

**RESPONDENTS'  
OPPOSITION EXHIBIT 20**

## Behnke, Stephen

---

From: Bossolo, Luana  
Sent: Thu 9/07/2006 6:04 PM (GMT-00:00)  
To: Farberman, Rhea  
Cc: Newman, Russ; Archer, Kathleen; Behnke, Stephen  
Bcc:  
Subject: RE: Washington Monthly NEEDS RESPONSE THIS AFTERNOON

Rhea, I agree with you on the statement. Russ is on the Hill right now and won't be back until 3:30pm. We'll get it in front of him ASAP.  
Luana

---

**From:** Farberman, Rhea  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 07, 2006 1:59 PM  
**To:** Bossolo, Luana  
**Cc:** Newman, Russ; Archer, Kathleen; Behnke, Stephen  
**Subject:** RE: Washington Monthly NEEDS RESPONSE THIS AFTERNOON

Luana, Russ – We've been dealing with this reporter (Art Levine) for a few weeks, he's very persistent.

Levine has spoken at length to many PENS critics (he's also interviewed Koocher and Behnke) and has asked them to comment or refute Arrigo's reporting of the Task Force discussions. We have reiterated the Task Force members' agreement that the proceeding of the Task Force were private and that the report would speak for the group. That we are therefore not going to comment on Arrigo's summary because she is not abiding by the group's agreement (an agreement she was party to).

That is one option although not a perfect one.

Another option –

Give Levine a statement from Russ (via email) that says something like:

**The PENS Task Force did enormously important work in giving guidance to psychologists working in national security arenas as to ethical behavior. The next step in the process, the creation of the casebook, will build on that process. My understanding of the casebook is that it will define such terms as degrading and inhuman. These definitions will be another important resource for psychologists who work in national security setting – helping to ensure that their work is always safe, ethical, legal and effective.**

What does everyone think?

If we're going to response we need to do so this afternoon.

Rhea

---

**From:** Bossolo, Luana  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 07, 2006 1:08 PM  
**To:** Farberman, Rhea  
**Cc:** Newman, Russ; Archer, Kathleen  
**Subject:** FW: Washington Monthly  
**Importance:** High

Hi Rhea,

The following Washington Monthly reporter contacted us about the PENS task force. I'm turning this over to you since it's the PENS issue, but wanted to copy Russ since the reporter is chasing down something he said. Kathleen Archer who recently joined the staff, took his call. I believe he's been a bit snippy with her.

Luana

---

**From:** Archer, Kathleen  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 07, 2006 12:26 PM  
**To:** Bossolo, Luana  
**Subject:** RE: Washington Monthly  
**Importance:** High

I just got another e-mail from this reporter late yesterday afternoon. The reporter said that he is referring to the PENS task force on psychologists' role in national security settings (released in June 2005). He also said that the quotes haven't appeared elsewhere because panelists took a vow of confidentiality. The reporter said that he used investigative reporting to get sources to reconstruct for him what was said in the meeting. Should I forward this e-mail on to Russ for his recommendation on how to handle this situation?

Thanks,  
Kathleen

---

**From:** Archer, Kathleen  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 05, 2006 5:39 PM  
**To:** Bossolo, Luana  
**Subject:** FW: Washington Monthly  
**Importance:** High

This is the Washington Monthly reporter who called last week. He is writing an article about last years task force. I know that he called Pam Willenz, but today he mentioned that he apparently spoke to a temporary worker in Rhea's group. I have many concerns about the quotes below that he is asking us to review. Let's talk tomorrow morning about this and about how to approach

Russ with this request. The reporter needs to submit his manuscript tomorrow afternoon. Thanks.

---

**From:** Art Levine [mailto:artslevine@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 05, 2006 4:28 PM

**To:** Archer, Kathleen

**Subject:** Newman comments

Karen Archer: I need some clarification of these points made to me by Jean Maria Arrigo and other sources familiar with the task force proceedings regarding what Newman reportedly said.. It's based on their best memory, so I'd like to get Newman's clarifications, confirmation, denial, or no comment, about what he said or points he made. I called last week, and am following up as a courtesy. I'm writing this evening and turning in a manuscript for editing tomorrow.

: Here's what I've been told:

Russ Newman, a lawyer and psychologist who heads the APA's practice directorate \*TK DEFINITION NEEDED. reportedly pointed out the need for confidentiality in task force proceedings: "This is a controversial issue, and the task force could ignite the fires instead of dampening the fires." The press, Newman and other officials reportedly said, isn't interested in reporting harmony, so any record of internal disputes could cause PR damage. *Question: those previous comments in paraphrase were made by APA officials, my sources say, they believe it was primarily Newman making that point; is that accurate, or did another official say them?* "We are on the firing line," he said

When discussion turned to citing specific abusive techniques or issuing an appendix or casebook of case histories, Newman allegedly contended, "We can't put in specific examples; this could be a document used in court."

"They could twist it and use it against you," he reportedly added, meaning those military psychologists who might possibly face prosecution or lawsuits.

####

Does that accurately reflect points or comments Newman made? If not, can he either give me the correct comments or respond in some way to these comments and views attributed to him?

Thanks, Art Levine

Art Levine  
202-248-9320