

SNOWflake

May 22, 2002 12:16 PM

TO: Doug Feith
FROM: Donald Rumsfeld *DR*
SUBJECT: Interrogation Techniques

383.6

Please get this letter from Jim Hovey and the attachment by Martin Seligman communicated to Dunleavy, Speer, Myers and Pace. Have them look at it, and get someone working on it.

Second, please draft a letter thanking them for the letter.

Thanks.

Attach.
05/21/02 Hovey ltr w/05/20/02 Seligman memo re: Interrogation Techniques

DHR:dh
052202-22

.....
Please respond by 06/11/02

22 May 02

U17179 02

11-L-0559/OSD/12444

JAMES W. HOVEY

(b)(6)

Sn - A copy of
this was given
to LD

SECDEF HAS SEEN

MAY 22 2002

May 21, 2002

The Honorable Donald Rumsfeld
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
1000 Defense Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301-1000

Re: Interrogation Techniques - Afghanistan vs. Guantanamo

Dear Don,

Martin Seligman is the top expert on learned helplessness - a phenomenon with major bearing on interrogation technique.

Attached is a memo from Seligman, based on an email to him from two Operation Anaconda interrogators, which compares techniques used in Afghanistan to those used in Guantanamo.

I urge you to at least scan the 3 or 4 numbered comparisons that the interrogators make in their email (page 2 of the memo).

Keep up the good work.

Best regards,

Jim

Attachment

11-L-0559/OSD/12445

To: The Honorable Donald Rumsfeld
Secretary of Defense

Priority: **Urgent and Confidential**

From: Martin Seligman (b)(6)
Fox Leadership Professor of Psychology
University of Pennsylvania

Re: Interrogation of Captives in Cuba

Date: May 20, 2002

SECDEF HAS SEEN

MAY 22 2002

Executive Summary

Interrogations of captives in Cuba are not as effective as they could be largely because the prisoners are in groups and are allowed small victories that checkmate the interrogators. Two successful Anaconda interrogators returned from Afghanistan and recently visited the Cuba facility. Their insights are attached to this memo.

On Thursday, May 17, 2002, I addressed a gathering of military intelligence officers who specialize in interrogation and resistance to interrogation at our base in San Diego. As an expert on learned helplessness and depression, I discussed the optimal conditions for successful interrogation with this experienced group. Among this group were two interrogators, recently back from Afghanistan and Guantanamo. While they understand the pressures that the press and others have put on the DoD with regard to the conditions of captivity there, they see a missed opportunity at Guantanamo.

Several conditions lead to the successful extraction of vital information from captives: foremost among these are solitary confinement and the prevention of "small victories" (such as turban-wearing and mullah-consulting) by captives. Failure here can easily checkmate the best interrogators.

They respectfully suggest that interrogation under the present conditions at Guantanamo is less likely to produce the vital information that we need. Given this week's news this information might be urgently needed. They further suggest that it is not too late. Attached is an email that I received from them:

In the Interrogators' own words

Dr. Seligman... (b)(6) here from US Central Command. I and (b)(6) met you at the conference...(and on the bus).

We were interrogators in Afghanistan, and recently visited Cuba to observe the operations there.....subsequently, Dr (Col) Banks invited us to the conference.

Our activities are really no secret, just the information gleaned. The conditions we induced, the roles we played, and the projected perceptions are all versions of classic interrogation techniques.

We found that our most successful tactics (in Afghanistan) involved the following:

1. Friendly "tea sessions"revolving around food, drink and the joint venture of eating. These sessions focused on pleasurable things...and allowed the interrogator and detainee to bond.
2. Empowerment. This effort focused on those subjects that were hostile, or totally withdrawn/resigned. Here we gave the detainee the "ability" to make a decision that immediately affected their surroundings....(an extra blanket, some more food, some comfort items...etc) Our party line was that "you get to choose your future, and the way you want to live it...."
3. Isolation/silence. This worked for the positive and the negative. Those that wanted to get better treatment and not be subject to peer punishment sought iso. Those that thrived on the group, and were problematic..iso proved effective.
4. Change of venue. This worked well as it allowed the interrogator to manipulate the venue...for the positive or for the negative.

Now, after our visit in Cuba, we saw that the interrogators were motivated, talented, but constrained. That constraint comes from the top on down. We saw the following:

1. No venue change. The only meeting/interview/interrogation will occur in a booth. The same booth is always used. (There are several and they are identical.) This restricts the creativity of the interrogator.
2. Tea Sessions. We saw that the interrogators were limited at providing/sharing items and perhaps suspect of "providing aid and comfort to the enemy."
3. Group support. We saw that the detainees are allowed to communicate openly with each other. This solidifies the individual to the group and reduces the interrogators goal of divide and conquer.

Overall, we would like to see the interrogators given more flexibility to exploit their subjects as they see fit.

I and (b) have learned that sometimes the best changes come from the most unusual routes. Any assistance that you could provide in this arena would be greatly appreciated.

Best ways to reach us...

(b)(6) MSgt. Duty Phone (b)(6)

Currently assigned in Tampa. Police Officer from Detroit.

(b)(6) MSgt. Duty Phone (b)(6)

Same assignment. Police officer from Orlando.

I only ask that you do not give this information wide public dissemination.

It was a pleasure listening to you, and hopefully we can work together in some capacity.

Jon Hathaway