



Psychology's Prejudice Against the Military

Jacob T. Shoenleben and Larry C. James

Abstract

Military psychologists have been at the forefront of innovation in clinical practice, training, and research within the clinical field since the early 1900s. Yet since the 9–11 attacks, military psychologists have been attacked and vilified as the leaders in the abuses at the detention facilities at both Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and Abu Ghraib, Iraq, without evidence to support these attacks. To date, no military psychologists have been sanctioned by the American Psychological Association for unethical conduct at any time post 9–11. Moreover, in spite of a lack of evidence documenting that military psychologists have committed ethical violations at these facilities, the American Psychological Association's governing body in 2015 (the Council of Representatives) voted to ban military psychologists from serving at the Joint Task Force in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. Why? What motivated the leaders of the American Psychological Association to pursue such antimilitary legislation if there was no evidence to support a decision to ban military psychologists for serving in any country or location? This chapter will examine the history of prejudice, bias, and disdain

against the military by civilian psychologists. The authors will trace historical roots of this bias and provide the reader with case examples of the prejudice against military psychologists.

Keywords

Military · Prejudice

In the summer to fall of 2003, the now infamous abuses at the Abu Ghraib prison happened under the occupation by U.S. Army military police and interrogators (James, 2008). Later, in the spring of 2004, leaked photos of naked dog piles, humiliation, and shocking abuses were shown on major news networks around the country. James (2008), in his book entitled *Fixing Hell: An Army Psychologist Confronts Abu Ghraib*, describes not only the abuses at Abu Ghraib but also the prejudiced attacks against military psychologists even before any investigations had begun into the causes of the abuses. Perhaps as a result of the abuses at Guantanamo in 2002, some members of the American Psychological Association may have wrongly concluded that military psychologists were at the center of these abuses. Or could it be that most civilian psychologists hold an inherent prejudice against the military and, in particular, military psychologists?

J. T. Shoenleben · L. C. James (✉)
School of Professional Psychology,
Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA
e-mail: larry.james@wright.edu

Prejudice is defined as “unfavorable affective reasons to or evaluations of groups and their members,” while stereotypes are “generalized beliefs about groups and their members” (Paige, 2007, p. 475). As such, discrimination is a behavioral bias, while prejudice is an emotional bias and stereotypes are a cognitive bias. To date, much of the research and literature related to the above topics have focused on ethnic and racial minorities (Jones & Dovidio, 2013; Sue, 2010). However, it has been suggested that veterans and military service members, as a result of the language, norms, and specific beliefs inherent within the military, constitute a subculture (Meyer, 2015; Reger, Etherage, Reger, & Gahm, 2008; Strom, Leskela, Gavian, Possis, & Seigel, 2012). As such, in concordance with the multicultural guidelines established by the American Psychological Association, clinicians, trainees, and other providers must be aware of, and consult the literature, to provide comprehensive multicultural treatment to this unique subculture (APA, 2017).

Throughout this chapter, we will explore the prejudicial treatment of military members and veterans throughout recent history with a cultural focus on modern bias against the military. It should be noted that the term service member will be used throughout the chapter to refer to active duty, reserve, and retired/veteran military members as at any point throughout an individual’s military career, they may experience the prejudices described in this literature.

The aim of this chapter is not to only document historical and subjective experiences of prejudice against service members; rather, the identified objective of this chapter is to explore the nature of prejudice, a sensitive subject in many arenas, as applied to the military, its members and veterans, and any progress made to ameliorate the identified deficiencies. A review of the literature regarding prejudice and stereotypes will inform empirical and theoretical work discussed in this chapter while allowing a critical understanding of the status quo and a progressive agenda to foster future work and research to be applied to this seemingly ignored aspect of cultural sensitivity, that is, prejudice against the military.

While there have been obvious instances of discrimination, racism, prejudice, and stereotypes surrounding the military and its treatment of members since the Declaration of Independence, our review of the literature begins with Vietnam War 1955–1975 and focuses on the prejudice experienced by service members returning home after their tour or tours of duty. For example, the American Psychological Association banned military clinical psychology internship programs from advertising in any of the APA publications. The ban was out of protest over the military barring gays and lesbians from military service. The misguided belief among APA members was that somehow military psychologists directed this ban rather than the President of the United States under an executive order.

While a complete history of the Vietnam War is outside the scope of this chapter, however, the reader is referred to an excellent Vietnam War documentary (Burns, 2007); the Vietnam War is regarded as an “unnecessary” war not only by many today but also by many throughout the war and shortly thereafter, which undoubtedly influenced service members’ reception at their homes.

Glover (1984) described themes of mistrust and posttraumatic stress disorder in Vietnam veterans. Within this research, the author notes the confounding experiences that service members witness throughout their time in theater, suggesting that the Vietnam War had been referred to as a “no-win war,” citing ineffective military strategy, problematic terms of engagement, and hostility by the Vietnamese as problematic events that the service members experienced while serving, which likely resulted in conflicting views of the war, its necessity, and eventual outcome (Glover, 1984).

Glover (1984, p. 446) also noted mainstream society’s negative response to the war, documenting that “the attitude of the public towards the returning veteran has ranged from indifference and lack of recognition to hostile condemnation.”

If one is unsure of the sociopolitical divide surrounding the Vietnam War, speak with several Vietnam veterans and you will likely find two

views surrounding a shared major political event despite being a part of the same generational cohort. Flores (2014), in his review of sources of Vietnam veteran pro- and antiwar political attitudes, suggested that broader cultural debates be included when examining political outcomes. As such, it is vital to understanding the prejudice against service members and the military that a look toward modern concepts of prejudice and stereotypes be critically examined to determine what societal factors are at play leading to overt or covert emotional or cognitive bias. General Colin Powell also added that most Americans don't have an understanding of the fact that the military at the enlisted ranks are men and women who come from the American lower SES. He went on to assert that these young soldiers view the military as a place to grow (Powell, 1995). Moreover, under the United States Constitution, the military does not decide whether to fight—civilian politicians do, even the terms of engagement. But the military personnel are usually the persons whom the Americans blame and vilify for “going to war.”

Before discussing the outcomes of the sociopolitical climate and its influence on prejudice and stereotypes regarding the military and service members, it is imperative to work from an empirical perspective. As such, a review of the literature will be documented below in order to provide the foundation for which theoretical and future empirical research will be explored at the conclusion of this chapter. In reviewing the literature related to prejudice and stereotypes against the military and service members, there is a stark contrast between the empirical research available for other selected areas of cultural sensitivity and the military. This may in fact reflect society's overlooking, minimization, or perceived competence in the area of prejudice against the selected demographic.

This is particularly problematic, given the large portion of the United States' population that identifies as veteran or service members. In fact, there are an estimated 23.4 million veterans and 2.2 million active duty service members in the United States (SAMHSA, 2017). Additionally, one should note that many of these individuals

would also experience prejudice for other reasons; for example, they are black or female or gay and thus experience additional prejudice. Given this large population, why is there not more research in these areas? While a complete review of the many possible or plausible factors leading to this paucity of empirical research is outside the scope of this chapter, societal beliefs regarding the treatment of veterans and service members may be the most obvious factor.

It is fairly apparent that veterans and service members from modern conflicts, such as those involved in Operation Enduring Freedom (from 2003 to present), Operation Iraqi Freedom (from 2003 to 2009), and Operation New Dawn (2010 to 2011), do not receive the lack of recognition, and more importantly hostility, that Vietnam veterans and service members experienced upon their return home. However, is the warm reception at the airports or surplus of viral videos of homecomings disguising prejudices and stereotypes underlying the American society that rear their ugly head after the essential “honeymoon” of returning from deployment had dissipated?

For example, Redding (2001), in an American Psychologist article, posited that most psychologists are politically liberal and possess not only an antiwar belief system but an antimilitary sentiment as well. Is there a sociopolitical façade within the United States masking varying levels of prejudice against the military and service members? The research published by Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research hawk and Public Opinion Strategies and the Pew Research Center will inform the following documentation of society's view of the military and service members with complimentary research conducted by various authors while serving as palpable evidence of the paucity of research in the area of attitudes and perceptions of the military and service members (Greenberg Quinlan, Rosner, Research, and Public Opinion Strategies, 2012; Pew Research Center, 2011).

One of the most notable and encouraging findings from the Pew Research Center's survey of 1853 veterans and 2003 adult respondents was in the area of respect and admiration for service members (Pew Research Center, 2011).

Unfortunately, it is also in this same area, and more specifically within the public's view and understanding of the military and service members, that we find our first evidence at a plausible prejudicial approach to service members, whether overt or covert.

Overall, Americans hold the military in high regard and have a respect for service members and their family's sacrifices, with 90% of Americans reporting to have felt proud of the troops in Afghanistan and Iraq (Pew Research Center, 2011). Furthermore, modern-era service members have identified the American populace as more supportive and respectful of them as compared to Vietnam-era veterans, stating that 47% and 24% see the public as having "a lot more respect" or "a little more respect" for the military now than when they served, although results differ significantly by era of service (Pew Research Center, 2011). Not surprising given the above documented public reception of Vietnam-era service members, 81% of these individuals state that modern-era service members are respected more than when they served (Pew Research Center, 2011). This era of service members is followed by 74% of service members who entered the military prior to 9/11 and 46% of all Korean War and World War II (WWII)-era veterans in believing that modern-era service members receive more respect than they did regarding their service (Pew Research Center, 2011).

Despite the respect that the American public has toward the military, it is clear, in the eyes of both service members and the populace, that the general public has little understanding of the military and the burden it imposes on service members. While seven in ten veterans say that the public has an incomplete appreciation of the rewards and benefits of military service, about eight in ten say that the public does not understand the problems, such as the physical, social, or psychological difficulties faced by those in the military or their families (Pew Research Center, 2011). This is particularly problematic as, in the eyes of service members, the general public does not understand the rewards and benefits of military service, nor does the public understand the problems faced by those in the military.

The Pew report (2011) goes on to say that the U.S. military is one of the most diverse organizations in the United States, and very few Americans are mindful of this. Most Americans are not mindful of the fact that according to the Pew Research Center, the U.S. military is one of America's most diverse organizations. For example, 40% of the military are persons of color. Seventeen percent are African American, 12% are Hispanic, 7% are Asian, and the remainder indicates others. As one examines these data, it can be asserted that few, if any, major corporations possess such a diverse workforce.

The opportunities for women, minorities, and persons from lower SES are outstanding, according to Pew.

Furthermore, of the post-9/11 service members who knew and served with someone who was seriously injured, 46% say that the public understands their problems "not well at all." The public appears generally aware of their lack of understanding, with 71% of respondents stating that most Americans have little or no understanding of the problems faced by those in the military (Pew Research Center, 2011). Moreover, while the general public appears to acknowledge their lack of understanding, even reporting that 83% of the service members and their families have had to make sacrifices compared to only 43% saying so about the American public, seven in ten agree that "it's just part of being in the military" (Pew Research Center, 2011).

Finally, despite this respect, the American public (47%) is much more ambivalent regarding encouraging youth to join the military than both post-9/11 (82%) and pre-9/11 (74%) veterans (Pew Research Center, 2011). This begs the question why, if the military is such a respected profession, the public does not encourage the youth to join. Is it as simple as saying that a service member is dangerous? Or are there much more insidious factors involved in this uncertainty?

Perhaps stigma, prejudice, and stereotypes related to service member behavior upon reentry to civilian life, mental health concerns, or work life after the military has some bearing on behavioral, emotional, and cognitive bias against the military? While it is common in media

reports and layperson conversations to identify reentry into civilian life as a significant barrier to returning to life after the military for veterans of all eras, the Pew Research Center (2011) found that over 70% of veterans noted their readjustment as “very” or “somewhat” easy. However, when one considers the modern-era veterans, that is, post-9/11, 44% note that they had difficulty readjusting to civilian life compared to 25% of pre-9/11 veterans (Pew Research Center, 2011). In light of these differences, there may be prejudice.

Additionally, if one considers the higher rate of serious injuries in the post-9/11 era despite a lower death rate, one can imagine the difficulty with which service members are returning to civilian life. Service members are returning with acquired disabilities due to traumatic brain injuries and likely find difficulty with readjusting to life with a new disability in a world built upon ableism. Conceivably, there is a difference in attitudes and stereotypes within the public regarding visible as opposed to invisible disabilities in service members.

The research supports the public viewing invisible disabilities as more common in service members than what has traditionally been found. MacLean and Kleykamp (2014), in their study of attitudes toward United States veterans returning from Iraq, found people to hold a negative stereotype about how service members behave upon their return home.

However, the researchers also found a conflicting approach to service members in that public perception may be colored by what is termed symbolic capital, defined as “the resources available to an individual on the basis of honor, prestige or recognition, and functions as an authoritative embodiment of cultural value; yet, when a service members behaves negatively, to an amount that exceeds their symbolic capital, stereotypes predominate” (MacLean & Kleykamp, 2014 p. 134). A survey of 801 adults throughout the United States aimed at taking an in-depth look at the country’s perceptions of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans demonstrated that while the public viewed the service members in high regard, similar to that of the Pew Research Center’s

(2011) study, these service members are disproportionately viewed as associated with stress, depression, and anger (Greenberg Quinlan, Rosner, Research, and Public Opinion Strategies, 2012).

Furthermore, work conducted by Schreger and Kimble (2017) found a moderate effect size for an association task between veterans and instability, demonstrating an implicit bias, which the authors believes may partially mediate the reintegration difficulties that service members experience. While an all-encompassing examination of the stigma, prejudice, and discrimination that individuals diagnosed with a mental health disorder experience is out of the scope of this work, it can reasonably be presumed, given the research presented above, that such approaches and treatment affect the service member population. But in what ways?

An alarming statistic found in the Pew Research Center’s, 2011 study is the difference in unemployment rates among post-9/11 service members. Service members in this era experience an unemployment rate of 11.5%, which is greater than that of the unemployment rate of all other eras of veterans combined (8.7%) and for nonveterans (9.4%) (Pew Research Center, 2011). This single statistic communicates that there may be factors negatively affecting service member’s reentry into civilian life. Is it covert prejudice, overt stigma, or blatant stereotypes of service members that dominate the mainstream sociopolitical culture as factors?

Perhaps the answer lies in the views of the necessity for the current conflicts as it is plausible that the public view of the worthiness of the conflicts reflects the unconscious affective treatment of service members. While it is not necessarily surprising that those who have had a role in the military (i.e., pre- and post-9/11 veterans) view the conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq as worthwhile endeavors, the public does not seem to be as certain. The American public views the conflicts at levels eight and nine percentage points lower than that of post-9/11 veterans, suggesting a view that the wars are not worthwhile in the eyes of the public (Pew Research Center, 2011).

Furthermore, 57% of the surveyed population says that the war in Iraq has not been worth engaging in, while 52% says the same about the Afghanistan conflict (Pew Research Center, 2011). Given this information, it appears clear that the American public has grown tired of the conflicts in the Middle East, and survey data support this inclination, stating that the public is paying less attention to the conflicts now than previously (Pew Research Center, 2011). Furthering the distance between the public and the military/service members, the survey data suggest that approximately half of the public says that these conflicts have had negligible impact on their lives (Pew Research Center, 2011).

While there is not a landslide difference in the views of whether the wars are worthwhile between service members and the public, the little impact on the public's lives, per the public, is somewhat alarming. Here, the general public is saying they are proud of the military and its service members; however, the individuals who have clearly sacrificed (in the eyes of not only the service members but the public as well) are being told that their efforts, losses, and resulting difficulties have had little impact on the lives of individuals back home. This is particularly disturbing as 93% of pre-9/11 service members and 88% of post-9/11 service members noted serving their country as the top motivating factor for joining the military (Pew Research Center, 2011).

Is the public's more recent indifference toward the war and the minor impact of engaging in such conflicts on day-to-day living a covert message being communicated to service members through interaction with the public after airport welcome receptions and the hometown parades? Conceivably, this covert, insidious attitude could be fueled by political influence and fear.

It is no surprise, during time war, that the public is not always supportive or proud of what the military and service members making the challenging decisions have to do. This is reflected in the research conducted by the Pew Research Center (2011), stating approximately that one third of Americans feel ashamed of the conduct of the military in the Afghanistan and Iraq conflicts. Perhaps it is party affiliation or

cohort may be swaying the public's opinion of the conduct of the military. And is it this dissatisfaction with the military as an entity that results in the clandestine prejudice that appears palpable to service members upon their return stateside?

Obviously, it is impossible and wildly unacceptable to make determinations regarding causal factors without further in-depth research; however, adults between the ages of 18 and 29 are more likely than older adults to have mixed or negative feelings regarding the military's conduct (Pew Research Center, 2011).

College graduates are most likely to say that they have felt ashamed of something that the military has engaged in during these conflicts, while Democrats and Independents are more likely than Republicans to say the same (Pew Research Center, 2011).

These sentiments may have been at play during the APA Convention in Toronto in 2015. It was at this Convention that APA's governing body, the Council of Representatives, voted to ban military psychologists from serving at the Joint Task Force Detention facility at Guantanamo Bay Cuba. In spite of the fact that there was no evidence that any military psychologist had been found guilty of any wrongdoing at all, the Council of Representatives voted to ban military psychologists from deploying to this location. Why? The vote or decision was not based on fact. Moreover, no military psychologist has ever had his or her license suspended for unethical behaviors. As James (2008) described in his book *Fixing Hell*, there appears to be an underlying resentment, disdain, and/or prejudice against military psychologists. Clearly, efforts to "ban" military psychologists were motivated not by facts but by prejudice.

As such, one must consider the sociopolitical climate, a climate that has shifted its focus toward acceptance and openness of differing ethnicities, religions, sexes, relationships, etc., that is so outwardly spoken, and rightfully so, regarding minority justice, how doing so may marginalize service members who, while holding other minority identities that are openly supported, also experience microaggressions, prejudice, and stereotypes given their connection with the military.

While there is no research regarding this subject matter, viewing the military as a subculture necessitates a similar openness of the language,

cultural views, and traditions inherent in military culture with the same respect and openness that other cultures are afforded.

Thus far, the chapter has focused on the relatively few research studies considering the military and its service members as a unique subculture that experiences prejudice, stigma, stereotypes, and even discrimination. What little available research there is, as so often is the case, leaves one with many more questions than answers. In the following paragraphs, a theoretical approach to understanding these factors will be undertaken with careful consideration that more research is needed in these areas.

This section is not to be taken as empirically supported truths; rather, directions future research may explore. Does the sociopolitical climate of the United States play a negative role in the attitudes of the public in viewing the military and service members? Does the stark contrast between public respect of the military and its little understanding of what being involved in the military and its operations is result in either overt or covert prejudice? Is it plausible that the volume of media coverage of military shortcomings and the ever-present political unrest communicate, in subtle ways, covert attitudes of the general public?

Does the fact that the conflict has lasted many years without clear “wins” and the perception that the conflicts have little impact on day-to-day life of the public negate the experiences that service members who joined the military to serve their country must live with daily? These are questions that cannot be answered at this time; rather, they may help to guide the following theoretical framework.

Case Examples of How the American Psychological Association Is Prejudiced Against the Military

In the aftermath of the 9–11 attacks, the United States captured the orchestrators of the 9–11 terrorist attacks at the Pentagon and the Twin Towers

in New York City. The terrorists were captured then imprisoned at the Joint Task Force Detention Center at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

At the height of the post 9–11 frenzy to kill or capture terrorists who plotted to kill Americans, the United States held approximately 660 to 700 prisoners at the Guantanamo Detention facility.

James (2008) and others (ACLU, 2018; Amnesty International, 2017) documented the abuses at the prison. In spite of the fact that there were no military psychologists involved in any prisoner abuses at Guantanamo, the American Psychological Association’s membership voted in 2008 that military psychologists could not be involved in interrogations at any unlawful detention facility in the entire world (APA Membership Petition Resolution, 2008). An unlawful detention facility is any prison facility outside of the United States that, according to U.S. law, violates United Nations agreements. This action was the first step in a process of any health care membership organization attempting to regulate where its members could and could not work.

Moreover, the shameful resolution was that the learned PhD scholars who had voted for this ban could not provide any evidence that military psychologists had either violated the APA ethics code or participated in any criminal activity.

As James (2008) described in his book entitled “Fixing Hell,” many of the American Psychological Association members lacked any first-hand understanding of the role that military psychologists provided in a national security venue. James (2008) asserted that it seemed that these psychologists relied on the stereotype that military psychologists were “baby killers” or “war mongers.” The author went on to argue that many in the APA membership have a disdain for and/or a distrust of any psychologist who either wears a military uniform or is employed as a police psychologist. The assumptions are that the military psychologist must be dirty or evil.

There is more evidence of this. A psychologist who Colonel James has never met filed multiple and redundant ethics charges against him in Hawaii, Guam, Ohio, Louisiana and at the American Psychological Association. In the complaints, Colonel James was charged with doing harm to prisoners and failing to prevent

prisoner abuse. When the state psychology boards dismissed the cases, this psychologist filed civil lawsuits in both Louisiana and Ohio.

In the civil lawsuits, these same individuals filed the lawsuits against the psychology licensing boards in both Louisiana and Ohio in an effort to have the court force an additional investigation of Colonel James even though there was no evidence that he had done anything wrong according to the Ohio and Louisiana psychology license boards.

The effort was an attempt to get a civil judge to force additional investigations of Colonel James even though his accusers could not present any evidence that he had acted either unethically or criminally. The civil lawsuits were dismissed by the courts in both states. Although there were no financial costs to James because the complaints were reviewed and dismissed, there were the lingering emotional and stress toll that these drawn out ethics complaints had on him and his family.

The assumption by James' accusers was that just because he served at Guantanamo and later at Abu Ghrib means that he must be guilty of wrongful acts (see Harvard Center for Constitutional Rights give <https://hrp.law.harvard.edu/u-s-health-professionals-and-torture/accountability-for-torture-begins-at-home/>).

In 2015, the American Psychological Association, in an effort to have an objective investigation into all of these allegations, sanctioned what is now known as the "Hoffman Report" (2015), which was conducted by David Hoffman, an attorney at the Sidley law firm in Chicago, IL. Many hoped that Hoffman would be able to ascertain and grasp both the complexities of the military culture, the military organization, and their chain of command and how military psychologists must follow all ethical, moral, and lawful orders.

In the Hoffman Report (2015, pp. 520–522), either Hoffman did not understand the military structure, culture, and rules that govern the military or he was prejudiced against the military or one could have had the impression that the investigation was incomplete. For example, on pages 520 to 522 of the Hoffman report, he described the ethics investigation filed against Colonel

James at the American Psychological Association. But Hoffman failed to mention that there had been four other ethics investigations filed against Colonel James (as well as civil lawsuits filed against psychology licensing boards regarding Colonel James service at Detention facilities). Why did Hoffman withhold this information? Was this a naïve omission, or was it a deliberate attempt to mislead the readers? Or perhaps this omission was a function of Hoffman's stereotypes about the military? In any event, stereotyping and discrimination against the military appeared to have played a role in his lack of military knowledge.

This was interpreted by the Department of Defense—that even military psychologists who were providing routine psychological care to detainees were "banned" and could not be stationed at these facilities. The unintended result of this was that, as of this writing, the United States is not in compliance with the United Nations treaty that asserts that captures must provide comprehensive medical and mental health care to its captives.

In an effort to "undo" this act of international negligence, military psychologists attempted to have a resolution passed that would allow military psychologists to provide treatment to detainees at the August 2018 Convention. The measure was voted down by a large margin by the APA's Council of Representatives. Critics of this resolution feared that it would open the door to military psychologists torturing detainees again (Jindial, 2018). Even though no one can produce evidence that military psychologists are guilty of any wrongdoings, the prejudice and attacks toward them have continued.

For example, in February of 2014, the American Psychological Association released a letter to explain why there was "no cause for action" against Dr. John Leso. Dr. Leso was a major in the U.S. Army and stationed at the Guantanamo Detention facility in 2002. An ethics investigation was filed against him at the American Psychological Association, and the investigation has gone down in history as the longest and costliest in the history of the APA ethics committee. The gist of the allegations was that

Dr. Leso did harm to the detainees and/or failed to prevent harm to them. The investigation spanned 7 years, and the committee reviewed over 2000 pages of documents. There was no evidence that Major Leso had done anything wrong at all. Regardless of the factual evidence, many psychologists still held the belief that military psychologists were torturers (Eidelson, 2013; Rosenthal, 2015). The final outcome from the APA Ethics Committee was that Dr. Leso had done nothing wrong upon the completion of the seven-year investigation.

Roughly a year later, in August of 2015 (item #23B), the American Psychological Association Council of Representatives voted to ban military psychologists from military detention facilities around the world (APA, August, 2015). The problem with this resolution was that this resolution “banned” all military psychologists from military detention facilities.

Also, in 2015, the American Psychological Association voted to accept a report that was a result of an investigation into the acts of military psychologists and APA staff. Coined the Hoffman report, it concluded that military psychologists and some APA staff “curried favor” with each other in an effort to support the military and the CIA in their national security endeavors. The author of the report reached conclusions that were later contradicted by a Society of Military Psychology investigation (2015). For example, in the executive summary of the report on pages i and ii,

The Society of Military Psychology Task Force found that the Hoffman Report’s conclusions are based on

1. An inaccurate understanding of DoD interrogation policies in place when the PENS Task Force met in June 2005,
2. An inadequate understanding of how military interrogations are conducted,
3. A misconception of military culture,
4. A deep bias against military psychology and Military psychologists, and that
5. While acknowledging that U.S. personnel were involved in Torture and abusive treatment of detainees following the events of September 11, 2001, TF19 did not find a basis

for an apology by Division 19 for actions of the division or for the actions of division 19 members with regard to interrogation support.

The Hoffman Report, including its appendix section, was approximately 1500 pages. Sadly, within 24 hours of the Hoffman Report’s release, many members of APA’s Council of Representatives acted inappropriately and concluded that military psychologists conspired to commit torture.

The author of the Report, David Hoffman (an attorney from Chicago), while presenting his finding in person at the August 2015 meeting, said: “I can find no evidence that any military psychologist has harmed anyone” (Hoffman, Personal Communication Note, APA Convention in Toronto during the Executive Session of the APA Convention). Regardless, innuendo and personal attacks upon military psychologists were commonplace. These shameful behaviors underscored the belief of the authors of this chapter that these well-educated scholars with PhDs held a deep dislike for, a hate for, and a prejudice against **ALL** military psychologists.

In summary, examples of prejudice against the military are abound. In spite of this, military psychologists continue to be at the forefront in research, teaching, and innovative practices in behavioral health and protecting the safety of Americans around the world.

References

- ACLU. (2018). *Guantanamo by the numbers*. <https://www.aclu.org/issues/national-security/detention/guantanamo-numbers>
- American Psychological Association Council of Representatives. (2015, August). *Resolution to ban military psychologists from detention facilities around the world, item #23B*. Retrieved from: <http://www.apa.org/independent-review/psychologists-interrogation.pdf>
- American Psychological Association. (2008). *APA members approve petition resolution that limits psychologists’ roles in settings that violate international law or the U.S. constitution*. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2008/09/detainee-petition.aspx>
- American Psychological Association. (2017). *Multicultural Guidelines: An ecological approach to context, identity*

- and intersectionality. Retrieved from: <http://www.apa.org/about/policy/multicultural-guidelines.pdf>
- Amnesty International: 14 years of Injustice. (2017). Retrieved from: <https://www.amnesty.org.uk/guantanamo-bay-human-rights>
- Burns, K. (2007). *The War*. New York, NY: PBS Publications.
- Eidelson, R. (2013). *The torture debate echoes: An army psychologist's job search*. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/dangerous-ideas/201301/the-torture-debate-echoes-army-psychologist-s-job-search>
- Flores, D. (2014). Memories of war: Sources of Vietnam veteran pro- and antiwar political attitudes. *Sociological Forum*, 29(1), 98–119. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sof.12071>
- Glover, H. (1984). Themes of mistrust and the posttraumatic stress disorder in Vietnam veterans. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 37(3), 445–452.
- Greenberg Quinlan, Rosner, Research, and Public Opinion Strategies. (2012). *A new generation of leaders: A report on America's perceptions of Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans*. Retrieved March 12, 2018 from <https://www.missioncontinues.org/uploads/A-New-Generation-of-Leaders.pdf>
- Hoffman, D. (2015). *The Hoffman Report*. Retrieved from April 1, 2018 from <https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2015/07/independent-review-release>
- James, L. C. (2008). *Fixing hell: An army psychologist confronts Abu Ghrib*. New York, NY: Grand Central Press.
- Jindial, S. (2018). Psychologists vote no return to Guantanamo amid heated debate over torture legacy. *The Intercept*. Retrieved from: <https://theintercept.com/2018/08/09/guantanamo-bay-psychology-tort>
- Jones, J., & Dovidio, J. (2013). *The psychology of diversity: Beyond prejudice & racism*. New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell.
- MacLean, A., & Kleykamp, M. (2014). Coming home: Attitudes towards U.S. veterans returning from Iraq. *Social Problems*, 61(1), 131–154. <https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2013.12074>
- Meyer, E. G. (2015). The importance of understanding military culture. *Academic Psychiatry*, 39, 416–418. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-015-0285-1>
- Paige, R. U. (2007). Proceedings of the American Psychological Association for the legislative year 2006: Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Council of Representatives, February 17–19, 2006, Washington, DC; and August 17 and 21, 2006, New Orleans, LA; and minutes of the February, June, August, and December 2006 meetings of the Board of Directors. *American Psychologist*, 6(5), 400–490.
- Pew Research Center. (2011). *The military-civilian gap: War and sacrifice in the post-9/11 era*. Retrieved March 10, 2018 from <http://assets.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2011/10/veterans-report.pdf>
- Powell, C. (1995). *My journey*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Redding, R. (2001). Sociopolitical diversity in psychology: The case of pluralism. *The American Psychologist*, 56(3), 205–215.
- Reger, M. A., Etherage, J. R., Reger, G. M., & Gahm, G. A. (2008). Civilian psychologists in an Army culture: The ethical challenge of cultural competence. *Military Psychology*, 20, 21–35. Retrieved from http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title_db_all_content_t775653681
- Rosenthal, A. (2015). Did psychologists help the government torture? *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/search?query=psychologist%20and%20torture>
- Society of Military Psychology. (2015). Response to the Hoffman Independent Review. *The Division 19 Task Force Report*. Washington, DC.
- SAMHSA. (2017). *Veterans and military families*. Retrieved March 10, 2018 from <https://www.samhsa.gov/veterans-military-families>
- Schreger, C., & Kimble, M. (2017). Assessing civilian perceptions of combat veterans: An IAT study. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 9(1), 12–18. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tra0000191>
- Sue, D. W. (2010). *Micro aggression in everyday life: Race, gender & sexual orientation*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Strom, T. Q., Leskela, J., Gavian, M. E., Possis, E., & Seigel, W. (2012). Cultural and ethical considerations when working with military personnel and veterans: A primer for VA training programs. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 6(2), 67–75. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028275>