

**RESPONDENTS'
OPPOSITION EXHIBIT 23**

Sender: anton [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 26, 2005 7:21:50 AM
Recipient: Behnke, Stephen </O=APA/OU=DC/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=SVB>
Subject: RE: TF update part 2

Hi Gerry:

You probably received my general response to Rhea a few minutes ago. Jean Maria got pretty loose today - e.g. questioning why the American Psychological Association was called the the American Psychological Association. She did a lot of splitting too, in my opinion, and was quite difficult. She continued to take notes, writing on the margins of our in-progress papers in spite of assurances yesterday that she wouldn't. I think she alienated everyone but Mike Wessels and I'm not too sure about his feelings. I have to say that the DoD folks were gentle, respectful, and open to her, but also were able to express their views. They are very interested in a continuing dialogue with APA and were pleased to be there and look forward to collaborating on other projects. Robert Fein even offered to brief the BoD.

I think we will have a dozen or so points for you to review that has pretty good agreement before the morning light.

[REDACTED]

>Hi Barry,

>
>Thanks VERY much for this update. I hope you do not mind my copying my
>response to Steve Behnke.

>
>[REDACTED]

>
>I too noticed Jean Maria's note taking and felt concerned because of her
>note taking. I am glad you brought it up. I'd suggest that the group
>agree on one "confidential" means. I suggest the following definition
>as a starting point:

- >
>1. The TF report should be reached by consensus.
>2. All communications about the TF report or findings come from the
>report itself (i.e., nothing discussed in the meeting that does should
>be reported in any public form unless it is included in the public report).
>3. Under no circumstances should the comments or anecdotes offered by
>any member of the TF be cited for attribution UNLESS there is unanimous
>agreement and these appear in the approved report.

>
>I have plans to talk with Steve today between Noon and 1 pm. I strongly
>support your idea about going through bullet points.

>
>Regards,

>
>Gerry

>
>
>
>
>anton wrote:

>
>>Dear Gerry:

>> **PRIVACY REDACTION**

>>We missed you this afternoon. There was some progress on defining the issues

>>but it was hard keeping people on task to answer the charge to the TF. The DoD

>>folks gave a lot of very interesting examples and scenarios that helped
>>exemplify how complicated some of these issues of role are. Around 3 p.m. I
>>raised the issue of whether what we were talking about in the TF was
>>confidential or not as Jean Maria sitting next to me was taking copious notes

>>and as we discussed the issue it was clear that this was making Scott and
>>others uncomfortable. On a split vote, we agreed that what was said in the
>>meeting would be confidential, but the report would reflect the thinking of
>>the group. We are working on some talking points now, but I wish we would
>>systematically go through the bullet points. My sense is that the group needed

>>to bond today and feel each other out. Tomorrow will hopefully be more
>>productive.

>> Would you like me to call you either tomorrow or Sunday?

>>Best,

>>

>>Barry

>>

>>Barry S. Anton, Ph.D., ABPP

>>Department of Psychology

>>University of Puget Sound

>>Tacoma, WA 98416-1046

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

Barry S. Anton, Ph.D., ABPP

Department of Psychology

University of Puget Sound

Tacoma, WA 98416-1046