

- G3 OPS EOC Org Account

(b)(6) z

From: [REDACTED] COL (MNB -N) DEP CDR
Sent: Thursday, April 22, 2004 8:34 AM
To: [REDACTED] LTC 3/2 Infantry Brigade XO
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] MAJ 3/2 Infantry Brigade S2; [REDACTED] MAJ 3/2 Infantry Brigade Provost
Subject: RE: Detainee Parole Concept
Importance: High

[REDACTED] We're trying to increase interrogators and other means of decreasing the investigation period, but I think everyone understands that given the situation down south chances are not good that we will solve anything on the manning front. The CG wants to decrease the time detainees spend in the EDF. My impression is that investigations are the long pole, but we have few options to resolve that. If we end up releasing some percentage due to lack of evidence (maybe 40%?... and standards of proof will only get tougher), then perhaps we can simply speed the process. Recommend you check w/interrogators to see what % of those voted for 'reinterrogation' end up providing evidence or intell--I suspect it's pretty low. Regarding the local populace (and opinion leaders') views of our treatment of detainees, while we are far better off than just about any sector in Iraq on that score, we are still losing. They are not receptive of detention by Coalition without local involvement, they grow bolder and more independent by the day, and the average person is absolutely inclined to believe we are abusing and mistreating detainees. I deal with this weekly. Recurring and strident complaints are: it takes too long to investigate; we hold the males incommunicado and in the process deprive families of livelihoods; we arrest and detain without just cause (and this is only bolstered when we hold someone for weeks on end only to end up releasing them without any charge or explanation--it happens frequently!; etc). I am in no way an advocate for these shitheads we detain; however, we have to deal with the perceptions and impressions of the locals, not to mention the fact that our process is drawn out and inefficient. Bottom line: we can't continue to operate as we have (regarding lengthy detention and investigation); given the amount of transparency and scrutiny we have here we will no longer be permitted to let guys stagnate in detention much beyond the 14 day period. If those that don't cooperate/confess within that time are low potential for exploitation--and there will always be exceptions--then why not find a means of speeding their exit from the facility? We're looking for ideas, if you have other suggestions let fly. Thanks,

-----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

023072

u09348

all (b)(6) z

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<

-----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
Importance: High

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
S2 [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

023073

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]

all (b)(6) 2