

02(5)(6)2

- G3 OPS EOC Org Account

**From:** [redacted] LTC 3/2 Infantry Brigade XO  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 22, 2004 8:36 AM  
**To:** [redacted] COL 3/2 Infantry Brigade CDR  
**Subject:** FW: Detainee Parole Concept

Sir-  
A burgeoning discussion on detainee ops. Here's what I sent to [redacted] I think we have yet to define the problem, and are on the verge of a bad solution and wasting a lot of staff time. I will continue to seek clarification as to what exactly TFO wants the focus of detainee ops to be - to me, it is keep bad guys off the street, and exploit for intelligence whatever we can. I think we demonstrably are fair - we "catch and release" a high percentage, and recommend release on a lot more. We are more than fair, and more than kind in our treatment. Given current manning levels, we turn these folks as fast as possible, I think. We will seek efficiencies, but this feels like a knee-jerk reaction to the perceptions of the people who he spends time with.

VR,  
[redacted]

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [redacted] LTC 3/2 Infantry Brigade XO  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 22, 2004 5:29 PM  
**To:** [redacted] COL (MNB -N) DEP CDR; [redacted] MAJ 3/2 Infantry Brigade Provost  
**Cc:** [redacted] LTC (MNB-N) Provost Marshal; [redacted] LTC (MNB-N) SJA OIC; [redacted] LTC (MNB-N) C2 OIC; [redacted] MAJ 3/2 Infantry Brigade S3; [redacted] CW3 209MI; [redacted] LTC 3/2 Infantry Brigade XO; [redacted] MAJ 3/2 Infantry Brigade S2  
**Subject:** RE: Detainee Parole Concept

Sir-  
I guess we will need some kind of guidance on what it will take to solve the problem. There are three potential problem statements:

1. We hold detainees so long that there is no hope of getting actionable intelligence. Possible solutions: increase interrogator manning; make conditions less hospitable so lengthy stays are a deterrent
2. Local government perceives that we are holding detainees too long. Possible solutions: IO directed at local government, explaining who we hold and why; release detainees automatically at a certain time
3. We hold detainees longer than our higher headquarters permits. Possible solutions: release detainees automatically at a certain time; take fewer detainees in; increase interrogator manning

The only standard I am aware of is to hold detainees for no longer than 14 days. OK - but it often takes longer than that to conduct exploitation of the site they were detained at; it takes longer than that for an effective interrogation series; it takes longer than that to collate and pit detainees against each other. This is all true, especially given that the conditions we put these guys in is in compliance with Western norms. The risk we run, in reacting to the expressed concerns of the local government by changing the way we do business, rather than changing their perceptions, is we will be less effective in exploiting. We absolutely comply with humane standards of treatment; we are edging towards judicial rules of evidence as opposed to military detention; and now we are on the verge of changing our operations to mollify the local government, who are possibly responding to a well-conveived IO campaign from somewhere else. I think, before we change too much, that we should define the problem more clearly.

VR<  
[redacted]

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [redacted] COL (MNB -N) DEP CDR  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 22, 2004 4:36 PM  
**To:** [redacted] MAJ 3/2 Infantry Brigade Provost  
**Cc:** [redacted] LTC (MNB-N) Provost Marshal; [redacted] LTC (MNB-N) SJA OIC; [redacted] LTC (MNB-N) C2 OIC; [redacted] MAJ 3/2 Infantry Brigade S3; [redacted] CW3 209MI; [redacted] LTC 3/2 Infantry Brigade XO; [redacted] MAJ 3/2 Infantry Brigade S2  
**Subject:** RE: Detainee Parole Concept

023117

U09342

Importance: High

all (b)(6) z

A problem (maybe not 'the' problem) is the length of investigation coupled with inevitable release of a large percentage of our detainees because there isn't the evidence to support onward movement. This has a downstream effect of detainees in the EDF for extended periods, which is a HUGE friction point with the local government and populace. This isn't about capacity but about length of detention, diminishing returns of reinterrogation of detainees, and reducing friction within AO-N. The problem of extended stays and increasing irritation (and an exploitable issue) absolutely does exist.

COL [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [REDACTED] MAJ 3/2 Infantry Brigade Provost  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 22, 2004 4:31 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED] COL (MNB -N) DEP CDR; [REDACTED] LTC (MNB-N) Provost Marshal; [REDACTED] LTC (MNB-N) SJA OIC; [REDACTED] LTC (MNB-N) C2 OIC; [REDACTED] MAJ 3/2 Infantry Brigade S3; [REDACTED] CW3 209MI; [REDACTED] LTC 3/2 Infantry Brigade XO; [REDACTED] MAJ 3/2 Infantry Brigade S2  
**Subject:** RE: Detainee Parole Concept

Sir,

my question would be "why do we need to reduce the population?" Is there a problem with the number we have? Has guidance been put out as to what the right number is? If so, I believe the parole concept would complicate the process. It would require more manpower to move the detainee back and forth and require manpower to track where they are. Just seems like we are creating more work for a problem that I'm not sure exists. I might just be out of the loop on what the real problem is...

MAJ [REDACTED]  
MP Planner, 3/2 SBCT  
521-[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]@sbct1.army.smil.mil

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [REDACTED] COL (MNB -N) DEP CDR  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 22, 2004 3:17 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED] LTC (MNB-N) Provost Marshal; [REDACTED] LTC (MNB-N) SJA OIC; [REDACTED] LTC (MNB-N) C2 OIC; [REDACTED] MAJ 3/2 Infantry Brigade S3; [REDACTED] MAJ 3/2 Infantry Brigade Provost; [REDACTED] CW3 209MI  
**Subject:** Detainee Parole Concept  
**Importance:** High

ALCON--CG wants us to look at the potential for implementing a policy of offering parole to those detainees who fall between 'definitely send to Abu G.' and 'reinterrogate...' in order to reduce EDF population. He mentioned it to CW3 [REDACTED] today and he will look at it as well. Basically if we identify someone who fits this category we would make the offer pending identification of a guarantor, would have the individual sign a statement pledging no anti-coalition activities, and would immediately move that person out of the general prison population. What I need to know is if there is a reason we can't or shouldn't pursue this. Provide feedback NLT 25 Apr; we'll come together to make a recommendation to the CG after that. Objective is to move quick on this. Thanks,

COL [REDACTED]  
COL [REDACTED]  
Deputy Cdr, TF Olympia  
MNB-N, OIF II  
DVTS 522 [REDACTED]

DNVT 302



(b)(6) 2