

RE: Interview request

Jacob Gillig

Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2013 1:26 PM**To:** Jacob Gillig**From:** Kirk Hubbard**Date:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 12:43 PM**To:** Katherine Hawkins <khawkins@constitutionproject.org>**Subject:** Re: Interview request

As I look at the questions, I just can't summon the energy or interest to go back and rehash this in detail. I've provided some comments below, however. Kirk Hubbard

On Tue, Aug 14, 2012 at 2:03 PM, Katherine Hawkins <KHawkins@constitutionproject.org> wrote:

Dear Dr. Hubbard:

Thanks for your reply. I will try to keep the questions brief. I will also look up Jim Rollin's letter.

1. Can you explain in general terms the rationale or decision making process for using SERE techniques, and psychologists whose background was in SERE resistance training rather than interrogation? I don't have a complete and thorough knowledge of this, so I'd rather not muddy the water.
1. Do you think the press's portrayal of Drs. James Mitchell and Bruce Jessen has been factually accurate? Has it been fair? Are there any specific inaccuracies you can discuss? There are too many inaccuracies to address. Here are some off the top of my head.
 1. Neither Drs. Mitchell or Jessen exaggerated or mislead the CIA about their qualifications or experience. They were not promoting themselves; the CIA approached them.
 2. Their reported consulting fees have been significantly inaccurate.
 3. Dr. Mitchell is not, nor has he ever been a Mormon.
 4. All of the enhanced interrogation techniques used on detainees have been used on many U.S. military personnel who are SERE graduates. So why do we seem to have a different standard for terrorists?
 5. Drs. Mitchell and Jessen had no authority to establish policy or procedure, or make independent decisions regarding the interrogation program. The conditions of their contract prohibited that. Everything they did was specifically approved by the CIA. See the GSA Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR), Part 7 Acquisition Planning, Subpart 7.503 (8).
 6. They were not fired by the CIA. Their contract was "terminated for the convenience of the government without cause". If they were fired, the wording would include the term "with cause".
 7. There was a complaint filed with the Texas Board of Licensing (for psychologists) against Dr. Mitchell. It was rejected for lack of merit. The same group filed a lawsuit against him in Texas. That too was dismissed for lack of merit.
1. Is the May 7, 2004 CIA Inspector General's Report accurate? In particular, the IG reports the head of the Office of Medical Services stating that OMS "was neither

consulted nor involved in the initial analysis” of the enhanced interrogation techniques, and that the SERE psychologists/interrogators lacked the expertise to ensure that the water board technique was used in a "medically safe" way. Others have told us that's not necessarily accurate, and OMS was involved from the beginning—and it seems clear that later they did sign off on the same techniques. Were OMS personnel initially consulted? Were they present to monitor the techniques? If not, why not? If so, why did the head claim otherwise? I haven't bothered to actually read the report. I have been told that critics have mistated the content of the report, or took some content out of context. I don't think OMS was involved in the "initial analysis of the enhanced interrogation techniques, but they were certainly present at a very early stage to monitor AZ's medical condition subsequent to his being wounded when captured. I also know that an OMS medical doctor observed at least some of the interrogations of AZ. OMS was more aware and involved than they would like you to believe, but primarily from a medical standpoint. CTC was running the interrogation part.

1. Do you think the continuing secrecy about the application of the techniques to individual detainees is needed? Drs. Mitchell and Jessen, to my knowledge, remain unable to comment due to restrictions placed on them by the CIA. And this frustrates them since they can't respond to baseless accusations. However, if specific information was declassified, I am sure that would spawn lawsuits into the next decade or more.

1. Are there any overlooked facts about psychologists' role you'd like to point out? Detainees are not patients nor are they being "treated" by the psychologists. Therefore the ethical guidelines for clinicians do not apply, in my opinion. Psychologists can play many different roles and should not be forced into a narrow doctor-patient role. Indeed, many psychologists are never trained in clinical treatment, e.g. social, experimental, developmental and forensic psychologists. And these types of psychologists are not eligible to obtain a license to treat patients. So if they are not treating patients why should they be constrained by the guidelines of psychologists who are treating patients?

Best,
Katherine Hawkins

Date: Monday, August 13, 2012 1:58 PM
To: Katherine Hawkins <khawkins@constitutionproject.org>
Subject: Re: Interview request

Dear Ms Hawkins,

Thank you for your note. This issue seems so long ago to me and I guess I am weary of dealing with the ultra-liberal psychologist group bent on forcing their extreme views on the rest of us. At most, I might be willing to address a few written questions, but I do not wish to be interviewed.

Have you contacted Ken Rollin? I think he may be a military psychologist who just wrote a letter to APA regarding

some of the issues you are interested in. I will try to get that letter and his contact info for you.

Regards,

Kirk Hubbard, Ph.D.

On Thu, Aug 9, 2012 at 12:55 PM, Katherine Hawkins <KHawkins@constitutionproject.org> wrote:

Dear Dr. Hubbard:

I'm an investigator for the Constitution Project's Task Force on Detainee Treatment, a nongovernmental group trying to do a balanced, thorough review of U.S. detention and interrogation of counterterrorism detainees. The task force includes two former generals, two former members of congress, two former federal judges, the former director of the FBI, the former undersecretary of state, a UN ambassador and former cabinet officers. More information about the bipartisan task force is available at http://www.constitutionproject.org/pdf/Task_Force_on_Detainee_Treatment_Mission_and_Members.pdf

I am writing the portion of the report that deals with the role of psychologists, psychiatrists, and other medical professionals in the interrogation program. I am especially hoping to speak to a knowledgeable defender of their role, since the other side of the debate is very well-represented in other sources. (We have spoken to other sources in the Agency, but none with medical or psychological training) From reading Dr. M. Gregg Bloche's account of your correspondence I know that you might have some valuable insights and information, although of course many details remain classified, and would be very interested in speaking to you at your convenience. You can reach me at this email, my work phone, [202-448-2212](tel:202-448-2212). I hope to hear back from you (even if it is to tell me you cannot speak further).

Sincerely,
Katherine R. Hawkins

Katherine Hawkins

Investigator, Task Force on Detainee Treatment

1 Thomas Circle, N.W., 10th Floor

Washington, D.C. 20036

Direct: [202.448.2212](tel:202.448.2212) |

khawkins@constitutionproject.org

www.constitutionproject.org