Interviewee: Jean Maria Arrigo
Interviewer: John Crigler
Date: June 26, 2005
Place: Irvine, California
Transcribed by: Teresa Bergen

Upon return from the June 24-26, 2005, meeting in Washington, DC, of the APA PENS Task Force, JMA recorded her impressions of the meeting in conversation with her husband JC. The conversation took place around midnight, a couple of hours after he picked her up at the Orange Country, CA, airport. The final half hour of the conversation, concerning her personal feelings and tremendous anxiety around the meeting, has not been transcribed.

BEGIN SIDE A

Crigler: I think, okay, go ahead.

Arrigo: Well, this is June 26, right? 2005. And I have just returned from Washington, DC, where I was one of ten people appointed to the American Psychological Association Task Force on Psychological Ethics and National Security. And the other person speaking is John Crigler. If you lie there with your eyes shut, I'm not going to be able to talk. [laughs]

I think there are several components to this event that I can't completely straighten out. One is the document we produced itself. And another was the political, the probable political course of this document. And then there's the process the committee went through to produce the document. And then there's my, of course from my point of view, role in the process of producing the document. What I contributed to it. And then there is my personal experience of the process. But you have to talk to me, or I can't do this.

Crigler: I think we ought to tape the things in that order. I think the last thing to go in is your personal experience with the process. Why don't we just knock this off one at a time, starting with the first one.

Arrigo: With the political course of this document?

Crigler: The document itself was the first one.

Arrigo: Okay. The document itself. Well_

Crigler: What is the document? It's the recommendations of the committee to the president, right?

Arrigo: It's, yes, supposedly. Actually, the recommendations of the Task Force to the APA board. That is where it's going before, first before it goes anywhere else. And we sort of sat out, even though it wasn't quite stated this way, the real purpose of what we were doing was to deal with the onslaught of, what do you call it? The onslaught of,

actually, almost assaults on the leadership of the American Psychological Association, because people think that psychologists have been participating in torture of detainees at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay and elsewhere. So they're getting letters right and left. And the media are approaching them. So how do they put out this fire, okay?

And there's the question was, the APA has quite a large and well considered ethical code. And the question was, does this ethical code tell us what to do in this situation? Tell us what to do about psychologists in national security settings. Or is it missing what we need? Now, this isn't as simple a question as I thought. Because, as it turned out, *if* the ethical code contains what we need and our response is just an application of the ethical code as it stands, then our report could go out almost immediately, after it was cleared by the board. But, if we say "no, the ethical code is missing some things," which I believed it was— and I didn't know all these consequences — then if you want to add something, new principles to the ethical code, it's going to take a whole year of process or so, before they can get into it. And then, of course, the document can't go out until all of that time.

So the way the document is written, it's full of how various pieces of the code support or lead to our conclusions. But I had no clue about why, until about the last hour that we were together.

Crigler: Why that is going to take a year? Or why_

Arrigo: No, no, no. Why everyone, why people were insisting, like the head of the ethics committee at APA, Steve Behnke, why he was, in his various drafts, he was always drawing on the code and trying to show the code implied all of our statements. And—

Crigler: So you wanted it to be more specific, and they wanted it to be covered by an interpretation of what was already there. Or at least the head of the ethics committee.

Arrigo: It wasn't exactly specificity. That's a very, we have written a very specific document. The issue was that, I thought that we hadn't really, that the ethics code really did not cross levels of analysis in this way. But it wasn't until the very end that I understood the political importance of this because they needed to put out something for the media right away. And nothing would go out right away if we said that we needed some other principles than what were in the ethics code already. So everything had to be derived from this. But those really belong with the political consequences of the document.

Crigler: So what is the document? And what does it say? Does the document have recommendations to the board?

Arrigo: Well, the document, that's the meaning of it is formally recommendations to the board. But, in fact, the document will go out to all the members. And now I'm really getting ahead of myself. But maybe I just should say where it's going. This is what, this is all things that I learned in about the last hour of the whole event. So I didn't have the picture of the meaning of this while we were doing it.

The first place it's going to, and this is the military component, the military members of the committee. I should say first that there were ten members of the committee. Six of

these people were military folks of fairly high standing. So, for instance, one of them had gone into reorganize Guantanamo Bay after the first mess there. And similarly had gone to Abu Ghraib to—

Crigler: What first mess?

Arrigo: The complaints about treatment of the detainees, and bad interrogations. Another one is the chief psychologist who supervises all of the psychologists who consult with interrogators for the army. And almost all of it is done by the army. So that was another person. So people have very substantial roles.

So they asked that it be sent to the military first. And the [APA] person, a person who was sitting in on it who's the policy kind of a liaison with the Department of Defense for the APA had this list of different military offices she was going to send it to. And the military people were very firm that it only needed to go to one person, and that was Rumsfeld. And that he would instantly send it off to everybody else. We were surprised. We didn't believe this. But they were all absolutely sure that it should go to him first, he would send it to everybody else, and then to Congress and everybody.

And everyone agreed that, seemed to be in agreement that Congress and the House of Representatives and Rumsfeld and everybody wanted this document. So the military people said, "After it goes to Rumsfeld, then in one hour, hardly let any time pass, then it should go to the press. And you should have a statement for the press." And the reason was, they said, is that anything that goes into the Congressional system is going to leak very fast. And you don't want other people putting their spin on it. You don't want the media putting their spin on it. There's great distrust of the media. With plenty of examples to back up their worries.

So, you know, then it should be sent out to members of APA and to the various divisions, and so on. They didn't want to send it out to the AMA, as I had suggested, because then they'll have to send it out to every other possible organization. They said, "Well, it will be public. It will be posted on our website."

So I was really quite astonished about how this all came to me at the last minute. I felt this was going to be some obscure document to cover our ass, but they are getting calls from the media right now. And everybody is all excited about this. So whether this is true or just self-aggrandizing, we will surely find out. One of the military people will have an appointment in a few days with the surgeon general to brief him on this.

And the military people have a similar problem to the American Psychological Association, which is that people are saying, "Oh, what are your psychologists doing torturing people?" So a lot of the talk in the meeting was, in this last part of the meeting, was about how to calm everybody down. Assure everybody we weren't doing anything bad. There's sort of a joint agreement that this is what we want to do.

We had this discussion by kind of conference call from the APA public relations person, who had read it and told us how the press would look at it. So we had to be very concerned about how the press would look at this, and how they might take out this sentence or that sentence and draw conclusions to it that would make our hair stand on end. So this was, and we had all the attorney, we had APA counsel there. So it was curious to me to see this statement about ethics considered from that public perspective. And I had none of this in mind as we were going along. So I was naïve.

So, it's not in its final form now. We just have a draft. So they say that ethically this is complex work and it's constantly evolving, blah, blah, blah. The Task Force was, nevertheless, able to set forth clear and unanimous statements about psychologists' ethical obligations. And I objected to the unanimous. I thought that was too far. Going too far. But anyway.

So they say the Task Force first states that psychologists do not engage in, direct, support, facilitate, or offer training in torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. Now this got a rise out of the APA publicist. Because the APA ethics code is all stated in the form, "psychologists do not do such and such, " or "they do such and such." Such as, "Psychologists do not have intimate sexual relations with their patients." And of course, everybody knows that psychologists *have,* and will continue to occasionally. Right? But the language means do not, they shouldn't. Whereas it could be interpreted as a false historical statement. So we have a problem with that throughout here when we say psychologists do not do such and such.

And of course, some of us believe that psychologists have been involved in heavy interrogations, and other people think, the military people think, they haven't. But that we're not addressing. Because we are not an investigative body. So there are ten major points here. Or eleven or so. The first one is that psychologists don't engage in, torture, blah, blah, blah, direct. Second is, psychologists are alert to acts of torture, or other cruel or inhuman or degrading treatment, and have an ethical responsibility to report these acts to the appropriate authorities. And I want to take credit for that one. Third one is that psychologists don't engage in behaviors that violate the laws of the United States. So here, there was a tension between the code of ethics—in other words, there are legal things which are not ethical.

And we had a big discussion on this because Mike, Mike, oh, what's his name. The other peace psychologist wanted us to follow international law. And everybody else wanted us to follow US law, especially the military people. So we never completely resolved it. But it looks here as though we did agree on that. So if there's a problem, if there seems to be a conflict in the psychologists' mind, we try to resolve the conflict in a responsible manner.

I think this is basically a cop out, okay? If the conflict cannot be resolved, psychologists may adhere to the requirements of the law. So that means actually that if Rumsfeld says, "The line is here," okay, and international law says the line is there, and psychological ethics says the line is over here, then the psychologists can follow the Rumsfeld definition of interrogation. This is what it literally says.

Fourth is that psychologists clarify their own role in a situation. Clarify it to themselves, where it could be ambiguous. So the psychologist isn't always going to identify himself to somebody, right? It's an espionage case or whatever. And he's doing an assessment of the person. But at least he has to declare in his own mind who his client is, and also has ethical responsibilities to people who aren't his clients. Although we haven't gone so far as to say he must identify himself to those. In some cases, it could be life threatening. Psychologists have to be sensitive to the problems inherent in mixing potentially inconsistent roles, such as health provider and consultant to an interrogation.

Now, six. It says that the Task Force believes that psychologists can serve in national security roles such as assistants to interrogators, consultants to interrogators, in a way that is ethically responsible. I mean, as they do for police. And they said that this is something

like "entirely compatible." And I struck out the word "entirely," and said that I thought it was sort of marginally compatible. So they let me take that word out.

There's been some, I'm not quite sure where it's made clear here, but the dual role idea, you know, that you could be, do one thing in one place and then take off your psychologist hat and do something else which is incompatible with psychological ethics, we have ruled out. Saying that wherever you're using, wherever you're using psychological expertise, you're bound by psychological ethics.

Crigler: Hmm, that's good.

Arrigo: Now, if you're a psychologist and you decide to lead the infantry over the hill, okay, you don't have to be doing psychological ethics. But anything using your expertise, you are a psychologist.

Seventh, now this one, I'm also going to take credit for. It says psychologists who consult on interrogation techniques are mindful that the subject of the interrogation may not have engaged in any bad behavior, untoward behavior, and may not be relevant. So we set up a test here for what you can advise the interrogator to do. And that is, test is, that if, you know, determining whether the person is relevant, or has done anything bad, can be a very long process, and very difficult. But if it's determined that the person was either irrelevant to the whole thing or, you know, is not guilty of any untoward behavior, then the psychologist should be able to say that what was done with this person was still appropriate. So is waking him up at three in the morning to interrogate him over the line? No. But, you know, is depriving him of sleep for five days over the line? Yes. So it basically establishes, recognizes that many, many people will be interrogated who are not your real targets. And essentially says you have to deal with him the same way. Which is probably a little bit stronger than people feel. But there it is. So I was pleased to be able to do that without, one of the military people there, we worked that out.

Eighth is that psychologists who serve in, well, let me just go back and give a couple of examples of what psychologists do that I think is really useful, but I didn't know about. But they wouldn't give any of these examples. And they were warned against it by everybody who they knew about dealing with the media. They said, "Any time you give any example, it can ruin you." They will start turning the example this way or that way, and you find at some point, you can't defend it.

The psychologists said they had the most rudimentary problems. Some detainee says to the interrogator, "Okay, I'll tell you where the bomb is. I'll show you where it is. I'll tell you anything." So the interrogator brings out a map and says, "Okay. Here's the map. Show me where it is." The guy can't show him where it is. Doesn't show him where it is. Well, he can't read a map. Where the person is brought in and they're getting basic information about him: rank, name, where does he live, what's his birthday, and so on. And there's a lot of hemming and hawing. They can't get his birth date out of him. Well, it turns out he comes from a culture where nobody has a birth date. So there are all these very rudimentary kinds of problems that require some cultural knowledge that some interrogators don't have.

So eight was, psychologists don't use health care information for the detriment of any individual's safety and well being. Because there have been a lot of problems about using medical records. Now, if you want to say that they shouldn't know what's in the medical

records, this is a problem. And people come from places where nobody has ever had any medical treatment at all. So now we have the interrogator who wants to establish rapport with the person by giving him a Snickers bar. But he's a diabetic, right? He doesn't know it. Nobody knows it. And apparently there are a lot of diabetics there. I don't know why there are so many. A person might have contagious diseases: TB, hepatitis, who knows what. And becomes a danger to other detainees, to the interrogators, everybody.

So another example that was given, somebody had had a big heart operation a few weeks before. So he just ruled him out and said, "You can't, nobody's interrogating him." So there's a reason that somebody has to keep track of this.

Nine, that psychologists make clear the limits of confidentiality. So you can't, they can't go in pretending that they're going to be, you know, ask a person questions and keep it confidential if they're not going to. They have to be completely clear about this. And they also have to be careful with whom they disclose sensitive information. You know, just as they would ordinarily.

Psychologists aren't supposed to act beyond their competencies, except in unusual circumstances. Now this is kind of disguised here. We wanted to say, some of us wanted to say, that psychologists should never be involved in interrogations. But the legal counsel said that really you should never say never. That you get into all kinds of problems with that. And the military people said there are cases if you're in the middle of an operation, the people who are supposed to do this may have, you know, gone somewhere else. You have to get critical information. The psychologist may be the only person who can. So nobody was willing to say that.

Eleventh, oh, this is the one where psychologists are careful to identify for themselves the identity of their client. And they have ethical obligations to people who aren't their clients.

And the last one is that psychologists have an ethical obligation to consult when they're facing difficult ethical dilemmas. Now this is a problem, because with whom are they going to consult in that situation? So one of our recommendations was to set up consultation lines for them. Remember when—

Crigler: Is that going to be funded by the APA?

Arrigo: No, this would have to happen within the military. It would have to be, for national security, it would have to be classified lines. Like remember when [Lawrence] Rockwood had that—

Crigler: Mm hmm.

Arrigo: Okay. Then there are some other conclusions we made. Such as the research that we should be doing, having to do with, for instance, how culture and ethnicity interact with investigative technique. [telephone interruption]

Crigler: All right. We had a little brief interruption. Now we're going to continue. We've covered, pretty much, the report. Now we're going to the political ramifications of this report, which are, I guess, when you went into this, not knowing that this was going to go to Secretary Rumsfeld and the media's waiting for this.

Arrigo: Well, he isn't going to read it. But one of the military people does have an hour meeting to brief the surgeon general on this. Which is sort of unusual.

Crigler: Yeah.

Arrigo: So the military and the American Psychological Association are both very, very interested in calming troubled waters here. And that came out a great deal, and to the point I almost felt as though I were participating, could be participating, in a cover-up job. I wouldn't say quite that, but it was the major concern. We were not really there to talk about psychological ethics and national security. We were there to talk about psychologists and coercive interrogation.

Crigler: So this meeting had a primary purpose, was political?

Arrigo: Yes. Yes. That was the agitation around this. And a reason for having six military people. I mean, these were, I don't mean that their ranks were high, because psychologists don't get that far up generally. But their positions_

Crigler: Their roles, they're doing a lot.

Arrigo: Their roles. They were at the top of the pyramid in their various areas.

Crigler: Well how do you think the political importance of this affected the work that you were to do from an ethical standpoint? I mean, from the standpoint of working on the ethics for psychologists who were involved in interrogation of detainees? Or didn't it affect it?

Arrigo: No, it certainly affected it. It certainly affected it. But I'm trying to think, say, *how* it affected it.

Crigler: Well, one thing was, maybe the confidentiality part of it, maybe.

Arrigo: Yes. Yeah, that was certainly a big part of it. I think that our audience became the media and the general public in some significant ways. Because of how things had to be stated. Not being willing to put any examples in that would have clarified things. Not because the examples, you know, involved blood and knives. Just that, you know, the cognitive [issues]. But because there was so much worry about how things could be misinterpreted and so on by the ignorant. Or by people outside of our field.

And one thing is, the constitution of the committee, that we had these six military people there. And then there was the chair of the committee, who didn't particularly know anything about this issue, but she could chair a committee. Which was not easy at all. What she did was quite amazing. And the person who actually wrote all of this was the head of the APA Ethics Committee. So he participated the whole time, and wrote like crazy. And gave us documents to critique. And he said that it was unusual in his experience that groups actually let him do this. So they wouldn't be able to come out with

a document at the end. Well here's one of the places where the political aspect was that we needed to come out with a document after these three days. Other people dawdle around for weeks.

Crigler: Right.

Arrigo: When people have a try at it and they don't let the director of the ethics committee do all this writing, he said.

Crigler: So the process was expedited and speeded up by the political pressure.

Arrigo: Yes. And I think that also put pressure on us to agree with each other. Because I didn't recognize what this pressure was when we were going through it. Other people did. I think it also meant that we may have had more people involved. For instance, the president elect of the APA was with us until he had a medical emergency in his family. But then he checked back in by telephone today. And an attorney who sat through the whole proceedings with us. And there were some other people that I think, we wouldn't ordinarily have, I'm guessing, have had that much brass, as it were, with us. But the speed and the pressure to agree.

For instance, today, when we were trying to have a last read through. In the beginning it said well, it's complex but we were able to come to this unanimous opinion. And I said I thought it wasn't quite unanimous. But that it was a process through consensus, that we saw that everybody had probably been pulled off their base by a few percentage points so that we could do anything at all and come to an agreement of some sort. And I felt irritation in the room at my saying that. Because they really wanted to represent it as unanimous.

Crigler: Strong.

Arrigo: Strong. Unanimous. Yeah. The fact that there were these military psychologists in hot positions, the fact of the matter is, if they weren't there, then the document wouldn't mean anything. But what I was really surprised at was how sensitive the military was to the opinions of (what they take as?) American Psychological Association. I mean, there is another psychological association. So I thought, I guess naively, well, well if they want to belong to a psychological association, and we're not doing the job with them, they can go belong to some other one. You know, what do they care about us? Why do they even need us at all? Why do they even need to have licensed, clinical psychologists? Why don't they just certify their own people?

So I asked them about that. And apparently there was a general period of professionalization in the military. I've forgotten when it happened, a few decades back, when it was determined that all members of professions should be certified by those professions. And I don't know if this is the same time when they got the idea that officers should have college degrees and so on. But it was part of a general upgrading, they considered upgrading certification. The military.

And one psychologist there, he was the one who was in charge of all the psychologists who consult for interrogations. And (?) and has a hand in, supposedly, in

all the interrogations, he gave us confidentially some papers he had written for his subordinates, the psychologists he directs. And I was quite astonished to read in here, let me find this. Under the ethical requirements, it's a several-page document here. But under ethical requirements, he says that we're going to adhere to the ethical, that the ethics code, APA ethics code, is binding on all psychologists who are members of the American Psychological Association, which is obvious. And all those who are licensed by state psychology licensing board. Well, that has to be corrected a little bit.

But the fact is that all [those] military psychologists are clinical psychologists. And they have to maintain state licensure, state license. Now not all of the states require that their members follow the APA ethics code. But a lot of them do. I mean, that's the standard, certainly California does. So they're putting themselves right in here.

And one of the reasons that this psychologist wants the APA document we made today is he's going to send it out to all of his people. They were very, very firm about psychologists don't torture people, and don't do all of these things. There was *never* a time when they weren't just completely firm about that. So that's what they want to be standard operating procedure. Now, I have other ideas about how things happen in other places. Blah, blah, blah. But they wanted that up front. Anytime anybody tried to obscure this point or moderate the language or anything, they always wanted to just say it straight out.

So that might speak to the urgency that they felt in dealing with this. And of course that's sort of the military way of going about things, you know. Oh, my God, you know, the bomb fell. And we're going to dig ourselves out right now.

But the APA people, just today, the ethics committee director had been sent a letter by some fairly prominent person in the, some fairly prominent psychologist saying, "I think there's a problem here. We should get on it. We should form a committee, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah." And he passed it around to all of us. A sort of sample of what he was getting in the media. So that was our job, to calm things down.

Now as far as process for the committee, I think part of what we, one thing that's instructive here is in our statement, there's a portion here which says, "The Task Force engaged in vigorous discussion and debate, and did not reach consensus on several issues." These are not all the issues, but it's a sample of issues. One of them was the role of human rights standards in the ethics code. And this was particularly Mike Wessells' point. That we have got to be dealing with international standards. Never mind US military standards. That's irrelevant. It's international standards. They wouldn't go for that. I don't think it's just that they wouldn't, I think they couldn't.

And then there was a question of the degree to which psychologists may ethically disguise the nature and purpose of their work. You know, some of us didn't like the idea, for instance, of a psychologist being invited along to a meeting in which a case officer was trying to entice someone into being a spy. I said that was completely unacceptable to me, because I thought it was really horrible to entice somebody into being a spy. And blah, blah, blah. I mean, if he wants to be your spy, it's something else.

Another was, and this one related particularly to me, was whether the discussion of the Task Force should have been made available outside of the Task Force. This is the confidentiality issue. And they said, it was written, some members believe that sharing the substance of the discussion, debates and disagreements, would be helpful to others in

understanding how the Task Force reached its conclusions. So I contradicted that today and said that the primary reason was not to show how the Task Force reached its conclusions, but was to foster development of professional ethics in other areas of national security. That's really what I wanted to use it for. I wanted to take a description of this to the military ethics conference, to the intelligence ethics conference. That was the issue. Deep issue.

There were also other areas of contention, which were not put in here. One of them I felt very strongly about— and this got nowhere, I can tell you— was the problem that, it seems to me that we've seen, in other ethics reviews, government instituted ethics reviews of national security problems with scientists, that I think they've gone very far wrong in assuming that the scientists are morally autonomous. And so we saw this in the Senate investigation of [the CIA behavioral modification program] *MKULTRA*. We saw it in the President's Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments. And that in fact they are manipulated, and blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. So I went into all of that. You know, in my one minute. And this, it was as if I hadn't talked. These military people are in charge of lots of people. I mean, you're called into Guantanamo to clean up the place, clean up the problem, you know. [snapping fingers] Everybody's jumping when you talk. So it seems to me that they can't even conceive. They're doing standard operating procedures. It seems to me that they cannot even conceive of the places where their arms don't reach.

So another issue I kept wanting to talk about is, what is the reach of psychologists in these settings? And that there's so much beyond their reach. And I gave the example of chaplains. Of there not being chaplains at the Nevada Test Site. I mean, if there's any place you would need a chaplain, you know, second to combat, it's when everybody sees the big bomb, right? People had all sorts of existential and religious crises.

[45 minutes]
[End Side A, begin Side B.]

Crigler: Okay, so we're talking about these things falling on deaf ears when you were talking about moral autonomy of people.

Arrigo: Of scientists, yeah. Yeah.

Crigler: And really psychologists in this case.

Arrigo: Yeah. I read a few passages from the interrogator I'm in correspondence with. I told them Garcia's views of how to manipulate scientists, and all this. But it didn't even raise debate, okay? People just couldn't hear it. Where some of the things we talked about, like whose law are we following, got a big debate. But also Mike Wessells, you know, the peace psychologist who's bringing up all these issues. He is very skilled in these things. I mean, he's been talking in places like this forever. And his experience is much more mainstream than mine is.

Crigler: So who supported him in international law?

Arrigo: I did. On the whole, I don't think we supported each other a lot. Because there were a lot of people at the table. You couldn't say very many things. You had to pick pretty carefully what you were going to talk about. So if you spent a lot supporting the other [you had not opportunity to raise your own issues], but we certainly did support each other.

Crigler: Okay. And our next point here then after the political fallout of the report is—

Arrigo: So we talked about the document itself, and then the process of the group. And this was_

Crigler: We sort of touched on that, too, of course.

Arrigo: We touched on it.

Crigler: We talked about the political ramifications.

Arrigo: Yeah. Well, I touched on it just now when I was talking about the disagreements, right? That the disagreements were deeper. The chair was very much in charge, and kept us on a good timeline. The head of the ethics committee was there, taking notes and framing this all. And so we had this huge, you know, oval table with us, ten people, plus the ethics committee chair. And then two other people who were really part of it. One of them was the delegate, the liaison from the APA board. There's a liaison from the APA board to the ethics committee. So he was part of it. And then the president-elect, while he was there. And then someone else who is a psychologist and an attorney. I don't exactly know what his official position is. But he had a lot to say concerning legal issues. And then we also had the counsel, but those people weren't really part of it.

The only voting members were the ten committee members, and the only thing we voted on was confidentiality. Which is stated here that by a vote, they voted on the confidentiality, and the gag rule, by a vote of seven to one, with one abstention. That's only nine people. What happened to the tenth person? Maybe the chair doesn't vote. That's probably it. Seven to one, with one abstention. And they did me the favor of putting that in there, okay? (Which is to say?), this is how it went.

So we were pretty heavy on the military side. If you can imagine this conversation going on, right? There's six of those people. And five of them were on one side of the table. I don't know why they set up the table this way. But five of them were on this one side of the table, and one of them was sitting next to me. He was the sweetheart. He was the one that was in charge of all the psychologists, and who wrote up this wonderful set of guidelines for his psychologists, saying follow the APA code of ethics and all. And so then there was Mike Wessells, who works with children involved in war. And me.

And the other psychologist, who got interested in these things at the time of 9/11, and, I guess (?) a therapist for people who have suffered traumas, political violence. But she was, as far as I could tell, the most conservative person there. I was never able to understand why she was there or what was on her mind. She did contribute some useful comments about cultural understanding. But apart from that, she shut me up pretty strongly a couple of times. And seemed to have procedural concerns that I was not able to

follow. She's been on a lot of committees, and been on boards of things. She certainly was not providing any counterbalance to a military view, as far as I could tell. I almost felt that she was my enemy there, which I did not feel of any of the military people. I don't know. You know, this is a matter of considerable consternation for me.

Crigler: So now we're getting more into the personal_

Arrigo: Okay. I'll go back into the, I should go back into the process.

Crigler: Where are we at in terms of our list here?

Arrigo: Well, we didn't come through these topics in any kind of linear order. And I have a lot in my book. The first morning, I was taking notes like crazy, like I always do. I mean, that's just a habit of life for me, because I can't remember anything. And it helps me process. I was just taking notes like crazy. And started typing up those today when I was in the airport. And I think that they will be sort of revelatory. For one thing, I always think I'm talking more than I am, because I'm responding in my mind. And mainly the military people. And a great concern to get to this issue of torture/interrogation. So I'm taking notes like crazy.

And then, part way through the morning, near the end of the first half of that day, the issue of confidentiality came up. Maybe at like eleven o'clock. And we spent an entire hour talking about that. At least an hour talking about that, with the chair saying that we cannot go on until we settle this issue. And one of the military people complained about me taking notes. He said, "It makes me very nervous when I see anybody taking notes." So we had, really, a big to-do about that. And that's when we took a vote. And I was very disappointed that Mike Wessells abstained. I didn't know what he was doing. I couldn't even see him, you know. I voted independently of him. I was surprised I was the only person. But anyway, there it went. So that soured me a little bit.

And I began to wonder whether this was just a kind of sham event. Because I have a lot more experience talking with military people than the other non-military members there. And my assessment was that it really had to do much more with them exposing themselves to each other.

Crigler: "Them" meaning the military people?

Arrigo: Yeah. The fact that they were all there with each other, I thought, was possibly the bigger deal than them talking to us, or whatever. But, so I went with that. What brought me back, and I felt what to my mind sort of put good faith in the meeting again, was when the fellow who was in charge of all the psychologists, and brought us these papers that he hands out to his team, and I saw how positively they viewed the APA.

We heard a lot of pain from the military people about being, you know, treated as the equivalent of the baby killers in Vietnam. A real anguish about that. To the extent that they didn't want to talk to outsiders, because that was the reaction they got. And they seemed to be very grateful to APA for reaching out to them and having this event with them. And they, you know, they came from quite great distances and interrupted very significant activities for themselves to be involved in this. So from a military point of

view, you know, they were really giving a lot to this. Never mind that APA was funding a little bit of stuff.

Crigler: You think that they came away with the feeling that they were getting a lot.

Arrigo: Oh, yes. Yes. They were all absolutely emphatic about that. And a lot of what they were getting was, everybody wanted ongoing discussions. Wanted this to continue on other themes, and so on, but to go on. To have a manual, for example, that would have examples, instructive examples that would help us communicate with other people and so on. I had suggested, this is getting into the recommendations here, but I had made a real issue about the historical loss of not getting, of our lack of data and historical loss. If these people who were sitting at the table died with what they knew, and we didn't get that by oral histories or however. And when I insisted on that, they were very positive to that. And started explaining, talking about ways about how that might be done. And they just brought up the idea of the Joint Military Intelligence College doing oral histories and keeping them there.

So I didn't have the experience, I think I was much more ~~abridged~~ a bridge to in the military than anybody else. In spite of my having taken a stance that was farther away from them. You know, I certainly established the distance bounds. But I also crossed over to them more strongly. Because of common ideas like that.

But their sensitivity to being treated as poor practitioners really quite surprised me.

Crigler: Pariahs of the field.

Arrigo: Yes. Pariahs of the field. And when I asked them why they hadn't just, why didn't they just set it up and do it by themselves, they can certify people, they talked about it in terms of the professionalization of all the fields. But you could see that there was a lot more in it in their hearts. Somehow being the commanding officer of all these zillions of people didn't do it. That there needed to be some acceptance by the civilian society. And after all, these are people who are risking their lives in the service of their country. Some of these people were worried about being identified. So if their country doesn't recognize their service, I think it's probably hard to keep that meaning.

Crigler: Well, why were they worried about being identified? Identified by whom?

Arrigo: The one who had been at Guantanamo Bay, identified by terrorists. And terrorist sympathizers. They felt their lives were at stake. One of the first things that happened when we got there, after the introductions and all, was that either the chair or the head of the ethics committee asked if we wanted to bring in, to talk to us, some doctor who had written an article for the *New England Journal of Medicine* who took the position that doctors and maybe psychologists, too, I've forgotten, had behaved very improperly in the interrogations. And one of the military people said, "If he comes, I'll have to step out of the room while he's here." And they thought this man was—

Crigler: Why would he have to do that?

Arrigo: Well, I'll tell you. They thought this man was absolutely despicable. And the reason was, he had named somebody in his article whom he considered, I don't know whether it was a doctor or a psychologist, one of the two, maybe a doctor, who had been involved. He thought he had been an accessory to coercive interrogations. And they said, "They've ruined that man! They've ruined him." You know, like he was a traitor and everything else. "They've ruined that man, because now he's a target for terrorists." And one of the people said when he was in Guantanamo Bay, there was a bounty on his head. So some of them feel that they're very vulnerable. This one in particular. So that was the reason he would step out of the room. Because he didn't want to be named by this man. He felt the man was completely irresponsible. They, almost in one voice, found it inconceivable that the *New England Journal of Medicine* had published this. Or that the man could have ever have thought of doing it. Whereas, you know, I'm thinking, others of us were thinking what's the deal? So that was quite something.

On the other hand, when I brought in the article by William Henry Anderson and my commentary and I passed it around, they weren't interested in that at all. And when I pressed the issue, what I said, essentially, was, "I feel that the psychologists here are too nice. That the military psychologists are all the good guys. And that what we're missing is another, harsher perspective that people are reacting to, but we don't have it represented here."

Well, they were not willing, at all, to let in William Henry Anderson. They weren't going to let him put his toe in the door. And they said, first of all, who knows when he was at Guantanamo Bay. It didn't say there. He said they could have been there years ago. And one of them told me, just in my ear, "We think the guy's a kook."

And I said, "Well, here he is, in the *Intelligencer*." You know, the journal.

And they said, "Well, people can write whatever they want after they retire."

They refused to take any responsibility for him at all. They refused to acknowledge, they didn't believe at all that they owed any explanation to anybody for him. And it was in my pressing this that got me absolutely shut up by Nina Thomas. She was quite rude to me about it. And that was the end of that.

Crigler: Nina Thomas was the chair?

Arrigo: No, no. Not the chair.

Crigler: She's the woman who worked with the 9/11 people.

Arrigo: Yes.

Crigler: And a political person.

Arrigo: Yes. Uh huh. So anyway, they really want to come off with the good guys. I mean, they didn't say_

Crigler: These are the six military?

Arrigo: Yes. And the one who had been in charge of Guantanamo Bay didn't say, "Well, I wonder when that guy was there. I'll look into that." Nothing. "He's a kook. People can say anything they want after they retire." Anyway.

Crigler: That might be true. You don't know if Anderson is retired.

Arrigo: He's certainly retired now. Yeah. He's certainly retired. But that doesn't, I mean, if a psychologist who had been—

Crigler: You're not addressing his position.

Arrigo: Yeah. They refused to—

Crigler: More than the fact that it was published in the *Intelligencer*.

Arrigo: Right. Or that he ever was there. Anyway. So we didn't get very far. The probes that I made into things further a field, okay, I raised the issue several times of how far can the psychologist go. What is their range? I suggested, at one point, one of the psychologists, one of the military psychologists had said, his argument, an argument for why the military psychologists were doing a good job there was that in no place where there were military psychologists did we have any scandals.

So the wheels began to turn in my head, and I'm thinking, you know, it sounds like it's pretty good to have psychologists doing these consultations. Because first of all, they're done better. We don't have this business about "kill the guy because he can't tell us where the point on the map is." And educating people. But I thought, look, they're bringing intelligence in here, and they're bringing accountability. Right? Now we have somebody who's on the line. We know they're clinical psychologists. They say this is what we're supposed to be doing. And he's there. We've got accountability. This is great. So we're bringing reason, science and accountability in there. So I said, "Can we have a statement that says we should have psychologists in all these places?"

Well, first of all, they don't have enough, okay? But a couple of them really took offense at the notion that psychologists were there to do monitoring.

Crigler: Of the military?

Arrigo: Yes. The military psychologists. Yes. That they would be there with a monitoring function. Which was just what I had thought, not exactly monitoring, but you know, accountability factor. So they wouldn't buy that. Everything had to be said many times by many people. Okay? Kind of a sense making. I felt a heavy pressure on consensus. I think that when I look through the morning notes I was able to take, actually after that morning, I did take some notes surreptitiously. One thing, it's hard to break me of the habit. But I was very self conscious. So I wrote in quite small letters in the margins. God knows if I can track around what I wrote at all or not. But I think that there was what I would call a drift toward consensus. Because in the part that I was transcribing, I saw Nina Thomas say something one place, and then later on she had

agreed with people in another place. And of course the military people, they disagreed with each other about some things.

Crigler: What?

Arrigo: I am really bothered that I cannot recall now. This is the sort of thing that I hope I have in my notes. But they were not deeply substantive. You know, it might be on something like the values of certain techniques of assessment or something. Not things that were deeply substantive. So these people have had the experience of being in the same system and talking to each other forever. They've known each other forever and all that.

Whereas the other people there don't have that experience. Even though Mike and I, we're both peace psychologists, as it were, in my entire life I might have spent two minutes talking to Mike Wessells. Our experience is not common. Nothing. So it was weighted very heavily toward that consensus over there. To the point where things that I said or Mike said, for instance, holding international law, could seem very extreme. But if there had been five of us, right, it wouldn't have seemed extreme. So our outlying points seemed very far outlying, I think, because we had this block of common understanding on the other side.

But as I say, it wasn't just peace psychologists against military people. Because we had, I had some very strongly overlapping concerns with them. Probably the greater distance, really, was between Mike Wessells and them. Although I was the one who was less skilled in this kind of discourse and more impulsive.

So we would go along, and then from time to time we would get some summary from the chair. Not the chair, from the other fellow [director of the APA Ethics Committee]. The chair came in from time to time to keep us on task, keep us on time, and to generally praise everybody in sight. She sounded like the wife of a diplomat. Everybody was praised up and down for everything possible. I found it sort of embarrassing. She was very nice about all this. It was very smooth. Almost to the point that I felt it was insincere. But anyway, she was very nice.

And after the first day, after our work on Friday, on Saturday we came back and had a paper written out. And I didn't realize we covered everything. But that's because they were really only intending to deal with this issue of psychologists in interrogation. So I was completely bamboozled. I mean, there wasn't anything that gave me the clue. But see, everybody else, that was where the political issue came up. Because that was the fire.

Crigler: The hot potato.

Arrigo: We had a fire there. You know, for the military (?). Because the first thing was to put out that fire. And there were many discussions, many comments all the way through. If you say that, then this will reignite it all. This will cause more controversy, whereas what we're trying to do is lay it to rest. So that became more and more explicitly, more and more explicit as we went along. So on Saturday, we spent virtually all of Saturday going through the document. And struggling over it and changing it and adding new things. so then there was a new document for Sunday. And on Saturday night, many of us, at least Mike and I, sent things to the person who was writing [Director

of the APA Ethics Committee], additional things. At least we were sending him more stuff. So we got a new document today. This is Sunday, so it was the same day. And so we went through it all again.

Crigler: And now tomorrow, you're supposed to approve the final one.

Arrigo: Yeah. Yeah.
[70 minutes]
Crigler: I checked your computer, (so it?) working.

Arrigo: Oh, well, if it doesn't work on my computer, I'll have to do it on your computer. And there aren't supposed to be any big changes now. Maybe a few words here and there.

Crigler: Is this eight o'clock eastern time or eight o'clock—

Arrigo: No, no. It's twelve noon their time. Okay, so that's why I say I have to—

Crigler: Nine o'clock.

Arrigo: Yeah. Nine o'clock I have to go in or, you know, forever hold your peace. So that's sort of how the process went, and the people who were the observers, they came and went. There were a lot of different people who were there. And I don't even know who all the people were. You know, somebody in the science directorate and counsel and various people. And they didn't say very much, mainly. But then they would chip in from their expertise time to time. I didn't quite understand that end of the table. So this is how it was, a very highly structured process.

But then the head of, the director of the ethics committee, the one who was putting together all these documents said to some of us, who were talking to him privately, "Well, it's just amazing that you let me do this. Other groups haven't let me do this." And I said that I thought the military contingent was partly, was largely responsible for that. Because they said what they meant the first time. They were masters of their mouths. They didn't change their opinions about things. And, as Mike said, they were used to delegating authority. And they just showed up, they were used to showing up and getting things done.

So we had a little break and I relayed this to some of the military people, and they laughed and said that was true, and thanked me. "Yes, that's how we work." They're much easier to work with than anybody else. And I think that's a tribute to them. They don't have guns there. We're not in their chain of command. They're used to commanding zillions of people, and they're very good humored. There was a lot of poking fun among themselves, and jokes between themselves, which added some levity to the group. And it was clear that they were used to joking with each other in a certain way that the psychologists aren't.

We also had dinners together. And breaks together. I can get into that on my personal issues. Those were pretty interesting. I found myself that talking to one military person was much more informative than talking to two.

Crigler: One on one?

Arrigo: Well, even two on one. Mike and I had one of them between us for dinner. And we talked about a lot. I think that the gag rule comes when there are two military people. That that's the issue. Then they want to tell sort of war stories and humorous things. There seems to be a lot of reason for discussion otherwise.

I think I should just go on here, so this doesn't carry on too long.

Crigler: Okay. What's the next thing on our list?

Arrigo: My role in the process.

Crigler: Did you feel that you got to accomplish what you wanted to accomplish?

Arrigo: Well, since I had a complete misconception about the thing. My most serious issue, probably, was that I wouldn't be participating in a cover up.

Crigler: What about when you left, your issue was to get some teeth into the ethics codes that would prevent people from participating in torture interrogation? And that if they were, that they would be booted out of the APA.

Arrigo: Yes. I think that that is there. And that's more a credit to the military people than to us, because of how seriously they take the APA. I mean, they don't even care about the American Psychological Society. And I hadn't realized, but for the reason that the APA really recognizes the clinicians. And it's also big and old and so on. But it really represents the clinicians, and they all have to be clinicians. But that's to their credit. Yes, I think that it does have some teeth in it that way.

Where I think it is weak, is in not recognizing the limits of standard operating procedures. And in not recognizing the manipulability of people in their situations, not recognizing how much stuff goes out at the edges. And there are all these interrogators who have to deal with foreign police forces and foreign militaries, right? If we're going to be talking about Abu Ghraib, if we're going to be talking about the people right in our compounds, then we're sort of in our situation of control. And in fact, people out there are doing zillions of interrogations outside of those limits where they have to be cooperating with all these other people. With all these foreign groups. You know, like our interrogator says, they didn't even know that there *is* an interrogation without torture. Probably where somebody gets killed, you know. It isn't even a concept.

Well, the idea that we aren't going to have any, we may not have any APA clinical psychologists out there, but we have all of these what they call behavioral specialists, that work under the psychologists. All these mental health counselors. There's a zillion people who are in these positions. And probably a lot of them who can give just as good advice as our clinical psychologists, right? Pay them half as much, and give twice as good advice, because they've been around. You know, like medics instead of doctors.

So there's that whole layer of things we're not talking about. We're not talking about their manipulability. The narrowness of their actual scope isn't represented in here anywhere. And I think that it wasn't just suppressed because of the kind of document this

is. I think genuinely they cannot grasp that. So that's a place where I think this is inadequate.

Another place I think it's very inadequate is it's a set of principles with no examples. And I already know from talking about torture interrogation that that goes completely by people. So if we're saying, "Military psychologists do not advise on coercive interrogation," your question is, "Well, what the hell do they do?" If they're not telling you how to exploit people's vulnerabilities, what are they doing? Because people don't have any idea about the map problem.

Crigler: You don't need to keep them alive. That's not their job. That's the doctor's, MD's, job.

Arrigo: Yeah. So what are they doing? So you have to have, I think we have to have stories for this to be worth very much.

Crigler: Maybe that would be a good thing for you to follow up with. And then maybe you could get some of these actual people outside of the presentation of the report where it's subject to this extreme scrutiny of the media that they're all concerned about.

Arrigo: It's one of the recommendations here, okay? But I cannot do it. It's one of the recommendations. I pushed hard on that.

Crigler: Why can't you do it?

Arrigo: The only person who can speak for this, the gag rule covers everybody in all these things. The head of the ethics committee is the only person who can speak for this. I may never have anything at all to do with this after this.

Crigler: Well, you could give some examples from your experience with [the Middle East interrogator with whom you've corresponded] and—

Arrigo: No, but I don't have examples of what psychologists are doing properly here, and should be doing. Those are the examples that we need.

Crigler: (?)

Arrigo: Well, you have to ask for them from military psychologists.

Crigler: Yeah. Ask the military psychologists. Exactly.

Arrigo: Well, I think I can light a fire under, you know, keep lighting fires under these people, keep reminding them. But I'm not the person who's in a position to do this.

Crigler: Right. I see.