

EXHIBIT 14

Sender: Newman, Russ </O=APA/OU=DC/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=RSN>
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2005 1:36:59 PM
Recipient: Mumford, Geoffrey <gmumford@apa.org>
Cc: Kelly, Heather <hkelly@apa.org>
Subject: RE: NEJM article on interrogation

That works fine. See you then. Russ

-----Original Message-----
 From: Mumford, Geoffrey
 Sent: Monday, January 10, 2005 1:36 PM
 To: Newman, Russ
 Cc: Kelly, Heather
 Subject: RE: NEJM article on interrogation

Russ,

If 9:30 tomorrow still works, Heather and I will drop by your office then.
 -geoff

-----Original Message-----
 From: Newman, Russ
 Sent: Monday, January 10, 2005 9:41 AM
 To: Mumford, Geoffrey
 Subject: RE: NEJM article on interrogation

That would be fine. I'm free before 10 tomorrow and 11 on Wednesday. Russ

-----Original Message-----
 From: Mumford, Geoffrey
 Sent: Monday, January 10, 2005 9:29 AM
 To: Newman, Russ
 Cc: Breckler, Steven J.; Behnke, Stephen; Honaker, Michael; Kelly, Heather
 Subject: RE: NEJM article on interrogation

Thanks Russ...it might be helpful for Heather to be part of that discussion and she won't be in until tomorrow but if you want to chat in advance I'm at your disposal.
 -geoff

-----Original Message-----
 From: Newman, Russ
 Sent: Monday, January 10, 2005 9:01 AM
 To: Mumford, Geoffrey
 Cc: Breckler, Steven J.; Behnke, Stephen; Honaker, Michael; Kelly, Heather
 Subject: RE: NEJM article on interrogation

Geoff,
 I had a conversation this morning with the Senior Army Psychologist in Special Operations. Would like to discuss when you have a chance. Russ

-----Original Message-----
 From: Mumford, Geoffrey

Sent: Friday, January 07, 2005 6:13 PM
 To: Newman, Russ
 Cc: Breckler, Steven J.; Behnke, Stephen; Honaker, Michael; Kelly, Heather
 Subject: RE: NEJM article on interrogation

Thanks Russ, we'll stand by for further word from you.
 -geoff

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

From: Newman, Russ
 Sent: Friday, January 07, 2005 5:06 PM
 To: Mumford, Geoffrey
 Cc: Breckler, Steven J.; Behnke, Stephen; Honaker, Michael; Kelly, Heather
 Subject: RE: NEJM article on interrogation

Geoff,

I've had a couple of conversations about a possible contact with the special ops psychologists and am awaiting a name. If that pans out, I will pass it along to you. Russ

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

From: Mumford, Geoffrey
 Sent: Wednesday, January 05, 2005 5:53 PM
 To: Newman, Russ
 Cc: Breckler, Steven J.; Behnke, Stephen; Honaker, Michael; Kelly, Heather
 Subject: FW: NEJM article on interrogation

Russ,

Really appreciate your candor and good humor at today's meeting. Just to close the loop, here are the 2 documents I was referencing. We'll definitely be interested in your perspective about how your Special Ops colleagues would fit into a proposed meeting with the Army Surgeon General and/or other outreach activities.
 -geoff

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

From: Mumford, Geoffrey
 Sent: Wednesday, January 05, 2005 10:40 AM
 To: Newbould, Peter; Richmond, Marilyn S.; Garrison, Ellen; Levitt, Nina
 Subject: NEJM article on interrogation

Hi All,

I wanted to make you aware of a couple of items of possible cross-directorate interest. The attached NEJM piece is coming out tomorrow (pdf). The last paragraph on page 5 indicates some on-going activity in the office of the Army Surgeon General and we (Heather Kelley) will be initiating some outreach to see if we can serve as a resource and hopefully get a meeting with him to discuss areas of mutual concern.

Further along in the same paragraph is the suggestion that an IOM study might be a useful vehicle to explore the range of issues being raised and, to the extent such a study might be congressionally mandated, we thought Tim Murphy might be someone to consult with given his friendship with Duncan Hunter.

The word attachment is a Task Force proposal aired at the last Board meeting and will be placed on the agenda for approval in February. Science staff are working with Steve Behnke and our range of DoD and intelligence community contacts to suggest nominees for the Task Force. Any concerns from any of you about this approach?
 -geoff

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

From: Behnke, Stephen
Sent: Monday, January 03, 2005 10:30 PM
To: Honaker, Michael; Gilfoyle, Nathalie; Farberman, Rhea K.
Cc: Mumford, Geoffrey
Subject: FW: forthcoming NEJM & L.A. Times pieces

I think it probably makes most sense to send Gregg the statement we crafted.

I'll speak to him "off the record" (I've known Gregg for many years), but will limit my remarks to "yes, as you say in your article these issues are very complicated; our Board of Directors is very concerned and is looking into the issues; and, like the ethics code of the AMA, our ethics code was not written with these types of situations in mind and now we need very actively to examine whether our Ethics Code gives adequate guidance to psychologists in such situations, as it is my understanding the American Psychiatric Association is doing as well."

Sound okay? (I'll speak in shorter sentences)

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

From: Gregg Bloche [<mailto:bloche@law.georgetown.edu>]
Sent: Monday, January 03, 2005 9:28 PM
To: Behnke, Stephen
Subject: forthcoming NEJM & L.A. Times pieces

Hi, Steve, & happy new year. Attached is a piece coming out in a few days in NEJM, on the role of docs, especially psychiatrists, in abusive interrogation practices. We're doing a related piece for this Sun.'s L.A. Times. Psychologists, it turns out, have been much more heavily involved than psychiatrists (they've been part of "Behavioral Science Consultation Teams," etc.). We'd like to address this (& the ethical rules, if any, that limit psychologists) in the L.A. Times piece. Has APA issued any relevant ethical guidance (or does it plan to)? I'd like to talk to you about this -- tomorrow if possible, given our deadline.

Best,

Gregg