is to win. Nations deal with the aftermath of war whether they win or lose, but the definition of war crimes and the terms of the peace and type of governance to be used thereafter is left in the hands of the victors not the defeated.

Let me be as clear as I can be at this point. I believe that the work of the PSR coalition to highlight abuses in interrogation practices that occurred during the Bush administration was justified and useful. Bringing the roles of psychology and psychologists in these domains into focus for APA has forced an active engagement on the issues and led to increasing clarity in the policies of the organization. However, to read the materials of the “Critics” one would have to believe that they discovered these abuses and were the first to call for changes. They were not. Years before they became involved, APA’s military and national security psychological communities had already begun this work. And it was their efforts, not the work of the “Critics” or of APA governance, or the Sidley team that led to changes in the policies, procedures, and actual practices of our Defense Department. And those successes, instead of being celebrated publicly were virtually ignored by the Hoffman Team.

The scorn of the “Critics” regarding these revisions continues to the present moment (Steven Stoltz, personal communication, July 29, 2016). And the emphasis remains focused on the areas of treatment of non-uniformed detainees, not on the War which has killed hundreds of U.S. and European citizens during the past year. In one of its most heinous features, the Hoffman Resolution of August 2015 calls for all of these foreign detainees to be accorded the exact same rights and privileges under U.S. criminal

law as U.S. citizens. In other words, the “Critics” and now all of APA governance have called for the government of the United States to grant the detainees a kind of special and limited citizenship. This is the response of our national organization to a trans-generational war that as Bobbitt (2009) has stated the world has never seen or experienced. The blindness of the “Critics” and of APA governance in this regard could not be clearer nor more dangerous to all of us.

The rhetoric, beliefs, and biases, of the “Critics” and the majority of the members of the Council of Representatives are easy to see and understand. The vast majority of them have never served in the military, security services, corrections institutions, public safety organizations, or done forensic work, they have no professional or personal experience or training to anchor them when such issues arise. They speak from minds and hearts literally born into and steeped in decades of healing work. Work that is noble, needed, useful, recognized by American society, and lucrative. And let me be clear, healers and healing perspectives should, even must, be part of any deliberations regarding the War on Terror and the roles that psychology and psychologists should play in its conduct. But, when the healers declare as a matter of APA policy that theirs is the only legitimate point of view or role to play, they have stepped way beyond what has been traditional within the Association and the explicit policy position it has held regarding the practice of psychology for more than three decades. And their actions and those that supported them in August of 2015 were blind to the long-term consequences.

As has recently been made clear by Mandelbaum (2016), the foreign and military policies and actions of the United States during the post cold war era have had very mixed results. Largely driven from what Mearsheimer (2001) would define as the liberal

perspective in foreign affairs and security strategy, it has failed miserably to bring more democracy to the world. I am not advocating here that America's role in the world should not be supportive of our democratic ideals and institutions. I am stating the obvious. Even with the best of intentions, the expenditure of trillions of hard earned U.S. dollars, and the deaths of thousands of men and women serving in uniformed and non uniformed positions throughout the world, our country and its allies have not yet won this War. And, even more importantly, the outcome of the War at this time is largely unforeseeable. For APA governance to literally blind itself and limit its considerations to extraordinarily narrow considerations during such dangerous times in both incomprehensible to me and I believe borders on what I identified in (Kilburg, 2006) as malignant ignorance. I coined that term to describe leaders and leadership teams that used ideologies, beliefs, and biases as the foundation of their decisions and actions. In the worst of such cases, those types of leaders and leadership teams are quite capable of the worst forms of violent and extreme actions. Hoffer (1951) in his book, *The True Believer*, stated:

In normal times a democratic nation is an institutionalized association of more or less free individuals. When its existence is threatened and it has to unify its people and generate in them a spirit of utmost self-sacrifice, the democratic nation must transform itself into something akin to a militant church or a revolutionary party. This process of religiofication, though often difficult and slow, does not involve deep-reaching changes. The true believers themselves imply that the 'decadence' they disclaim about so volubly is not an organic decay (p. 162).



Hoffer suggested that the ends of all mass movements are to achieve radical and rapid change. While all of his observations do not apply to the work of the PSR coalition, APA membership has witnessed the emergence of this group of psychologists from a small number of people who were trying to move the Association to examine the roles of psychologists in the interrogation of non uniformed detainees and the potential that some of its members had participated in acts of torture to a movement that succeeded in galvanizing the Board of Directors to spend millions of hard earned financial reserves to produce what any cursory reading would define as a very limited Report. And as the foregoing sections of this and my previous Essay (Kilburg, 2015) have demonstrated, the Report itself was conceived, supervised, constructed, and delivered in extraordinarily biased ways. The net result of those actions was the Hoffman Resolution and its implementation plans some of which have been described above.

The true ends of the PSR coalition have now been made more clear and they are to more or less purge from APA any members involved in defense, national security, public safety, forensic, or corrections work outside of those involved in psychology's traditional healing roles. And in keeping with Hoffer's analysis, the initial advocates of such revolutions turn themselves into the leaders of movements. Movements that are designed to remove from the scene the leaders, policies, programs, and beliefs of the decadent past in favor of the preferred future. In the current case, as I suggested above, the movement we are witnessing appears to be in the final stage of the take over of the American Psychological Association by HSPs and those whom they support. All of the remaining members of APA and particularly GAPs may now be faced with the same type of strategic choice faced by scientific psychologists in the late 1980's and early 1990's to

stay and be ruled by a majority with the capacity to determine what they can and cannot do and who they are or are not. While it is not too late for APA governance to change its course of action and strategic intent, it is a very perilous time for everyone. It is a time when true wisdom is required on the part of the leaders of the Association.

### **Shame and Sado-Masochism: Some Working Hypotheses**

The foregoing treatment of the Hoffman Report and associated processes is based largely on material that can be seen, that is, read in text form and then examined from a variety of conceptual frameworks. The effort thus far has been to examine the Report from metahistorical, cognitive and emotional biases, ethical, geopolitical, and ideological perspectives. As complex, difficult, and risky as this has been in many ways, this last perspective presents me with the greatest challenges because I believe it is worthwhile to explore in brief certain aspects of these activities and actions within APA governance and between various constituencies from a psychodynamic perspective.

This is fraught with peril, not the least of which is the fact that psychodynamic theory and practice have lost its once prominent place in psychology and has been pushed largely to the periphery of the discipline. To be sure, it is still alive, but many, if not most graduate programs in psychology now tend to teach psychodynamics from an historical point of view rather than as a central theoretical and practical, that is to say essential, perspective. At my age and this point in my career, I am a throwback to those times when psychodynamic considerations were often at the epicenter of most conversations about diagnosis and intervention in human affairs. I have been mentored and taught by many training psychoanalysts and count Harry Levinson and Elliott Jacques, who were both trained analysts and both globally known for their work as

consulting psychologists, as past mentors, colleagues, and dear friends. On a daily basis in my work with leaders, I find psychodynamic theory and methods extremely useful and productive (Kilburg, 2000). Not to belabor the point, I believe it may be helpful to examine certain aspects of the problems that APA has created for itself from these perspectives.

I want to proceed tentatively with an hypothesis. I believe that APA's leaders and governance structures have allowed themselves inadvertently to engage in what amounts to be more than a decade of sado-masochistically informed and shame bound conflicts, activities, and processes. These observations and ideas are my own and must stand on the merits for their accuracy, usefulness, and quality that readers of this essay perceive in their own judgment. The following sections of the Essay are based on the work of Kilborne (2002), Kilburg (2000), Lewis, (1971), Novick and Novick (1996), Steiner (2011), Tangney and Dearing (2002), Wurmser (1981, 2000, 2007), and Wurmser and Jarass (2013).

Shame has long been identified by many scientists and practitioners as one of the primary negative human emotions. It has a variety of functions in the day-to-day lives of people, but primarily it serves as a foundation through which they regulate their relationships with each other and judge their performance in virtually every domain of activity. It is extremely powerful and even in small doses can motivate humans to the most extreme forms of offensive and defensive behavior. It can be stimulated by others physically, verbally, and even nonverbally through gestures, facial expressions, and postures. Short exposures to intense shame can produce lasting psychological trauma. Shame is pervasive in daily life simply because humans are constantly being judged in

various ways by family members, friends, teachers, strangers, peers, colleagues, and superiors. When accompanied by various forms of physical contact, from simple acts of touch and withdrawal, through various forms of embrace and more intimate acts, and virtually every form of aggressive or violent behavior, shame can be profoundly degrading and humiliating. It is most often accompanied by cognitive messages such as “I’m not good enough, I’m not lovable, I am hated or despised, or I have failed.” These messages can be delivered by others or they can be produced in the inner mental lives that all humans possess and experience. Humans tend to go out of their way to avoid being shamed, but in the end, being a part of any society makes that impossible. People thus learn wide varieties of ways to manage and express shame.

In the worst cases, individuals can become extraordinarily self-destructive and even suicidal when shame is a pervasive part of their lives. On the other side of that continuum, they can express these intense emotional states through acts of hatred and violence aimed at others including homicide. In the most extreme cases, mass murder and instances of genocide have been strongly linked to this emotion. In its subtle forms of simple embarrassment or even the minor anticipation that shame could be experienced, a wide variety of positive and negative behavior can be seen. Students study hard for good grades and to avoid the shame of failure. Athletes train hard and compete intensely to achieve victory and avoid defeat. In general, people join groups to gain valuable relationships and avoid the shame and often its accompanying sadness and anxiety that come from being an outsider or loner. And when any group turns on a member or another group, the exchanges can rapidly escalate in destructive ways.

Novick and Novick (1996) summarized a small, psychoanalytically driven, clinical research project that attempted to examine the roots of sadomasochistic behavior in children. For the purposes of this Essay, I am extending their work to include adults, as it has been my extensive experience that in these matters, they are no different than children. They and their colleagues found and described a pattern characterized by four major elements:

1. A beating is taking place – someone is either beating someone or being beaten by someone. The reality of beating experience is internalized by the person and does not need explicit external stimulation to play a central role in the pattern being elicited and enacted. The roles of victim and perpetrator are fluid. A person can identify him/herself either as the victim or as the perpetrator and can shift seamlessly from one to the other. The beating experiences can range widely from serious physical punishment and injury to receiving feedback from a parent, family member, friend, or colleague at work about even the most minor aspect of one's appearance or performance. To be beaten is profoundly humiliating and painful. Intense states of shame, anxiety, anger, sadness, and guilt often occur simultaneously with the physical or psychological experiences.
2. The responsibility for the behavior, the beatings and all of the associated consequences are externalized and projected. The reasons for both sadistic and masochistic behavior are usually perceived as starting somewhere else. Nevertheless, the beatings and their associated processes can be internalized by individuals, groups, organizations, cultures, religious organizations, and entire

nation states as parts of their identities. In such cases, no real external stimulation is needed to either beat oneself or others, or to allow oneself to be beaten.

3. The delusion of omnipotence pervades the efforts of people to cope with these experiences. The individual psychologically metabolizes the sadistic and the masochistic aspects of their responses and arrives at an internal point in which s/he can and does perceive and experience themselves as almost God like in their abilities to endure or deliver punishment. This leads to such patterns as “I/you can/must pay for any good thing by suffering and enduring pain.” “I must appease/seduce my tormentor.” “I will torment and seduce someone to keep them in my control.” “I must maintain control of every and all situations and people.” “I will torture you or myself and you cannot or will not stop me.” “You can torture me, just don’t abandon me.” “I will torture/kill you so that you cannot torture/kill me.” “No one can stop me.”
4. Individuals can recognize that they are troubled in these significant ways and often solicit help. However, their consistent underlying intention is to ensure that efforts to change will not succeed.

If we take this very succinct summary as the starting point for a brief examination of what has occurred during APA’s efforts to manage the issues involved in what we can call the “Torture Chronicles,” several issues are readily apparent. Even though the Hoffman Team was comprised entirely of lawyers, they attempted to elicit a type of historical overview of the people, activities, and events they viewed as primarily important in answering the questions the Special Committee framed in their charge to

them. Notable in that charge is the absence of any specific directive to search for causative or correlated psychological aspects of the behaviors of the primary actors in the events described. Despite the absence of such instruction and in the absence of any formal psychological training, the Hoffman Team proceeded to hypothesize about and find evidence for patterns of motivated behavior. As documented in preceding sections of this Essay, the “Critics” were assigned largely positive motives involving the desire to eliminate the torture/abuse of detainees, pursue justice both inside of APA and outside of the organization, examine evidence for wrong doing and publicly call attention to it, and lobby for desired changes in policies and practices, narrowing or completely eliminating the possibilities that such horrific events would ever occur again, etc.

“Defenders” on the other hand were assigned negative motives including protecting those who torture, hiding evidence of their behavior, engaging in criminal acts, advocating loose ethical standards that were Nazi-like in their intents and execution, lying publicly and in private, and not providing equal levels of support or resources to the groups involved in the conflict. Beyond this simplistic motivational analysis and in the 500 plus pages of the Report and six volumes of supportive documentation, the Hoffman Team provided no extensive map of who did what, why, when, where, to whom and with what reactions. Readers, even those like me who have examined the Report and documentation in significant detail, were left with gaping holes in the historical narrative, no true information about what individuals and groups were thinking and feeling, and what they either tried or did in response. As I have stated earlier in the Essay, we are completely devoid of many streams of information that would help us truly understand the complexities of the past 14 years of APA history regarding the Torture Chronicles.

Left with the limited, and I believe were extremely biased, materials the Hoffman Team presented, the ensuing actions on the part of the members of the Council of Representatives, Board of Directors, and others are quite understandable.

However, if we look at the hypothesized underlying psychodynamics involving shame and sadomasochism, we can suggest at least one other way of comprehending what has happened and why the entire organization is, and probably will continue to be, stuck with the current patterns of exchanges and pathways of action. Here is my brief hypothesized perspective based largely on decades of experience in leadership, management, consulting, psychotherapy, and approaching a decade of work in three positions as a member of APA's central office staff including 18 months as a member of its senior leadership team.

1. Individual members of APA with long standing concerns about the ways in which it functions, intense emotions regarding the events following September 11, 2001 and the reactions of the Bush administration to invade first Afghanistan and then Iraq, and shared ideological perspectives about appropriate approaches to peacemaking, U.S. foreign policy and national defense, the country's long standing dependence on an aggressive, militaristic tendency embedded in its culture and government institutions, and the intense desire to make a difference in the ways in which the country was responding to global events meet, talk, agree, and identify with each other. They are properly and righteously motivated to end suffering of all sorts and the impacts of what they are concerned is an unjust war conducted incompetently and immorally.



2. Other APA members with intense professional and personal ties to the defense and security organizations of the government are intensely busy obeying orders given that Congress has more or less declared war. Their attention is explicitly on executing their instructions as best they can.
3. U.S. military and security forces are successful on the battlefield. They take prisoners. It is impossible to sort out who is an actual soldier, as those captured do not wear uniforms. The prisoners are herded together first in Afghanistan and later in Iraq. Security services like the CIA open alternative detention facilities. The Defense and Security services are extremely worried about the possibility that weapons of mass destruction have been obtained and that more strikes against the U.S. mainland and other interests are planned and underway based on events going all the way back to the 1983 bombing of a U.S. marine base in Lebanon. Senior Bush administration officials desperate for actionable intelligence and also stung by public criticism and outrage for having failed to prevent the attacks of September 11, 2001, decide to take off the gloves by authorizing a variety of previously outlawed methods to support their efforts to interrogate prisoners of war, including the non uniformed detainees.
4. Language describing the prisoners is modified. They are divided into combatants and non-combatants. Lacking the uniforms and official auspices of any government's support, they can no longer be called prisoners of war. They are defined as "detainees." Such a label on the surface seems to abrogate the Geneva Conventions on torture, prisoner abuse, and treatment. Some awful

things happen to who knows how many people. Real and extensive beatings take place and are conducted by those employed by the U.S. government. The American public will probably never know the full truth or extent of these activities despite the substantial efforts of Congressional investigations. Torture at the hands of U.S. security and military forces was authorized and occurred. These activities are largely ineffective in gathering actionable intelligence. New means are sought. Psychologists involved in SERE training for U.S. military forces are consulted. At least, two are hired by the CIA to consult on interrogation.

5. Military psychologists in the formal chain of command of the Department of Defense are ordered to get involved in a wide variety of ways from cleaning up abusive practices in the prisons operated by the U.S. in Iraq and Afghanistan, to providing consultation to interrogation teams on the methods being used, to assessing the levels of veracity of the results of the investigation, to examining the psychological and cultural elements of diversity of the detainees, to determining their mental status, and even to intervening with those who have manifested serious psychological distress, and to consulting on their care. Psychologists and psychology are present and active where the beatings are happening.
6. APA is consulted by the Department of Defense and the CIA and asked to help explore the current state of psychological science related to interrogation, lying and truthfulness, psychological dependency, stress, and related subjects. In keeping with its long-standing commitments to collaboration with the U.S.

government during times of war and peace, APA welcomes the opportunity to assist.

7. Public reports of detainee abuse begin to surface. Practices in Iraq lead to investigations and prosecutions. Reports from the Red Cross from Cuba state that some detainees have been seriously abused. Psychology's roles begin to be made public.
8. Previously concerned groups of psychologists now organize formally and begin to demand that APA take a more vigorous public stand against abusive practices and that the roles of individual psychologists who may have been involved in abusive practices be investigated. APA's response is less vigorous than that which is desired. The concerned psychologists now get even better organized and become the "Critics." They mobilize public support and make connections with reporters and others in the American media. They have more or less taken a stance of opposition to most of the policies and activities of the Bush administration. They identify with the abused detainees as victims of torture. Many of the "Critics" are practicing clinical and counseling psychologists long experienced in treating victims of physical, sexual, and emotional violence and abuse. They are passionately committed to preventing such practices from occurring. APA's responses and activities in support of the Department of Defense and the CIA become public knowledge. The "Critics" feel and express a profound sense of betrayal and shame, and turn those emotional reactions into concrete advocacy steps. Calls and demands for additional action take place.

9. APA leaders and staff, now explicitly drawn into an open conflict between their long standing commitments to supporting the government and the desires for immediate and specific action to strengthen the organization's positions on torture and detainee treatment, consider a variety of steps. APA governance and staff members are not expressly and publicly clear either about their internal conflicts, personal values, or ideological beliefs. In their normal reactions to such advocacy on the part of subgroups within APA governance and membership, intense internal deliberations are conducted. Without conscious intent, they become the "Defenders." Consultations with all sides ensue, but historical patterns of relationships and hence preferences have been established. The substance and tone of the "Critics" turns publicly hostile and even more critical. Exchanges between individuals and small groups are often mutually contemptuous. Secret conversations occur on both sides. Mutual distrust and sometimes overt hostility begin to characterize the relationships. Beatings are now occurring between individuals and groups of APA members. Wounds and injuries mount up. Both sides can count their casualties. Blame is directed toward the "others."
10. APA leaders decide in addition to everything else they have done that another formal initiative is required. PENS is launched. APA staff members engage in their usual activities in support of such an effort. APA leaders decide to place the initiative in the Ethics Office. The APA Ethics Director is designated as the senior staff member to organize and orchestrate the PENS process. The Chair of the Ethics Committee is pressed into service as the governance leader

of the group. No one in APA Central Office or governance questions whether this is a good idea. No one appears to ask whether there may be long-term consequences.

11. The “Critics” now formalize their role as critics and protectors of the beaten detainees. Their demands are loud and public. They put constant pressure on APA leaders and staff. They make themselves heard and felt. Identifying with the victims of what they can now point out as DOD and CIA abuse and torture, they are outraged by anything less than full and complete compliance with their ideas and demands. APA staff and governance leaders by this time are now sharing the shame. Nothing they do is good enough. Military and national security psychologists now engaged for years in a War and working in dangerous, often life-threatening conditions, now perceive they are being targeted for and experience abuse themselves. In their experience, the abuse is unjustifiable. They have been extremely diligent, laboring within the bounds of their roles in the military and national security services to make changes in the policies and practices established by the Bush administration. They have actively tried to live the APA’s Code of Ethics. These activities cannot be made public for security reasons. Mutual outrage, mistrust, shared shame, name calling and other forms of verbal abuse occur, and extensive hardening of the boundaries of both groups occurs.
12. The PENS group is created, meets, deliberates, and makes findings and recommendations. The membership of the PENS group is not as diverse as it should be. The APA Ethics Director does his job. Notes are taken, a report is

drafted, consultations between central office staff, APA governance leaders, and the advocates for the “Critics” and the “Defenders” take place. Long-standing and mutually supportive relationships are reinforced and thrive. It is more difficult to engage with those who are so critical and seem intent to undermine all of their legitimate work. It has become very difficult for people to talk to each other. The levels of mistrust, hostility, and number and type of adversarial, even mutually and verbally abusive, exchanges increase. The PENS Report goes directly to the Council of Representatives by-passing the normal rounds of discussions and negotiations between the Boards and Committees of APA governance. Those historical processes usually allow the constituency groups to exchange views and lobby each other vigorously. Most often, compromises agreeable to most parties are reached. Consultations on word smithing the final draft take place between the Board of Directors and members of Council. Both sides are consulted. The Defenders side is accorded more deference. The PENS Report passes. The “Critics” decide it is insufficient. They continue to advocate for their perspectives. They continue to criticize. There are still detainees. The “Critics” still identify with their conditions. They are still opposed to the U.S. government’s positions on the War on Terror. They still feel outside of APA governance, excluded and marginalized.

13. The Obama administration takes office. There is a brief respite. The liberals now control both houses of Congress and the Presidency. There is public hope that the War on Terror will be brought to a happy ending. Events in Iraq and

Afghanistan prove intractable. New technology now makes a different type of warfare feasible. Drones begin to be deployed more extensively and offensively in Afghanistan and Pakistan. The Obama administration steps up the pace of drone attacks and although troops are withdrawn from Iraq and Afghanistan and fewer U. S. and NATO casualties are incurred , not all of them come home. The Arab spring provides a brief scent of hope. It collapses in Egypt and then in Syria where a bloody civil war starts. More attacks on U.S. cities and interests occur and many attempts are foiled by the FBI, CIA, NSA, and other collaborating security services. Everyone loses patience and hope. The detainees are being released from Cuba, but Congress refuses to let the President close the facility there in what is a minor aspect of the ideological war between conservatives and liberals.

14. In the minds and hearts of the “Critics” detainees are still being abused. Innocents in Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and other places are being killed in drone strikes. They continue to advocate for additional actions and experience the resistance and sometimes open hostility of their colleagues. Publicly induced and shared shame is now a constant feature of the emotional landscape of governance in APA. Maneuvers to gain additional seats on Boards, Committees, and the Council of Representatives are successful. The “Critics” gain in visible support and power within APA governance. The “Critics” use now well-established contacts in media outlets to funnel information to them. James Risen is consulted heavily. He publishes his book in the Spring of 2014. The ground has been laid for another advocacy effort.

15. The “Defenders” are now portrayed as criminals and proclamations are issued declaring that the entire future of the Association now rests on the ability of the organization to respond to the “Critics” assertions of duplicity, lack of transparency, underhanded dealings, and criminal collusion. The composition of the Board of Directors has now shifted and the “Critics” succeed in their call for an investigation. For the first time, the “Critics” dominate the APA’s Board of Directors. GAP members of the Board are marginalized formally and forced to recuse themselves from decision-making roles. The Special Committee is formed and Hoffman is hired. It is hoped that this will put an end to the conflicts. The ineptness of APA leadership in the management of the entire sequence of events proves impossible to overcome. The Report is delivered, leaked, and leads to a set of actions that only humiliate and enrage the “Defenders.” Staff are scapegoated and fired. Long term grudges are settled, debts are paid, and vengeance is both called for and exercised. Careers are ruined and reputations injured. The “Critics” agenda that started as an effort to ensure that APA did not support torture or prisoner abuse in any form now extends to a complete rewrite of the APA Ethics Code, the elimination of entire domains of psychological practice, the codification of APA as a health service oriented organization, and the massive expenditure of APA discretionary funds on litigation attorneys to protect the existing leaders of APA’s governance structures from the legal attacks of the “Defenders.”
16. The “Defenders” reorganize and now fight back. The Hoffman Report and Processes are revealed to contain significant distortions, biases, and gaps.



Papers documenting alternative narratives of events countering the findings of the Hoffman Team are published. Attorneys for those injured by the activities of APA governance and the “Critics” are hired. Some efforts at negotiation are undertaken, but formal lawsuits and public trials are now definitely possible. An ethics complaint is filed against senior members of APA’s Board of Directors. The public member of the Ethics Committee resigns with a letter detailing the efforts of the Board of Directors to interfere in the deliberations of the Committee. APA’s Council of Representatives reconvenes. The “Critics” have run two individuals for the office of APA President elect in the past two years. There is now a formal organization working to counter the ongoing efforts of the “Critics.” Public exchanges in writing continue. The hostilities and beatings continue. Everyone is at fault there are no innocents.

When this admittedly personalized and extraordinarily condensed delineation of what has transpired during the Torture Chronicles, it is fairly easy to see the consistent role of shame in the events, exchanges, and relationships between the various actors involved. I believe it is safe to say that the events and exchanges have left the senior governance structure of APA with a rather massive overdose of shame. No one is immune. And in keeping with what is known in the science and practice literatures on shame, the emotion has mutated. Individuals and groups do not publicly discuss how words and actions offend, wound, dishearten, and cripple them. All of those experiences are driven underground and emerge instead in self-righteous claims, denials, accusations, and exchanges in writing or in actual words. Anger and aggression now channel the chronic, undiluted shame that pervades the leadership of our Association. And it is

virtually impossible to raise this issue for to do so automatically invites an opportunity to examine who has failed, why, when, where, with whom, and how much. Opening such discussions when the parties to a conflict are actively engaged is nearly impossible.

Usually, the first step in making progress on these fronts is the declaration of a cease-fire.

The parties to the conflict simply must stop committing new acts of aggression and thereby stop the wounds and injuries from mounting. In the present governance climate, I fear we are still a long way from taking such a step.

I also believe that the underlying pattern of sadomasochistic exchanges can be deciphered from this abbreviated summary. First, someone has been and continues to be beaten. However, just whom that someone is depends on the perspective one takes. For the “Critics” it is clear that the victims are those detainees held by the U.S. government in Cuba and other locations around the world and themselves who have courageously and righteously advocated for them. Every one of their demands and actions proceeds from the assumption that those held are being mistreated and that they must be accorded the rights of citizens to a criminal prosecution under U.S. law. They would also cite their treatment at the hands of APA central office staff and members of APA governance who did not take them seriously, did not provide equal access to processes and resources, and who publicly and privately treated them with contempt, as legitimate reasons for the continuation of their determined efforts. They have finally won and will not yield easily.

For the Defenders, those being beaten is more a complex issue. It starts with the recognition that the citizens of the United States have been and continue to be targeted by *jihadists* and their supporters who have a multi-generational commitment to global dominance. It includes those brothers and sisters in the armed and security services who

have died or been seriously wounded and disabled as a result of doing their duties in combat zones. The families of those who have served are also members of this class of people, especially their own who sacrificed a great deal when they were deployed to combat zones and other types of duty. They themselves have experienced public verbal beatings at the hands of the “Critics” and their allies in the media and among the membership. And in the final coup de grace, APA funds the Hoffman Report, supervises it like they know nothing about research or research ethics, provides early and secret access to the Report by some of the leading “Critics,” publishes the Report on line before giving an opportunity to respond to its contents, withdraws the Report from the web when it becomes clear what a major mistake has been made, leaps to a set of extensive actions on the floor of the Council of Representative without proper vetting of those actions by any sub component of APA governance providing reviews and commentary, and hides behind a wall of litigation attorneys when questioned by colleagues. It is infuriating at best. The desire for justice burns just as brightly. The willingness to take aggressive action is just as strong.

The resulting levels of shame and now rage are indeed well earned on both sides. And it is hard to see how either side will stop trying to beat the other or defend themselves from being beaten.

Second, both sides are deep into the processes of externalization and projection. Few if any conversations are taking place between the leaders of both sides. Such behavior is understandable. The web has become the instrument of choice for mutual beatings. Public exchanges are well written, understandable, and basically repeat the refrain, “you’re wrong and I can prove it.”

Third, in the first part of the Torture Chronicles, the “Defenders” held the high ground in the conflict. APA staff and its Boards and Committees were either actively supportive or disengaged. Most actual disagreements were settled by modifications of existing policies and adding additional language. The “Defenders” were mostly satisfied with these results because in reality, they had largely won in their eyes. They were able to remain in the dominant position for more than a decade. The success blinded them to the strategic intentions and determination of the “Critics.” While I cannot honestly say that the “Defenders” were delusional in their self-satisfaction and secure in their positions of authority, they quite clearly were caught off guard.

The “Critics” on the other hand seemed to take their semi-successes and semi-failures and internalize them in a way that increased their determination to strike again and again. Their connections to Mr. Risen proved crucial and the publication of his book that included material they provided the launching pad for all that has followed. The righteous tones of all of the communications this group has issued over the past nearly two years, including the publication of a list of targeted members of APA staff and past and present leaders, most of whom have now suffered significant personal and professional injuries is proof of their experienced, omnipotent power. Their calls for criminal investigations and punishments and changes in state licensure laws are positive proof of their victory laps. They won the vast majority of the votes on the Council of Representatives in support of their wording of the Hoffman Resolution and its recommendations in August of 2015. APA’s Board of Directors has delivered a string of specific and detailed actions supporting their positions during the past year. In short, they are now riding a very victorious mount.

Fourth and finally, neither side appears to be either exhausted or ready to call for a truce, the first formal cry for help in these types of situations. The Board of Directors has sat down with some of the “Defenders” to discuss their views. But those discussions were in the presence of the lawyers for both sides. It remains to be seen if and when any peace making activities will be undertaken. At present, it seems unlikely and thus headed for the courts for a costly round of litigation. Even if the parties were to agree to negotiate, I am extremely hard pressed to believe that the “Critics” will cease their advocacy for a narrowing of the roles of GAPs. If that does not happen, then the fourth component of the sadomasochistic tetrad will hold in place. Any efforts to make change will first start and then founder in the maelstrom of these dynamics.

The psychodynamic literature defines such a pattern as a repetition compulsion. In essence, the parties involved are seemingly unable to express free will and must engage in the same actions and activities in a kind of infinite, positively reinforcing, closed loop. It is very difficult for individuals, couples, families, groups, organizations, or nation states so structured to initiate or maintain change under the best of circumstances and impossible under such as these. Something novel or radical must happen for the equilibrium to shift.

In those texts cited above that describe these patterns, psychotherapeutic interventions can sometimes be successful. However, the outcomes of those efforts are seen as being strongly dependent first on the motivation of the person seeking change. Then, it is clear that careful, delicate, and sophisticated efforts are required on the part of very experienced professionals to help induce change. Those who intervene are strongly advised to be enormously familiar with the experiences and expressions of shame within

and between the individuals seeking change and themselves, the likelihood of early and often frequent relapses into the previous patterns, and the derivative reinforcements and satisfaction that can come from maintaining the status quo. I am hard pressed to see anyone to whom the “Critics” or “Defenders” would turn to for assistance or anyone currently on the scene with the knowledge and skill to do so.

### **Summary and Recommendations**

At a minimum, the foregoing assessment should raise questions in the minds of everyone involved in what is now one of the most sustained, serious, and troublesome conflicts in the history of APA as an organization. This is no longer a quiet fight between groups of members arguing in private or within the halls of the organization’s headquarters. It has been specifically and definitively given a partial public face. Thus far, that public face has defended the actions of the “Critics” and APA governance members supporting the Hoffman initiatives. I believe that face has just begun to be revealed. When and if a lawsuit is filed in a court in this country, all of the above information and documentation will come to light. Formal legal processes and procedures will be invoked. Everyone involved to this point will face the potential of being called to testify under oath either in a formal deposition or before a judge and potentially a jury. A judge and a jury will be guided through the Ethical Code and the actions taken or not taken by APA governance brought to light. The activities of the various individuals and sub-organizations (divisions, state associations, and other related entities) within psychology will be open to scrutiny. Private emails and those between organizations can be forced into the open. What has been private will now become very public. Humiliation may come on a grander and unavoidable scale to everyone involved.

As I argued last summer, I believe those intimately involved must stop and take a deep breath. I believe it can legitimately be said that no one can accurately forecast the outcome of such potential events. And if APA and its members are to protect the future of the organization and their chosen discipline, then the leadership actions and decisions made thus far must be reconsidered in depth and in light of the true risks to the Association. For it is not just its reputational capital that can be forfeit, its economic foundations may well be shaken in a profound fashion because juries can take powerful and huge swipes at an organization. The headlines of newspapers and magazines frequently describe the types of awards juries make when they believe injustice has been done. And every member of APA governance must keep in mind that the current climate of the entire country is extremely tense and seriously affected by events in France, Germany, Boston, Orlando, and San Bernardino. With the current Republican candidate for President calling for stronger law and order measures and a closure of American borders to most Muslims, it may be difficult for the Association to argue the merits of its revolutionary policy to limit the role of psychologists in interrogations to that of health care provision. This is particularly the case when the position of the organization for more than three decades has been to not take such measures under any circumstances and the fact that there is no scientific basis for the policy that has been adopted. So, what, if anything can be done? Last summer I argued for a series of steps that the organization could take. None of these were considered yet alone implemented. Rather than give up, I would like to suggest that APA's leaders consider the following actions as potential ways out of the dead end in which I believe they now find themselves.

- Be determined to base your decisions and actions on science in so far as possible. Relying solely on the advocacy of individuals and groups, while politically adept at times, can cause real problems in the long run.
- Appoint a task force of non advocate members of the Association to explore and examine the activities, events, positions, and behaviors of all of the members of the Association and staff who have been involved in the extended controversies regarding the torture policy conflicts and require a public report of its findings. In other words scientifically validate the work of the Hoffman Team and where errors, omissions, and problems with methods or findings are discovered acknowledge them and take appropriate action in response.
- Suspend the Hoffman resolution and all associated work until such time as the task force publishes its findings.
- Establish a standing committee of the Council of Representatives, independent of any other governance body, that will be responsible for studying all matters regarding the nation's defense and security, public safety, forensic uses of psychology, and corrections and making such findings and recommendations as are consistent with the ongoing state of psychological and other forms of research directly to the CoR. The committee would be directed to make significant efforts to distinguish between the ideological advocacy positions of various parties and what the available scientific data demonstrate as factual knowledge and empirically supported practices.



- Adopt a policy that all state associations create a revolving mechanism whereby their representatives to the CoR are elected from HSP, GAP, and academic constituencies every three years and ensure that those representatives rotate on a schedule that prohibits the domination of the COR's membership by any constituency at any point in time.
- Discharge all litigation attorneys with thanks and appropriate compensation and hire lawyers with substantial experience and expertise in mediation and conflict negotiation. Pull all of the parties together and start an entirely new chapter in the Torture Chronicles dedicated to including the legitimate views of all of the affected constituencies and rectifying, in so far as possible, all of the past errors and mistakes that have been made by all of the parties.

I realize that what started out as a limited Essay has now become much more extensive than I originally planned, and more like a monograph. For those of you who read parts or all of it, I can only thank you for indulging me. The events of the past 13 months have been profoundly disturbing to me. APA is an organization that has sheltered, supported, and nourished me for my entire professional life. I have been striving within my abilities to be as constructive and creative as I can from the vantage point of being a simple member. I think I can safely say that most of us profoundly wish that our leaders discover and aggressively pursue a way out of the complex web of problems the organization now faces while causing minimal additional damage. I want to acknowledge that any errors and mistakes in this document are mine alone and that I have not consulted anyone else in its creation. I am solely responsible for its contents.

## References

- Anderson, W. T. (Ed). (1995). *The truth about the truth: De-confusing and re-constructing the postmodern world*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.
- APA. (2010). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*. Washington, D.C. : American Psychological Association
- APA. (2015). *Resolution to amend the 2006 and 2013 Council Resolutions to clarify the roles of psychologists related to interrogation and detainee welfare in national security settings, to further implement the 2008 Petition Resolution, and to safeguard against acts of torture and cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment in all settings*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Banks, L. M., Dunivin, D. L., James, L.C., & Newman, R. (2015). Hoffman's key conclusion demonstrably false: The omission of key documents and facts distorts the truth. Retrieved from [hoffmanreportapa.com](http://hoffmanreportapa.com).
- Bazerman, M. (1998). Judgment in managerial decision making (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Bernard, M. E. (Ed.). (1991). *Using rational emotive therapy effectively: A practitioner's guide*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Bobbitt, P. (2002). *The shield of Achilles: War, peace, and the course of history*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Bobbitt, P. (2009). *Terror and consent: The wars for the twenty-first century*. New York: Anchor Books.

- Boring, E. G. (1950). *A history of experimental psychology 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Clay, R. A. (2016). *Jean Maria Arrigo wins AAAS award.* Monitor on Psychology, 47(4), 8.
- Corey, G. (2009). *Theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy (8<sup>th</sup> Ed.)*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Frye, N. (1957). *Anatomy of criticism: Four essays.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gergen, K. J. (1991). *The saturated self: Dilemmas of identity in contemporary life.* New York: Basic Books.
- Gergen, K. J. (1999). *An invitation to social construction.* London: Sage.
- Harvey, S., Barry, J., Bonvie, J., Engerran, D., Laurence, J., Lewis, L. Ogranovich, M. & Williams, T. (2015). Response to the Hoffman Independent Review: The Society for Military Psychology (APA Division 19) Presidential Task Force. Unpublished Report.
- Hoffer, E. (1951). *The true believer: Thoughts on the nature of mass movements.* New York: Harper & Row.
- Jost, L. & Wuerth, J. (2011). *Perfecting virtue: New essays on Kantian ethics and virtue ethics.* New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking fast and slow.* New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Kilburg, R. R. (2000). *Executive coaching: Developing managerial wisdom in a world of chaos.* Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

- Kilburg, R. R. (2015 a). *On hitting the bulls-eye while missing the point: An essay on the American Psychological Association's Hoffman Report*. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Kilborne, B. (2002). *Disappearing persons: Shame and appearance*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Klein, G. (1999). *Sources of power: How people make decisions*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Klein, G. (2003). *Intuition at work*. New York: Doubleday.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1977). *The essential tension: Selected studies in scientific tradition and change*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lewis, B. (2002). *What went wrong? Western impact and Middle Eastern response*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, H. B. (1971). *Shame and guilt in neurosis*. New York: International Universities Press.
- MacIntyre, A. (2008). *After virtue (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.)*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Mandelbaum, M. (2016). *Mission failure: America and the world in the post-cold war era*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mannheim, K. (1946). *Ideology and utopia: An introduction to the sociology of knowledge. (Translation by Louis Wirth and Edward Shills)*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & Co.

- McAdams, D. P. (1993). *The stories we live by: Personal myths and the making of the self*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Novick, J. & Novick, K. K. (1996). *Fearful symmetry: The development and treatment of sadomasochism*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, Inc.
- O'Donohue, W. T. & Fisher, J. E. (Eds). (2009). *General principles and empirically supported techniques of cognitive behavior therapy*. Hoboken, N. J. : John Wiley & Sons.
- Pepper, S. C. (1966). *World hypotheses: A study in evidence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Steiner, J. (2011). *Seeing and being seen*: New York: Routledge.
- Tangney, J. P. & Dearing, R. L. (2002). *Shame and guilt*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- White, H. (1973). *Metahistory: The historical imagination in nineteenth-century Europe*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- White, H. (1987). *The content of the form: Narrative discourse and historical representation*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- White, M. & Epston (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Wurmser, L. (1981). *The mask of shame*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wurmser, L. (2000). *The power of the inner judge: Psychodynamic treatment of the severe neuroses*. New York: Jason Aronson, Inc.

Wurmser, L. (2007). *Torture me but don't abandon me: Psychoanalysis of the severe neurosis in a new key*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Wurmser, L. & Jarass, H. (Eds.). *Nothing good is allowed to stand: An integrative view of the negative therapeutic reaction*. New York: Routledge.

**Exhibit 1**

<i>White's Framework for Meta-historical Analysis A Succinct Summary</i>	
<i>Component</i>	<i>Description</i>
<b><i>Forms of Emplotment</i></b>	
<b><i>1. Romance</i></b>	Stories of heroic transcendence through complex experience. The hero's victory over circumstances
<b><i>2. Tragedy</i></b>	Stories of the fall of the protagonist. The shaking or elimination of his/her world.
<b><i>3. Comedy</i></b>	Stories of hope for readers that temporary victories are available to protagonists over their worlds/problems.
<b><i>4. Satire/Irony</i></b>	Stories in which there is no transcendence, victory, or redemption for the protagonist. They are captives of their times and circumstances.
<b><i>5. Epic</i></b>	Longer and more general stories, usually told in poem form. Main characters undergo trials and outcomes can be revealed in any of the other forms of plot.
<b><i>Pepper's Forms of Truth</i></b>	
<b><i>1. Formist Theory</i></b>	A focus on unique actors, sequences of events, and other types of agents to describe and explain a piece of history/
<b><i>2. Organicist Theory</i></b>	A deliberate attempt to provide a more integrative explanation of an historical story. It usually possesses a structure relating microcosmic to macrocosmic relationships that arrange the pieces to yield a gestalt of the data.
<b><i>3. Mechanist Theory</i></b>	An effort to prove a theory or laws in history by arranging the data to provide such verification. A theory of a case for how to understand stories within a chronicle.
<b><i>4. Contextualist Theory</i></b>	An approach that weaves the data available from the chronicle to describe what happened to individuals and organizations through experienced events in the sociocultural fabric of the times to provide understanding.
<b><i>Manheim's Ideologies</i></b>	
<b><i>1. Conservatism</i></b>	Advocates natural rhythms to social change based on the belief that the status quo is best maintained because it is the closest to the ideal form humans can achieve.
<b><i>2. Liberalism</i></b>	Advocates more remote and utopian futures societies can strive towards through the uses of parliamentary debate, negotiated agreements, and democratically achieved election results.
<b><i>3. Radicalism</i></b>	Advocates utopian goals that are immediately achievable through direct actions that may or may not be achieved

	through democratic means.
<b>4. Anarchism</b>	Advocate an idealized view of the past that vilifies the present as corrupted compared to history. Utopian goals can be achieved immediately by conscious acts of willful destruction of the current social establishment.
<b>Major Rhetorical Tropes</b>	
<b>1. Metaphor</b>	A person, place, or thing can be characterized by its similarity or differences from something else by the use of a simile or analogy, “the dog was a communist.”
<b>2. Metonymy</b>	A name change in which the name of a part can be used for the whole, “millions flee” as a description of a large flock of birds rising to the air.
<b>3. Synecdoche</b>	An expression in which a part of a whole is used to symbolize a component possessed by the whole, “his thoughts are chunks of coal” as a description of a depressed person.
<b>4. Irony</b>	Words or expressions that are used to figuratively negate literal meanings. Examples are seen in absurd expressions (catachresis) “toneless feet” or oxymorons, “disgustingly tasty.”



**Exhibit 2****Examples of Important Metaphors in the Hoffman Report**

1. Critics – instead of naming PSR leaders and their supporters by name; implying a broad and intense group of advocates rather than a consistently narrow but vocal group of APA members.
2. Nuremberg Defense – Using the Nazi defense as a statement of equivalence for Ethical Standards 1.02 & 1.03.
3. Loose Ethical Standards – substitution for Ethical Standards 1.02 & 1.03 and re-contextualizing them away from their historic meanings and rationales.
4. Torture as an identifier for harsh interrogation methods, military and security interrogations in general, and the activities conducted by military psychologists in operational capacities.
5. Special relationship – code for the conspiracy conducted by Stephen Behnke and Morgan Banks.
6. Collusion – legal term implying an illegal, unethical, and immoral working relationship with similar means designed for similar ends.
7. Criminal conspiracy – what the PSR leaders and supporters alleged that APA leaders, Central Office Staff, and key members of the DoD and U.S. security services conducted. It was intimately associated with calls for FBI Investigations, identified psychologists losing their licenses and APA memberships, successful campaigns to remove named psychologists from elected positions.
8. Criminal prosecution – trials by jury or judge to determine guilt, innocence, and associated punishment.
9. Curry Favor – term implying illicit, inappropriate, immoral, and unethical efforts to achieve influence with another person, organization, or governmental agency.
10. Deontological Ethical Codes – a repeated statement of preference for narrow, explicit, and normatively derived ethical principles and statements of what the right and wrong behaviors are for professionals to engage with ever increasing specification rather than educationally based principles and standards or virtue based ethical principles and standards.
11. Educationally based ethics enforcement – repeated and pejorative reference to the approach taken by the APA Ethics Committee on a wide variety of cases during the term of office of Stephen Behnke.

12. Definitive, independent, and objective review of the allegation and all relevant evidence – direct statement that the Sidley Team and the Board of Directors Special Committee would proceed in an unbiased, transparent, and scientifically defensible fashion to reply to the charges leveled by James Risen in his 2014 book, “Pay Any Price: Greed, Power, and Endless War.” The actual report was not definitive, not independent, and not objective.

13. Do No Harm – first sentence describing Ethical Principle A: Beneficence and Nonmaleficence of the 2010 APA Ethical Code. The sentence reads “Psychologists strive to benefit those with whom they work and take care to do no harm.” In the introduction to the document, the final paragraph states, “the modifier used in some of the standards of the Ethics Code (e.g., reasonably, appropriate, potential)...allow professional judgment on the part of psychologists...eliminate injustice and inequality that would occur without the modifier...ensure applicability across a broad range of activities...or guard against a set of rigid rules that might be quickly outdated. By implication, striving to do no harm is not the equivalent of doing no harm in the stated intent and context of the APA Ethical Code. The Hoffman Report expended no effort to make these refined distinctions.

14. Indelible stain – a term introduced to describe APA’s prior positions regarding psychologists’ involvement in national security interrogations.

15. Warped and improper definition of what it means to be a psychologist (p4). Speaks for itself and refers to the positions of the “Defenders.”

**Exhibit 3****Examples of Hoffman Report Footnotes Making Claims with No Documentation**

<b>Page Number</b>	<b>Footnote Number</b>	<b>Subject</b>
110	301	Interview with Dr. Grill
114	320	Interview with Dr. Behnke
118	360	Interview with Dr. Behnke
125	392-394	Interviewees are labeled as witnesses as in a criminal prosecution
131	441, 442, 444	Interviews with Drs .Dunivin, Morgan, & Banks
132	455	Interview with Dr. Banks
134	462, 463, 464	Interview with Dr. Banks
135	471	Interview with Dr. Banks
136	475, 477	Interview with Dr. James
182	760	Interview with Dr. Zimbardo
223	966, 967	Interviews with Drs. Levant, Newman, & Koocher
228-229	990	Interview with Dr. Newman
230	993	Interview with Dr. Behnke
236	1021	Interview with Dr. Koocher
449	2136	Interview with Dr. James
485	2352	Interview with Dr. Carliner
493	2399	Interview with Dr. Behnke
494	2404	Interview with Dr. Behnke