



CHAPTER 8

Beyond Institutional Betrayal: When the Professional Is Personal

Ellen Gerrity

Dr. Ellen Gerrity's career spans clinical work, teaching, research, and policy-making on the psychological effects of traumatic stress. In this chapter, she offers a personal reflection and an analysis of the institutional role of the American Psychological Association (APA) in US torture policy and its implementation. Her essay is both an indictment of the APA's betrayal of bedrock principles against psychological harm, and a personal meditation on the choices we face as individuals and members of institutions in standing against torture.

At the heart of Gerrity's work is the APA's 2005 Report of the Presidential Task Force on Psychological Ethics and National Security. In that report, written in response to the disclosure that APA members were assisting in designing and carrying out the euphemistically named "enhanced interrogation techniques" for detainees in the war on terror, the organization attempted to carve out a role for psychologists that avoided the language of torture, although not necessarily the relationships and processes that contributed to it. Gerrity places her analysis of the APA's action in a larger institutional context comprising the position statements on behalf of patients' rights to privacy and genuine care released by three groups:

E. Gerrity (✉)

Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences,
Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA
e-mail: ellen.gerrity@duke.edu

© The Author(s) 2018

A. S. Moore, E. Swanson (eds.), *Witnessing Torture*, Palgrave Studies
in Life Writing, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74965-5_8

111

Coalition for an Ethical Psychology, Psychologists for Social Responsibility, and Physicians for Human Rights. She reveals her own sense of professional betrayal by the field's umbrella organization when it responds to public criticism with personal attacks on detractors, as opposed to the kind of self-reflective questioning the author herself undertakes.

The historical context that Gerrity analyzes stretches from 2005 to 2016, against a backdrop of increasingly scathing disclosures of APA psychologists' roles in torture that are revealed in journalistic reports, in the Executive Summary of the Senate Intelligence Committee Study of the Central Intelligence Agency's Detention and Interrogation Program, and in the APA's refusal to disavow completely its Pentagon contacts and its slow change in leadership.

Faced with the organization's intransigence, Gerrity concludes her chapter with an examination of the multiple ways she continues to do her work outside of the APA's umbrella. Finding alternative areas in which to work and areas in which to train, she bears witness to unexpected alliances with survivors and other health professionals that provide mutual support as well as opportunities for fresh initiatives. Indeed, it is in joining with survivors and other anti-torture advocates, as opposed to siding with the security concerns of the state, that health professionals find the emotional renewal necessary to be most effective within their fields.

* * *

Listen with your eyes, as if the story
you are hearing is happening right now.
—from “How to Listen,” Joyce Sutphen¹

INTRODUCTION

It has been difficult to write this essay. The challenge posed by the editors of this volume was to move away from the “objective” stance of a scientist to talk about my personal experience, my own feelings and thoughts about torture, and about working with and on behalf of torture survivors. For me, this meant that I needed to shift gears to private, vulnerable places, where both my truths and my uncertainties could be understood and expressed. This has

¹Joyce Sutphen, “How to Listen,” *First Words: Poems* (Northfield, MN: Red Dragonfly Press, 2010).

been part of my difficulty. Another part is that the topic of torture is itself *soul-searing*, a term put forward by the editors, and it is especially so when facing the reality of torture now being promoted by some as an acceptable part of my profession—psychology—and as an acceptable activity on the part of my country, the United States. What does this mean for me, as a psychologist, as an American, as a human being? The position that my professional organization, the American Psychological Association (APA), has taken for more than a decade in relation to torture and interrogation has left me embroiled in anger, shame, helplessness, and guilt, and this is part of the story that I was asked to tell. Opening up to all of this has shaken the foundations of what I have understood about life. I knew that what was necessary for me to confront this problem was to do what the poet Joyce Sutphen proposes in her poem “How to Listen,” which is to “listen with our eyes, as if the story [...] is happening right now.” I—*we*—need to engage with all of our senses, to experience what is happening in a way that is as real for each of us as it is for those experiencing torture. In my view, looking away is not an acceptable option. Sutphen further advises, “This is your chance to listen carefully. Your whole life may depend on what you hear.”

I have worked as a psychologist since 1983, in multiple capacities as a teacher, researcher, clinician, research administrator, and federal policy advisor. Most of my work has focused on the psychological impact of trauma, including torture, and on helping to advance research and federal policy related to prevention and improving treatment for survivors. Because of these interests, I became very involved in monitoring what was going on with the APA and its support of torture, a process that was and still is hard to understand.

It is wrenching for me to face the reality of torture squarely, to witness the horror of the experience of those who have gone through it, to wrap my own mind around the reality that this is true, that this is something that human beings do to one another. My personal pain is absolutely nothing compared to the physical and emotional wounds experienced by those who have been tortured. It is important to me to emphatically underscore this as a fact in the context of this essay. I stand continuously in awe of those who have taken their own experience of torture and their own pain, fear, and anger, and turned all of it into a fight for what is right, like Sister Dianna Ortiz—herself a torture survivor, author of *The Blindfold’s Eye* (2002), and founder and board member of the Torture Abolition and Survivor Support Coalition International (TASSC)—and so many others involved in this volume. I want to be part of this fight, to do

something to help, but in my efforts to find my place and to try to do something to help, I often feel lost and powerless.

Elizabeth Swanson described in the opening section of this book the story of the conference that kindled the idea for this collection. In her description, I recognized the experience of being challenged as a “non-survivor” (someone who has not personally experienced torture) about my right to speak about torture. I was similarly confronted once. I was the co-chair of a 1997 multi-agency conference on the “Mental Health Consequences of Torture,” sponsored primarily by the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), where I worked as the head of the Violence and Traumatic Stress Research Branch. Over 100 participants were invited to discuss many issues related to torture, with a focus on the mental health consequences. As the meeting got underway, a torture survivor stood up and challenged the format and planners of the meeting, angry that survivors were not prominent speakers. In my role as co-chair, and because I was at the podium when this happened, I felt the responsibility to act immediately. What I remember now is that instead of holding tightly to an official role and defensively explaining how survivors had been included in the planning and as presenters, I felt something shift inside me, and I instead responded as a human being. I said, “You are right. More can be done. Let’s do something about it right now. We’ll take a break to discuss this together, make up a new panel of speakers, and begin with this panel when we return.” This is what happened, and it made a critically important difference to the conference, adding an honesty and vulnerability to the discussions about what this experience really means. I believed it was essential for the survivors to know immediately that they had been heard, and to just act, to make the change that was requested. I felt that in the end, if the meeting was not about what survivors needed, then what was it for?

The conference was much better for this change, more honest and productive, and it generated other NIMH activities, one that was launched by a group of South African representatives from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission who had attended the conference. In a follow-up to the conference, they asked NIMH to develop a formal report describing the scientific evidence related to the mental health consequences of torture and related trauma, to refute the views of those who held that there were no such consequences. It was shocking to me at the time that there would be any doubt about the existence of such consequences. Whether the expressed doubt is, in essence, a disingenuous claim on the part of those

responsible for torture to avoid the full consequences of their actions, or is related to a need for more education, increased advocacy, or something else, it is hard to determine. Whatever the cause, the request came as part of the legal and political work underway in South Africa at the time. The Director of NIMH agreed to their request, and I co-chaired a workgroup to develop the formal report. The international workgroup included researchers, clinicians, and advocates who had devoted their lives to understanding torture and related trauma and advancing efforts to help people recover. Sister Dianna Ortiz was an essential member of the working group, providing guidance about the needs and experiences of survivors of torture. I believed then, as I do now, that science means nothing if it does not address the real experiences of the human beings it is studying, and that those human beings have a right to have a say about what that science does. Sister Dianna participated fully in the workgroup discussions as a representative of a larger survivor group who were consulted during the process, contributed to the report, and reviewed all of its contents. The report was completed and delivered to the Commission by its deadline, and was subsequently developed as a book,² with proceeds used to keep the book more widely accessible through the publisher at that time. As a result of these and other efforts, including the tireless advocacy of the late US Senator Paul Wellstone, NIMH also directed funding through its normal grant award process to study the effects of torture on human beings, an expansion of research in this area long sought by advocates and representatives of torture treatment centers.

Through these experiences—the conference, the working group, the book, and the research funding—I learned many things, two that I believe are especially important to the issues being addressed in this volume. The first is that research and the “objective” reports based on science and analysis, if done right, are critically important, since they are part of the currency by which survivors and advocates make legal cases and medical analyses that advance efforts to end the practice of torture and support survivors in their recovery. Secondly, I became aware of how the scientific process can, and usually does, leave the survivor’s own experiences out of such analyses, and can cause further harm and lead to inaccurate conclusions, however well intentioned. A balance is needed.

²Ellen Gerrity, Terence M. Keane, & Farris Tuma, eds. *The Mental Health Consequences of Torture* (NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publications, 2001).

I brought mind, heart, and soul to these tasks, while feeling on shaky ground as I bridged the world of NIMH research and the world of the torture survivor. I felt confident in the rightness of doing so as I worked with torture survivors and those who supported them in their recovery. But I still often felt a sense of being an outsider, especially when I saw again the same kind of rift between survivors and researchers at another conference some years later. The creative approach that this volume is taking to bring these two worlds together is a good one. I believe it is important for all those who are committed to this issue to work together in the one world in which we live. I believe such collaboration can heal the lack of trust that can rise up even among those who are on the same side of a cause.

I recognized too that because of some of my own life experiences (e.g., having been raised as a Catholic, and then learning of the Church's history of child abuse), I lack faith in institutions and the claims they often issue about doing the right thing in the face of documented wrong-doing. Instead, I have faith only in the goodness and courage that reside in the individual hearts of those who speak the truth, even—especially—when there are personal consequences and costs for doing so. Likewise, wrongs committed on behalf of institutions are in fact made possible by the individuals directly involved, and also by those internally who could take action but do not. When survivors of torture confront the researchers or policy-makers who meet with them, it may not be because they do not have trust in those specific individuals (though they may, in fact, not). Rather, it may be that the meeting itself allows survivors, perhaps for the first time, to raise concerns to the individuals who are *right now* the ones in front of them, ready to listen to what they have to say, and to believe that maybe it will be this person who will act. Who would not take the opportunity to speak the truth when given such a chance, and to hope (if not trust) that they will be heard? I believe that speaking up in such situations is itself a courageous act, given that any trust a survivor may have once had in people, institutions, or the truth was intentionally crushed by torturers and their protectors.

In the end, I believe that trust is built between individuals, and that such trust can lead to action and change. I accept the truth behind Margaret Mead's statement, "Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world,"³ and believe that the trust among such citizens

³ Margaret Mead, The Institute for Intercultural Studies, http://www.interculturalstudies.org/faq.html#quote_use (accessed October 2013). Used with permission.

is built over time, through shared experiences of success and failure. For me, deeper trust came from the experiences I had working with Senator Wellstone, a man of intrinsic courage and compassion. A few years after the NIMH conference, I was assigned to work in his Senate office, an arrangement that lasted several years. He always fought for the “little guy,” especially those who have no power and no voice. It was his office that had encouraged NIMH to hold the cross-agency conference on torture and to direct funds toward research in this area. Through this work, I had the opportunity to learn how courage can be contagious. I could be braver because of his example, as could many others. While in his office, I was able to work on issues affecting the daily lives of many people: human rights, torture, mental health and addiction treatment and research, suicide prevention, education, child welfare, and veterans’ services, and I collaborated with many others who also fought hard on these issues. I now see this time as an inspiring gift for me, a chance to work with those who take personal and professional risks to do what is right and who then take responsibility for the outcomes. I learned what being part of a community can mean when things go right and when they go wrong, both useful experiences for what came later.

PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY AND THE APA

I came to explore the wreck.
 The words are purposes.
 The words are maps.
 I came to see the damage that was done
 and the treasures that prevail.
 —from “Diving into the Wreck,” Adrienne Rich⁴

It is with these experiences behind me that I learned about the role of psychologists in the interrogation and torture of prisoners at the Guantánamo Bay detention camp. A story in *The New Yorker*⁵ revealed that psychologists were involved in the development of extreme interrogation and torture techniques, and were advising interrogators at Guantánamo regarding the use of these techniques upon detainees. Some health organizations (e.g., the American Psychiatric Association and the

⁴Adrienne Rich, “Diving into the Wreck,” *Diving into the Wreck: Poems 1971–1972* (W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. 1973).

⁵Jane Mayer, “The Experiment,” *The New Yorker*, July 11, 2005.

American Medical Association), although initially silent, began to voice clear positions that their members must not take part in such interrogations. The American Psychological Association equivocated, stating in its now infamous *Report of the Presidential Task Force on Psychological Ethics and National Security* (PENS)⁶ that psychologists working with interrogators could use information from medical records as part of the interrogation, and could conceal from prisoners their professional identities or relationship with interrogators.⁷ Under pressure, the APA released statements claiming that it opposes torture, but I noted that the careful wording it used in its statements was very similar to that of the military interrogators and those who protect them; for instance, parsing the definition of the word “torture” to make it mean what it wanted it to mean, to somehow distinguish it from “extreme interrogation.” The APA began early on to differentiate between the participation of psychologists in “torture” versus participation in “interrogation,” and claimed that the presence of psychologists could in fact *protect* those being interrogated. It was clear to me that something was very wrong, that further investigation was needed to discover the meaning of these contradictory and ambiguous statements and what lay beneath them. In Adrienne Rich’s poem “Diving into the Wreck,” she proposes the purposefulness nature of such investigation: “I came to explore the wreck, the words are purposes, the words are maps. I came to see the damage that was done,” later specifying that her exploration was of “the wreck and not the story of the wreck.” What I hoped to find was the truth, and not the story of the truth.

Feeling white-hot anger upon encountering these early statements, I immediately contacted the President and Executive Director of the APA. In response, I received an email from a lower-level official who noted the imminent release of the PENS report and claimed that it would provide details that would allay my concerns. Instead, I soon learned from many publications and reports of the flaws in the PENS report and in the nature of the Task Force itself, which included several members with strong ties to the military. The PENS Task Force had held secret meetings and rushed through the approval of the report, precipitously establishing the APA position that it was ethically acceptable for psychologists to participate in military interrogations.

⁶American Psychological Association, *Report of the American Psychological Association Presidential Task Force on Psychological Ethics and National Security*, June 2005.

⁷Steven H. Miles, *Oath Betrayed: America’s Torture Doctors*, 2nd ed. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2009).

Soon, several advocates began calling for investigations, gathering information to challenge the position and actions of the APA. Many of the details of the psychologists' involvement in interrogation were documented and disseminated by Steven Miles, who made available 60,000 pages of relevant government documents via his website,⁸ as well as through subsequent reports from others described in detail in what follows. In defending itself, the APA claimed that its purpose in supporting military interrogations is to allow psychologists to prevent "behavioral drift," whereby interrogators could veer from their interrogator role into abuse and torture. By asserting that this kind of control is possible in institutions controlled by the military, the APA ignored years of psychological research and many recent examples where the "behavioral drift" was not that of interrogators becoming abusers, but rather of psychologists themselves becoming abusers.⁹ Over time, discourse about APA involvement in torture and interrogation expanded from revelations about its position on torture, to defenses by APA leadership, to protests about its actions, and ultimately to numerous efforts by the APA to marginalize and attack opponents. More details were gradually revealed through the persistence and courage of investigative journalists, psychologists involved in the internal discussions, and APA members (and then former members) who launched protests, leading ultimately to the far-reaching report, *Independent Review Relating to APA Ethics Guidelines, National Security Interrogations, and Torture*, by David H. Hoffman et al.,¹⁰ further described below.

As this process unfolded, I was filled with shame and disgust by the behavior of APA officials and what became many years of dissembling on their part. My first impulse was to resign as a member, as loudly and as publicly as I could. Many people did. Award-winning author and psychologist Mary Pipher returned her APA Presidential Citation award, citing that she

did not want an award from an organization that sanctions its members' participation in the enhanced interrogations at CIA black sites and at

⁸ "United States Military Medicine in War on Terror Prisons," ed. Steven Miles and Leah Marks, University of Minnesota Law School Human Rights Library, 2007. <http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/OathBetrayed/index.html>

⁹ Miles, *Oath Betrayed*, 2009.

¹⁰ David H. Hoffman, et al., "Report to the Special Committee of the Board of Directors of the American Psychological Association: Independent Review Relating to APA Ethics Guidelines, National Security Interrogations, and Torture" (Chicago, IL: Sidley Austin LLP, July 2015).

Guantánamo. The presence of psychologists has both educated the interrogation teams in more skillful methods of breaking people down and legitimized the process of torture in defiance of the Geneva Conventions.¹¹

Other APA members protested or signed a joint resignation letter via listservs and websites, such as a 2009 website petition that listed seventy-six members who publicly resigned, stating that “the APA has demonstrated such profound ethical failures that we can no longer, in good conscience, remain affiliated with the organization.”¹² I was encouraged to retain my membership by colleagues who were also concerned, but who thought that I might be able to do more from the “inside,” perhaps because of my prior involvement with the US Congress. As with many others who tried this path, this proved not to be effective. Many journalists, APA members, and other health professionals who were knowledgeable about torture similarly voiced their concerns, only to face strong institutional resistance and personal attacks from APA officials.¹³ Many then moved to take actions outside of the APA.

Among other efforts, three organizations were particularly strong and vocal examples of leadership in challenging the APA: the Coalition for an Ethical Psychology, Psychologists for Social Responsibility, and Physicians for Human Rights. The Coalition for an Ethical Psychology¹⁴ was formed in 2006 specifically to “mobilize diverse groups for the removal of psychologists from US programs of torture and other detainee abuse.” It was led in its efforts by Stephen Soldz, Steven Reisner, Jean Marie Arrigo, and others. The Coalition issued many public statements and reports, including *All the President’s Psychologists*, a report that presented more detailed analyses of the email evidence that described the role of the APA with the Bush administration on its torture program.¹⁵ These findings were further

¹¹Mary Pipher, “Why I’ve Returned My Award to the American Psychological Association—Because It Sanctions Torture,” *OpEdNews*, August 24, 2007.

¹²Dan Aalbers, “We Resign from the APA,” *ipetitions*, <http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/aparesignation/>

¹³James Risen, “Outside Psychologists Shielded US Torture Program, Report Finds,” *The New York Times*, July 10, 2015, http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/11/us/psychologists-shielded-us-torture-program-report-finds.html?_r=0

¹⁴Coalition for an Ethical Psychology, <http://ethicalpsychology.org/>

¹⁵Stephen Soldz, Nathaniel Raymond, and Steven Reisner, “All the President’s Psychologists: The American Psychological Association’s Secret Complicity with the White House and US Intelligence Community in Support of the CIA’s ‘Enhanced’ Interrogation Program,” <https://web-beta.archive.org/web/20150817031854/http://ethicalpsychology.org/materials/All-the-President-s-Psychologists-Key-Findings.pdf>

cited by James Risen in a significant *New York Times* report on April 30, 2015.¹⁶

The Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PsySR) organization, launched in 1982, is an engaged community of members and supporters who work to advance peace and social justice through the ethical use of psychological knowledge, research, and practice.¹⁷ Led in its efforts during recent years by Yosef Brody, Stephen Reiser, and others, PsySR issued many statements and reports calling for a public investigation of the APA's involvement in torture in its work with the military.

Physicians for Human Rights¹⁸ repeatedly issued public statements and press releases, many cited in this essay, calling for a governmental investigation of the APA and adding a significant human rights voice to the public dialogue.

In response to these actions, officials at the APA issued many statements and press releases questioning the reputations and motives of those who objected to APA activities and positions, while avoiding addressing the key issues increasingly being raised by APA members and the press. Efforts were made by some APA members to hold the organization accountable, but these were ignored or attacked by APA leaders.¹⁹ Unfortunately, many APA members, denying or ignoring the growing evidence about its role, did nothing or very little to protest the actions of the APA as an institution or to call for an independent investigation. This is hard to understand, given the gravity of the situation, but as I witnessed more and more of this inaction, I tried to analyze it from a broader perspective. One explanation may be found in the expanding significance of the APA in the lives of psychologists over the past several decades. It is a very powerful institution in the educational and career advancement of psychologists, playing major roles in training, fellowships, licensing, publication, continuing education, and much more—including establishing national connections for individuals to high-level task forces, policy leadership groups, and other activities that could have a significant impact on

¹⁶James Risen, "American Psychological Association Bolstered CIA Torture Program, Report Says," *The New York Times*, April 30, 2015, <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/01/us/report-says-american-psychological-association-collaborated-on-torture-justification.html>

¹⁷Psychologists for Social Responsibility, <http://www.psySR.org/>

¹⁸Physicians for Human Rights, <http://physiciansforhumanrights.org/>

¹⁹Risen, "Outside Psychologists Shielded US Torture Program, Report Finds," July 10, 2015.

academic and practice careers. Given the APA's public attacks on those who did voice their concerns about its actions, and the potential impact of a backlash on their personal and professional lives, this could have been enough of a barrier for some to hesitate to speak up. This feasibility raises questions about whether there are sufficient "checks and balances" in place to mitigate the influence of the APA in the lives of psychologists. This idea helped me to have a larger context for the situation, though it does not explain why some could overcome these barriers, and others could not. What made the difference is a question to consider.

In 2014, the public awareness of torture reached new heights with the publication of two major reports that established in detail the participation of the government in activities following the terrorist attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001, including the involvement of psychologists and the APA in supporting government-sanctioned torture. The first was the publication of the book *Pay Any Price: Greed, Power, and Endless War* by James Risen,²⁰ which examined the consequences of the "war on terror" that was launched after the 9/11 attacks. Included in Risen's book are details about the cooperative role of the APA with the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the latter's use of torture in its interrogation program. The information about the APA prompted more questions from APA members and the public. In the aftermath, Physicians for Human Rights called for a Department of Justice investigation into whether the APA and the CIA engaged in unlawful conduct related to this brutal torture program.²¹ I became hopeful that Risen's book and related reports and calls for action would make a difference in holding accountable those responsible and preventing such activities from continuing.

The second publication was the December 2014 release of the Executive Summary of the *Senate Intelligence Committee Study of the Central Intelligence Agency's Detention and Interrogation Program*, which included many more details about the involvement of psychologists in developing and implementing torture techniques, and that this involvement provided

²⁰James Risen, *Pay Any Price: Greed, Power, and Endless War* (NY: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2014).

²¹"PHR Calls for Federal Probe into American Psychological Association's Role in CIA Torture Program," Physicians for Human Rights, October 16, 2014, <http://physicians-forhumanrights.org/press/press-releases/phr-calls-for-federal-probe-into-american-psychological-associations-role-in-cia-torture-program.html>

“cover” for the administration’s torture program.²² Senator Dianne Feinstein acted courageously in combating strong opposition for the release of this report, which established in detail the role of psychologists and the APA in the torture program, including important information about how even agency health professionals inside the CIA were protesting the approaches that the psychologists were promoting. Noting the role of the APA in a related release, Feinstein stated that “[t]his is a stark reminder that torture can corrode every institution it touches, including medical and psychological professions.”²³

Under increasing pressure, the APA authorized an “independent review” to be conducted by David Hoffman of the law firm Sidley Austin LLP regarding

whether there is any factual support for the assertion that APA engaged in activity that would constitute collusion with the Bush administration to promote, support, or facilitate the use of “enhanced” interrogation techniques by the United States in the war on terror.²⁴

While it may not have been the APA’s intention, the timing of this announcement (after the Risen book was published and before the Senate Committee report was released) effectively gave the APA a pretext to avoid questions for months after the Senate report became public, doing so by citing the ongoing review. While a genuinely independent review of the APA’s activities was to be welcomed, this strategy seemed familiar to me, in that the APA avoided answering questions after the 2005 Mayer article was published, citing the imminent release of the PENS report, which did not in the end address the expressed concerns of members. Watchdog organizations, keeping a sharp eye on these actions, continued to call for a separate full federal investigation into the

²²“Senate Intelligence Committee Study on CIA Detention and Interrogation Program,” *United States Senator for California Dianne Feinstein*, <http://www.feinstein.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?p=senate-intelligence-committee-study-on-cia-detention-and-interrogation-program>

²³“Feinstein on Alleged Link Between APA, CIA Torture Program,” *United States Senator for California Dianne Feinstein*, April 30, 2015, <http://www.feinstein.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/press-releases?ID=c4164060-080f-4f04-915f-a3b4b46091b3>

²⁴“Statement of APA Board of Directors: Outside Counsel to Conduct Independent Review of Allegations of Support for Torture,” American Psychological Association, November 12, 2014, revised November 28, 2014, <http://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2014/11/risen-allegations.aspx>

allegations cited in Risen's book²⁵ and launched a petition for the immediate public release of the Hoffman review, objecting to the APA's original plans for multiple internal reviews prior to its release to the public or APA members.²⁶

These reports and APA's reactions provided ample evidence that torture survivors had reason to be distrustful and cautious in their dealings not only with the US government, but also with psychologists whose primary professional association had violated their rights, time and time again. A significant consequence of the actions of the APA was the serious impact on survivors who sought help with recovering from their traumatic experiences. How many torture survivors would be unable to trust mental health professionals because of the positions the APA had taken regarding torture?

Finally, in July 2015, the Hoffman Report was released to the public through the *New York Times*, verifying much of the evidence that had been cited by Risen and by the courageous advocates who had fought for a decade to reveal the truth of the APA's role in the perpetration of torture as part of the "war on terror." The report concluded, among many things, that

some of the association's top officials, including its ethics director, sought to curry favor with Pentagon officials by seeking to keep the association's ethics policies in line with the Defense Department's interrogation policies, while several prominent outside psychologists took actions that aided the CIA's interrogation program and helped protect it from growing dissent inside the agency.²⁷

The report revealed evidence that the APA's own ethics office "prioritized the protection of psychologists—even those who might have engaged in unethical behavior—above the protection of the public."

The report was released while the APA was still conducting its "internal review" and immediately produced widespread outrage from the public

²⁵ "American Psychological Association to Conduct an Independent Review Into its Role in CIA Torture Program," Physicians for Human Rights, November 14, 2014, <http://physiciansforhumanrights.org/press/press-releases/american-psychological-association-to-conduct-an-independent-review-into-its-role-in-cia-torture-program.html>

²⁶ Email to the author from Psychologists for Social Responsibility, <http://hosted.vertical-response.com/442001/0b3f918b43/1493529749/6e6d22ca03/>

²⁷ Risen, "Outside Psychologists Shielded US Torture Program, Report Finds," July 10, 2015.

and APA members. In response, at the APA's annual meeting in August 2015, the APA's Council of Representatives held a vote, which passed almost unanimously, on the issue that

psychologists shall not conduct, supervise, be in the presence of, or otherwise assist any national security interrogations for any military or intelligence entities, including private contractors working on their behalf, nor advise on conditions of confinement insofar as these might facilitate such an interrogation.

This, described as a “ban on torture,” was seen as a major victory for advocates and a major shift in APA policy.

I was surprised by my own reaction. Initially very relieved and heartened by the outcome, over time I became angry, increasingly so as I watched APA colleagues who, after a decade of silence or dismissive responses, were now hastily moving to reconciliation, skipping, in my view, an essential accountability step and the need to establish a watchdog stance while actual changes were proposed. My anger grew when some members extended praise to APA for launching the independent review and for emphasizing how important it is to “work from the inside,” thereby dismissing the efforts of the courageous members who had no choice but to work from the outside, and without whom the evidence of the APA's complicity with torture would never have come to light. Equally disturbing were the efforts by some APA members to focus on “institutional betrayal,” that is, the anguish that members were feeling at this betrayal by their professional organization which they trusted, as if the most serious issue was how *members* were feeling.²⁸ The latter, thankfully, was countered by Physicians for Human Rights in a statement reminding those who needed reminding that the focus should be on those who had been victimized by the actions of psychologists who promoted torture and by those who protected them.²⁹

Whether the APA vote will ultimately make a difference in how the institution operates remains to be seen. Only a few APA leaders among the many cited in the report have been fired or have left under pressure. Early reports are that the vote may not make a difference. It will only matter if

²⁸ <http://www.apatraumadivision.org/hoffman.php>

²⁹ Donna McKay, “The Brutal Toll of Psychologists’ Role in Torture,” Physicians for Human Rights, August 6, 2015, <http://physiciansforhumanrights.org/blog/the-brutal-toll-of-psychologists-role-in-torture.html>

it is enforced, and the enforcement is controlled by the APA Ethics Office,^{30,31} whose actions in recent years have essentially destroyed its credibility. In early 2016, even before any changes were made in the APA's ethics rules to conform to the new policy, the Pentagon began exerting pressure on the APA to drop or weaken the ban on psychologists' involvement with torture, so that they could go on working in military interrogation settings. The APA has agreed to meet with Pentagon officials. It is difficult to determine whether the future will be like the past, marked with deception and denial, or if real change will occur.³²

Those who fought for the release of this information were essential to this outcome, and because of their work, much has been revealed about the role of the APA and about what has happened to US policy as a result of its stance toward torture. This public disclosure has helped reverse some of the policy and legislative actions that led to the use of torture. For example, on June 16, 2015, Senators Dianne Feinstein and John McCain, with fifteen Senate colleagues, co-sponsored an amendment to "ban the use of torture," proposed as part of the National Defense Authorization Act. The amendment passed in the Senate by 78–21, and was included in the final law (S.1356/PL 114-92; signed on November 25, 2015), a very positive outcome. However, this is not the final word, as the amendment relies on the Army Field Manual, especially its Appendix M, as the standard for interrogations. The Appendix lists the kinds of interrogation techniques that are allowed, eliminating many forms of torture, though not all. Several coercive techniques, such as humiliation, solitary confinement, and sleep deprivation, are still included. In an effort to address this problem, the Senate amendment requires regular revisions to the Manual, and the involvement of the administration's "High Value Detainee Interrogation Group," which relies on interrogation research and emphasizes the use of non-coercive techniques, such as rapport-building and incentives. In the aftermath of the amendment's passage, tensions remain

³⁰ "Key Provisions of the New APA Policy," American Psychological Association, <http://www.apa.org/independent-review/key-provisions-policy.aspx>

³¹ John M. Grohol, "American Psychological Association's New Torture Policy is Unenforceable," PsychCentral, August 18, 2015, <http://psychcentral.com/blog/archives/2015/08/18/american-psychological-associations-new-torture-policy-is-unenforceable/>

³² James Risen, "Pentagon Wants Psychologists to End Ban on Interrogation Role," *The New York Times*, January 24, 2016, <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/25/us/politics/pentagon-wants-psychologists-to-end-ban-on-interrogation-role.html>

between those who hold differing approaches to interrogation. Some officials want to continue to be able to use torture techniques, others want them banned. The debate has continued as agencies prepared their first reports to Congress (required by the new law) on revisions to the Manual.^{33,34,35} Vigilance and advocacy are still necessary while these and other debates go forward.

As a witness to these events, it is clear to me that many voices are needed to speak out against torture, and that nothing should be assumed about how institutions and individuals respond under personal, political, or professional pressure related to this issue. Throughout these years, I have observed in myself and in others a continuum of responses: courage and fearfulness; integrity and lies; kindness and cruelty; and intelligence and ignorance. I have tried to find my way to help during this time, although compared to others my contributions are very small. In 2007, I was asked by an APA Division, the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI), to collaborate in writing a policy statement for it about the APA's position on torture. The statement focused on research that showed the ineffectiveness of torture, the mental health consequences for torture survivors and perpetrators alike, and the national and international laws prohibiting torture, and included a protest regarding the APA's involvement in torture and a call for the APA to end these practices. It made a strong case for ending the involvement of psychologists in interrogation, opening with this statement:

The United States and its military should immediately ban the use of torture, and psychologists should be expressly prohibited from using their expertise to plan, design, assist, or participate in interrogations that make use of torture and other forms of cruel, inhumane, or degrading treatment. The use of torture as an interrogation device is contrary to ethical standards of conduct for psychologists and is in violation of international law. Torture is ineffective as a means of extracting reliable information, and likely leads to faulty intelligence. Torture has long-term negative consequences for the

³³ Kaveh Waddell, "Here's What CIA Interrogators Are Still Allowed to Do," *National Journal*, December 12, 2014, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/defense/here-s-what-cia-interrogators-are-still-allowed-to-do-20141212>

³⁴ "US: Support Anti-Torture Legislation," *Human Rights Watch*, June 16, 2015, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2015/06/16/us-support-anti-torture-legislation>

³⁵ Ali Watkins, "Obama's Anti-Torture Team Has One Job—and Nobody Wants Them to Do It," *BuzzFeed*, January 20, 2016, <http://www.buzzfeed.com/alimwatkins/obamas-anti-torture-team-has-one-job-and-nobody-wants-them-t#.hv9xedKV8>

mental health of both survivors and perpetrators of torture. The use of torture has far-reaching consequences for American citizens: it damages the reputation of the United States, creates hostility towards our troops, provides a pretext for cruelty against US soldiers and citizens, places the US in the company of some of the most oppressive regimes in the world, and undermines the credibility of the United States when it argues for international human rights.³⁶

This resolution was published on the SPSSI website, and eventually became the basis for an additional in-house publication³⁷ and a peer-reviewed journal article.³⁸ I had hoped that the statement would be put up against the APA's position in some internal and perhaps influential way, given the reportedly independent relationship between SPSSI and APA. This did not happen. The 2007 policy position did spark a series of responses in the *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy* (ASAP) journal,³⁹ which the ASAP editors described as a valuable opportunity to offer "differing views," but they failed to recognize that even presenting the idea that torture is potentially an appropriate tool for interrogation as a "differing view" is taking a position that contradicts principles accepted in international law (e.g., the prohibition of torture), and violates the ethical principles of many professional associations and religions. The forum merely allowed APA officials to continue making their claim that the APA prohibits torture and to deny the actions that it had taken to the contrary, stating that they could not authorize an independent investigation, although in fact they finally did in 2014. Other authors addressed nuanced research issues related to interrogation, many of which begged the question about the ethical involvement of psychologists or Americans more generally in torture.

I was dismayed by the process itself. Elizabeth Swanson notes in her introductory comments that in her view, "it is a massive step backward in the theory and practice (intellectual, activist, legal) of human rights to open a debate about the potential efficacy of torture, as well as about

³⁶Mark Costanzo, Ellen Gerrity, & M. Brinton Lykes, "Psychologists and the Use of Torture in Interrogations," *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy* 7, no. 1 (2007): 7–20.

³⁷Costanzo, Gerrity, & Lykes, *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 2007.

³⁸Mark Costanzo & Ellen Gerrity, "The Effects and Effectiveness of Using Torture as an Interrogation Device: Using Research to Inform the Policy Debate," *Social Issues and Policy Review* 3, no. 1, 2009.

³⁹Costanzo, Gerrity, & Lykes, *The Use of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhumane, or Degrading Treatment as Interrogation Devices*, The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, 2007. <http://www.spssi.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=page.viewpage&pageid=1460>

various forms and methods of torture.” I agree with this view, and it seemed to me that the ASAP discussion had been an example of this kind of debate. I feel that a kind of false equivalency is evoked when those who believe that torture has its place and those who do not are presented as arguing opposite sides of the same principle. In this case, I felt that the ASAP editors were taking the safe road of providing another venue for APA officials and their supporters to state that the APA is against torture, while still using ambiguous wording that allowed psychologists to be involved in military interrogation.

Although I had hoped my effort with this statement would make a difference with what was going on at APA, I see now that this was very naïve; to my knowledge, this is the only public action that SPSSI took during this period. I strongly believe that every action, however big or small, can make a difference, sometimes in ways that are unexpected. But in the case of the APA’s continued resistance, it was disturbing to think that all of the protests seemed to be making little difference, that so much more was needed to make a change. It is critically important that the Hoffman Report revealed what it did, but what will happen remains to be seen. To regain credibility, the APA will need to make deeper organizational changes. I firmly believe that vigilant oversight will be essential in the future, whatever APA states its position to be going forward, and especially as this relates to its work with the military and with the government.

I tried to do what I could “from the inside,” but I am certainly no longer on the inside, probably never was in any practical sense, and what I could do early on felt like precious little, though I signed petitions, donated funds, and added my voice when I could. I am no longer a member of the APA, although I recently joined as an affiliate member the APA Trauma Division, an experimental step I took to see if this Division, with its understanding of trauma, would take this issue seriously as decisions are made, and if I can help as the Division leaders develop their own response to the Hoffman Report. As of this writing, it is uncertain whether the Division or any other APA Divisions will focus on the serious issues related to human rights, torture, and the role of psychologists in a way that will change the larger organization. If not, the outside advocacy organizations cited earlier and other professional associations are places where I and other psychologists and advocates can contribute.

In the meantime, knowing that there are many ways to help, I turned to my own work to try to do more. For the last twelve years, I have been a senior policy official with the National Center for Child Traumatic Stress,

the coordinating center for the National Child Traumatic Stress Network (NCTSN),⁴⁰ and in that capacity I try to help children and families affected by many forms of traumatic experiences. This initiative was launched by the US Congress, under the leadership of Senator Tom Harkin, Representative Rosa DeLauro, and others (including Sen. Kennedy, Sen. Durbin, Sen. Wellstone, and Sen. Murray) to expand and improve care for children and families exposed to traumatic events. Within its mission, researchers, clinicians, and other service providers are helping children affected by all forms of trauma, including those related to torture, war atrocities, refugee trauma, and other events. More recently, member centers are helping children who are being trafficked for forced sexual activity and labor. Most of my work has been to raise awareness about these issues and to translate what we learn to inform policy change and improve clinical care. This is important work, but I also am aware of the immense scope of the problem and the gaps in my own organization's efforts. We do not do enough about torture, nor about some forms of traumatic events that include institutional collusion. For example, we focus a great deal on children who experience other forms of trauma, including abuse or neglect by parents who are often themselves poor or abused and who become involved with the child welfare system, but less so on children who have been abused by clergy or coaches with the knowledge of the institutions which protect them. We are beginning our work with children who have been forced into slavery (in my view, an accurate term for trafficking) as part of national and international exploitation, but the problem is growing and we need to do more. Our work with refugee families is substantial, though insufficient, and the torture experience as a unique clinical or political issue is not emphasized. We work hard to collaborate equally with survivors of trauma, but we need to remain vigilant on this issue. There is much more that can be done.

I am grateful to the editors, survivors, and other advocates for this volume, which emphasizes the voices of survivors to point a direction for policy, treatment, advocacy, and research, and allows other authors (scholars, activists, advocates, and clinicians involved in this work) to speak more personally. It is my hope that this will be the beginning of many such collaborations and discussions. My own participation, with its requested focus on the personal, was set in the context of political and public debate, and has led me to explore my own fears and what I can do about them to

⁴⁰National Child Traumatic Stress Network, www.nctsn.org

find new ways to contribute. I have asked myself questions, some that I had avoided examining too closely. Could I be a therapist working with torture survivors? Am I skilled enough to do forensic interviewing? This is not merely a training question—I wonder if I am strong enough to be of help, to bear witness, to support someone as they recover. If I am too wrapped up in my own internal issues, I will be of no help to anyone else. Will my non-survivor status mean that my contributions are unwelcome or suspect or ineffective? Will this be even more challenging, now that the APA has so severely damaged the reputation of psychologists? If so, what are my responsibilities to help to break down those barriers? It is acutely embarrassing to admit to worrying about my capabilities or my emotions when survivors, who have been through horrific pain and betrayal, can overcome their own despair to speak up on behalf of those who did not survive or who are still in captivity. But if I can recognize such dynamics and thereby resolve my own issues, perhaps I can then see a clearer path forward. This is something I think about all the time, and I want to move my ideas into new action.

WHAT CAN I DO? WHAT CAN I HELP OTHERS DO?

Never separate the life you live from the words you speak. (“Conscience of a Liberal,” Senator Paul Wellstone)

Helping Those Who Help Those who never give up have my deepest respect. When I was at NIMH in the early 1990s, I met regularly with some representatives of the Center for Victims of Torture (CVT, a torture treatment center in Minnesota), who were asking that NIMH do more to study the psychological impact of torture. They succeeded in this effort then, and have not stopped doing what they can to advance many issues. Since that time, CVT has been a leader of an active consortium of torture treatment centers who advocate for more funding for treatment and to end torture.⁴¹ In 2008, CVT led an effort with other organizations to bring together 200 international leaders to sign a declaration to ban torture.⁴² This effort was instrumental in encouraging President Obama to

⁴¹ National Consortium of Torture Treatment Programs, <http://www.ncttp.org/index.html>

⁴² “Declaration of Principles for a Presidential Executive Order on Prisoner Treatment, Torture, and Cruelty,” *cvt.org*, <https://web-beta.archive.org/web/20150905113837/>

sign an executive order about torture and interrogation in 2009. This kind of action brings together the courage of many people and must overcome many barriers; it is one way that change occurs when people do not give up, and where more help is needed. At this time, legislation for the reauthorization of the Torture Victims Relief Act, which includes language for the continued funding of torture treatment services, has been introduced, but its final passage is still pending. Research is also lagging; despite the targeted funding in 2000, as of 2016, and due in part to the more narrow priorities of NIMH research, only five grants related to torture are funded across the National Institutes of Health. Much more advocacy is needed here.

The organizations involved with torture that I know best are TASSC, CVT, Advocates for Survivors of Torture and Trauma, and the Guatemala Human Rights Commission. These are among the many organizations that provide services for torture survivors, involving volunteers in the process. In Washington, DC, TASSC also coordinates the June 26 annual event to commemorate the United Nations International Day in Support of Victims of Torture. Opportunities with organizations that help torture survivors include assisting with practical matters (driving, food, office work) or more complex issues such as asylum applications, therapy, legal support, or housing. The issue of being a survivor or a non-survivor may arise in some of these interactions, but I see these opportunities as a chance to build trust. I am exploring the work of these and other organizations, and have taken a course sponsored by Physicians for Human Rights on conducting psychological interviews with asylees who have been tortured as one avenue where I would like to contribute. The reality of doing this is still very challenging to me, but I see what others have done, and that helping those who help is one of the clearest paths forward.

The American Psychological Association As already described, the APA's role in supporting the participation of psychologists in torture has been revealed. Some of the individuals involved have been fired or are resigning or retiring, but whether this will lead to real change is unknown. More is needed, and as a psychologist I feel a responsibility to do more about this, though these experiences have resulted in a deeper skepticism

http://www.cvt.org/sites/cvt.org/files/downloads/CTBT_Declaration_of_Principles.pdf.
See also <http://www.cvt.org/sites/cvt.org/files/u18/Master%20Endorser%20List.pdf>

about institutions being able to withstand pressures and stand up to powerful forces. Perhaps for me this is related to a belief that there is a moral order to the world, one that helps form the basis for decisions around right and wrong, just or unjust. What is important is not to let skepticism, the potential result of experiences such as these, lead to inaction, despair, or fear. What has helped me is to spend my time finding other ways to contribute, such as through the Coalition for an Ethical Psychology, which I believe will continue to be a watchdog, and to allow myself to be inspired by these individuals and organizations as a strong counter to the despair I feel when I witness injustice or passivity. The expressed shock of some members in the aftermath of the Hoffmann Report's release is astonishing, given the amount of evidence that had been available throughout the past decade, and I often find myself angry over the disingenuous and ongoing denial of many members. But I do recognize the pressures faced by many members, and that, as with other traumatic events such as child abuse, it is difficult sometimes to accept that these things do actually happen and that voices must be raised for change. In the end, of course, it is up to me to do my part. I can further add my voice to those who have been committed to changing the role of the APA and the United States' views and actions about torture, perhaps finding new ways to help through the courageous organizations who lead in these areas. Even within the APA, some of the original protestors are holding important watchdog roles in the organization, and may be able to influence what comes next.

In December 2014, *The New Yorker* investigative journalist Jane Mayer, continuing her watchdog activity about the torture issue, noted that President Obama may have missed an important opportunity when he spoke in the aftermath of the release of the Senate Committee's report about the extent of government-sanctioned torture. In his remarks, instead of speaking honestly about the brutality that had occurred, he instead praised the CIA officer "patriots" who were involved in post-9/11 activities. Mayer suggested the better path he could have taken. Citing David Luban, the author of *Torture, Power, and Law*, she emphasized that there are many forms of accountability for torture, and one of the most meaningful would be to honor the real torture patriots—those who had tried to stop it.⁴³ The APA itself could learn a lesson from this advice.

⁴³Jane Mayer, "The Real Torture Patriots," *The New York Times*, December 13, 2014, <http://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/real-torture-patriots>

Raising Awareness I believe that scientific evidence can help survivors and advocates in their work, and to that end I am exploring the possibility of updating the information that was included in the report and book for the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission. So much has happened in the last fifteen years, including changes put in place after 9/11, that has made the world we live in one where human rights are questioned and torture has spread. At the same time, our understanding of trauma has advanced dramatically, with many improvements in clinical care. Because of the courage of torture survivors and their involvement in research and advocacy, we know much more about the impact and long-term consequences of torture. The torture information in the original book needs to be updated, as do the related chapters that focused on refugees, rape, veterans, and war trauma, as well as treatment, neurobiological science, and human rights. I think a new edition, or a comparable research collection, could be a valuable resource for survivors, advocates, clinicians, attorneys, and scientists. I am exploring ways to move forward with this idea.

Within the National Child Traumatic Stress Network, programs and resources have been developed that are relevant to many forms of trauma, but a working group that focuses specifically on torture has not yet been established. I would like to spearhead this effort in collaboration with torture survivors, as I believe that this could help consolidate relevant resources that could be of value for torture survivors and those who help them, and could bring torture into the mainstream of NCTSN's work. Such an effort could also help link the resources developed by the NCTSN with the Consortium of Torture Treatment Centers and other organizations involved in the issue.

FURTHER THOUGHTS

It's no use waiting for what only appears at a distance. (Barbara Kingsolver, *The Poisonwood Bible*)

In one of my favorite books, *The Poisonwood Bible*, author Barbara Kingsolver thanks her husband in her author's note for teaching her that "it's no use waiting for what only appears at a distance."⁴⁴ For me, this was

⁴⁴ Barbara Kingsolver, *The Poisonwood Bible* (NY: Harper Collins, 1998).

an encouraging and persuasive reminder that just wanting and waiting will not bring what one hopes for any closer. For me, it means that I will need to take action myself, even when it involves overcoming fear and pushing against seemingly insurmountable personal or external obstacles. For many of us, the goal of ending torture seems to appear only at a distance and sometimes, with all the barriers, seems hopeless. For me, even finding a way to contribute has often seemed to be a goal “at a distance,” too. Identifying small steps has helped turn an overwhelming challenge into something manageable, as has finding support from colleagues and friends. People like those represented in this volume take their experiences and their pain, and move forward on the path they are on—whether it is recovery from horrific personal experience, or advocacy, research, counseling, refugee services, legal support, investigative journalism, prosecution, or truth-telling. I don’t have to look far for examples to provide courage and hope. Working toward a goal is a form of hope, trusting that I can be of use, and moving the fight along on the path I have in front of me.

In my time with Senator Wellstone, he often advised people “Never separate the life you live from the words you speak,” meaning: act authentically and live your life according to the values you profess. He lived that way, even when the outcome of a Senate vote was 99–1, and he was the 1. He did not say “Never separate the life you live from the words you speak, *unless you are challenged, or frightened, or it is really hard to do, or you might lose the election, or you may be threatened.*” He knew what each person might be up against in fighting for human rights or justice, but advised us to *do*, as well as to *talk*. I took this to heart, too, and try to do this wherever possible. I believe that this is what so many survivors of torture do as they advocate for change even in the face of grave danger.

Those who are tortured say that they are told again and again that no one cares or will ever care about what has happened to them. Part of the torturer’s objective is to isolate and instill despair. Fighting against this is part of survival and recovery, I believe, and those who support survivors in clinical, legal, or other activities are helping to eradicate that part of the torture. The survivor is not alone, nor is the non-survivor advocate. The question is asked whether non-survivors have a right to speak up against torture, to formulate recommendations for policy change, to try to help. I believe that they—*we*—do, yes, but also as with any soul-searing experience, those who have been through it and who are forever changed by the new knowledge of what it is really like have a perspective that is essential to any presentation, dialogue, therapy, or recommendation for change. I

think non-survivors may at times be confronted, and perhaps when that happens they are serving as stand-ins for others who were not or could not be confronted, or who were confronted but failed to listen or respond. When challenged, consider that it is best to listen so that survivors can be heard, and to figure things out together. I think in this work, people know that, and even when it is hard, they try to do exactly that. Hence, this book.

Handing Things Along The example of those who have not given up is the model for the future—what else, after all, can we do, but learn “how to save one another” as Gene Knudsen Hoffman suggests, move things along, take the charge from those who fought before us, do what we can, and pass it to those who come after, grateful always that we are not alone on this journey.

And I am waiting
 For the song
 To swell from a million,
 Million throats
 Because we learned
 How to save one another.
 —from “I Am Waiting,” Gene Knudsen Hoffman⁴⁵

⁴⁵Gene Knudsen Hoffman, “I Am Waiting,” *Poetry of Peace*, edited by David Krieger (Santa Barbara, CA: Capra Press, 2003).