

EXHIBIT 48

Sender: Honaker, Michael </O=APA/OU=DC/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=MYH>
Sent: Tuesday, January 04, 2005 1:05:52 PM
Recipient: Behnke, Stephen <sbehnke@apa.org>;Mumford, Geoffrey <gmumford@apa.org>
Cc: Gilfoyle, Nathalie <ngilfoyle@apa.org>;Farberman, Rhea K. <rfarberman@apa.org>
Subject: RE: forthcoming NEJM & L.A. Times pieces

Okay by me.

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

From: Behnke, Stephen
Sent: Tuesday, January 04, 2005 10:12 AM
To: Mumford, Geoffrey
Cc: Honaker, Michael; Gilfoyle, Nathalie; Farberman, Rhea K.
Subject: RE: forthcoming NEJM & L.A. Times pieces

Yes--could we meet for a few minutes, at 2, in Mike's office, just to make sure we're on the same page about what all is going on (e.g., board item for the task force), and to touch base about any other issues we think may come up?

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

From: Mumford, Geoffrey
Sent: Tuesday, January 04, 2005 9:54 AM
To: Behnke, Stephen
Cc: Honaker, Michael; Gilfoyle, Nathalie; Farberman, Rhea K.
Subject: RE: forthcoming NEJM & L.A. Times pieces

I'm at your disposal.. might be good to include Steve Breckler too?

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

From: Behnke, Stephen
Sent: Tuesday, January 04, 2005 9:49 AM
To: Mumford, Geoffrey
Cc: Honaker, Michael; Gilfoyle, Nathalie; Farberman, Rhea K.
Subject: RE: forthcoming NEJM & L.A. Times pieces

Might it be possible for us to gather briefly today, perhaps sometime in the afternoon?

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

From: Mumford, Geoffrey
Sent: Tuesday, January 04, 2005 8:10 AM
To: Behnke, Stephen
Cc: Honaker, Michael; Gilfoyle, Nathalie; Farberman, Rhea K.
Subject: RE: forthcoming NEJM & L.A. Times pieces

Steve,

When we met on this at the beginning of last month it seemed there was a sense (a hope?) among some in the room that the story would die but it has, in fact, been part of the news cycle pretty consistently for over a month now. A high profile piece like this coupled to changes in oversight of the intelligence agencies by congress are likely to keep it in the news for awhile. It seems to me APA might want to be in a position of being able to say we have something at the level of a "Task Force" (or whatever) to indicate that we, as an association, are giving the matter high priority. I could easily see the IOM review, recommended in the article, gaining traction and we'd certainly want to be represented in that effort. Finally, and I'm not quite sure how to put this, but are there issues of perception that we should be concerned about if the wife of the Practice

Directorate ED has in fact been deployed to Guantanamo? Presumably, what she does is classified in which case I would not expect Russ to have any additional insight but if our level of activity as an association on this set of issues were questioned, that may be an awkward situation to try and explain and it doesn't appear to be a secret that she's been down there. Just my 2 cents...
-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 **PRIVACY REDACTION**
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

