

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] (b)(2)
 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
 (b)(1) demand for interrogators post-9/11, [REDACTED]
 (b)(2) [REDACTED]
 (b)(3) [REDACTED] Based
 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]
 [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]
 [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

(b)(2)

HEADQUARTERS [REDACTED] INDEX.

1. PHONE LIST, [REDACTED] UNKNOWN AUTHOR, UNDATED, ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

2. PHONE LIST, [REDACTED] UNKNOWN AUTHOR, UNDATED,
~~CONFIDENTIAL//NOFORN~~

3. EMAIL, LIST OF PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN CONSOLIDATED [REDACTED]

(b)(6)

~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

(b)(2)

4. [REDACTED] LISTING OF
INTERROGATION PERSONNEL (JIDC), JUNE 2003, AUTHOR, [REDACTED]
~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

5. LIST OF DEPLOYED PERSONNEL - [REDACTED] DATED 15 JULY 2004, AUTHOR,
[REDACTED] ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

6. LIST OF DEPLOYED PERSONNEL - [REDACTED] DATED 16 JULY 2004, AUTHOR,
[REDACTED] ~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

HEADQUARTERS [REDACTED] PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN TASKER SEARCH:

[REDACTED]

(b)(3)

[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]
[REDACTED] ~~(C)~~

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