

From: [REDACTED]
(b)(3) **Sent:** Tuesday, December 09, 2003 11:55 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Interrogation Policy

CLASSIFICATION: ~~SECRET~~

CAVEATS: ~~NOFORN~~

TERMS: NONE

(b)(3) [REDACTED] – Please see below from [REDACTED]. In speaking with [REDACTED] just now, he recommends bringing [REDACTED] into the fray. He has the institutional knowledge and expertise to best convey our argument to GC.

(b)(3) [REDACTED] you are not missing anything. It is the lawyers who are missing the point. The [REDACTED] interrogation mission is codified under JCS and combatant command doctrine, and included in the [REDACTED] founding documents. In keeping with this mission, [REDACTED] has routinely identified and deployed interrogators to assist JTFs and Combatant Commanders with interrogations. With the increased demand for interrogators post-9/11, [REDACTED]

(b)(2)

(b)(1) [REDACTED]
(b)(2) [REDACTED] Based
(b)(3) on questionable conduct in the past by [REDACTED] interrogators, murky rules of the road, OSD interest in GTMO rules, significantly different [REDACTED] rules, and the central role [REDACTED] plays at GTMO, I directed a [REDACTED] interrogation policy be developed. I am pretty sure the DD was aware of this, [REDACTED] attended several OSD legal meetings on interrogation policy. I believe the legal view that we simply belong to the Combatant Commanders and fall under their rules is shortsighted. [REDACTED] It seems to me that these individuals need to be able to operate off of a fully coordinated and vetted interrogation policy. We have the experience and expertise to prepare such a document, and it definitely should be a joint document. If the lawyers want it to be a Joint Staff document, then I would argue the way to go is for DIA to coordinate and dispatch its policy, and then let the Joint Staff codify it in their doctrine, as we did with [REDACTED]. The Joint Staff does not have the expertise to prepare what you guys pulled together. I do not recall discussing this with [REDACTED] but I know he was aware of its development and of the meetings [REDACTED]. Frankly, it never occurred to me that anyone except [REDACTED] DIA would prepare and issue such a policy. We issue policies on everything else we do—why not interrogation?

(b)(3) [REDACTED]

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

From: [REDACTED]
(b)(3) **Sent:** Tuesday, December 09, 2003 9:28 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Interrogation Policy
Sensitivity: Private

[REDACTED] (b)(1)

(b)(2) 1. 29 OCT 02: [REDACTED] SUPPORT TO U.S. CENTRAL
COMAND OPLAN 1003 ~~(S//NF)~~

2. 15 NOV 02: AUTHORIZATION FOR [REDACTED] OFFICERS TO PARTICIPATE IN
CUSTODIAL INTERVIEWS ~~(S//NF)~~

[REDACTED]

(b)(1)
(b)(2)

12 JUL 04: [REDACTED] CONTACT [REDACTED] LIAISON CONTACT WITH [REDACTED] (b)(1) (b)(2)
[REDACTED] ~~(C)~~