

EXHIBIT 112

Behnke, Stephen

From: Newman, Russ
Sent: Tue 7/26/2005 5:25 PM (GMT-00:00)
To: Farberman, Rhea K.; Behnke, Stephen
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: [APABODEMG] FW: Draft PHR Ad for approval

I do think some pre-ad management is the other important piece to this, both with Div. 19 and with the PENS task force itself. We know what it means that this is simply a *paid* advertisement dropped into the "market place of ideas." But the reaction of the military psychology community to seeing this for the first time in the Monitor may be nothing short of shocking, particularly since APA had previously banned their advertising. I just hate to see all the good work done with this community in the past year go up in smoke. Russ

-----Original Message-----

From: Farberman, Rhea K.
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2005 1:15 PM
To: Newman, Russ; Behnke, Stephen
Subject: RE: [APABODEMG] FW: Draft PHR Ad for approval

Steve, Russ -- I don't think we can reasonably expect the Physician's group to okay an editor's note that says much more than we are already saying in the current note (below). There's also the issue of what will fit on the page.

Editor's Note: The claims expressed in this ad are those of the advertiser. Physicians for Human Rights is not affiliated with the APA. The report of the APA Task Force on Psychological Ethics and National Security, released in July 2005 and available at <http://www.apa.org/releases/pens0707.html>, reaffirmed APA's 1986 Resolution against torture, cruel, inhumane or other degrading treatment. See story, page 16.

The ad will also be labeled "advertisement" at the top of page.

I think from here we have to trust our readers to be able to separate opinion and innuendo from fact.

That being said, if you would advise that I contact Division 19 to let them know that this ad will appear, I can certainly do that.

Rhea

From: Newman, Russ
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2005 10:08 AM
To: Behnke, Stephen; Farberman, Rhea K.
Subject: RE: [APABODEMG] FW: Draft PHR Ad for approval

I agree with Steve's concern about the ad's implication concerning psychologists engaging in unethical behavior and/or torture. Anything that can be done to mitigate this would be important. Russ

-----Original Message-----

From: Behnke, Stephen

Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2005 10:03 AM

To: Newman, Russ; Farberman, Rhea K.

Subject: RE: [APABODEMG] FW: Draft PHR Ad for approval

It seems to me untenable not to run the add. (it's curious that a couple of the original signatories, such as Marcia Angell and George Annas, no longer appear) At the same time, the add is provocative both in its language and its format and in some respects gives PHR a free pass to make innuendos and conflate issues.

Rhea, my feeling is that we should go further than an editorial note saying that the views are not necessarily those of APA. I think we should draft a statement--along the lines of Ron's letter to the New Yorker--and ask PHR itself to acknowledge the contents of the statement (which would run alongside the add), e.g., that APA created a task force to address these issues, that the Task Force set forth guidelines, that psychologists do not engage in, facilitate, or support torture and have an ethical responsibility to be alert to and report acts of torture, that psychologists do not use information from a medical record to the detriment of an individual's safety or well-being, etc. Also, I think one aspect of the statement should be that no credible evidence has emerged suggesting that any APA member has engaged in unethical behavior.

The statement would be signed by PHR (although obviously they would not be charged for the space). I could draft the statement this morning.

Of course, they may not go for it, but I think the add as written gives them a free pass to imply that APA members are engaging in unethical behavior, if not torture, and that we should insist on some balance.

-----Original Message-----

From: Newman, Russ

Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2005 7:49 AM

To: Farberman, Rhea K.

Cc: Behnke, Stephen

Subject: RE: [APABODEMG] FW: Draft PHR Ad for approval

Has Steve weighed in on this decision? Russ

-----Original Message-----

From: Farberman, Rhea K.

Sent: Monday, July 18, 2005 2:56 PM

To: Newman, Russ

Cc: Behnke, Stephen

Subject: RE: [APABODEMG] FW: Draft PHR Ad for approval

I think Steve is okay with our running the ad with a editor's note and is concerned about PR fallout (with a

very different segment of our audience) if we decline to run the ad. As I am.

Steve's out of town but I'm copying him so he can weigh in on our discussion.

Thanks.
Rhea

From: Newman, Russ
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2005 2:53 PM
To: Farberman, Rhea K.
Subject: RE: [APABODEMG] FW: Draft PHR Ad for approval

If you're committed to running the ad, a disclaimer of that sort couldn't hurt. What does Steve think about the effect of running this on the group he has been courting for the last year (as have I, although not to the degree that Steve has worked on this).

-----Original Message-----

From: Farberman, Rhea K.
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2005 2:44 PM
To: Newman, Russ
Subject: RE: [APABODEMG] FW: Draft PHR Ad for approval

A possible way to counter this (partially at least) might be to state in the editor's note that ***the opinions expressed in this advertisement are those of the advertiser and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the APA*** or something to that effect.

Do you think that would be helpful?

Rhea

From: Newman, Russ
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2005 7:14 AM
To: Farberman, Rhea K.
Subject: RE: [APABODEMG] FW: Draft PHR Ad for approval

The one concern I would have about running the ad is that the PENS task force and other activity over the last year has worked to rebuild a relationship with our psychologist colleagues who work in national security activities. They have previously felt quite disaffected from APA. That has been changing, but running this ad may work against that progress, particularly since the ad includes statements that our colleagues working in

national security positions would say are simply not true. Russ

-----Original Message-----

From: APA's Board of Directors Executive Management Group

[mailto:APABODEMG@LISTS.APA.ORG]**On**

Behalf Of Farberman, Rhea K.

Sent: Friday, July 15, 2005 6:38 PM

To: APABODEMG@LISTS.APA.ORG

Subject: [APABODEMG] FW: Draft PHR Ad for approval

All. The attached is an advertisement which the group Physician's for Human Rights has asked be published in the September *Monitor on Psychology*. (You'll remember that this group has been a high profile critic of our PENS report, saying that the report and APA have not gone far enough in condemning torture and the DoD procedures on interrogation).

This ad is very different from anything we have ever accepted for publication in the Monitor and we could decline to publish based on our ad acceptance policy which gives us full license to reject ads that deal with controversial issues.

However, after thinking about this for a few days, I am recommending that we accept the ad and run it with an editor's note. My thinking is based on three issues –

- 1. Declining the ad is likely to draw criticism from the Physicians for Human Rights group and from some members of Council.**
- 2. I feel we need to embrace the marketplace of ideas in the Monitor rather than not.**
- 3. There are no legal problems in running the ad (General Counsel's office has reviewed it).**

The editor's note I would run is:

The report of the APA Task Force on Psychological Ethics and National Security, released in July 2005 and available on the web at [www...](http://www.apa.org), reaffirmed APA's 1986 Resolution against torture, cruel, inhumane or other degrading treatment.

I think this strategy turns a potential PR problem into a positive situation.