

PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT

AUTHORITY: Title 10 USC Section 301; Title 5 USC Section 2951; E.O. 9397 dated November 22, 1943 (SSN).
PRINCIPAL PURPOSE: To provide commanders and law enforcement officials with means by which information may be accurately identified.
ROUTINE USES: Your social security number is used as an additional/alternate means of identification to facilitate filing and retrieval.
DISCLOSURE: Disclosure of your social security number is voluntary.

1. LOCATION CRYSTAL CITY, VIRGINIA	2. DATE (YYYYMMDD) 2004/05/18	3. TIME 1251	4. FILE NUMBER
5. LAST NAME, FIRST NAME, MIDDLE NAME	6. SSN	7. GRADE/STATUS SGT	
8. ORGANIZATION OR ADDRESS B/CO, 470TH MILITARY INTELLIGENCE GROUP, CAMP BULLIS, TX 78254			

WANT TO MAKE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT UNDER OATH:

I arrived at Abu Ghraib on or about 20 October 2003. [redacted] assigned me as a section leader for four Tiger Teams, after [redacted] and I sat down and discussed my soldier's strength and weaknesses. When we first arrived, we were given a tour of the Joint Interrogation Debriefing Center (JIDC). We were told when to wear our gear. There was no training on interrogations or procedures. We were given a sheet with the Interrogation Rules of Engagements and were told what we could and could not do. We were also told about some of the interrogation techniques which required [redacted] approval prior to us executing them. Within the first two weeks of our arrival, we were given the IROES to sign. The thing that surprised me about the IROE was that certain approaches required a certain level of approval while others that I felt should have required approval were acceptable. When I asked about them, I was told that is what had been approved and that was the way it was. One of the techniques requiring prior approval was Pride and Fee Down. The teams I had consisted of [redacted] and [redacted]. For linguists support, we pulled from all the linguists the teams were already interrogating. We all jumped right into our roles. I conducted an initial counseling of all my personnel when I first arrived. I saw [redacted] as being experienced but not well trained even though they had been there a while. [redacted] were not experienced. I felt that [redacted] had a problem with authority. [redacted] had been an analyst in the Navy but he did not have any interrogation experience before Abu Ghraib. He had a problem with the military. He did not like the way the military chain of command functioned. And he didn't view the chain of command as something he needed to follow. I worked with all my teams and asked them to tell me what they knew. I would do my best to train them during Sergeant's Time. We would focus on the IROEs, different type of approaches, paperwork, and report writing. I would help them rewrite their memorandums. [redacted] really had a hard time writing his reports and they often had to be rewritten. He would ask me to help him with some approaches and I gave him some correspondence course manuals on approaches. I felt I had strong analysts, but they needed a lot of supervision. I conducted interrogations as needed or as time permitted. I usually assisted with interrogations when the interrogator could not break a detainee. My workload was too much and there were too many issues to deal with. I didn't really get very much sleep. The average number of interrogations each team was required to conduct were two per team per day. All of my soldiers struck me as very intelligent. The detainee abuses I witness are as follows: One of my jobs was to go check on my soldiers and the detainees. When we moved to the night shift, I would go to the cellblocks to speak to the MPs. I usually went with another interrogator or by myself. I went to Camp Vigilant during the day to move detainees we were going to interrogate during the night. I know that prior to the gunfire, [redacted] was scheduled to interrogate [redacted] but another detainee had mentioned that [redacted] might have a gun. [redacted] notified the team of command. Instead of [redacted] going to interrogate, the MPs approached [redacted] to find out if he had a weapon. [redacted] had gone to visit him at the hospital to find out where he had gotten the gun. He found out that an IP had brought the gun and other weapons in to the detainee. One time after the gunfire, I heard [redacted] was back. I went to check on him in the cell. I was surprised to see the MP who [redacted] had shot, was on duty guarding the section where he was. I asked the MP if he thought this was a good idea. He told me he didn't really want to be there but that he could be professional about it. [redacted] was in the same cell he had been in prior to the incident. I walked to his cell to check up on him. It was very cold that night. I found [redacted] without clothes, no blanket or mattress. His wounds were still bleeding and he still had the catheter in. He did not have the bag just the catheter. I yelled at the MP and asked for the NCOIC. I asked why was the detainee without any clothes and no blanket. He said they didn't have any clothes or blanket. I told him he better find some. I went over to the Medical site and told the specialist on duty to get the doctor. It was after 2200hrs and the specialist told me that the doctor (a COLONEL) did not want to be bothered unless it was an emergency. I told him it was an emergency and to wake the Colonel. The Colonel asked me what I wanted. I asked him if he was aware that [redacted] still had a catheter in. He said yes that the CSH had made a mistake. I asked him "can't you take it out". He said no because the CSH put it in so the CSH had to take it out. I told him this was unacceptable. He asked me what did I want him to do. I told him to take it out. He said he couldn't do it and that the detainee was due to go back to the CSH the following day.

10. EXHIBIT	11. INITIALS OF PERSON MAKING STATEMENT [redacted]	PAGE 1 OF 7 PAGES
-------------	---	-------------------

ADDITIONAL PAGES MUST CONTAIN THE HEADING "STATEMENT OF [redacted] TAKEN AT [redacted] DATED [redacted]"
 THE BOTTOM OF EACH ADDITIONAL PAGE MUST BEAR THE INITIALS OF THE PERSON MAKING THE STATEMENT, AND PAGE NUMBER MUST BE INDICATED.

AG0000252

He said fine sergeant you do what you have to do, I am going back to bed. [REDACTED] was with me during this incident. After speaking to the COLONEL, I notified my supervisor. I don't remember if it was [REDACTED] the night OIC or [REDACTED] when he came in for day shift. I told him that the COLONEL might be a bit upset. [REDACTED] was on leave at this time. I do not know what [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] did after I told him. I believe that [REDACTED] was taken to the CSH the following day. I do not know if the MPs recorded it. They kept a log, but it was not detailed or accurate. I asked to see the log and they had not recorded the incident. I also notice they had not recorded some other incidents which I knew had happened based on what my soldiers told me. When I went to check on a detainee, I would go straight to their cell and did not look at other detainees for several reasons, I did not want the detainees to see me because I might interrogate them at some point and I did not want them to see me in other circumstances than in the interrogation booth. It was also too dark in the cells to see anything unless the detainee was right up against the cell door. Sometimes a detainee would call out to me as I walked by. They asked us for things. I tried to minimize my contact with them. I never saw an MP kick, punch or push a detainee. There were sometimes when I questioned their actions. Once, I noticed that a detainee was wet and cold. His blankets were also wet. The detainee stated that the MPs had washed their clothes and gave it back to them wet. I went to the MPs and told them to get the detainee dry clothes. They said they did not have any, I told him to get some. I can't remember the date; it must have been in December because it was fairly cold outside. I believe this occurred in the late nighttime or early morning. I believe the linguist with me was [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] was one of my favorite linguists. He was very good. In reference to female panties, I remember seeing the detainees wearing them. Anyone who walked out to the cell should have seen them. I didn't report it because I thought they were approved. This was considered an acceptable approach and the MPs did it for disciplinary action. I personally never signed off on an interrogation plan on this technique. If one of my Tiger Team members purposely did this without my signature, I would have recommended removal from interrogations. The MPs had some detainees handcuffed to the cell door. I asked them if this was part of their SOP, they replied with, "What SOP?" My first line supervisor I would report it to was [REDACTED]. We had daily meetings with all the section leaders, [REDACTED] and myself attended. [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] sometimes attended. All section leaders should have been aware of the women's underwear. My section didn't use the dogs for interrogations. At GTMO we used the dogs for security purpose during in processing. In Iraq, the dogs were used differently. They were used during a shake down and inside the first line of concertina wire in the camp. The dogs if they had been used for interrogations, would be used as a fear up and needed an approval from higher. After the gunfire, my section came on duty while the IP questioning was going on. [REDACTED] had ordered an IP round up and they were all questioned. The team we were replacing had been at it for over 12 hours. I spoke to the [REDACTED] and asked if he wanted my team to take over. He said yes. I cleared it with the chain of command and my soldiers relieved the other teams. I do not remember where [REDACTED] was at this time. [REDACTED] were on duty and maybe [REDACTED] as well. [REDACTED] was already relieved of her interrogation duties and I found her interrogating. [REDACTED]

INITIAL OF PERSON MAKING STATEMENT
[REDACTED]

PAGE 2 of 7 PAGE [REDACTED]

AG0000253

[REDACTED] I notified [REDACTED] and she went to stop [REDACTED] from interrogating. I think she had some arguments from others in the chain of command about [REDACTED] being allowed to have "contact" with detainees. At that moment, there were no interrogation plans. I took my teams and told them "do not do anything you would normally not do. Watch yourself." I interrogated one IP who might have known who brought the gun. After being unsuccessful, I handed him over to the MPs to process him as a detainee. I saw no dogs that evening. If an interrogator asked an MP to have a dog bark near a detainee who was being interrogated or questioned and if that interrogator told the detainee that if he did not answer the questions they were going to sick the dog on him, that would have been a violation of the IROEs. If they did it without a prior approval from higher, they were wrong and would be pulled from interrogations immediately. I constantly made comments to my section about not doing anything without my approval. Obviously, things occurred without my approval but as soon as I found out about misbehavior, I took action. Sometimes I was supported by the chain of command and sometimes I wasn't. There was no doubt in my mind that my section understood my rules about approving approaches before they went in the booth and following procedure for exceptions to IROE. There was a rumor about three male interrogators who had done an interrogation with a female. If a gathering was called for this incident, I do not remember since we were always having formations for [REDACTED] where he appeared to be agitated. One evening, around 0200 or 0300 hours, there were some administrative issues I was busy dealing with from higher. [REDACTED] came to me and said he needed to speak to me. I told him to wait and he said he needed to speak to me now. I hung up the phone and began to speak to him. He told me that [REDACTED] and her analyst [REDACTED] had just screwed up. She had just walked a naked detainee across the camp. I told him to get them in now. When they came to me, I asked what had happened. They both did the talking. [REDACTED] said she had questioned the detainee and he would not answer and he had a bad attitude so she stripped him of his clothes. I asked her if the detainee was naked when she walked him back into the compound (Vigilant) and she said she gave him a blanket. I told her that we had had riots and this event could have caused a riot if the detainees saw a female walking a naked detainee. I told her she did not have this in her interrogation plan I had signed and that was relieving her from interrogations pending me notifying the chain of command. [REDACTED] was nervous and very remorseful. [REDACTED] concerned me with her attitude. No matter how I explained it to her, she still didn't feel that she had done anything wrong. This event happened even after I had a session with everyone in my section about what they could and could not do. I went to see the MPs and asked if the detainee was clothed and if they had had any problems. I asked them to log it and write an incident report. I notified [REDACTED] when she came on duty around 0600 or 0700 hours. [REDACTED] asked us to write sworn statements. I found out during the sworn statement writing that there was a third soldier who was involved but he was brand new and was sitting in the interrogation for the first time. I think [REDACTED] had a problem with me being her supervisor because we were specialists together at DLI and I had gotten promoted before she did. [REDACTED] just seemed to be burned out. I had told him before that if he had any questions to ask me and he did come to me on some occasions to bounce things off of me. Later that day, [REDACTED] wanted to talk to me and asked for my recommendations. I told him that [REDACTED] should get an [REDACTED]

INITIAL OF PERSON MAKING STATEMENT
[REDACTED]

PAGE 3 of 7 PAGE [REDACTED]

Article 15 and the max punishment; [REDACTED] should get an Article 15 with less punishment. The third individual should be counseled and told what was wrong with the incident and probably trained. [REDACTED] myself and a couple others (whom I can't remember) discussed the incident. We went through everything that happened and how [REDACTED] had done a "strip interrogation". I was asked again for my recommendation and I gave the same recommendation. [REDACTED] also gave the same basic recommendation. [REDACTED] took several days to make a decision but no Article 15s were given. I believe that [REDACTED] told me they received a local letter of reprimand. The incident was apparently kept quiet. My soldiers would ask me what happened, I told them that I made my recommendations and could not discuss them. I believed [REDACTED] had a clear understanding of her boundaries. Any advice I gave her, she was real quick to pick it up. I was very shocked when I found out what she had done. After the incident, [REDACTED] shut down with me. She was pulled from my section and reassigned. She wouldn't speak to me anymore. I knew she had a good understanding of the IROE but I felt she could not distinguish the difference between right and wrong. [REDACTED] left on leave and things were still being run the same. When word got out that she was not returning, things went down hill from then on. I spoke to [REDACTED] and told him that everyone was doing whatever he or she wanted and I requested to be relieved as the Section Leader. My section was selected to be a special project section by [REDACTED]. This project was to interrogate those who could not be broken. This project did not last long because we requested permission to use techniques that required approval from higher but we never received the approval or it took too long to get a response. I had requested to be taken away from interrogations. After [REDACTED] was captured, [REDACTED] was selected to be in a special project and departed for a while. I was told he no longer reported to me and belonged to someone else. My opinion was that [REDACTED] was not that experienced, but my opinion did not matter. His reports were very bad and he often had to rewrite them but he was very people oriented and someone in the chain of command thought he was a good interrogator. He had 30 detainees, but he only concentrated on five. [REDACTED] and his four associates. [REDACTED] was very ignorant of a lot of the procedures. He was strong willed and proud of the fact that he could get along with almost everyone. Others in the chain of command considered him one of the best interrogators. I had requested, through [REDACTED] to have [REDACTED] taken out of my section and was told that [REDACTED] was a "golden child" and I would be moved before they would move [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] came and told me I was no longer the section leader. I asked him why was I being relieved, "because I had requested it or for another reason?" He said he didn't know. He said the decision came from higher than him. I saw [REDACTED]. I told him that I needed to know why. I told him that if I had done something wrong, someone should have counseled me and given me a chance to correct what I was doing wrong but no one had. [REDACTED] told me he was sorry and that I hadn't done anything wrong. I asked him if [REDACTED] had made the decision, he said he didn't know. Everyone knew that [REDACTED] had a personal problem with me. Some of the decisions made at Abu Ghraib were made on personal opinions not professional. [REDACTED] replaced me as the section leader. We were all, [REDACTED] (Section Leader for new Special Project), and [REDACTED] given a new project. We were receiving direction straight from [REDACTED]. This special project was supposed to [REDACTED]

INITIAL OF PERSON MAKING STATEMENT
[REDACTED]

PAGE 4 of 7 PAGE

have the most qualified interrogators but I questioned some of the interrogators on the team. [REDACTED] was very aggressive and I refused to work with him. I told [REDACTED] that I thought [REDACTED] was a loose cannon and a jail sentence waiting to happen. I had been in the booth with [REDACTED] before and I felt that he and I clashed as interrogators. One day when I went up to one of the camps, I began to speak to one of the MPs on duty. He told me he didn't know I was the NCOIC. He thought that [REDACTED] was because he always gave his name as a point of contact. [REDACTED] liked to BS with the MPs. In reference to [REDACTED] shaving detainees head, I know we had a head lice problem and we had to shave off the hair. IF the shaving was done for interrogation approach purposes, it was an exception to IROE. Once, [REDACTED] and I had a conversation about the use of dogs. He and another SGT wanted to used them as part of a drawn out approach. I told him that there were aspects of the approach that were crossing the line. He disagreed with me and wanted to go higher up the chain of command. We took the issue to [REDACTED] He didn't listen to me very often because he always had others from the chain of command that supported him and told him he was doing a great job. Most of the requests we submitted were on sleep deprivation and we did get some approved. The requests should be in the JIDC, but I can believe them getting lost because we often lost complete files. Our filing system was not the best. We did not have serviceable file cabinets and teams were given approval to place file in cardboard boxes. One day when I briefed LTG SANCHEZ and MG FAST, I was asked what support we needed. I gave her my list. File cabinets and safes were on the list. MG FAST delivered about 40% of the list, but no file cabinets. Civilians were placed in position of authority. One of the CACI employees, [REDACTED] was placed in charge of screening. [REDACTED] was in charge of B Section. [REDACTED] was in charge of the Detainee Assessment Board (DAB). Who did I think was in charge? When I first arrived, I knew [REDACTED] was in charge of the Interrogation Control Element (ICE). I knew COL PAPPAS was the Brigade Commander but he was never there. He later lived in the ICE area though. I knew that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were there but honestly I do not know what their true roles were. [REDACTED] was more involved with housing issues and didn't really get involved with interrogations so when he would call formations and was giving us orders in relation to interrogations, I questioned that. Once he held a formation to incorporate a new "salute" policy. I raised my hand and asked him how that would affect the interrogators who use a different rank as approaches. He yelled at me and said he wouldn't argue this with me. I felt it was wrong for him to be involved in interrogation rules or procedures with no interrogation background. I don't think his boundaries were clear to anyone, including him. I know [REDACTED] reported to [REDACTED] but I did not know what he did. I found this out during one of the meetings when [REDACTED] was trying to give her opinion, she was told by [REDACTED] to be quiet and back down. As far as ghost detainees I didn't deal too much with them. We had a board in the ICE that showed all the cells to include those that had "OGA" on them. I was told the detainees in those cells belonged to OGA and we shouldn't be concerned about them. I was told that I did not have to allow OGA to see my detainees. When [REDACTED] was there and I denied their request, the chain of command backed me up. Once [REDACTED] left, my requests to deny OGA access to my detainees were denied by my chain of command. [REDACTED] might have more information. She worked more with them. When OGA would take my detainees I would ask that one of our interrogators sit in on the [REDACTED]

INITIAL OF PERSON MAKING STATEMENT
[REDACTED]

PAGE 5 of 7 PAGE

interrogation and a copy of the report be provided to me. I did get both requests. The only other thing about OGA is that I was told that one of their detainees died of a heart attack in our detention facility while being interrogated. The detainee was taken out on a stretcher and treated as if he was sick so as not to upset the other detainees. In December, I told [REDACTED] that I didn't want to be involved in interrogations anymore. [REDACTED]

~~Do~~ [REDACTED]

Not

used

[REDACTED]

INITIAL OF PERSON MAKING STATEMENT

[REDACTED]

PAGE [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] PAGE

9. STATEMENT (Continued)

Shortly afterwards I became the reports officer. I did this for one week and then I was placed back on interrogations on a special team. While on this team, I told [redacted] and [redacted] that there were several incidents that I felt uncomfortable with and requested to be taken out of an interrogator role. I said I would assist as an advisor but not to go back into interrogations. One incident occurred when I was running an interrogation on an Iraqi general who was being questioned in relation to SADAM's capture. I reported to COL PAPPAS that I was getting nowhere with the detainee. I was later called into the ICE and told there would be someone assisting me. It was a JORDANIAN MAJOR. A warrant officer (I can't remember his name) told me to brief the JORDANIAN on everything I had on the general. I asked to speak to the warrant officer outside. I told him that I could not do that because some of the information was SECRET/NOFORN. He told me to do what I was told. I told him not if it was unlawful. [redacted] came out and wanted to know what had happened and I told him it was an OPSEC violation. He told me just to give him the Jordanian the unclass version and take him into the booth. While in the booth, I introduced him as my colleague. The translator introduced him wrong and stated that the JORDANIAN was my assistant. I told the detainee that I was getting nowhere with him and that I was going to leave him with my colleague (the Jordanian). The detainee jumped up and told me he would tell me whatever I wanted to know. The following day, another interrogator went in to talk to the detainee without consulting me. This totally ruined the rapport I had established with the detainee. Another issue was an OPSEC issue; I felt that we were putting too much information in the SIPR database. I felt we developed tear lines for a reason, but they were not being used. All the information on a detainee's background was posted plus the number of times he was interrogated, personnel reading the reports would then be able to link the detainee with the interrogator. In reference to photos: Sometime after the CID investigation, around March or April 2004, [redacted] (who lived in the same cell block I lived in) came to me and handed me a thumb drive. When she told me that a guy had told her that she had left it in the Internet café. I told her it wasn't mine. We decided to look in the pictures to see whom it belonged to. We saw several pictures of MPs with dead bodies and MPs with detainees. We recognized [redacted] in several photos. I reported it to [redacted] because the photos appeared to be something that should have not been taken. I went to [redacted] and told him we found pictures of detainees and how we had acquired them. [redacted] looked at the photos and told us to write sworn statements on what we knew. [redacted] told me later that the photos were not that bad. I do not know what happened after that. I know that one of the files had 40-50 photos and there were several files. I was shown some photos and was able to identify some individuals. Photo 3 file name [redacted] shows [redacted] facing the camera. There are some dog handlers with two dogs barking at a detainee. [redacted] was very close with [redacted]. They would both hang out and watch movies together. She would sit on his lap or under a blanket very close to him. I saw this because she and I lived in the same area and he would come to her area to visit her. Photo 6 on file named [redacted] shows a picture with an analyst who worked in the FAC. He was called [redacted] for [redacted]. He is standing with his back facing us and he is looking down at naked cuffed detainees on the ground. Photo 23 on file [redacted] shows [redacted] leaning against the left wall facing the naked detainees on the ground. [redacted] is in the photo as well. He is wearing PT shorts and is looking down at the detainees. Photo 25 on file [redacted] shows [redacted] facing away looking down at the detainees. Photo 54 on file [redacted] shows [redacted] (a CACI employee) with [redacted] (a linguist) interrogating a detainee who appears to be in a dangerous stress position sitting on a chair with his back exposed and a concrete floor to his back. The ICRC came by to visit but I was never made aware of the ICRC results.

Q. is there anything else you would like to add to this statement?

A. No.

End of Statement

AFFIDAVIT

I, [redacted], HAVE READ OR HAVE HAD READ TO ME THIS STATEMENT WHICH BEGINS ON PAGE 1, AND ENDS ON PAGE 7 FULLY UNDERSTAND THE CONTENTS OF THE ENTIRE STATEMENT MADE BY ME. THE STATEMENT IS TRUE. I HAVE INITIALED ALL CORRECTIONS AND HAVE INITIALED THE BOTTOM OF EACH PAGE CONTAINING THE STATEMENT. I HAVE MADE THIS STATEMENT FREELY WITHOUT HOPE OF BENEFIT OR REWARD, WITHOUT THREAT OF PUNISHMENT, AND WITHOUT COERCION, UNLAWFUL INFLUENCE, OR UNLAWFUL INDUCEMENT.

[redacted] (Signature of Person Making Statement)

WITNESSES:

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a person authorized by law to administer oaths, this 18th day of MAY, 2004 at CRYSTAL CITY, VA.

[redacted] (Signature of Person Administering Oath)

[redacted] (Typed Name of Person Administering Oath)

UCMJ, ARTICLE 36

(Authority To Administer Oaths)

INITIALS OF PERSON MAKING STATEMENT [redacted]

PAGE 7 OF 7 PAGES