civilian, was interviewed on 12 February 2004, as follows:

Q. Has anybody informed you as to the nature of your presence here with us this morning?

A. No.

Q. I'm amazed. Okay, so you were basically told to just show up?

A. It's the extension of a 15-6 and I'm not Army, so I'm not familiar with the extent of what a 15-6 is.

Q. That's fair. Let me go ahead then and inform you of the nature of this interview. I'm Major General Taguba, the Deputy Commanding General of the Coalition Land Forces Component Command, headquarterd at Camp Doha, Kuwait. My Commanding General, Lieutenant General David McKiernan, appointed me as the investigating officer under the provisions of Army Regulation 15-6, which gives us the authority to conduct the investigation, and also the direction of General John Abizaid, the Commander of CENTCOM, Central Command. This investigation is to gather all relevant facts and circumstances surrounding the recent allegations of maltreatment of detainees at the Abu Ghurayb, also known as the Baghdad Central Confinement Facility, as well as detainee escapes and accountability lapses as reported to CJTF-7. Now, we were also directed to investigate the training
standards, employment, command policies and internal policies concerning the detainees held at Abu Ghurayb Prison. And we’re also to assess the command climate and the supervisory presence of the 809th Military Police Brigade Chain of command.

I also want to advise you that the course of our interview will be recorded so we can capture the accuracy of the questions and the responses for the record. So, do you have any questions before we continue?

A. [Negative response.]

Q. Sir, for the record, would you please state your full name, your social security number, your job position and of course your unit of assignment.

A. Sure. My name is [Redacted], I am [Redacted], as well an interrogator, who is employed by CJTF-7, to support operations, KMI operations throughout theater, specifically, Abu Ghurayb.

Q. Thank you. When were you assigned to conduct your present duty assignment?

A. I arrived in country, in Iraq, on 5 October 2003, and on 5 October, we arrived at the prison, as well.
Q. Prior to that, were you informed of the--I would assume, back in the United States, as to the nature of your duty assignment?

A. To the extent of....

Q. What you were going to be----

A. Yes, I was informed that I was going to be an interrogator, possibly at Abu Ghurayb or other facilities in the country.

Q. What was your job position back in the United States prior to being informed that you were coming to Iraq?

A. For 6 months, I was off, roughly 6 months, prior to that, I was off. And prior to that, I was mobilized from November '01 until March of '03.

Q. Doing what?

A. I'm a Navy intelligence specialist. I was working with DIA, Defense Attaché System.

Q. But you're no longer associated with the Navy, or are you still on----

A. I'm on Inactive Ready Reserve status, so I could come out here on this deployment.

Q. Was your background pretty much on Navy intelligence, HUMINT?
A. My last, basically 2 years, have been involved on the HUMINT side. And prior to that, between intel analyst, as well as imagery.

Q. Now, did you have a previous assignment that's coincidental, even relative to what you're conducting today, like a GTMO or Bagram or anyplace else?

A. You mean interrogation assignment?

Q. Yes.

A. In a military setting, no, but my commercial training, if that's what you're alluding to, has come from what I've done, International Recruitment, similar training from my DIA counterpart, I was a case officer, running sources, do business development is the same thing as dividing and gathering your networks, interviewing your possible staff that you might hire or hire for other companies. It's the same hiring and questioning process that you would through, an interrogation, questioning or screening series.

Q. Training, that sort of thing?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you have any experience whatsoever being directly involved with interrogation of a detainee?

A. When I was operational, or provided operations and supervision support out of the USDA [inaudible].
Q. So you’re out here on the 5th of October, or about, there about, and you were directly assigned to the Abu Ghurayb confinement facility.

A. Yes.

Q. Who was your supervisor at that time, if you recall?

A. Within the JDIC Ice operations?

Q. Sure.

A. The...who was the NCOIC...I can’t recall the NCOIC’s name. They were part of the--when we were arriving, there was a turnover there. So he was only there for about a week. From that point, Chief [redacted] was the secondary OIC, and then Captain Carolyn [redacted] was the OIC.

Q. Now, the JDIC did not exist at that time, or did it exist when you arrived?

A. From my understanding, it did exist.

Q. All right, to your understanding. Did you receive any in-briefs or set of instructions on the operating environment and what the nature of the, specific nature of your duties would be?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who gave you that instruction?

A. Captain [redacted]
Q. Captain [REDACTED] did? Did that set of instructions include any familiarity at all or refresher training on the Geneva Convention?

A. No.

Q. No? Did you, since you were in that particular set of experiences previously as a Naval officer in the Reserves, in the context of other training that you conducted prior to your assignment here, did you have any knowledge whatsoever or training, interaction with detainees or through interrogative means or detention include some knowledge or familiarity with the Geneva Convention?

A. Yes, I have. In fact, I read up on that on my own, as well as provided the--recently, I’ve used them again to refresh and provide guidance for a friend of mine.

Q. But when you arrived here, there was nothing....

A. There was nothing formal in place pertaining to the Geneva Convention, that’s correct.

Q. But you were informed or at least had knowledge of the contents of the provisions of....

A. Yeah.

Q. Did you have any assumption at all or any knowledge that you, being a civilian contractor, also could be held liable
for any violations that might be consistent with the Geneva
Convention?

A. Absolutely. That was one of the first questions prior
to my arrival. And once I did arrive in country within our
organization, as well as within the military setting what
statutes the civilians fall under versus military members, which
are punishable by the UCMJ. Civilians are punishable, from my
understanding, under the Federal court system.

Q. Did you inquire as to what your status would be while
you're in a combat operating area, that your status, if you were
ever captured by anti-coalition forces, did you inquire into the
nature of what your status will be if you were captured or
detained?

A. From my understanding, since we are contracted, I just
assumed, because on my CAC card, it says we're covered under the
Geneva Conventions.

Q. But nothing beyond that.

A. No.

Q. So in a case where you may be held or detained or
killed or wounded in a combat area, it was never stipulated to
you in any clear terms?

A. No, not at all.
Q. Okay, all right. Let me move forward. You’ve been there since the 5th of October.

A. Yes.

Q. And conducting interrogations or whatever you’re being directed to do, I’m not asking you—let me preface this, not asking you the contents of any interrogation, but could you elaborate a little bit on the typical operation of an interrogation? I mean, when do you—is there a plan of sorts that you discuss previously with a translator? Is there a plan of sorts that you discuss with anybody from the MPs that are holding the detainee, time, that sort of thing?

A. All the interrogators are assigned to teams, Alpha through Charlie, through Echo. We’re given—we’ll just start with a new case file.

Q. Sure.

A. Find the assessment, let’s see where the detained has derived from, what the circumstances of capture are. As the interrogator, you sit down with your analyst. You go through, find out as much information about the detainee as possible, the capturing unit, check with the magistrate’s office, review what they have on file, collect whatever you need from to put in your file to build up the foundation. At that point in time, you schedule with your section chief as to the time of
interrogation. In most of the cases I work in, I usually have
an analyst there with me, so I brief the analyst prior to going
into the interrogation. To what depth and what extent, that
will vary with what the interpreter will receive. And also,
it's a matter of comfort and level of trust with the
interpreter, as well. Some, we use specifically as just—if you
want an umbilical cord of the interrogator. Others can become
more in depth who are assigned to more of your high value
targets who will become more actively involved and read up on
reports, etceteras.

Q. Basically, do you typically work with the same
interpreter, or do you change around based on the nature of----
A. Recently, I've worked with the same interpreter due to
the significance of the case and the level of his expertise.
But prior to that, I had used a reasonable amount of the
interpreters.

Q. Is there an established or a set schedule, written or
otherwise, that says, "These are the detainees I want to
interview today?"
A. Depending on your case load, you work with your
section chief and you're organizing your schedule throughout the
time period.
Q. Let me be a little bit more specific. The detainees that are held at Tier 1 A, they're held there for a specific purpose that you're familiar with. In your interaction with the MPs that are holding, or at least a company or a unit that is holding that particular detainee, when you have a set schedule, is that schedule articulated to them verbally or is it articulated to them in a written form?

A. It's not articulated to them at all.

Q. So how does that happen?

A. In terms—you do your prep and planning. Depending on the reaction and the information received or not received from the previous interrogation is how you'll schedule and time your next interrogation. In some cases, it could be late at night due to the fact that the detainee is less alert and is apt to get more information because all they want to do is go back to bed.

Q. Sure.

A. Versus a midday one when they're nice and relaxed and had a good night's sleep. They're more responsive and are able to countermeasure us and etceteras. So, in terms of putting those efforts, they're done within the operations section. I'm not outside with the MPs.
Q. And is that an established or a standard operating procedure that's provided and approved by----

A. That has been the operating procedure that's been presented to us upon my arrival and I've assumed to be the norm since then.

Q. And that was briefed to you by whom?

A. It wasn't briefed, that's just what was.

Q. What was, so that was your understanding. Was that in a written form or common practice?

A. Common practice, nothing written.

Q. Nothing written; so that was basically left to your approach or a common approach within----

A. As well as the coordination with your section chief.

Q. So that was an approved process. So there's no question in your mind that that was the approved process?

A. For setting a time period for coordinating interrogations in isolation—or segregation, as it's referred to now?

Q. Sure.

A. [Affirmative response.]

Q. Was there ever a requirement in the unit or the battalion that you belonged to, that you were associated with, which is I believe at that time, the 165th MI Battalion.
A. Prior to that, it was the 519th.

Q. Was it the 519th MI Detachment?

A. Right.

Q. Was there a requirement to put an interrogation plan in writing?

A. Yes, you have to have a double-sided interrogation plan, what your approach is, whether or not the detainee's information has been researched, whether it needs national agency check and background check etceteras, exploitation, any type of requirements that are outstanding for collection against HCRs, things along that nature. Then you turn it over and you write out an interrogation plan. The one currently being used now is an evolutionist one that was being used previously. So it's been an ongoing living document. That's how they've been documenting the process.

Q. Who approved that plan?

A. Section chief reviews it. Then it goes to either the NCOIC or the OIC.

Q. What governs that interrogation plan?

A. The rules of engagement.

Q. The rules of engagement. How long has that rules of engagement been published?

A. As far as I know, since the time I've arrived.
Q. It's been posted?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall that being briefed to you when you first arrived?
A. We were given a--everybody, from a Khaki perspective, and any people we bring in on board are given the rules of engagement brief. We have to sign that. Now, we've signed multiple variations since we've arrived, but everybody has had to read them and re-sign them.
Q. Does that interrogation plan look anything--I'm sorry, rules of engagement, look something similar to that [while showing document to Mr.  
A. This is the copy that was posted in the ISO.
Q. Okay. It was posted in October when you first arrived?
A. No, this was posted--I'm not quite sure when they posted it. They've had an 8 1/2 by 11 piece of paper up on a bulletin board. And then recently, I think it was in December, I can't remember the actual time, it was early December, end of February--November, when you go out through the doorway, there's a bunch of pieces of....
Q. This particular interrogation rules of engagement was posted, I believe, after Colonel Tom Pappas assumed command of
the Forward Operating Base Abu Ghurayb. And this particular
interrogation rules of engagement was approved by General
Sanchez because of differing and inconsistent practices done
during interrogation. Was that explained to you?
A. No.
Q. So you just took it at face value that this was
revised due to other things that had occurred. Have you had any
knowledge of interrogators being disciplined for going beyond
the bounds of their authority?
A. Just recently.
Q. Which one was that?
A. Just seen members, I'm not sure from where--I was told
right when we arrived, there was an incident in the segregation
section where a soldier was----
Q. Segregation in the hard site?
A. Yeah, alpha section. It used to be isolation, but now
the new term is "segregation," the hard site. And they came in
for their final, I guess, I wasn't sure if it's Article 15 or
what the procedure was, and people I had seen when I first
arrived were coming back in and reintroducing....
Q. Based on those infractions, do you recall the
Battalion Commander, Detachment Commander, the Brigade Commander
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gathering all the interrogators and amplifying any kind of corrective actions to be taken?

A. You mean right after this----

Q. Right.

A. I mean, nothing strikes the mind. We’ve had recent refresher: on rules of engagement. But citing, “Hey, this, X, Y and Z happened. Do not do this. Do not repeat the behaviors,” and lessons learned from it? No.

Q. So you don’t recall any of that. Moving a little faster here. You made a statement that was dated the 22d of January of the events on the 20th of December. It was you, Sergeant Eckron, you also mentioned John Israel in there, of remanding or returning a prisoner back to the custody of the MPs. I believe you mentioned Sergeant [redacted] and Staff Sergeant [redacted] if I’m not mistaken. Can you describe for us the events, what was going on?

A. After conducting our interrogation that evening, which at that point in time, common practice was, we were afforded the option to interrogate in the upstairs shower facilities or a rear stairwell down in the far left corner of the isolation, Alpha wing. When we had concluded our interrogation, we had handed off the detainee to the MPs who came back to the stairwell to receive the detainee. We proceeded forward. The
MP and the detainee were behind us, handcuffed, restrained, walked him back to what we call the hole, which is a complete segregation cell, no walls, there's no wires. The MPs placed the detainee in the room. As we were getting ready to walk up the steps, heard suspicious sounds. They were suspicious. I didn't see anything. We heard something suspicious enough that we confronted the MPs.

Q. What kind of sounds? Yelling? Choking?
A. Not a yelling, not a choking sound, an "Umph." You know, say if--the only way I can equate it to is if you're--and you're getting in you're getting in a fist fight and somebody hits you in the stomach, and "Umph," and they knock the wind out of you.

Q. Now, the MPs would not have weapons on them at any time, a baton or firearms or anything that you observed?
A. Batons, no. I've never seen an MP with a baton in that wing at all. The MPs, it was common practice for an MP to carry a weapon. They would have weapons in there in their staging area.

Q. Although firearms are not included [inaudible] SOP on allowing firearms in there while they're handling a detainee, but there are other items that could be construed as a weapon.
A. Yes.
Q. A knife....
A. Everybody--my rules are, meaning MI, no knives, no
Gerbers, nothing.
Q. None of that.
A. So we are sanitized. And that's strictly enforced on
a regular basis. Everybody's checked. I've gotten to the point
I don't even carry a Gerber anymore because it's not worth the
problem of taking it on and off throughout the day. So if they
were wearing one, you actually couldn't see if they were or not.
At the finish, when we had walked, went upstairs and we signed
the detainee in the log, from that point, when the MPs were
standing around waiting for them to come back up, we confronted
them, "What was that all about?" They weren't happy or
comfortable with the fact that we questioned them on that. Once
that was done, we presented that to them, we went back into the
operations area. I spoke directly to Chief [REDACTED] and
then we also----
Q. [REDACTED] was your ICE there?
A. Yes, he was the OIC at the time. Captain [REDACTED] was
gone. She has been redeployed. Chief [REDACTED] was the OIC for
the evening, and presented it to him, as well as we went with
that to Chief [REDACTED] who was in operations, and we presented it
to both of them.
C. That was a verbal report to them.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any knowledge, whatsoever, of the use of
dogs in interrogation or in the detainees' cells?
A. In the detainees--for interrogation purposes?
Q. Right, to intimidate the detainee or other than for
what the purpose is to search?
A. I know, just the searching aspect, I have not used
them as part of--using dogs to intimidate----
Q. Not you, per se, but rumors or anything of that sort,
but the use of military working dogs----
A. The only thing I've been a part of is walking down and
seeing the dogs doing the searches and in that capacity.
Q. Did you physically observe that, or did you just have
knowledge of it?
A. Had knowledge of it and one instance where I did
observe, was in one of my written statements, which I indicated
when I came down, my detainee was on three sessions of a managed
program. So given that, he was then under medical supervision,
trying to determine if the doc was in yet for the psychological
supervision. It was right around the time when then the
psychologist came on board. So we had been monitoring all the
different facets, mental, physical well-being. And he had
problems with his feet swelling up, so I went down to check on
him, check his condition. And at that instance is when they
were doing the cell checks, the detainee was not in his cell.
The detainee was still in the hole at that point. He was in
between the sleep management program in which he was put into
his isolation cell, or I should say, in the hole. And from
there, the MPs were going to check him, the hole, and that’s
where I seen the dogs. They were barking at him; they went in
and checked his area. The dog continued to bark. And given a
normal operating environment, seeing—since he was my detainee,
I did go ask the detainee two or three questions pertaining
particularly to the operation as to why we were checking the
detainee. And from that point, walked out, the MPs, the dog was
still working, barking and going through. So I don’t know—I’ve
never gone through and seen what they do when they search his
cell and what have not. And once that pretty much finished, sit
around and watch for a little while longer, and then I went up
to my area.

Q. Just for clarification, where in that hole then, the
detainee was in his cell with the dogs in his cell?

A. The only time that the detainee was in the hole with
the dog was for about a brief 8 to 10 seconds. The detainee was
on the back side of the wall. The dog was being held on a short
leash.

Q. But then, in other words, you assumed or at least were
informed that a search was being conducted?
A. Yes.

Q. Did you know that when they do a search of a
particular cell or particular area that the detainee is not
supposed to be in his cell with the dog present?
A. That I did not know.

Q. Because that could be construed as using a military
dog as part of the search, or could be construed as part of the
interrogation process.

The night there was some shooting incidents in there,
riots that you may have known about or have direct or indirect
knowledge about, were you asked to at least participate or react
to that particular shooting incident that happened on or about
the 24th of November?
A. I was down there for a brief time, a short time span.
The night of the shooting, I wasn’t there for the shooting. I
was working in the JDIC, the ICE. They called the majority of
the interrogators down, with “they,” meaning the command, that
was Colonel [REDACTED] and Chief [REDACTED] They requested a large
number of interrogators to go down because they just did a
shakedown of the Iraqi police and they were suspected of
arresting seven, eight Saddam Fedayeen members, and they were
doing on-the-spot interrogations in the passageway that leads
down toward the segregation section.

Q. There is a gate there that separates the rest of the
hard site, I believe, with the tier. Was the inspection being
done there?

A. Yes, from that section all the way up to the--you come
in from the Alpha, Bravo section, that tier, from where that
gate is up until the Iraqi police, first tier there.

Q. So they mobilized all the interrogators. Were you
inside Tier I?

A. No.

Q. Not at all.

A. The only time I went in was, shoot, I don’t know if it
was the next day or that night, because I wanted to see where
the shooting was.

Q. Sure.

A. That’s also a detainee that I had been working on from
the time in which he was brought in.

Q. The guy who got shot.

A. Yes. And actually, I was supposed to go in and
interrogate that night with that person.
Q. But somebody else interrogated him.
A. No, not from my understanding.
Q. Comments were made by MPs that there were two civilian interrogators who were inside his cell, that one was a female translator, along with a military working dog detachment. Were you aware of that?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. Were you ever informed that that existed during that period of time?
A. [Negative response.]
Q. Were you aware that Colonel [redacted] was there at the time, as well?
A. For that interrogation? No.
Q. Let me go back to locations of interrogations. Where are the authorized sites for interrogations normally conducted?
A. As of today?
Q. As of then.
A. As of then? I believe we had the steel site, which was located right outside Camp Vigilant; the wood site, which is behind the isolation--segregation section. And then three locations within segregation, itself, two showers on the upper floors, and then the stairwell in the back corner of the first floor.
Q. Those sites are outside, those are separate and
   distinct from the cell area, themselves.
A. Well, separate in what way? Separate in they're not--

Q. Separate from the immediate location----
A. Yeah, separate from the cell, itself, yes.
Q. Is it common practice or a practice as far as a matter
   of expediency to do any kind of interrogation immediately in
   their cell?
A. From my understanding--oh, actually, yeah, that's the
   other one. It's been common practice to go in and question a
   detainee in his cell, yes.
Q. In his cell.
A. Yeah.
Q. Typically, who is present in the cell?
A. Your interpreter, interrogator, analyst.
Q. That's a standard operating procedure in the absence
   of other guidance? Well, let me rephrase that. Those times
   when they were being interrogated, the detainees were being
   interrogated in those sites you just described, I believe the
   facility at Abu Ghurayb just experienced mortar shelling. And
   those that I interviewed, was the reason why those sites were
being used, utilized for interrogation was both to protect the
interrogators, and this is for safety requirements.

A. Right.

Q. But let me understand then, but is it an approved,
established procedure in your experience as an interrogator that
interrogations are done in the cells, themselves. There's no
prohibition, whatsoever----

A. No, it wasn't prohibited. It wasn't in writing
saying, "Do not go in there and do that." That was presented
from when I arrived as, that's an area in which you could go in
and interrogate the detainee.

Q. In terms of training though, were you experiencing
that or at least folks knew it was common practice of doing an
interrogation immediately in the cell?

A. We reviewed our plan as to where the detainee would
sit or stand. So in terms of other than like personal knowledge
of self defense and knowing that my number one protection of the
team that goes in with me is the protection of my interpreter,
which is always closest to the doorway for safety reasons,
followed by the analyst, if you have a supporting analyst there,
and then myself, or the interrogator last. In that term, when I
have utilized doing an interrogation in the cell, the detainee
would sit down and you would be standing, so to make it not a--
at least you have a partial advantage if there were something to
go away.

Q. Well, it's pretty confining in that particular area.
A. Yes.

Q. Are the doors typically closed when the interrogations
are being conducted?
A. When the segregation section was full and you had say,
for an example, four people brought in, you know, suspicious or
caught in the act of placing IEDs. They have personnel that had
been in segregation that were customarily in the same general
area. So, you would close the door to try and muffle some of
the sounds of the interrogation because once it goes out,
everybody talks and there's so much cross-chatter as far as the
environment of the interrogation. Because at that point in
time, we didn't have a hard site so----

Q. Exactly, that's my point.
A. Yeah.

Q. You were pretty much in a common area, regardless of
the situation.
A. Yes.

Q. And we visited the JDIC, the interrogation room is
rather confined there, as well. In other words, contents and
other individuals are viewable on the other side of the tier are
pretty much held in strict conference. So I’m rather curious as to why the practice, whether common or not, of doing the interrogation in the site themselves, where exchanges, questions and answers could potentially be heard by the other detainees, in that regard.

A. My feeling was, it was a push for operations, keep operations going.

Q. But at the same time though, it’s also safeguarding information. So I convey that to you because the contents of your interrogation and the contents of the information that you gather are of a sensitive nature. Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Is there a practice today about conducting interrogations in the cell?

A. I would say short of going up and asking questions, not for interrogations as previous. Like it’s not uncommon for me to go in and visit my detainee. I would report to the detainee. I’d go in and ask common questions. I don’t ask tactical or strategic questions. So, once we’ve been afforded the opportunity to expand our interrogation setting, the sensitive questions are dealt with in that environment, the general familiarities and rapport building are what the focus is, and only the focus.
Q. Post-interrogation, you’ve concluded the interrogation
of a particular detainee, and then the additional information is
conveyed to the MPs in terms of a sleep management, meal plan or
terms of isolation, segregation, that sort of thing. How is
that conveyed and to whom is that conveyed to?

A. Post-interrogation, you conclude, you go back, you
return the detainee to the possession of the MPs. Regardless if
things went well or unwell, say, a lot of times the MPs will--
you don’t discuss the details of the interrogation.

Q. Sure.

A. What they will ask, you know, “Was he cooperative?
Was he not?” “He was all right, so, so,” whatever. And
pertaining to the meal management, because, at least in my
situation, I’ve been in the visibility of the detainees, I’ve
had to continue to be diligent as to what we do. I brief the
MPs as to, “Okay, what’s the reaction been when you check on the
detainee,” as to the common characteristics. “Has he been
responsive? Has he been staying awake? What’s the response
been to, you know, on an approved plan where he gets 20 minutes
of sleep.” A few hours later, he gets a 50-minute block of
sleep. And we want to know how he’s responding. Is he staying
awake? Is he fighting, resisting? Trying to get feedback and
Q. In your statement, you mentioned that, you described a sleep management, meal plan, that the instructions are given to the MPs, that this particular detainee would get only 4 hours of sleep over a 24-hour period.

A. That's correct.

Q. You stated that that's provided to them in written form---

A. That is provided—yes, that's provided to them in a written format that has to be approved. I write it up, it goes to the OIC. From there, it goes to Colonel Pappas. As long as everything is within the rules of engagement, which he's approved to sign off on, then signed back to me. They do look at the schedule of what the hours are, when it starts, when it finishes and when the detainee will get sleep. We calculate the minutes and make sure it's 240 minutes every 24-hour period of time.

Q. Total.

A. Total. And as well as, after 72 hours of the sleep management program, or sleep, meal management program, then they get 12 uninterrupted hours of sleep. And then they can resume the program again.
Q. One more time. And then it's given back to you, do you give that to the MP guard or do you give that to their supervisor?

A. From when I've joined him--when I first started doing it, it was handed to the Alpha/Bravo NCO who was located there. And that's just been a customary practice, is to give it to them and they verbally hand it over when the shift changes.

C. And they execute it.

A. Right.

Q. The only reason why I say that is because, you give it to a guard, a guard during the day, let's just say for example, is that his understanding may not be conveyed to the next guard relieving him on the shift. And if it's understood that it's 4 hours for every 24 hours and not counting for all the minutes to accumulate to 240 minutes, you know, don't you think--curiosity, or do you care whether that's being conducted properly or do you monitor that or do you leave that to the conveyance of the guard that's executing that set of instructions?

A. My experience has been when I've given it to the NCOIC, they've reflected that they are the one in charge and that it was their responsibility to hand it over to the next shift, except they do shift briefs. So when that's conveyed to
me, and that was the operating procedure from what I understood
from a VOQO, verbal, that's the language that I proceeded----
Q. Did they show you any kind of record of all that they
are--10 minutes here, 20 minutes there? Did they show that to
you?
A. Given that it's on the schedule, they have--you know,
when I go down and ask, "How's everything going? How's the
program going?" They say, "Yup, fine, things are going fine."
Some MPs check off the times, making sure they go through and do
it. Others, I've never seen a logbook of them monitoring and
managing, that sort of thing.
Q. Provided it's conveyed to you that you've accomplished
the mission. What about isolation and segregation? Two
different things, is it isolation and segregation, or just
isolation----
A. I've been informed that the new word for Alpha wing is
"segregation." We don't use "isolation" in our terminology.
Q. When were you informed of that, the new terminology?
A. The last couple weeks.
Q. Just the last couple of weeks? But the distinction
wasn't made then, it's just one terminology----
A. One terminology for Alpha Wing, Alpha/Bravo Wing;
that's isolation.
Q. But in terms of isolation though, I'm sure you're involved with providing that type of a recommendation, approve, whatever the case may be, as part of the post-interrogation process. When you gave that sort of instruction, did you stipulate anything of a special treatment, especially in the sense of a negative as a matter of punishment?

A. In terms of a punishment in a special treatment, as I clarified in my written statement earlier, my definition of a special treatment was to--I have one particular detainee I've been working for a good reasonable amount of time. The detainee didn't like getting a shower. There was no reason why the detainee couldn't have a shower in a reasonable, timely fashion and made sure he had well grooming standards. The reason was for that was because the way in which the detainee was at the point of capture and significance of the facial hair, the hair, in and of itself on the being, and what that represented as part of the approached plan. So, to neutralize that in the setting of the interrogation was why that was recommended.

Q. To isolate him.

A. His special treatment was, I had quite often said, "Please make sure his beard is shaved. Please make sure his head is shaved. Please make sure he gets a shower. Please make sure he takes care and brushes his teeth, because he has really
bad oral hygiene." When you're close and interrogating in a
small room, it's rather pungent. So, that is what my definition
of special treatment is and was very well defined.
Q. In terms of isolation, have you ever given
instructions to the MPs that isolation is required for a
specific detainees or any detainee for that matter, to be
interrogated?
A. You mean, throw him in the hole?
Q. Right.
A. Only if had that, you know, if it's part of my plan.
Q. If it's part of your plan.
A. Yeah.
Q. Let me ask you this, in your experience as both in the
military and civilian. What is your understanding of isolation
and for how long would you isolate---
A. A detainee, in terms of this environment, through my
experience has been according to our rules of engagement, is 30
consecutive days. After that, it needs a written statement,
memorandum for the record. It needs to go up to General Sanchez
asking for an extension for an additional 30 days.
Q. Is there any understanding whatsoever of the
requirements of checking a detainee every so often within a
period of 30 days?
A. You mean have I ever left a detainee down there just for 30 days and not check on them?

Q. Not you, per se, but the MPs.

A. No——

Q. Because you’re the experience one and all the MPs are going to do is follow your instructions as approved by competent authority. A detainee is placed in the hole, as you call it, for 30 days. Is it common understanding or your assumption that the MP is supposed to check on them every 15 minutes——

A. If you’re talking about “the hole,” the MPs are supposed to—the MPs have informed me verbally that they take the detainee out for regular bathroom breaks. They make sure the detainee is fed, unless it’s specifically requested by an interrogator as something, for an approach, that they have the appropriate amenities that go with them in the hole, such as water, food, they are fed. They’re not to remove that unless it’s part of an approach where they’re on bread and water or something along that line. I’ve never seen—I’ve seen extreme cases, but I’ve never encountered that.

Q. You’ve never encountered that at all.

A. No.
Q. Have you ever given a set of instructions to the MP to put anybody in isolation during the course of your employment here from the 5th of October until now?

A. Not without my approval plans, not that I can recall.

Q. Since you have access to Tier One A and Tier One B, are you familiar with the guards and their guarding those detainees in those cells? I'm not interested in--

A. No, I mean, when I go down there, I say "Hi," and see their faces and things along that level.

Q. Could you name some of those guards that were guarding those detainees in those cells?

A. Given the nature, I rarely use my name down there, and only probably four of the MPs, I only use their surname. Because of security reasons, I don't want anybody to know my name down there. So, I know Sergeant [redacted] he's one of the strong tier leaders, Sergeant [redacted] who works the other shift, excellent strong tier leader, Sergeant [redacted] and there's... I can't remember the name of the other one. Then I'm familiar with the faces of other people down there and I can point them out and say, "Yup, I know the guy may have worked this shift," or "I've seen him on this shift."

Q. Is it a common practice for you as approved by the chain of command not to reveal your identity?
A. It's a common practice to use a pseudo name, if you need to, especially in that environment. At least that's been verbally portrayed to me.

Q. Portrayed to you as approved by the chain of command?
A. If it's in writing, that I don't know.

Q. Did you ever ask?
A. No, I have not.

Q. Have you used that technique before?
A. I only go by my name in Arabic, is [redacted] and that's my proper name.

Q. Well, you're a pretty imposing individual, large individual, could be construed as very intimidating and you have been named by some of the people as [redacted] and there are other [redacted] I believe, that are also interrogators in that regard. Was it to your self protection not to be identified? I think you also wear civilian clothes.

A. Yes, I do.

Q. It's a common practice?
A. Yes.

Q. And you don't think, or you do not know whether that particular practice is approved by your chain of command.

A. To use a pseudo name?

Q. To use a name, to use your real name.
A. It's something I've never addressed. I've just known other people to use other names, other interrogators, military and civilian. I like to use different names when I go in a booth.

Q. But you're not CIA or DIA, you're a civilian contractor.

A. That's correct.

Q. The reason why I ask that is because I've asked commanders if that was common practice, and they said it was not a common practice.

A. It's very different amongst the troops then.

Q. This is going to be one of my recommendations, that there be a standard operating procedure because the MPs that you know that you're interacting with, you know them, or at least their rank because they're wearing----

A. Their uniform.

Q. Within the context of those MPs, in the performance of their duties, do not know who you are. They commonly refer to you as an MI interrogator. They think Mr. Israel, for that matter, is an interrogator, when in fact, he is not. He is part of the interrogation team. And for that matter, he's not involved with your plan other than what you brief him on. So, I think it's rather unusual that it's commonly practiced here,
especially in the context of what we call "detainee operations,"
Mr. especially in the context of your understanding
of the Geneva Convention, and without checking into the legal
implications of that particular context, you could be held
liable for anything as an employee of the United States
Government. Protection, obviously, is okay, but this being a
common practice, and my recommendation would be that it be made
a common practice to govern and protect the interest of the
United States Government inasmuch as we protect the interest of
the detainee.

Have there been any changes--I'm sorry, let me go
back. Are you aware of all the allegations that were made or at
least the investigation that was conducted by the Criminal
Investigation Division of allegations of detainee abuses by
guards that you know of that were associated with performing
their duties in Tier One A?
A. No, I'm not, only by rumor.
Q. Only by rumor.
A. Yes.
Q. So you don't know what Corporal did or what
Sergeant did?
A. No.
Q. Or Sergeant did, none of that?
Q. What was those rumors? What did you hear?
A. The rumor I've heard is that videos and pictures were taken of detainees, some performing illicit sex acts, or some other type of act, and it was filmed.
Q. It was filmed?
A. Yes.
Q. Other than taking photographs of detainees for identification, have there been instances of detainees being photographed for other than identification purposes that you know of?
A. That I know of, no.
Q. Not any videotape or not in the conduct of an interrogation?
A. No, because at this point, we don't do--other than when they first come in screening, that's their only picture.
Q. Not at all.
A. No.
Q. Okay, based on what you heard through rumor of detainee allegations--I'm sorry, detainee abuses and maltreatment, was it conveyed throughout the command, 205th or whoever else that you were placed under, of any changes
whatsoever to be made with regards to detainee and interrogation operations?

A. From that, we were no longer would conduct interrogations in segregation, Alpha/Bravo. There was no formal command gathering and saying, "These are what the allegations are. These are the things that are happening." It felt like a type of non-discussion.

Q. Were those changes conveyed in a written form or a formation of sort or a briefing by the commander or chain of command?

A. The— I was told by the section sergeant that we are no longer doing interrogations in segregation.

Q. When you first were informed of that, were you in a meeting of some sort?

A. No, I was with my sergeant— my section chief.

Q. Provided you that information that you were no longer, as a matter of practice—-

A. That's correct.

(The interview paused at 1217, 12 February 2004, and reconvened at 1225, 12 February 2004.)

Q. We just want to refer back to a previous question I asked you with regards to the implementation of the treatment plan, what I'll refer to as a treatment plan after an
interrogation, that would be in the context of a sleep
management, meal plan, SMMP, or placing somebody in the hole, as
you referred to. But before I do that, what exactly is “the
hole”?
A. It’s the—when you went into the Alpha wing, just
say....
Q. Bottom floor, top floor?
A. Bottom floor, first cell on the right-hand side, steel
door—or a metal door, and it’s just a room in the wall, a
concrete room.
Q. A concrete room, no light, it would be just a bare-
sided wall with a steel door. Is there any other access to that
like besides the door, itself, that you recall?
A. You can’t—I don’t think you can lift it up, because
they’ve always opened it up to check in on the detainee. I
don’t know if----
Q. Is there a little peephole----
A. Yeah, I don’t know if that works. I’ve never seen
anybody use it. I actually think it’s welded shut.
Q. Okay. So, it’s welded shut today. Was it welded shut
before?
A. As long as I know, that hasn’t worked. A lot of the
mechanical components in certain areas haven’t worked.
Q. But it was typically referred as "the hole," or "thrown in the hole."

A. Right.

Q. Do you know if anybody else, any of your interrogators, associates referred to it as--or even intimated to an MP to place somebody in there?

A. I mean, it's commonly used. I mean, I've known, like the MPs, they've had a detainee who stuffed their toilet full of a whole mattress that they tear up into pieces, they will take the detainee out, and then as a form of punishment, will throw the detainee in the hole.

Q. All right, so it's not exclusively just the interrogators.

A. No, I mean, it's been for behavioral discipline, people from Ganci, detainees coming over from Ganci who--and things along that nature.

Q. Let me ensure, for a point of clarity here, that when you gave a set of instructions to an MP to implement the sleep management meal plan or whatever other set of instruction, you mentioned that you conveyed that to the guard once it's approved by the chain of command, typically a warrant officer or [inaudible], up until that time, it was only approved up to whom, Colonel Pappas?
A. If it was within the--like the sleep--like staying in segregation for more than 30 days, everybody knows that goes to General Sanchez.

Q. But before.

A. That has been the whole case. Colonel Pappas, you get your--you fill out the request to put the detainee in segregation. You put the detainee in segregation--well, you'd send forward your request, give it to the chain of command. And when it came back, then you'd put the detainee in segregation.

Q. But your understanding was that General Sanchez was to approve that.

A. Right.

Q. But before then, has it always been like that since you arrived---

A. There's been circumstances where they've been able to put the--they said, "It's okay, go ahead and put the detainee in---"

Q. Pending approval?

A. Right. So that, I have seen in the past.

Q. Because Colonel Pappas was not there until after the 19th of November.

A. Right.
Q. So typically, then, the--would approve such a
practice, or at least give authority----

A. It would be Colonel [redacted]

Q. So, that's provided, given to the MPs, assuming it was
done properly. Then you mentioned that then he would rely then,
without your interaction on that being executed with the
intention----

A. Uhm hum.

Q. And there's no checks by you whatsoever.

A. Other than on our own accord to go down and look after
our----

Q. Checks.

A. I mean, there are no other--no, there isn't a regular
schedule to go down and make sure the detainee has received
this. I mean, it's the initiative of the team or the operation,
itself.

Q. So, that procedure is where a set of instructions
identifying the term, provided to the MP for execution with
a...how would you call it, precise supervision other than what
the MP understood his instructions to be. In other words,
everything is relegated to the MP to execute that term.

A. Yes.
Q. And that's common practice, I take it. But do you feel that kind of strange that I'm giving my own set of instructions for somebody else to execute, that in the case where something happened to that detainee and that MP is then held liable for that set of instructions?

A. I feel it strange that when I've asked for rules of engagement for the MPs and standard operating procedures for the MPs, that they requested one, the people who work the hard side requested one from the chain of command and they didn't have one to provide myself.

Q. The MPs.

A. Yes.

Q. You requested what their detention rules of engagement were?

A. Exactly. Yes, I find it curious, and I have asked. Have I written it up? No, but I have asked on numerous times as to the specifics in detail for the rules of engagement other than what is on the rules of engagement in the signature block that we go through.

Q. I would find it curious, as well.

A. As you should.

Q. You're providing a set of instructions to someone to execute, and if something ever happened to that detainee, you
would find it curious, as well, and interesting that you would be held liable for that. Of course, a lot of that could be either misinterpreted or misunderstood or just easily understood.

Now, the rules of engagement here today that you said were not the same, were somewhat revised based on things that have happened in the past. The improved interrogation operations and operation procedures, were those the same ones or somewhat adjusted to meet the current operating environment?

A. I guess these are the ones we use now or the ones we used back then.

Q. Before Colonel Pappas showed up.

A. I can’t answer the question because we’ve had at least five iterations that I’ve signed on rules of engagement changes.

Q. Just your best....

A. I think they’re pretty much the same. Actually no, I think those are the one--Colonel Pappas came on board, these came on. I mean, the intent was there, they’re just written on a different format. This, like I said, this didn’t come out until....

Q. After he showed up.

A. Right.
Q. Notice in the right-hand column there, there are two things that come to mind right now, the use of military working dogs, you made a statement that said basically that you commented on that you noticed dogs that were either conducting a search or just their presence, that indicate on here, the use of military dogs today must receive CG’s approval. So your understanding was, the presence of military dogs was a common practice at that point in time, whether they’re being held or ... being used for searches or for other purposes?

A. My interpretation was, if you were going to be in a formal interrogation setting in the booth with a planned interrogation procedure, that’s where that approval needs to be met. In terms of, if you’re in the environment of whether it’s in Vigilant, Ganci, we used to be—in the civilian population until they modified our access for safety reasons. We’re not allowed to go into Ganci or Vigilant, that presence of military working dogs was a normal occurrence. That was my understanding.

Q. That’s your understanding. Relative to that, there was Ganci, Vigilant----

A. As well as isolation, meaning all the detention facilities.
Q. The process that which just the operating environment there today, Ganci is pretty much an open environment, even though you had Camp Vigilant exposed, so is Vigilant for that matter. So the only ones that are confined in the term of this particular environment was that at JDIC where you hold the interrogation, or even the hard site was exclusively separated, confined, and not exposed. Do you agree with that?

A. That it's an exclusively confined space?

Q. Right, you're not exposed to any observation whatsoever because you're not conducting, at least that we're aware of, including interrogation inside of Ganci or Vigilant, because any interrogations, the detainee is removed from that particular site to another site.

A. At one point, you could conduct an interrogation at Ganci.

Q. Is there a facility at Ganci to——

A. Each Ganci compound, I think, I don't know if there's more than eight now, I know it's grown a lot since it's been off limits——

Q. It's a big compound.

A. Each compound has its own command tent. And within the command tent, you could probably fit three or four, you know, in a living space. You know, a couple tables and you
could sit in there and ask the detainee questions and interrogate the detainee there.

Q. But in the same environment as that, you would find the JDIC. In other words, they're confined—

A. You can find—

Q. —enclosed so nobody else could hear comments or answers or responses to the questioning associated with that particular interrogation?

A. I mean, let me make sure I didn't--yes, they're completely....

Q. Just so I understand, have you ever done any interrogation in Ganci or Vigilant?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. But not in a setting where people could hear the questioning and the responses.

A. In the back of the tents right there, it's right next to the compound and the detainees are walking around. I mean, they're only 10 feet away. You ask the MPs to keep the detainees away and they pretty much just go about their business.

Q. So that's kind of a common practice, an established practice.

A. Right.
Q. So in all of the guards now, based on your
understanding today on these current rules of engagement, things
like change of scenery, dietary manipulation, sleep adjustment,
isolation for longer than 30 days, sleep management, 72 hours
max, sensory deprivation, 72 hours max, must be approved by the
Commanding General, as you know it today. This is how you
understand it? Since it’s posted in the common area----
A. Right, yeah. I mean, sleep management....
Q. In excess of----
A. In excess of 72 hours.
Q. Right.
A. And any of the ones I’ve done, they’re never in excess
of 72 hours. They’ve always mandated--I’ve always made sure
they have actually had more time than the 12-hour minimum. And
usually, it’s been, on average, one day.
Q. During our tour of the facility, you mentioned that
instructions are given to the guards. In one particular
document that we saw that was signed by a warrant officer
basically said, prisoner isolation, segregation, dated the 4th
of February. You mention it is now, the terminology that is now
used, “segregation.” This particular memo, we saw “segregation”
and “isolation” signed by the warrant officer. Now, you said
that they might approved by the chain of command. In this
particular memo, it didn't stipulate how long for isolation or
how long for segregation. Are you aware of maybe perhaps there
is still a misunderstanding of sorts common to the chain of
command that establish procedures when they have not been
clearly understood?

A. Yes. And the reason--when that was clarified to me it
was by the JAG officer, Captain [redacted] who specifically--
when I worked with him. More recently, prior to his departure,
was "No, the proper terminology is 'segregation'."

Q. Not both.

A. No, it was spelled out very clearly to me. We don't
use that word; it doesn't exist. It is segregation. I've even-
the way in which I wrote my notes and everything, it comes out
"segregation."

Q. All right, I just want to confirm the commonality of
consistency.

Well, I don't have any more comments, sir. So, I'd
like to ask you though, your recommendations to improve the
environment with regards to detention operations. I mention to
you that detention operations is not an isolated operation.
There is a purpose to why those people are being detained, and
that's, of course, your role in that matter of collecting
information, collecting intelligence whereby it is a useful set
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of circumstance for them.... So what will be your
recommendation now that you've been here for 4 months?
A. The MP mission, whether that remains an MP mission or
becomes commercialized, the MI operation, they need to
amalgamate in one form or another.
C. One centralized....
A. The MPs, if they're going to be running it, as far as
I know today, there is not a JAG officer on site to advise the
MPs. I asked, "Do you have a JAG officer? Where's your JAG
officer?" Because we refer to ours, if needed. And she said,
"We don't have one on-site." So, they didn't have access to
their tools. Having them meet an operating procedure that works
for both and everybody's clear on it, everybody's briefed on it.
And a continuous, no verbal deviations of the rules of
engagement. That's--why have the rules of engagement if you're
going to verbally change something or approve something or to
approve something verbally. It totally throws your rules of
engagement off and makes them void, in my eyes. Having a
liaison rep that works and dedicated if they're going to
maintain a large presence of people in segregation, that they
are coordinating with the MPs, they're coordinating with MI, and
they are briefing the teams. If that thing does happen, that
they brief the whole section. The International Red Cross just
came through not that long ago. Not one brief, and I’ve asked
all the way up to the JAG, from the MI, “Please give us a brief
so the troops and everybody else can learn what the value of the
Red Cross visit was. They’re not bad guys. They’re good guys.”
And they’re saying “Yes, yes, we’ll do one.” Well, they’re
gone. Nobody knows why the Red Cross was here. The 202d is in
now. They will not gain any value from the Red Cross visit
other than the command who, what was transferred over to them,
but the troops won’t. The information is not flowing down. You
do a formation. They do them two, three times a week for the
military members. They could do a better job of disseminating
information from a strong command presence, not necessarily just
from an NCOIC or OIC of the operation.

I think the training that, you know, techniques,
things from Huachuca for interrogation, analyst skills, the
development skills are coming along really well. There’s a lot
of self-initiated programs, so I give him hats off for that.
But maintaining with what we are protecting our assets and
protecting the detainees, we really, continuously need to
reemphasize. And you know, I offered and have helped
participate in providing that, you know, going into the
direction. If you have a complaint, you need to muster up and
have a solution if you’re going to jump in and do it. So, I
think everybody who works in there needs to--it's the same
attitude for everybody.

Q. A common understanding is what.... Were you aware--
just one more question, please. Were you aware of a visit by
Major General Miller, who is the Commanding General of Guantanamo? At
least his presence or anything that was cascaded down to you.

A. I remember hearing of--I think that was right when we
received a lot of DVs, and he--I heard that he was coming in. I
don't know if he ever came in, because I never seen or met the
person. I don't know.

Q. Nothing was conveyed as to the purpose of his visit

A. The purpose of his visit was not conveyed.

Q. What about General Ryder, who was the Provost Marshal
of the Army, who has also visited the facility?

A. I am not aware of that.

Q. Okay, do you have any other closing comments that you
want to convey?

A. No, sir.

[Mr. _______ was duly warned and the interview concluded at
1245, 12 February 2004.]