

The DoD Times (Redacted)

# NEWSLETTER

SATURDAY, 22ND NOVEMBER 2025

ISSUE 98.

## SYSTEMIC MISTRUST: HOW A SERVICE MEMBER WAS MISCLASSIFIED BY A MILITARY FAMILY PROGRAM





*An active-duty United States military officer authored this article. The author wishes to remain anonymous due to ongoing legal matters. The officer has served 13+ years in the U.S. military. The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the [Walk the Talk Foundation](#) and its members. (Published November 22, 2025)*

**Check out our Podcast, *The Star Chamber*, on: [Apple](#) | [Spotify](#) | [YouTube](#)**

---

### ***Systemic Mistrust: How a Service Member Was Misclassified by a Military Family Program***

I am a U.S. service member who sought help through a military Family Advocacy Program (FAP) office after experiencing escalating communication challenges and coercive, distressing behavior within my household. I believed the program would provide guidance, professional counseling, and support while helping restore stability. I was wrong. What began as an effort to seek help during a difficult time became a devastating example of how the system can invert reality—misdiagnosing a client and victim as the offender, disregarding context and evidence, and eroding trust in the very institutions that promise care and integrity.

Because I was assigned to a joint installation where one branch of the military administered family support programs for all personnel, my case fell under that service's jurisdiction. From the outset, the process was confusing and opaque. Through later information and privacy requests, I learned that the reports and notes written about me misrepresented my words, thoughts, and intentions, while information that contradicted those accounts was omitted or ignored. The clinician who provided confidential therapy after I voluntarily sought counseling—someone I believed was offering confidential and supportive care—met privately with my spouse after meeting with me and used information from both of us to shape conclusions about me that I was never allowed to review or challenge before they were entered into my file. This violated the core principles of confidentiality, informed consent, and professional ethics. When the review committee later convened at my spouse's request, I was not



informed how my therapist would participate and use my statements to portray me as an offender. Only afterward did I learn that this account—riddled with omissions, distortions, and unsupported inferences—had become part of my official record.

When I tried to clarify and correct these errors through the proper channels, my requests were ignored or redirected back to the same offices responsible for the original inaccuracies. My appeals have not yet been reviewed independently. The result is a record that does not reflect my words, behavior, or intentions, but a constructed narrative shaped by bias and professional misconduct. Portions of this file were later shared outside the U.S. military system and used in civilian legal proceedings, where it was accepted as credible despite its lack of evidentiary reliability. The review process itself requires only that unnamed participants reach a conclusion based on a preponderance of the evidence—a minimal administrative threshold that measures probability, not proof, and provides no assurance of accuracy or fairness. In my case, the underlying documentation is demonstrably inaccurate and ethically compromised, rendering the determination unfit for use in any judicial or administrative forum.

The damage has been profound—personally, professionally, and psychologically—not only for me but for my children, who have endured the ripple effects of decisions made in a process that was neither ethical nor lawful. What makes this especially tragic is that government employees I trusted to help safeguard my family instead took actions that caused lasting psychological harm to my children.

After reading about other cases, I realized that what happened to me was not unique. Kristina Graham's 2025 account described the same pattern: victims who reach out to FAP in good faith being misclassified as offenders, explicitly denied due process by US military regulations, and retraumatized by a system that confuses therapy with investigation. Her story echoed mine almost exactly — the same refusal to correct errors, the same closed-loop appeal process, and the same institutional indifference. Both of our cases reveal a deep structural flaw in the FAP system: its dual role as both caregiver and adjudicator creates conflicts of interest that compromise fairness, confidentiality, and safety.



When a process is this compromised, it cannot produce truth. FAP case files are not judicial findings; they are administrative documents compiled by individuals who may lack objectivity, experience, or training in trauma-informed practice, particularly DARVO on individual and institutional levels. Yet these files are treated as if they carry legal authority, even influencing custody and safety decisions in civilian courts. In my case, this has meant that an inaccurate, ethically flawed record is being used to define my character and credibility — despite violating the confidentiality protections established by DoW and service regulations as well as the professional ethics code of those involved.

My experience shows that the problem is systemic, not personal. The military's family advocacy structure—particularly at joint installations where members of multiple services and their families fall under a single administrative process—operates without consistent oversight, transparency, or accountability. When victims of extortion, coercion, or abuse cannot safely report their experiences without fear of being misclassified or silenced, the program ceases to protect and instead perpetuates harm enabled by overlapping clinical and command authority. Until such decisions are subject to independent review, separated from therapeutic care, and barred from use in civilian or foreign courts, the military will continue to retraumatize those it claims to help.



If you would like to help us fight these issues, please consider donating to the Walk the Talk Foundation [HERE](#). We greatly appreciate your support. As a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, your donation is 100% tax deductible.

**Send this newsletter to your elected officials if you believe they need to correct the issues discussed.**

- ▶ Find your Representative here: <https://www.house.gov/representatives/find-your-representative>
- ▶ Find your Senator here: <https://www.senate.gov/senators/senators-contact.htm>





Feel free to reach out privately at [francescagraham@walkthetalkfoundation.org](mailto:francescagraham@walkthetalkfoundation.org) or in the comments.

PETITIONS: [SIGN THIS PETITION](#) demanding that our leaders in Congress change the DoD's unjust administrative investigatory system.

All our articles are posted on [LinkedIn here](#) and [Online here](#). Be sure to subscribe to the newsletter on LinkedIn and follow us on [Instagram](#), [Facebook](#), and [X \(Twitter\)](#).

Graphic: AI Generated