

From: Kaslow, Nadine [[NKASLOW@emory.edu](mailto:NKASLOW@emory.edu)]  
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 6:44 PM  
To: Behnke, Stephen Houran; Rhea Farberman ([rfarberman@apa.org](mailto:rfarberman@apa.org))  
Subject: RE: On Behalf of Psychologists for Peace of the Australian Psychological Society

Hi, ok thanks. njk

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

From: Behnke, Stephen Houran [[mailto:steve\\_behnke@hms.harvard.edu](mailto:steve_behnke@hms.harvard.edu)]  
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 12:43 PM  
To: Kaslow, Nadine; Rhea Farberman ([rfarberman@apa.org](mailto:rfarberman@apa.org))  
Subject: RE: On Behalf of Psychologists for Peace of the Australian Psychological Society

Nadine, I'll like to touch base with you about responding to the Australian psychologists.

There are some complexities given your trip, which I want to make sure is not affected.

I'll be in touch with you shortly,

Steve

---

From: Kaslow, Nadine [[NKASLOW@emory.edu](mailto:NKASLOW@emory.edu)]  
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 12:24 PM  
To: Rhea Farberman ([rfarberman@apa.org](mailto:rfarberman@apa.org)); Behnke, Stephen Houran  
Subject: FW: On Behalf of Psychologists for Peace of the Australian Psychological Society

Hi,  
Where are we with having a response for me for this.  
njk

---

From: Yosef Brody [<mailto:brody.yosef@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Saturday, March 01, 2014 4:28 AM  
To: [sbehnke@apa.org](mailto:sbehnke@apa.org)  
Subject: On Behalf of Psychologists for Peace of the Australian Psychological Society

Dear Drs. Behnke and Childress-Beatty:

Dr. Winnifred Louis, on behalf of Psychologists for Peace of the Australian Psychological Society has asked me, on behalf of Psychologists for Social Responsibility, to forward the following communication to you (PDF version attached).

Sincerely,

Yosef Brody, President-Elect, Psychologists for Social Responsibility

\*\*\*\*\*

Winnifred Louis +61 7 3346 9515<<file:///C:/localhost/tel/%252B61%207%203346%209515>>

Office hours by appointment in Jan/Feb 2014 Rm 407 McElwain Bldg (#24A) School of Psychology, University of Queensland

<http://www.psy.uq.edu.au/directory/index.html?id=529>

Gratuitous link <http://www.amnesty.org.au/action/>

---

From: Winnifred Louis

Sent: Friday, 14 February 2014 10:36 AM

To: '[thannan@csu.edu.au](mailto:thannan@csu.edu.au)<<mailto:27thannan@csu.edu.au>>';

'[l.littlefield@psychology.org.au](mailto:l.littlefield@psychology.org.au)<<mailto:27l.littlefield@psychology.org.au>>'

Cc: '[S.Hammond@psychology.org.au](mailto:S.Hammond@psychology.org.au)<<mailto:27S.Hammond@psychology.org.au>>'; Heather Gridley ([H.Gridley@psychology.org.au](mailto:H.Gridley@psychology.org.au)<<mailto:H.Gridley@psychology.org.au>>);

'[Anthony.Love@vu.edu.au](mailto:Anthony.Love@vu.edu.au)<<mailto:27Anthony.Love@vu.edu.au>>'

Subject: PsySR, Psychologists for Peace raise serious concerns about APA, APS stance on torture

To: A/Prof Tim Hannan, President, Australian Psychological Society Professor Lyn Littlefield, Executive Director, Australian Psychological Society

Cc: Sabine W. Hammond, PhD, FAPS | Executive Manager, Science and Education, APS Heather Gridley, Public Interest team, APS Tony Love, Chair, Ethics Committee, APS

Dear Lyn, Tim, and team,

We would like to pick up the threads of a conversation that we had with the APS Conference Scientific Program Organising Committee and the APS Ethics Committee last year that we don't believe was ever satisfactorily completed.

The issue concerns psychologist involvement in torture, and the disturbing stance that the American Psychological Association, and Professor Stephen Behnke, as Director of the APA Ethics Office, continue to take on this issue. We refer you to the accompanying letter from Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PsySR), which outlines the current problem concerning a recent APA decision not to take sanctions against a psychologist, Dr John Leso, who has been implicated in devising and implementing interrogation techniques that constitute torture. The ethical issues and APA decisions related to his involvement at Guantanamo are too important to deserve anything less than a full and widely disseminated explanation for psychologists, the profession, and society at large.

We support the argument by PsySR that psychologists' participation in all forms of torture is unethical, and we understand this is notionally the official position of the APA. We have our own APS statement that argues similarly - The Australian Psychological Society, as a member of the International Union of Psychological Science, fully endorses the United Nations Declaration and Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment 1997.

As you know, Psychologists for Peace were very disappointed at the inclusion of Stephen Behnke as keynote speaker at the APS Conference in Cairns, and at the active promotion of his workshop to APS members, including the offer of free workshop places to members of the APS Ethics Committee. We do not believe that the APS's active support and promotion of Stephen Behnke was appropriate, given the widespread concerns about the apparent unwillingness of the APA ethics committee and Behnke's own office within the APA to act in accordance with its stated principles on these grave matters of psychologist involvement in torture.

We would like an undertaking by the APS Board/Ethics Committee to consider psychologists' ethical positions and records on torture (and any other matters that so obviously risk bringing our profession into disrepute) in future invitations to APS-endorsed events.

We would also like to request that the APS considers writing to Dr Behnke to inquire about the position that the APA has taken on the Dr Leso case, and convey the concerns expressed by many APS members over the past decade on the way in which our profession has appeared to respond to human rights abuses of this kind.

We appreciate that regarding the recent visit, Dr Behnke has asserted to APS Ethics committee members among others that there was no wrong-doing. We also appreciate Dr Behnke was willing to meet informally, in private, at the last APS meeting with PfP members to give them the same reassurance. However, we are seeking transparent, public discussion of the issues, and transparent, public commitment by the APS to a more open process concerning controversies over torture, including in communication with the APA.

We also hope to receive a timely response to this e-mail, which did not occur in last year's instance.

Regards,

A/Prof Winnifred Louis, PhD, MAPS  
on behalf of Psychologists for Peace

cc: APA Ethics Committee  
APA Board of Directors

This e-mail message (including any attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this message (including any attachments) is strictly prohibited.

If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender by reply e-mail message and destroy all copies of the original message (including attachments).

---

**From:** Behnke, Stephen Houran

**Sent:** Sunday, May 4, 2014 1:24 AM

**To:** Kaslow, Nadine; Garrison, Ellen

**Subject:** RE: [COR] DoD Response to APA Letter about 2013 Detainee Welfare-related Policy

Sorry I am just getting online now...was at APPIC in Austin, where I believed I had lost my laptop(!) Fortunately, cab driver returned it to his dispatch. Will \*definitely\* get the laptop equivalent of a lojack installed. Do not wish to repeat the experience.

I will work on draft of letter. Hope you're both well,

Steve

---

**From:** Kaslow, Nadine [[NKASLOW@emory.edu](mailto:NKASLOW@emory.edu)]

**Sent:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 2:07 PM

**To:** Garrison, Ellen

**Cc:** Behnke, Stephen Houran

**Subject:** RE: [COR] DoD Response to APA Letter about 2013 Detainee Welfare-related Policy

Great, njk

---

**From:** Garrison, Ellen [<mailto:egarrison@apa.org>]

**Sent:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 1:59 PM

**To:** Kaslow, Nadine

**Cc:** Garrison, Ellen; Behnke, Stephen Houran

**Subject:** Re: [COR] DoD Response to APA Letter about 2013 Detainee Welfare-related Policy

Nadine, as I recall, Steve is taking the first run at that. I'm happy to help as we usually write in tandem!

Ellen

Sent from my iPhone

---

On May 3, 2014, at 9:30 AM, "Kaslow, Nadine" <NKASLOW@emory.edu<mailto:NKASLOW@emory.edu>> wrote:

Can you please create my letter to Division 39 this month, incorporating this information.

njk

From: Council Representatives List [<mailto:COR@LISTS.APA.ORG>] On Behalf Of Garrison, Ellen

Sent: Friday, May 02, 2014 3:38 PM

To: [COR@LISTS.APA.ORG](mailto:COR@LISTS.APA.ORG)<<mailto:COR@LISTS.APA.ORG>>

Subject: [COR] DoD Response to APA Letter about 2013 Detainee Welfare-related Policy

Dear Council members,

As follow up to my note below, I am providing you with the attached response from the Department of Defense (DoD) to our recent APA letter to Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel informing DoD of our 2013 reconciled and unified Council policy related to detainee welfare and interrogation in national security settings. As you will see, the DoD letter states that "All personnel involved in detainee operations are required to treat detainees humanely, no matter their role. The Department does not tolerate the mistreatment of detainees."

It is our expectation that DoD will interpret and apply their policies relevant to psychologists in a manner consistent with APA's 2013 policy. All military psychologists, including those working as behavioral science consultants, should be required to comply with APA policy concerning the treatment of detainees.

I will continue to keep you apprised of new developments on this front, as well as provide you with any responses that we receive to the other nine letters that we sent to key federal officials to inform them of our 2013 policy.

Best,  
Ellen

Ellen G. Garrison, Ph.D. | Senior Policy Advisor Executive Office  
American Psychological Association<<http://www.apa.org/>>

750 First Street NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242

Tel: (202) 336-6066 | Fax: (202) 336-6069

email: [egarrison@apa.org](mailto:egarrison@apa.org)<<mailto:egarrison@apa.org>> | [www.apa.org](http://www.apa.org)<<http://www.apa.org/>>

<image001.png><<https://www.facebook.com/AmericanPsychologicalAssociation>>

<image002.png><[http://www.linkedin.com/groups?gid=58284&trk=hb\\_side\\_g](http://www.linkedin.com/groups?gid=58284&trk=hb_side_g)>

<image003.jpg><[https://plus.google.com/109392714004041510585/posts?utm\\_source=embedded&utm\\_medium=googleabout&utm\\_campaign=link](https://plus.google.com/109392714004041510585/posts?utm_source=embedded&utm_medium=googleabout&utm_campaign=link)> <image004.jpg><<http://twitter.com/#!/apa>>

<image005.jpg>

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Council Representatives List [<mailto:COR@LISTS.APA.ORG>] On Behalf Of Garrison, Ellen  
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2014 4:13 PM  
To: [COR@LISTS.APA.ORG](mailto:COR@LISTS.APA.ORG)<<mailto:COR@LISTS.APA.ORG>>  
Subject: [COR] Informing Federal Officials of Unified APA Policy on Detainee Welfare/National Security

Dear Council members,

As you will recall, Council overwhelmingly adopted a resolution in July of 2013 that reconciled and unified our many APA policies dating back to 1986 related to detainee welfare and interrogation in national security settings. This 2013 resolution entitled, "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<<http://www.apa.org/about/policy/national-security.aspx>>," was developed over a two-year period by an APA member-initiated task force chaired by Linda Woolf. Related Council actions at the time included rescinding the Report of the APA Presidential Task Force on Psychological Ethics and National Security (PENS) policy and two other policies from 2007 and 2008 that were outdated or no longer valid due to subsequent policies and the 2010 revision of the APA Ethics Code.

Both the 2013 resolution and Council's implementation plan wisely call for outreach to federal agency officials and key members of Congress to inform them of these policy developments. APA is also directed to continue to urge the U.S. government to prohibit the use of torture and other abusive treatment and punishment of detainees and to clarify psychologists' restrictions related to detainee operations and settings. In addition, APA is to call upon the U.S. legal system to reject testimony that results from abusive detainee treatment or punishment.

To carry out Council's directives, then APA President Don Bersoff and CEO Norman Anderson sent a letter to President Barack Obama in December. More recently, an additional nine letters were sent by APA President Nadine Kaslow and Dr. Anderson to Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel, CIA Director John Brennan, and Attorney General Eric Holder, Jr., along with letters to the chairs and ranking members of the House and Senate Armed Services, Intelligence, and Judiciary Committees.

The attached press release (which will be available shortly on the APA website) documents this most recent concerted outreach effort to federal officials. For more information on APA's activities in this critical area, please see the Timeline of APA Policies & Actions Related to Detainee Welfare and Professional Ethics in the Context of Interrogation and National Security<<http://www.apa.org/news/press/statements/interrogations.aspx>>.

Best,  
Ellen

Ellen G. Garrison, Ph.D. | Senior Policy Advisor Executive Office  
American Psychological Association<<http://www.apa.org/>>  
750 First Street NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242  
Tel: (202) 336-6066 | Fax: (202) 336-6069  
email: [egarrison@apa.org](mailto:egarrison@apa.org)<<mailto:egarrison@apa.org>> | [www.apa.org](http://www.apa.org)<<http://www.apa.org/>>  
<.png><<https://www.facebook.com/AmericanPsychologicalAssociation>>

<image002.png><[http://www.linkedin.com/groups?gid=58284&trk=hb\\_side\\_g](http://www.linkedin.com/groups?gid=58284&trk=hb_side_g)>  
<image003.jpg><[https://plus.google.com/109392714004041510585/posts?utm\\_source=embedded&utm\\_medium=googleabout&utm\\_campaign=link](https://plus.google.com/109392714004041510585/posts?utm_source=embedded&utm_medium=googleabout&utm_campaign=link)> <image004.jpg><<http://twitter.com/#!/apa>>

<image006.jpg>

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Click on this link to unsubscribe from this list UNSUBSCRIBE<<mailto:COR-unsubscribe-request@lists.apa.org?subject=unsubscribe>>

An email will automatically open with "Unsubscribe" in the subject area. Just Send the message, as is, to unsubscribe from this list..

This e-mail message (including any attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this message (including any attachments) is strictly prohibited.

If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender by reply e-mail message and destroy all copies of the original message (including attachments).

---

**From:** Kaslow, Nadine <[NKASLOW@emory.edu](mailto:NKASLOW@emory.edu)>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 29, 2014 6:03 PM  
**To:** Behnke, Stephen Houran  
**Subject:** RE: Your New Business Item

I assume you can write a note to this effect

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

From: Behnke, Stephen Houran [[mailto:steve\\_behnke@hms.harvard.edu](mailto:steve_behnke@hms.harvard.edu)]  
Sent: Sunday, June 29, 2014 5:59 PM  
To: Kaslow, Nadine; Ellen Garrison ([egarrison@apa.org](mailto:egarrison@apa.org)); Nathalie Gilfoyle ([ngilfoyle@apa.org](mailto:ngilfoyle@apa.org))  
Subject: RE: Your New Business Item

Also, you will need to consider whether to have Dan Aalbers on the call. It's very odd that Scott would not realize how inappropriate the request is to include an individual who is not an APA member, must less not a member of Council.

From: Kaslow, Nadine [[NKASLOW@emory.edu](mailto:NKASLOW@emory.edu)]  
Sent: Sunday, June 29, 2014 5:05 PM  
To: Behnke, Stephen Houran; Ellen Garrison ([egarrison@apa.org](mailto:egarrison@apa.org)); Nathalie Gilfoyle ([ngilfoyle@apa.org](mailto:ngilfoyle@apa.org))  
Subject: FW: Your New Business Item

Fyi,  
nadine

From: Scott Churchill [<mailto:bonobo@udallas.edu>]  
Sent: Saturday, June 28, 2014 2:18 PM  
To: Kaslow, Nadine  
Subject: Fwd: Your New Business Item

Dear Nadine,

In the interests of "transparency", I am sharing with you the message I just sent out to a small group of the co-movers (I am unofficially including here Dan Aalbers, who has been working on this for over a decade on the sidelines, and who would like to participate in a conference call with you and Jean Maria Arrigo (Div 48) and perhaps one other colleague (from Div 39) to discuss APA's concerns as communicated to us by you.

I am feeling pressure from some on this list to forge ahead no matter what APA Legal says, because there is the impression that this is just a stalling tactic to delay the NBI until Jean Maria and I are both off Council. Frankly, I do not think this at all, and the process you have described to me does not strike me as out of the ordinary, except perhaps that it seems odd that the Legal folks can't make a decision on this after four months of deliberating.

So I've got my colleagues shouting from the sidelines in private emails "Don't back down! Insist that we go to the floor of Council with this in August -- let Council decide!" and "This is just more of the same from APA -- one delay after another until we're defeated." (I'm paraphrasing.)

So you see my dilemma: I am wanting to do something in a spirit that will enjoin the majority to vote with me. And I know that this is the message you are sending to me as well. However, I share with you my letter to my team, so you can see how I am positioning this with them - and you can also see where I stand (which is not so sure footed these days -- without even bringing my bruised foot into the discussion!).

If you can give me a couple times when we could talk on the phone, I promise we can keep it short. I am available much of this next week from 10 am until evenings and also on weekends.

best regards,

Scott

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Scott Churchill <[bonobo@udallas.edu](mailto:bonobo@udallas.edu)<<mailto:bonobo@udallas.edu>>>  
Date: Sat, Jun 28, 2014 at 1:05 PM  
Subject: Re: Your New Business Item  
To: Jean Maria Arrigo <[jmarrigo@cox.net](mailto:jmarrigo@cox.net)<<mailto:jmarrigo@cox.net>>>  
Cc: Dan Aalbers <[dan.aalbers@gmail.com](mailto:dan.aalbers@gmail.com)<<mailto:dan.aalbers@gmail.com>>>, FRANK H FARLEY <[ffarley@temple.edu](mailto:ffarley@temple.edu)<<mailto:ffarley@temple.edu>>>, MarshaMcCary

<marsha.d.mccary@gmail.com<mailto:marsha.d.mccary@gmail.com>>, Frank Summers  
<franksumphd@gmail.com<mailto:franksumphd@gmail.com>>

Thanks Jean and Dan for your comments -- and also, Dan, I just listened to your message form yesterday afternoon - (I was doing my PT for foot injury when you called).

I don't know that the NBI is automatically added to the Agenda just by virtue of its having been submitted -- I can check with Maureen O'Brien on this. I think the question is whether when it appears, it will have the endorsement of the APA review process. It would be nice if it did, as that would sway votes decidedly in our favor; were it to appear as a result of a stubborn demand on our part -- no matter how justified it feels to us -- I fear that the recommendation AGAINST the NBI would kill it. My take from 5 yrs on Council is that a recommendation against an item is pretty much a kiss of death. Once once that has happened, it is too late to turn around at the next meeting and call for a re-consideration.

Jean Maria and I have three more Council meetings, which means we have ONE shot at this. I have written back to Nadine (from whom I am awaiting a phone number to call) telling her we would rather proceed with at least a part of the NBI than throw in the towel altogether. I asked, for example, why the letters to officials would be out of question, if they could be drafted without breaking any laws?

My concern is based on the perception, at the moment, that the tone of her letters is still friendly, collegial, and welcoming - while expressing what I believe to be information that blind-sided Nadine as well. (And this is one of the things I want to have her clarify for me when we speak: to what extent is she too surprised by the resistance to proceeding on the part of Legal?) However, I am concerned that disregarding her advice and demanding to be placed on the agenda would not only alienate her own goodwill towards this NBI, but would also put the entire APA "block" of forces in defensive mode against us. We would become a "them" in an "us - them" disagreement. And this almost never works out well. MY whole strategy is for "them" to see themselves as aligned with "us" -- who are those interested in saving APA from shame. We want the military psychologists here (ie, those who order the psychologists to witness/participate in interrogations) to be the "them" - not us! If we forge ahead to try to make a touchdown at this next meeting against their advice, "better judgment", etc, then we become the enemy team - and all those waffling on the sidelines will look to the podium for cues as to how to vote. We would be walking into sure defeat.

This is why I want to talk with her on the phone, and ask for a conference call so all voices can be heard by her before simply demanding that the NBI go to council as written.

The whole idea of submitting an NBI is to allow "them" (oops!) to weigh in -- and hopefully support the proposal once the language has been fine tuned. I don't think any NBIs go to council floor without some editing.

Dan, let's see if we can address Nadine's concerns (which are obviously coming from Legal) with regard to the inaccuracies she indicated in her first letters?

And Jean Maria, this is an excellent point re: our having status already within the UN and therefore are we not required to adopt UN policies? Just as we are asking psychologists to adopt APA policies rather than the military's position on torture?

This may in fact be the bargaining chip here: that APA has a duplicitous role as "belonging" to both the USA and to the UN -- just as psychologists have a duplicitous role in belonging to APA (as well as to the wider profession) and to the USA.

How can we put into action the 2008 membership vote if we cannot get past these dual roles?

Scott

Scott D. Churchill, PhD

Professor of Psychology and Human Science, University of Dallas Editor-in-Chief, The Humanistic Psychologist (an APA Division Journal) Fellow and Council Representative, The American Psychological Association Fellow and Film Discussant, The Dallas Institute of Humanities and Culture Senior Film and Performing Arts Critic, Irving Community Television Network

<http://udallas.academia.edu/ScottChurchill>

Department of Psychology, University of Dallas

1845 East Northgate Drive, Irving TX 75062

tel: (972) 721-5348<tel:%28972%29%20721-5348> fax:(972) 721-4034<tel:%28972%29%20721-4034>

On Sat, Jun 28, 2014 at 11:56 AM, Jean Maria Arrigo <[jmarrigo@cox.net](mailto:jmarrigo@cox.net)<<mailto:jmarrigo@cox.net>>> wrote:

Scott,

Thanks to you for bearing the brunt of the confrontation.

APA "legal" has to go with the definition of torture in the United Nations Convention Against Torture. We saw U.S. law under the Yoo memos, and that can happen again. APA is an accredited NGO at the United Nations. We have to hold out for the UN Conventions against Torture definition. Otherwise, NBI23B can easily be rendered meaningless.

Jean Maria

On Jun 27, 2014, at 10:00 PM, Dan Aalbers wrote:

Hi Scott,

I'll try to contact Bryant, the former general counsel of APA and see if he believe that an item put on the agenda can be taken off the agenda because the boards did not review the item in a timely manner. I'm sorry to say that my experience with the APA leads me to suspect that someone wants this to be delayed until a time until you and Jean Maria are off CoR and the divisions that support our efforts have different leadership.

We have done all that they have asked, we have followed the rules and ceded to their requests. We are not responsible for the boards inability to review this in a timely manner and, frankly, I don't see why meeting in a phone conference is such an extraordinary act. This is not to our advantage -- I believe that we should speak to the president together and that we should be on the call with COLI.

best to all, Dan

On Fri, Jun 27, 2014 at 1:27 PM, Scott Churchill <[bonobo@udallas.edu](mailto:bonobo@udallas.edu)<<mailto:bonobo@udallas.edu>>>>  
wrote:

Well -- here is a follow up from Nadine in response to my query about moving our NBI on to the other groups while Legal is still taking its time with it.

scott

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Kaslow, Nadine <[NKASLOW@emory.edu](mailto:NKASLOW@emory.edu)<<mailto:NKASLOW@emory.edu>>>

Date: Fri, Jun 27, 2014 at 9:05 AM

Subject: RE: Your New Business Item

To: Scott Churchill <[bonobo@udallas.edu](mailto:bonobo@udallas.edu)<<mailto:bonobo@udallas.edu>>>

Hi Scott,

I'm so sorry to hear about your foot. Please let me know if you'll need assistance getting around at Council and Convention. I hope you're feeling better.

I'll be happy to speak with you. The timeframe for a new business item returning to Council depends on many factors. The President isn't able to commit to any set time frame, but I am able to provide you with some more information about the process moving forward.

In addition to the time typically needed for governance review, the added challenge with your NBI, as submitted, is that it has multiple and significant inaccuracies regarding legal and policy issues that will need to be addressed. The Committee on Legal Issues (COLI) is taking the unusual step of meeting by conference call this week in order to follow up on concerns discussed at its spring meeting and to prepare written comments evaluating identified problems regarding the item's interpretation and application of U.S. and international law and procedure, as well as APA policy. COLI has scheduled this meeting in order to move the item forward in an expeditious manner. The other governance groups assigned to your item -- the Policy and Planning Board (P&P), the Board of Professional Affairs (BPA), and the Ethics Committee -- will then receive COLI's review and recommendation to inform their respective reviews.

Although this process takes time and will not be completed before August, the process can also serve to your advantage. You will be receiving more specific feedback about the content of your motion from the referral groups once they have had the opportunity to review your item, and, at that time, you will be given the opportunity to develop a substitute motion that addresses the legal and policy issues in your original motion. I encourage you to work with the referral groups to ensure that your item is current and accurate when it returns to Council.

Thank you, Scott, for your thoughtful response to my letter. I look forward to speaking.

Best,  
Nadine

From: Scott Churchill [<mailto:bonobo@udallas.edu><<mailto:bonobo@udallas.edu>>]

Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2014 1:01 PM

To: Kaslow, Nadine

Subject: Re: Your New Business Item

Thanks Nadine!

You were on my radar already to call this past week, when an unexpected foot injury put me in the hospital!

Let's try to talk this coming week, if that works for you? I understand what you've explained; though, I am surprised that this is so complex that it is still in Legal review.

I believe that my co-movers and I would certainly be willing to modify the language of the portion of our first resolution regarding licensing boards (we would of course conform to existing language; I think where we wrote something to the effect to process "with prejudice" was meant to communicate "we mean what we say!" -- and not that this language has to then be incorporated into each licensing board's bylaws or rules of order.)

Regarding which definition of torture the APA has adopted, we would of course want to be accurate here, and there was no intent to mislead nor awareness that what we wrote was incorrect. Can you perhaps let us know where we went wrong so that we can begin fixing that portion of the resolutions?

We understand that there are different definitions of torture circulating now, and that the UN and the USA do not operate using the same definition. So this would certainly be a matter for Legal to investigate. Can we get a time frame, though, so that we won't discover further delays if we agree to postpone?

Thanks, I'll look forward to discussing with you soon!

Scott

Scott D. Churchill, PhD

Professor of Psychology and Human Science, University of Dallas Editor-in-Chief, The Humanistic Psychologist (an APA Division Journal) Fellow and Council Representative, The American Psychological Association Fellow and Film Discussant, The Dallas Institute of Humanities and Culture Senior Film and Performing Arts Critic, Irving Community Television Network

<http://udallas.academia.edu/ScottChurchill>

Department of Psychology, University of Dallas

1845 East Northgate Drive, Irving TX 75062

tel: (972) 721-5348<tel:%28972%29%20721-5348> fax:(972) 721-4034<tel:%28972%29%20721-4034>

On Sat, Jun 21, 2014 at 7:59 AM, Kaslow, Nadine

<[NKASLOW@emory.edu](mailto:NKASLOW@emory.edu)<<mailto:NKASLOW@emory.edu>>> wrote:

Dear Scott,

Attached is an additional letter with more specific information related to your new business item. I hope

that this information is helpful to you. I trust that you will share this letter with your co-sponsors. See you in DC.

Nadine

Nadine J Kaslow, PhD, ABPP

Professor, Vice Chair, Chief Psychologist (Grady) President, American Psychological Association Editor, Journal of Family Psychology Emory Dept of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences, Grady Hospital, 80 Jesse Hill Jr Dr Atlanta, GA 30303 404-616-4757<tel:404-616-4757> (office); 404-547-1957<tel:404-547-1957> (cell)

This e-mail message (including any attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this message (including any attachments) is strictly prohibited.

If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender by reply e-mail message and destroy all copies of the original message (including attachments).

---

**From:** Behnke, Stephen Houran

**Sent:** Monday, July 7, 2014 10:35 AM

**To:** Gilfoyle, Nathalie; O'Brien, Maureen; Nadine Kaslow; Garrison, Ellen

**Subject:** RE: Kaslow-Reply to the Legal Critique of Motion NBI23B Implementation of the 2008 Membership Vote

I'm fine with removing that sentence.

---

From: Gilfoyle, Nathalie [[ngilfoyle@apa.org](mailto:ngilfoyle@apa.org)]

Sent: Sunday, July 06, 2014 6:21 PM

To: O'Brien, Maureen; Nadine Kaslow; Behnke, Stephen Houran; Garrison, Ellen

Subject: RE: Kaslow-Reply to the Legal Critique of Motion NBI23B Implementation of the 2008 Membership Vote

COLI has a conference call this week on the topic. The current chair Terese Hall is very thorough but I'm not sure if she is ready for an onslaught from Arrigo and/or Aalbers. It may make sense to take this out for now and let me see how the COLI call goes. We can offer this later if it seems right and necessary. N.

---

From: O'Brien, Maureen

Sent: Sunday, July 06, 2014 6:15 PM

To: Nadine Kaslow; Behnke, Stephen Houran; Garrison, Ellen; Gilfoyle, Nathalie

Subject: RE: Kaslow-Reply to the Legal Critique of Motion NBI23B Implementation of the 2008 Membership Vote

Letter is good except I do have concerns about the last sentence about reaching out to the governance groups. Some assigned to the item haven't even discussed it. If you want to put something I think they could talk to COLI chair but would need to give COLI Chair a heads up on that. I think you may want to consider taking it out entirely. Maureen  
Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: "Kaslow, Nadine"  
Date: 07/06/2014 5:30 PM (GMT-05:00)  
To: "Behnke, Stephen Houran" ,"Garrison, Ellen" ,"Gilfoyle, Nathalie"  
Cc: "O'Brien, Maureen"  
Subject: RE: Kaslow-Reply to the Legal Critique of Motion NBI23B Implementation of the 2008 Membership Vote  
So just waiting for maureen, njk

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

From: Behnke, Stephen Houran [[mailto:steve\\_behnke@hms.harvard.edu](mailto:steve_behnke@hms.harvard.edu)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 06, 2014 5:28 PM  
To: Garrison, Ellen; Gilfoyle, Nathalie  
Cc: Kaslow, Nadine; O'Brien, Maureen  
Subject: RE: Kaslow-Reply to the Legal Critique of Motion NBI23B Implementation of the 2008 Membership Vote

Ellen's thought is a good one, to say s/he (assuming you will copy Scott on reply) should contact committee chairs, rather than governance groups.

I think this reply is a good follow-up to your conversation with Scott today.

---

From: Garrison, Ellen [[egarrison@apa.org](mailto:egarrison@apa.org)]  
Sent: Sunday, July 06, 2014 4:25 PM  
To: Gilfoyle, Nathalie  
Cc: Nadine Kaslow; Behnke, Stephen Houran; Garrison, Ellen; O'Brien, Maureen  
Subject: Re: Kaslow-Reply to the Legal Critique of Motion NBI23B Implementation of the 2008 Membership Vote

Me, too. Thank you so much, Steve, for taking the initiative to draft this response.

My only suggestion, echoing Maureen's response to an earlier letter, would be to suggest that they might contact the three governance group chairs rather than the committees (since apparently the latter would not be appropriate).

Ellen

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jul 6, 2014, at 9:38 PM, "Gilfoyle, Nathalie"

<[ngilfoyle@apa.org](mailto:ngilfoyle@apa.org)<<mailto:ngilfoyle@apa.org>>> wrote:

>

> I agree.

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

>> On Jul 6, 2014, at 2:02 PM, "Kaslow, Nadine"

<[NKASLOW@emory.edu](mailto:NKASLOW@emory.edu)<<mailto:NKASLOW@emory.edu>>> wrote:

>>

>> Hi, great note. I won't send until I hear from others.

>> Nadine

>>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Behnke, Stephen Houran [[mailto:steve\\_behnke@hms.harvard.edu](mailto:steve_behnke@hms.harvard.edu)]

>> Sent: Saturday, July 05, 2014 9:51 PM

>> To: Kaslow, Nadine; Garrison, Ellen; Gilfoyle, Nathalie

>> Cc: [mobrien@apa.org](mailto:mobrien@apa.org)<<mailto:mobrien@apa.org>>

>> Subject: RE: Kaslow-Reply to the Legal Critique of Motion NBI23B Implementation of the 2008 Membership Vote

>>

>> Nadine, here is a draft of a possible response, with Scott (but not Dan Aalbers) copied: (would want Ellen, Nathalie and Maureen to review as well)

>>

>> Dear Jean Maria,

>>

>> Thank you for your message. I want to be clear that my letter to Scott should not be considered a "legal critique" of the new business item. Rather, it was a brief overview of why I believe it is necessary to allow the governance review process to proceed as it normally does when a new business item is introduced.

>>

>> As Scott's item acknowledges, and your message confirms, the legal issues are complex and involve questions of domestic national security and international law. These are not the kind of legal questions that APA is accustomed to address. For this reason, I think it is essential that the Committee on Legal Issues be given the time to complete its review, and that the other review groups have an opportunity to respond as well after they have received COLI's review.

>>

>> I want to assure you that this item is moving forward through the governance process, and that the governance review groups to which it has been assigned are very aware of the

sponsors' desire that it return to Council as soon as it is ready.

>>

>> I look forward to seeing you in August, and encourage you and Scott to use Convention as an opportunity to address concerns regarding the accuracy of the item. Convention is also an excellent opportunity to reach out to other governance groups in a collaborative fashion.

>>

>> Best,

>>

>> njk

>> \_\_\_\_\_

>> From: Kaslow, Nadine [[NKASLOW@emory.edu](mailto:NKASLOW@emory.edu)]

>> Sent: Saturday, July 05, 2014 3:01 PM

>> To: Behnke, Stephen Houran; Garrison, Ellen; Gilfoyle, Nathalie

>> Subject: FW: Kaslow-Reply to the Legal Critique of Motion NBI23B Implementation of the 2008 Membership Vote

>>

>> And it keeps coming

>>

>> From: Jean Maria Arrigo [<mailto:jmarrigo@peat-intel.org>]

>> Sent: Saturday, July 05, 2014 2:58 PM

>> To: Kaslow, Nadine

>> Cc: Scott Churchill; Dan Aalbers; FRANK H FARLEY

>> Subject: Kaslow-Reply to the Legal Critique of Motion NBI23B Implementation of the 2008 Membership Vote

>>

>> Dear President Kaslow,

>>

>> \_\_\_\_\_

>>

>> This e-mail message (including any attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this message (including any attachments) is strictly prohibited.

>>

>> If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender by reply e-mail message and destroy all copies of the original message (including attachments).

>>

---

**From:** Kaslow, Nadine <[nkaslow@emory.edu](mailto:nkaslow@emory.edu)>

**Sent:** Friday, August 1, 2014 12:06 PM

**To:** Behnke, Stephen Houran; Farberman, Rhea; Garrison, Ellen; Gilfoyle, Nathalie

**Cc:** Moore, Nancy; O'Brien, Maureen  
**Subject:** RE: [COR] Revised Agenda Items & NBIP Report to Council

Hi, gosh that would be so so helpful and most appreciated.

Nadine

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

**From:** Behnke, Stephen Houran [[mailto:steve\\_behnke@hms.harvard.edu](mailto:steve_behnke@hms.harvard.edu)]

**Sent:** Friday, August 01, 2014 12:05 PM

**To:** Kaslow, Nadine; Farberman, Rhea; Garrison, Ellen; Gilfoyle, Nathalie

**Cc:** Moore, Nancy; O'Brien, Maureen

**Subject:** RE: [COR] Revised Agenda Items & NBIP Report to Council

Nadine, would you like us to draft a response?

**From:** Kaslow, Nadine [[nkaslow@emory.edu](mailto:nkaslow@emory.edu)]

**Sent:** Friday, August 01, 2014 11:45 AM

**To:** Farberman, Rhea; Garrison, Ellen; Gilfoyle, Nathalie

**Cc:** Behnke, Stephen Houran; Moore, Nancy; O'Brien, Maureen

**Subject:** RE: [COR] Revised Agenda Items & NBIP Report to Council

Well seems clear to us.

njk

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

**From:** Farberman, Rhea [<mailto:rfarberman@apa.org>]

**Sent:** Friday, August 01, 2014 9:12 AM

**To:** Garrison, Ellen; Gilfoyle, Nathalie

**Cc:** Behnke, Stephen Houran; Kaslow, Nadine; Moore, Nancy; O'Brien, Maureen

**Subject:** RE: [COR] Revised Agenda Items & NBIP Report to Council

I agree with what's already been said. Its not up to staff or the Board to describe the items or their author's intent. Each mover will have the opportunity to speak; Council members will have the opportunity to read each item, hear the 5-minute presentations and draw their own conclusions.

Rhea

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

**From:** Garrison, Ellen

**Sent:** Thursday, July 31, 2014 9:44 PM

**To:** Gilfoyle, Nathalie

Cc: Behnke, Stephen Houran; Nadine Kaslow; Garrison, Ellen; Moore, Nancy; O'Brien, Maureen; Farberman, Rhea

Subject: Re: [COR] Revised Agenda Items & NBIP Report to Council

Nadine, I agree with both Steve and Nathalie. Steve's proposed response seems good to me.

Even a naive Council member would likely see the Salter NBI as a counter measure, which was indeed its intent. It's not that lengthy that any provision could be well "hidden." I also suspect that Diane may raise the licensing board issue in her summary.

Ellen

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jul 31, 2014, at 8:57 PM, "Gilfoyle, Nathalie" <[ngilfoyle@apa.org](mailto:ngilfoyle@apa.org)> wrote:

>

> I think that is very reasonable. (In the alternative, I also think you could say ,without any harm, that the two items pose different approaches , including for example that one directs APA staff to write to licensing boards and the other directs them not too . But the crisper approach is to leave it to the two proponents to say what they want that is on topic in their 5 minutes) . I think that his effort to ascribe a sinister motive to the placement in their item of the licensure board issue is inappropriate.

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Behnke, Stephen Houran [[mailto:steve\\_behnke@hms.harvard.edu](mailto:steve_behnke@hms.harvard.edu)]

> Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2014 8:45 PM

> To: Nadine Kaslow; Garrison, Ellen; Moore, Nancy; O'Brien, Maureen; Farberman, Rhea; Gilfoyle, Nathalie

> Subject: RE: [COR] Revised Agenda Items & NBIP Report to Council

>

> It's difficult to know how even to respond to this message.

>

> I would simply acknowledge the message, and indicate that how the sponsors use their 5-minutes is up to them, but it would not be appropriate to shape or characterize the messages on behalf of the sponsors.

>

> Do others think differently?

>

> Steve

>

> From: Kaslow, Nadine [[nkaslow@emory.edu](mailto:nkaslow@emory.edu)]

> Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2014 12:14 PM

> To: Behnke, Stephen Houran; Garrison, Ellen; Moore, Nancy; O'Brien, Maureen; Farberman, Rhea; Gilfoyle, Nathalie

> Subject: FW: [COR] Revised Agenda Items & NBIP Report to Council

>

> Here we go. Thoughts?

> Nadine

>

> From: Scott Churchill [<mailto:bonobo@udallas.edu>]

> Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2014 6:27 PM

> To: Kaslow, Nadine

> Subject: Fwd: [COR] Revised Agenda Items & NBIP Report to Council

>

> Hi Nadine,

>

> I just have one quick concern regarding the two NBIs whose movers you have graciously allowed to address Council at the Plenary session:

>

> The main reason why you decided to let NBI-23A also give a report, I presumed, was because you recognized that it was intended as a direct "counter" measure to ours, since it prohibits APA from in any way trying to influence licensing boards by sending letters. This was seemingly "buried" within the larger NBI-23A precisely so as to disguise its primary motivation, as a "counter"-proposal.

>

> However, the "framing" of the NBI-23A by the Ethics committee does not in any way serve to underline both this "counter" proposal, nor the justification for therefore giving them "equal time" at the plenary session. (That is, our request to address Council was in light of the "complexities" attributed to it, that stand in its way of moving more swiftly through process. Whereas, I do not suppose that the movers of 23A made any such request to address Council; and your inviting them to is out of a sense of fairness, since it was obvious to you that theirs was in large part a counter-measure to ours.)

>

> In the five minutes allotted, they will be able to successfully "hide" its motivation as a counter-measure in preference of emphasizing the congratulatory nature of the rest of the proposal (which I presume you, too, can "see through" as a kind of fluff to veil the real intent of the proposal).

>

> The result would be to inadvertently hide from Council the real reason for allowing the two items to be given "updates" together, and instead to lead Council into thinking 23A is largely a just gesture of goodwill that ought to be supported once it comes to the floor.

>

> I think that it would be disingenuous for this to happen -- for the movers of 23A to be able to gloss over or even hide the "counter" nature of their proposal.

>

> The letter that went out last week serves to present these as two completely unrelated proposals, unless I missed something. And I \*know\* that this was not your intent.

>

> So our team would appreciate it if the "counter" proposal nature of 23A were made more explicit in the framing of it for Council, when both teams are introduced to address Council next week.

>

> Thanks,

>

> Scott

>

> ----- Forwarded message -----

> From: O'Brien, Maureen <[mobrien@apa.org](mailto:mobrien@apa.org)<<mailto:mobrien@apa.org>>>

> Date: Thu, Jul 24, 2014 at 4:08 PM

> Subject: [COR] Revised Agenda Items & NBIP Report to Council

> To: [COR@lists.apa.org](mailto:COR@lists.apa.org)<<mailto:COR@lists.apa.org>>

>

> Three documents have been posted to Council's Communities page. To simplify your life, a brief explanation of what's been posted (and attached to this email) can be found below.

>

> 1. The Board of Directors is recommending Sizeism and Body Image as the topic for the 2015 diversity training for Council and boards and committees. The revised agenda item is attached.

>

> 2. Item 22, Selected Spending Guidelines, was inadvertently included as an action item in the Council agenda. Because of the recent delegation of financial authority to the Board of Directors and due to the clear conflict of interest the Board has in approving elements within this item, the Board will be asked to approve, at its August 2014 meeting, a motion delegating the approval of revisions to SSPG 2.0 "Travel and Other Expenses of the Board and the President" to the Finance Committee. The revised agenda item is attached.

>

> 3. The New Business in Progress Report to Council is attached.

>

> Maureen

>

> Maureen O'Brien | Associate Executive Director Governance Affairs American Psychological Association<<http://www.apa.org/>>

> 750 First Street NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242

> (202) 336-6077<<tel:%28202%29%20336-6077>> | (202) 336-6157<<tel:%28202%29%20336-6157>>

> email: [mobrien@apa.org](mailto:mobrien@apa.org)<<mailto:mobrien@apa.org>> | [www.apa.org](http://www.apa.org)<<http://www.apa.org/>>

[cid:image015.png@01CFA751.09827D50]<<http://www.facebook.com/AmericanPsychologicalAssociation>> [cid:image016.jpg@01CFA751.09827D50]

<<http://www.linkedin.com/groups?gid=58284>> [cid:image017.png@01CFA751.09827D50]

<<http://plus.google.com/+americanpsychologicalassociation>> [cid:image018.jpg@01CFA751.09827D50] <<http://www.twitter.com/apa>> [cid:image019.jpg@01CFA751.09827D50]

<<http://www.youtube.com/theapavideo>>

>

> [cid:image020.jpg@01CFA751.09827D50] [cid:image021.png@01CFA751.09827D50]

>

> P Please consider the environment before printing this email.

> Click on this link to unsubscribe from this list UNSUBSCRIBE<<mailto:COR-unsubscribe-request@lists.apa.org?subject=unsubscribe>>

>

> An email will automatically open with "Unsubscribe" in the subject area. Just Send the message, as is, to unsubscribe from this list..