3

U.S. ARMY CENTER OF MILITARY HISTORY

+ + + + +

INTERVIEW

OF

(b)(3), (b)(6)

C = 3

MULTI-NATIONAL CORPS-IRAO

JANUARY 24, 2008

BAGHDAD, IRAQ

This transcript was produced from tapes provided by the U.S. Army Center of Military History.

*

* SECRET *

-	PROCEEDINGS
2	b 3, b 6 This is (b)(3), (b)(6)
3	(b)(3), (b)(6) the Multinational Corps-Iraq Historian.
4	Today is Thursday, the 24th of January 2008 at
5	approximately 1630. We are here at the Headquarters
6	for Multinational Corps-Iraq at the al Faw Palace at
7	Camp Victory, outside of Baghdad, Iraq.
8	Also with me is =-
9	(b)(6) , the writing
LO	historian for 3 Corps and CMH.
11	(b)(3), (b)(6) And we are
12	interviewing (b)(3), (b)(6)
13	(b)(3),(b)(6) could you introduce yourself
14	in your own voice with your rank, first name, middle
15	initial, last name?
16	(b)(3), (b)(6) : Yes. I am (b)(3), (b)(6)
17	
18	(b)(3), (b)(6)
19	(b)(3),(b)(6) Thanks. I would just
20	like to refer the listener to our previous interviews
21	that are on hand with b3,b6), the last one being
22	on the 10th of October 2007.

(b)(3),(b)(6) , we have a previous release
form on file. If that is acceptable, we will consider
that to still be in effect.
(b)(3),(b)(6) Perfectly acceptable.
(b)(3), (b)(6) Great. I wanted to
start with just sort of a big open-ended question,
which I wanted to ask you if, as you look now in the
last couple of weeks of 3 Corps' tenure as the
Headquarters for Multinational Corps-Iraq, have the
defining features of who the enemy is changed?
(b)(3), (b)(6) Not in the last two weeks,
but But over time, if that is what your question is
(b)(3),(b)(6) And in particular,
since we spoke in October.
(b)(3),(b)(6) No. I don't believe that
they have changed since we spoke in November as far as
the groups go that we are dealing with. However, the
viability and capacity of those groups have changed.
Al Qaeda in Iraq has gotten less capable.
Their operating areas have diminished considerably
since then. The current operation that we have going

SECRET*

on, Phantom Phoenix, which is designed to go into those vestiges of AQI, is succeeding.

An example of that is, although we had some operations going on in Diyala Province in Baqubah at the time, those have intensified under Phantom Phoenix, and are going quite well.

So the enemy there has been diminished in capability and has moved, as it has in other places, Al Qaeda in Iraq; and they have moved to the north toward Mosul in the Nineveh Province, for the most part, although there are elements elsewhere in Iraq.

Seems that they found Mosul to be -- or the areas west of Mosul to be a better operating area for them right now because of operations, as well as local populace turning against them in other places. So that a change with regard to AQI.

Now the other element we talked about in November was extremists Shia elements, JAM special groups, and again although their capacity, I would say, hasn't diminished, the threat from them has, because of Sadr -- Moqtada al Sadr imposing a freeze that is being, for the most part, by mainstream JAM

followed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The exceptions to following that freeze are some noncompliant elements of what we call special groups of Jaish al Mahdi, but when you look at attacks overall, overall are done, and those are the two primary reasons or, rather, two of the primary reasons, friendly operations being successful against AQI, the freeze by Sadr, and then in terms of Shia extremists, also our operations against them. That is in addition to what I mentioned before about the fact the populace has turned against, actually, both of the violent elements of those groups, all of AQI, and then extremists JAM elements. The populace has turned against them.

So all those factors together, yes, the enemy has changed in capacity. The groups are still the same.

(b)(3), (b)(6) Great.

(b)(6) (b)(3), (b)(6) , when we last

interviewed you three months ago on the 10th of October, Phantom Thunder had progressed and appeared to be reversing the violence.

* SECRET *

SECRET

How would you assess -- This is a slightly different question than the one (b)(3),(b)(6)

asked. How would you assess the threat today, and explain or highlight the changes over the last three months?

I know that we just launched another operation, I guess, at the beginning of this month, Phantom Phoenix. But if you look at November, December, and up to now in January, could you assess any changes or highlight any changes to the threat in those three months?

(b)(3),(b)(6) Although the question is different, the answer is very similar to what I gave. We had Phantom Thunder, and we talked about that last time. We had Phantom Strike, which are some very specific operations that followed that, and then now we have Phantom Phoenix going on.

So that three-month period of time covers those three operations. The threat is less overall than it was at the time, and those operations, I believe, are the primary reason for it to be less because of the effect that it had on the enemy, but

* SECRET *

also the effect that it had on the populace.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I mentioned that a minute ago. Because security improved as a result of those operations, they felt more comfortable defending themselves, turning in the enemy themselves, forming Awakening movements and then joining Concerned Local Citizens groups as well.

So that the threat diminished, because we killed or captured some of it, but also because the local populace felt secure and took security into their own hands and furthered it.

(b)(6) Let me follow up with that just a minute. When Phantom Thunder kicked off in June, Diyala was a specific target.

(b)(3), (b)(6) It was.

I come back in January, I see almost replicated another operation in Baqubah or in Diyala, and Phantom Phoenix to chase them out.

Now for an observer like myself coming back after a long absence, it seems like almost that we are doing the same operation that we did back in

* SECRET*

SECRET

June/July with 25th Division. Now we are doing it with the 1st Armored Division.

So on the surface, that would say, hey, something happened to allow those guys to go back in there, but we needed to go back in there and move them out.

Thunder succeeded in terms of within the city limits of Baqubah, but what happened was some elements of the enemy, AQI, went to the area surrounding Baqubah, Moqtadiyah specifically, up to the edge of the Hammerin Mountains and along the Hammerin Ridge. So in several spots around there, other small villages.

So we had the capacity to go into Baqubah and remain, but to do significant operations in these other places, we needed a combination of Coalition forces and Iraqi forces.

So the difference is we are in the ares outside of Baqubah, and we have far more Iraqi forces with us this time that will be able to remain in addition to Coalition forces in the area.

The reason we know we are having a good

* SECRET*

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

effect right now is the fact that the enemy has, besides being captured/killed some of them -- they have gone over the Hammerin Ridge, and they have gone through Mosul, as I said before. So they are moving out of that area.

They can't go back in Baqubah. So they have to go somewhere else or get killed/captured or, if they are fence sitters who have been with AQI, give up on the insurgency and become rejoin the populace as normal citizens. So that's the effect that it has had.

(b)(3),(b)(6) Could I ask one real specific follow-up to that?

Do we have a definitive sense at this point as to the strength of AQI?

(b)(3),(b)(6) I wouldn't want the numbers on it. There are some that may. We did actually before our last meeting, and I don't think I pulled the numbers out at that time, and I wouldn't want to use those numbers anymore, because, obviously, we have had an effect on them.

The thing about whether you are talking

* SECRET *

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

AQI or JAM is it can ebb and flow depending on local support. You know, people join or people quit, dependent on how things are going, is what happens. So I wouldn't want to give you the -- We have not redone the numbers.

The way we do it is a very specific methodology, that we go out to the MSEs to get their input, and we put some math to it as well, and we come up with the numbers, and we haven't gone through that for four or five months.

(b)(3),(b)(6) I wanted to ask a question about -- and you kind of alluded to it; so I wanted to as more, which is: I think by anyone's standard, we have had some success this year, when you look back at the start of 3 Corps' tour to where we are now.

I just wanted to ask: As you wind down to your last couple of weeks, how has our success in terms of things like the reconciliation initiative, the rise of the Concerned Local Citizens, our success in helping the populace turn away from extremist groups in general -- How has that changed the nature

* SECRET

of the intelligence collection process, or has it? Do you find different things are important now that weren't?

In other words, how do we -- What is our intelligence focus in the area where we are actually getting more into governance and economic development issues?

changed a lot in the last three or four months, but it has changed over our 15 months since we have been here, because an example is what you just cited a minute ago, intelligence support to reconciliation and our involvement in it.

Before, we had to know, obviously, about people that key leaders were engaging with, but those were - There were a lot of those, but there weren't nearly as many as there are right now.

So knowing the motivations of the people who are coming forward, some of whom would have been on a targeting list not long ago -- all that has developed in a kind of sophisticated way where we have -- in a specific cell in the case for us. The

* SECRET *

Coalition analysis and control element, our analysis section, that is what they do. We have an officer in the reconciliation cell that leverages them and makes sure he provides the right intel to those guys.

So the same is true for governance in making sure we understand what is going on with the key leaders in the government, how we can best support, for example, the legislation that is going through, those kinds of things.

So having insight into all of those nonenemy or nontraditional targets, our collection has definitely changed over this 15 months. Those are just a couple of examples.

(b)(3), (b)(6) Is the job harder or easier?

(b)(3),(b)(6) It's much harder. It's far more complex now than it was 15 months ago, and it's way more complex than it was the last tour we were here, because I mean, you still have all those other things that were there before.

They may be diminished and not as threatening, but they are still there, and you still

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

* SECRET *

have to do the collection and the analysis on them, but then you have all of these additional angles that you have to follow, people that you have to support. It's more sophisticated, no doubt.

and in 07-01, you indicate in the intelligence part,

Paragraph 1 and in the situation, that a portion of
the population is anti-occupation. In fact, I've seen
that going all the way back to '06 and '05.

Can you put a more precise measurement on how that anti-occupation feeling in generating insurgency is? I don't know whether I stated that right.

(b)(3),(b)(6) No, I get it. It depends on how the -- In fact, it sort of depends on how the insurgency is going. That particular -- It's really their information operations. That kind of a campaign is more successful when the insurgency is strong.

In other words, it's kind of got momentum.

It gets momentum and gains momentum if the insurgency is strong and it diminishes, but there are some elements that retain it.

* SECRET *

For example, Jaish al Mahdi, you know, the core of Jaish al Mahdi, even when they are being cooperative, Moqtada al Sadr and all -- they are anti-occupation and will always be that way. There is no doubt about it.

Clearly, al Qaeda in Iraq, the hard core al Qaeda in Iraq folks, are anti-Coalition. So both Sunni and Shia have those elements that have -- When they are strong and violent and they can convince the populace that we are having negative effects on them, that garners their support. There is no doubt about it.

There's a whole other element of them that that doesn't work on, especially when we are protecting the population the way we are now, and that's a big difference from when we got here. Remember, it was all about transition when we got here, and now it's all about protecting the population.

So there's a whole lot of Sunnis that used to be anti-occupation, but they aren't anymore. They want us here. There is no doubt about it, and they've

SECRET*

changed their tune.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So, yes, you have those elements that are going to always anti-occupation, but I would say the vast majority of the Iraqi population is not. You know, they are ambivalent in many ways. They are not hard core anti-occupation. They will always join just to get us out of here.

There are times when they will, but for the most part, as long as we are protecting them and they get some good out of it, they are not going to-

Diminished over the course of this past year?

The last year. There is no (b)(3), (b)(6)doubt in my mind. They usually -- Anbar, and that's example. I mean, you remember what the easiest happened. You know, you had (b)(3), (b)(6) out there saying that -- you know, it will never be good; it will always be an al Qaeda stronghold. talked to him a couple of weeks ago, and he said I would have bet Fort Knox that this never would have

So that is an example of that sentiment

happened, you know. That's kind of what he says.

* SECRET *

changing, because they were definitely -- I mean, having been here for Fallujah 1 and Fallujah 2 and everything else, that was all anti-occupation throughout, and it's not anymore. They want us to stay, for the most part. So that's one example.

(b)(3),(b)(6) I wanted to ask about some of the interactions and interface with the Information Operations piece. In general, I just wanted to ask what sort of interaction is there between C-2 and IO, and just looking for some sense as an intelligence officer and the C-2 what your perspective is on how the messaging piece has played in, and do you get feedback through intelligence channels as to how we are sort of doing on that front of psychological ops and sort of getting people over to our way of thinking.

(b)(3),(b)(6) Yes. That's something that, speaking of getting back to Fort Hood, I want to spend a little on, figuring out what we did right and what we did wrong; because we did something right, because the IO effort over the last year has been great. General McDonald and his crew have done a

great job.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The intel support to him -- Intel support to IO was hard last time we were here, our last rotation, because the whole IO program was kind of in the beginning. Now they've got it to the point where it's easy to support them, because what they need to know is who to target and how to do it and get feedback on it.

We've got the systems, whether it's 14c (Phonetic), 14c (Phonetic) and everything else out there -- and it's mostly 14c

1.40

1.4c But the systems are in place as long as you've got the right tasking out there and you are listening for the right thing, talking to the right people.

You can get them what they need to get the right message to the right people, see who is susceptible to the message and all, and then you get the feedback on how well it is working.

I'll give you an example of the feedback mechanism. You know, they used to have the [.4b, 1.4c, 1.4c]

when we were here our 1.4b, 1.4c, 1.4d rotation. In the intervening years it went away, and that's one of the first things that General Odierno himself and I noted when we got here.

5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17

That is helpful in a lot of other ways, too. I mean, that's helpful in governance. It's helpful in the economics, you know, the things that we are targeting, surf for and all those types of programs, but then again it helps with the IO program

1

2

3

4

18

19

20

21

22

1 as well.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So as we are doing our regular intel work for these other lines of operation, we are able to support IO pretty well. So it will be interesting.

General McDonald, I think -- trust me, he would tell me if we weren't giving him what he needs. So I think he is happy with the support, but the bottom line is, it's not like you have this intense IO only focused effort for intelligence to support it. It is kind of a natural component of the overall intel effort when you are supporting more than just the security line of operation, which I think we are doing fairly well now.

you are saying it's almost just finding a new market for existing products. Is that --

(b)(3),(b)(6) Yes, and taking your existing collectors and making sure they are tasked to do the right things. So they are not -- You know, they are not just looking for HVIs and those guys,

1.4c

or you are having a 1.4c go ask about it.

* SECRET *

They are out there asking the other questions as they do their collection. So you got them tuned into the right --

(b)(3),(b)(6) Is the mechanics of the interface that you have with IO this time something that should be noted? In other words, is there an ongoing meeting? How is that fusion achieved when you talk about it this time? Is someone embedded in your team? Do you have some body embedded in theirs?

(b)(3),(b)(6) We do not. In fact -Well, (b)(3),(b)(6) (Phonetic) is the reconciliation guy and, as you know, IO and reconciliation are all located together. They are not all the same. He is up there with (b)(3),(b)(6) (Phonetic) who is the IO guy.

So if they need some adjustment, they just tell us, and we do it. So there is not a -- It's not like there is a IO targeting type board system where we are going through a process.

Fortunately, the other processes seem to support getting them what they need. So I'm not going

to say it's informal, because it's not. It's embedded in every other process we do.

I think it's part of everything that you do. So because it is, you know, whether it's those intel products that the CG gets in the morning are inclusive and kind of the same thing the IO guys need to know as well. So that's a consideration in what we do, both in terms of the question I talked about before and in terms of the analysis and products that we give folks.

That's why I said I want to do an article or something on it when I get back, because when you prepare -- When we prepared for the exercise, when you go through all the MRX process and all, it's very structured.

Whether it is targeting or whether it is IO, and they are very similar, there's this process that is there. It's a debilitating process that sucks away all your time, and we've gotten away from that. We've been able to get away from it and still achieve greater effects than some have, I think, without having this -- It's not all about process. It's all

* SECRET *

22

about product. It's all about output right now, and 1 we achieved that in IO, I think, as well as targeting. 2 3 Great. (b)(3), (b)(6) 4 (b)(6)(b)(3), (b)(6) in one of my first -- and actually, I think it was my first 5 6 interview with you, you talked about the importance of the relationships -- of relationships in general, and 7 the CT team that you brought over here, the experience 8 of working together with G-2s in past rotations. 9 10 mentioned a couple of names. Before I get to the actual question, I 11 wondered if you know - you probably do -- (b)(3), (b)(6) 12 (b)(3),(b)(6) (Phonetic), 4th ID b 6 13 14 Right now? (b)(3), (b)(6) (b)(3), (b)(6) 15 (b)(3), (b)(6) 16 You know him. That's an (b)(6)17 But over the course of this deployment, can 18 you talk a little bit about how the C-2 has evolved 19 and if you think you kept that tight team that you 20 brought here and trained with? 21 I know that the case has turned over, for example, and we discussed that, actually, I think, in 22

* SECRET *

the last interview. But I know you had placed back in March a lot of emphasis on the teamwork.

I wonder if you would reflect on that over the past 15 months now at the end of this tour?

(b)(3),(b)(6) Well, that's certainly the key to my success, has been the people that we assembled before we came, trained with, and then brought over. So that has continued to pay off.

There is no doubt about it.

without going into the exact people, but essentially I've got the same team that was hand-picked before I came here in C-2 proper as the core, and I say c-o-r-e, of that team. So that's what has been helpful. But the people who joined us all along have become just as valuable. But I attribute that to the fact they joined a team that was pretty high performing and pretty tight, but very willing to be inclusive of new folks that came along.

So I think the legacy of that is that those people who joined us as individual augmentees have gotten up to a level where there will be good continuity with (b)(3),(b)(6) (Phonetic) team when

SECPET

he gets here with 18th Airborne Corps.

Now one thing I have noticed is that after he did his PSS, saw what we did, he has worked very hard to assemble a team himself that, I think, will be real strong. He lost his deputy. She had medical issues, and he had to replace her, but with people that General Austin knew, a Lieutenant Colonel that he knew and, I think, that (b)(3),(b)(6) knew, too.

So I think they sort of followed the same model. So I'm not unique in this, I don't think, now any longer. I think he has been successful in forming a team as well. But the answer to your question is, yes, it has continued to pay dividends. It has continued to get better as we have gone along.

(b)(3),(b)(6) I want to ask about a specific challenge, which is actually something that General Odierno pointed out that was picked up on in the open medial. It has to do with dissatisfaction in the grassroots of all the Shia population and the idea that, at least in the open source, that none of the Shia groups were really providing the sort of services and satisfaction that the Shia citizenry wanted,

* SECPET *

Does our intelligence gathering -- have we focused any efforts on that, and have you seen any opportunities that we have exploited or just become more aware of?

(b)(3),(b)(6) Well, we've definitely focused the intelligence collection on that because clearly, if the groups that are not helpful are providing those services as opposed to the government, then we got a problem.

have been focused. One of the things they focus on is exactly that. So the opportunities would be where to provide -- you know, urge the GOI, and back to what we talked about, governance, economics and all that -- We got to urge the government of Iraq to focus some of its efforts so that they are the provider of services, just like there should be security, rather than some of these other groups; because -- I mean, that is one of Jaish al Mahdi's strengths, is that in some areas, historically Sadr City, but there are others, they could become a grassroots movement, because they were

SECRET

able to provide services that the government wasn't.

Now I think that is much less so now, which is, I think, one of the reasons that, although Moqtada al Sadr is not going to ever openly talk to us probably -- at best, that we use interlocutors -- he is willing to talk to the government of Iraq and become more part of the mainstream, because their capacity is improving, and it is no longer just him and his movement that can offer those in certain places, those services in certain places.

Yes, and that is back to -- I mean, that is part of Intel operations in this environment, is making sure you focus on collecting that and give the decision makers that kind of information, which is far different than the traditional security line of operation support that we provide.

(b)(3),(b)(6) Just one more related question that has actually has to do with a specific situation. I'm just wondering how Intelligence has played into the Commander's process for one of the issues with the Concerned Local Citizens groups that we have had a lot of success with.

* SECPET

By the same token, it seems at this moment we face two challenges. One is increasing tax on the

risk of infiltration into those CLC groups.

How has intelligence coming into play to help the Commander sort of sort that out and figure out how to best deal with it?

leaders of those CLCs. The flip side of that is the

(b)(3),(b)(6) We have a good window into most of the CLCs, because we infiltrate them, too, and that helps us know who the players are, who at least the leaders are. So if you get infiltrated by the individuals at the higher level, I think you know.

If you get groups that are purely -- and there have been a couple of suspected -- groups that were suspected of all. You know, being insurgents, they just tried to pick up the mantle and be a CLC and get in that way. Luckily, that wasn't the case, but we needed to do the intelligence collection on them.

So infiltration is a risk. They will be successful in some ways in some numbers, probably low numbers, but we have a pretty good window on them.

But they are self-policing, too. I mean, they know

* SECRET

their friends and neighbors pretty well, and they have definitely policed themselves.

The other side of that is anybody effective in this country is at risk, as long as violence is going on, of being targeted. It happened today in Mosul with the Provincial Director of Police killed as he was inspecting the big glass site. You probably heard about this today, killed by a suicide vest bomber.

The same is going to be true -- We've got some operations now that are being led -- initially led by CLCs before the Iraqi Army goes into them. There's a couple this upcoming week or so where that is the case.

Well, you know, when you get CLCs that are that effective, it's just like the P-Op in Mosul. I mean, they are at risk of getting targeted by the enemy in that area. So that is going to happen.

To me -- You know, we did a study, briefed General Odierno about a week and a half ago, that said when you look at the increase in number of people in CLCs and the increase in number of attacks -- good

* SECRET

1 proportion.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So in other words, it's not like suddenly you have a whole bunch more attacks on a set or finite number of people. It's the number of people has gone up and, therefore, the number of those type of people that have been attacked has gone up. So it's kind of proportional.

So, therefore -- But the issue is their leaders are getting targeted more, too, and I think that is back to the fact that they are effective. So it's a risk.

(b)(3),(b)(6) : Great.

(b)(6) (b)(3),(b)(6) , I would like to show you a slide from General Odierno's 17 January briefing, Pentagon press briefing in which he showed this map here, and he said that that had been captured in Baghdad in December of '06 during the press conference.

Are you familiar with this map?

(b)(3), (b)(6) Yes.

(b)(6) And can you tell me how much or if it did play a part in your development of the

* SECRET *

* SECRET *

Baghdad Belt analysis? Where I put it is February-March. That's when I see the Baghdad Belt analysis slides, but maybe you can be more specific.

(b)(3).(b)(6) Well, even before we deployed, we looked at Saddam's Baghdad Belt strategy, and he put divisions around Baghdad, because he believed Baghdad was the center of gravity.

That helped us figure out, frankly, where the vestiges of the enemy probably were, because of where Saddam Fedahine (Phonetic) or Republican Guards units had been and all of that. But it also told us where al Qaeda in Iraq probably wanted to be in terms of Baghdad itself, because that's just the mindset they had.

So what -- This map was discovered in the documents after that incident in December. It sort of solidified what we thought, which is that they thought the Baghdad Belts were important, and they intended to use them to their advantage as well.

That all drove the decision making. That component of the enemy analysis is what helped drive the decision making on where units were.

* SECPET

Right. The surge units. 1 2 Absolutely. So instead of (b)(3), (b)(6) 3 putting them all in Baghdad proper, which I think was 4 the thought in Washington when the surge came, you 5 know, the decision was to -- We created Multinational 6 Division-Center as a result to deal with the southern 7 Belts, essentially, of Baghdad, and then, you know, we put one brigade in Diyala, and then we put the rest 8 9 either in Baghdad or in the Belts. 10 So all of that analysis that you are 11 talking about that occurred drove where the surge 12 units went and how we employed those units, how we 13 fought the Battle of Baghdad, basically, is what it 14 is, which became, obviously, (Phonetic) (b)(6) 15 and into the further operations. 16 So it just brought home the fact that not 17 only is Baghdad the center of gravity, but the Belts 18 around Baghdad are very important. 19 (b)(6)Can you -- I'm a little bit --20 The documents are a little bit non-specific or 21 unspecific in the dates when you did the Baghdad Belt

analysis or at least when I see the slides of the

1	Baghdad Belts. It seems to be February-March, but is
2	that correct?
3	(b)(3),(b)(6) It is, I have to look at
4	the
5	(b)(6) So it is correct? Okay.
6	(b)(3),(b)(6) It is, and I can go back in
7	there and look and tell you exactly. The day we
8	planned it, we took a picture.
9	(b)(3), (b)(6) I have that picture.
10	b 3, b 6 You have that picture. And
11	if I look in my e-mail, I can see what the date is on
12	it.
13	(b)(3), (b)(6) It was done by(b) 3 b)(6)
14	It was b3, b6 (Phonetic).
15	(b)(3), (b)(6) Did(b)(3), (b)(b)take it?
16	(b)(3), (b)(6) He's the one who gave
17	me the picture.
18	(b)(3),(b)(6) Actually, I think I'm
19	almost positive that General Devlin took the picture
20	himself.
21	(b)(3),(b)(6) Yes, he mentioned it
22	was General Devlin. It must be the same one I'm

* GECPFT

thinking of.

(b)(3),(b)(6) So whenever that picture was taken, that's when we did it, and I can find out.

b 6 Okay, thank you. That helps.

(b)(3), (b)(6) I wanted to ask

another interface question with another incident and see how that's evolved over time. I wanted to ask about combined Joint Special Operations Task Force with Multinational Corps-Iraq, and if you can speak to me about what that relationship has been along with C-2 lines with them, and has the relationship changed over the last 15 months as the battle has evolved and as we have had things like reconciliation come into play?

(b)(3),(b)(6) Yes. It started out real strong, and it was far stronger when we got here this time than the last rotation. It's back to personalities as well as General McCrystal (Phonetic) and General Odierno are great friends, classmates from West Point, and Brigadier General Mike Flynn (Phonetic) who was the J-2, Colonel Mike Flynn when we got here was the J-2 of JSOC (Phonetic) and,

SECRET *

therefore, the task force, were good friends, go way back.

The mindset, though -- It was already in place when we got here. That just made it all the stronger, but the mindset had been one of cooperation.

No more, you know, black world group, you know, typical of knowing what they are doing and a very cooperative relationship, both in terms of operations and in terms of intel.

So there wasn't anything to overcome when we got here. It was just a matter of strengthening a good relationship that already existed. They were perfectly willing to share everything they got. We are doing the same thing.

So you know, the mission is different, though. I mean, their mission is very focused on high value individual targeting, manhunting, and people forget that sometimes. But we've got the whole broad spectrum of every mission, and a subset of that now, though, is exactly those operations.

So a brigade combat team commander has to be able to do those kind of operations, manhunting,

* SECPET

you know, persistent ISR on a target to do a capture or kill operation, all the way out to, you know, tracking the Prime Minister's convoy if he is going through your battle space or, you know, chemical munition coming from Tawatha (Phonetic) to BIOP (Phonetic) to be thrown away -- actually, that was radioactive material about a week and a half ago, where you have -- I mean, the whole gamut of ISR.

The close relationship with JSOC allows to share intel for similar targets or even shared targets, but also get their -- We learned their teaching, too. You know, we learned their procedures by working so closely with them.

So that's why BCTs are able to do these things just as well as they are, because they learned from them, and they've got a good cooperative relationship with them, and they operate in the same battle space. They go around and, obviously, do their high end operations within each of these brigades' battle spaces. So they have a cooperative relationship, too. But in terms of intel, very close.

(b)(3), (b)(6) : Let me ask you this,

+ C = C = E = .

* SECRET

if I could. Realizing this is a year that probably people are going to pick apart in great detail as time goes on, but one of the questions in general that will probably be asked is: To what degree was that special operations role key to the success?

From an intelligence officer's seat, seeing what you see in terms of intelligence feedback, how has that manhunting piece -- Any sense for how much of a contribution that was or wasn't?

(b)(3),(b)(6) I think it's significant, because it started out being al Qaeda only. So we'll talk about that for a minute -- from al Qaeda in Iraq, taking out key individuals, key leaders in the networks, clearly always caused setbacks, and then it always caused people who were considering joining that effort to think twice and just waited some, because they are so effective.

When they started getting the mission to do extremist targets and set up Task Force 1.4a that had the same effect. I mean, the most extremist elements of Jaish al Mahdi who were attacking, for the most part, Coalition forces were taken out, many of

them, and then others were very much dissuaded from -- became very fearful.

Of course, what we were doing in Sadr City

-- that really had an effect. Much more reluctant to
do that now that there are cooperative elements of

JAM, but -- So I think what has been successful over
this past 15 months is the combination of all the
things that are going on.

I do not specify their contribution, but yes, their contribution at the high end, condition forces operations across the battle space, the populace being protected and turning against the extremist elements on both sides leaders on the JAM side or the Shia side becoming compliant and cooperative with GOI and the Awakening movements and Concerned Local Citizens - you put all that together, and a key component, that high end targeting. But all these other things with it become very effective.

(b)(3),(b)(6) Thanks.

(b)(3),(b)(6) That's a big answer to a small question.

* SECRET *

1	(b)(6) I have two real quick
2	questions. One is: Looking at Op Ord 08-0801, I read
3	your in the operations order, your Paragraph 1,
4	estimate of the enemy, and I compared it with 07-01,
5	and then I went to your intel estimate, and I couldn't
6	find your intel estimate.
7	When I clicked on the link, it linked me
8	to an '06 I think it was 06-03 intel estimate. Did
9	you
10	(b)(3), (b)(6) As far as I know, we had a
11	new one.
12	(b)(6) You do have a new one?
13	(b)(3),(b)(6) Right.
14	(b)(6) Okay. It's the new computer.
15	Okay, that's solved.
16	Then I just had one final question. I'd
17	like you to, if you could, reflect on, probably in
18	your mind, the most important contribution the C-2
19	made over the last 14 months, 15 months. If you could
20	tie it to something very specific, that would be
21	helpful, but just a reflection on your part as the C-
22	2.

maverick and tell you that I think I want to be a maverick and tell you that I think the -- I'm going to give you a general answer. Generally, I think we gave the Commander good insight into what was going on in terms of the very, very diverse threat, and the populace, I guess I would say, the Iraqi people and what they were thinking. So, yes, the threat. So we got some insight into that.

The specific thing, I think -- and there's been lots. So I'm on the spot. So I'm going to give you what I can come up with now. But the thing that comes to mind is that it was very obvious to us that the Awakening movements were real and that the Concerned Local Citizen program, if we stood it up, would work.

I think that counsel to the Commander, reinforcing what he thought, and this is all on Odierno. The recognition of Awakening Councils and seizing on the opportunity to do Concerned Local Citizens in response to that, that's all General Odierno with our insights: The Awakening is real; CLCs are working.

SECPET*

So that would be the one specific thing that came to mind. There is a very specific intel system out there, 14c and everything else, that gave us that, with some real good analysis, I would tell you.

Secondarily, another example, maybe equally important -- I don't now -- that contributed to that is that the surge has worked. In other words, that 30,000 troops would make a difference in terms of two things, combat power to do the things we talked about earlier, but the signal that it would send to both the enemy in terms of our resolve and it will have an effect on the enemy in terms of combat operations, and the reassurance to the population they would be protected, securing the population being the theme instead of transition for a while.

So those are two examples. I think -- and I don't want to speak for him, but I think General Odierno has incredible intuition as a commander, and one of the things that is helpful, I think, is to be able to take that intuition, that informed intuition, and confirm or deny it. Usually, it was confirming,

* SECRET *

because he is usually right, but you know, occasionally it was denying.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Those are two examples when I think we were able to feel good about his intuition, which he went with. In one case, politically sensitive to do it, in the case of the surge; and in another operationally risky to go with Awakening movements, trust them, and seize on them with CLCs.

(b)(6) Sure. Thank you.

(b)(3),(b)(6) One recent thing was an uptick in the infrastructure attacks, in particular on some of the electricity sites. Any reason from intelligence that that was organized --

(b)(3),(b)(6) I am not convinced there was an uptick. If you go back and do the analysis,

I'm convinced that -- Well, let me back up and tell you.

If you do the analysis, there are periods when -- from 2003 all the way to now, where there are spikes and, yes, there have been spikes. What happened, though, was that General Petraeus -- He resolved to do something about the infrastructure, you

* SECRET*

know, make things happen, made them even more significant.

So in other words, used to be -- I don't want to indict anybody, but we would just let the process work as far as repair and those kinds of things, but now we are making such progress in getting this infrastructure up that what used to be viewed as minor are now majors. You can't get the 46-inch pipeline, you can't get the right power line up and all -- it's a big deal to General Petraeus.

So I think that heightened the awareness that these infrastructure attacks were happening. They have always happened, and many times for locals.

Do I think there is a concerned effort?

No, I do not. If they really wanted to go do something debilitating, they can do it, and they really haven't. You know, it's potshots at the infrastructure when you get right down to it.

So I don't think it's concerning, but I think it has been -- It has hampered the progress they have made, the other side of that being that General Petraeus and General Odierno as the guy who's got to

* SECRET *

send forces out to help them and very proactive in repairing them, securing them, repairing them, and improving the infrastructure as well. So heightened awareness as opposed to more attacks or any kind of coordinated effort, in my opinion.

(b)(3),(b)(6) Can I get one more in here before we break? Task Force 14a and detained releases: I'm just wondering about what your thoughts are from an intelligence standpoint on the release of these detainees and how that impacts the fight, and are we actually seeing vigilante type action out there when they are released in areas where there is a strong CLC presence, for instance, or a strong community presence that didn't want them released?

recidivism, you know, but not as bad yet as some people have feared. We'll see how these increased releases go. However, the detainee release program has been good in some aspects when targeted. In other words, when we release detainees that will do good for us, we have guarantors and their intent is to go back and assist -- those very specific detainees have been

* SECRET *

helpful.

So you can make the detainee program work for you. I'm not saying every one of those was a good idea, but some were, and some are helpful. Some are not. So that's been -- You know, it has assisted in some ways with reconciliation. It has assisted in garnering support from the local populace, if you do certain detainees or sometimes certain numbers of detainees and those kinds of things.

There has been recidivism where you've had guys who have done significant attacks, who you go back and find have been released previously. So there's two sides to the coin.

(b)(3), (b)(6)

Thanks very much.

That concludes this interview.

* SECRET *