

# **EXHIBIT 53**

**Sender:** Behnke, Stephen </O=APA/OU=DC/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=SVB>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 12, 2005 10:18:54 AM  
**Recipient:** Newman, Russ <rnewman@apa.org>  
**Cc:** Gilfoyle, Nathalie <ngilfoyle@apa.org>  
**Subject:** RE: PENS and My Two Cents

---

Russ, this is great. I think we should definitely emphasize your points, and anticipating them a bit (from other things you'd said), in my interview yesterday I tried to use the phrase "experts in human behavior" when describing psychologists.

Also, I think we should try to move the debate from *whether* psychologists should be involved in interrogations to *how* they may do so ethically. We've actually got some good help here from unlikely sources--the Division 48 resolution is premised on the assumption that psychologists *may* be involved in this work, and the letter from Physicians for Human Rights says that "While certain types of consultation by psychologists in interrogation may be quite benign," thus clearly allowing that psychologists may, under appropriate conditions, participate in the interrogation process. I don't think we can say this enough: All of the principal parties to this APA discussion agree that the important question is not *whether* psychologists may engage in information-gathering and interrogation processes, but rather *how*-as experts in human behavior--they may do so in an ethical manner. (Also important to keep in mind is that the PENS Task Force had three members of Division 48)

Thanks for your message. It's really helpful, and please send along any other thoughts you have.

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

Newman, Russ  
Friday, August 12, 2005 8:00 AM  
Behnke, Stephen  
Gilfoyle, Nathalie  
PENS and My Two Cents

**DO NOT DISSEMINATE**

Steve,

I had some thoughts as a follow up to your comment the other day that some of what is missing from the PENS related discussion is the value of psychologists' contributions when working in this area. As you may recall, one of my interests in psychologists working in national security activities is that I believe it is a very good example of psychologists as "experts in behavior" (rather than simply mental health or health professionals), bringing to the activities, skills and competencies that other professionals just do not have.

When it comes to the activities of the psychologists working with the Behavioral Science Consultation Teams ("Biscuits") related to military interrogation missions, there are two very clear and specific unique contributions that the psychologists are able to make to ensure *safe, ethical, legal and effective* interrogations. (It is important to note that some of our members do not believe there is such a thing as "safe, ethical, legal and effective" interrogations; for those members, the issue of the psychologists' positive contribution is moot.)

First, the psychologists working with the Biscuits and with the Survival, Evasion, Resistance and Escape (SERE) training programs (were military personnel at high risk for capture are trained to deal with captivity) are sometimes referred to as "safety officers" for the role they play. That is, during the course of the interrogation process (whether it be the interrogation of enemy combatants or of U.S. military personnel undergoing SERE training) the psychologists use their training in behavior and their learned skills in observation to spot what the SERE folks have referred to as "behavioral drift" with interrogators. Behavioral drift, in its most extreme form, is what caused Zimbardo to close down his Stanford prison experiment since the college students playing the role of prison guards began to abuse their authority and behave

inappropriately simply as a result of being in that role.) It is my understanding that when the psychologists observe behavioral drift beginning to occur, they have the authority to actually stop the interrogation process, whether that be an interrogation of enemy combatants or a training exercise. The skill sets of the psychologist related to observation and behavior enable the identification of behavioral drift at a very early point, far in advance of the type of behavior exhibited by Zimbardo's college students. This contribution by psychologists serves to help ensure that any information gathering activity will be *safe, ethical and legal*.

Second, the psychologists' training, skills and understanding of the existing research contribute to the goal of *effective* information gathering. The most frequent example of this is what the literature says about positive incentives and rapport/relationship building as effective methods of interrogation to secure accurate information, in contrast to punishment and torture (which may only produce a lot of *inaccurate* information). Not unimportantly, the contribution of psychologists to assuring effective interrogation in this way also reinforces their contributions to safe, ethical and legal interrogations.

Just some thoughts that might come in handy during the discussions that will ensue over the next week.

Russ