CBSNEWS.com HOME

Text Of Bush Pentagon Statement
WASHINGTON, May 10, 2004

Below is the text of President Bush's remarks Monday at the Pentagon about Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and the fighting in Iraq, as transcribed by the White House:

…Third, because America is committed to the equality and dignity of all people, there will be a full accounting for the cruel and disgraceful abuse of Iraqi detainees. The conduct that has come to light is an insult to the Iraqi people, and an affront to the most basic standards of morality and decency. One basic difference between democracies and dictatorships is that free countries confront such abuses openly and directly.

In January, shortly after reports of abuse became known to our military, an investigation was launched. Today, several formal investigations led by senior military officials are under way. Secretary Rumsfeld has appointed several former senior officials to review the investigations of these abuses. Some soldiers have already been charged, and **those involved will answer for their conduct** in an orderly and transparent process. We will honor rule of law. All prison operations in Iraq will be thoroughly reviewed to make certain that such offenses are not repeated.

Those responsible for these abuses have caused harm that goes well beyond the walls of a prison. It has given some an excuse to question our cause and to cast doubt on our motives. Yet, who can doubt that Iraq is better for being free from one of the most bloodiest tyrants the world has ever known? Millions of Iraqis are grateful for the chance they have been given to live in freedom — a chance made possible by the courage and sacrifice of the United States military…

I understand the difficulty of the mission of our men and women in uniform. They're facing an enemy in sand and heat and blasting winds, often unable to tell friend from foe. I know how painful it is to see a small number dishonor the honorable cause in which so many are sacrificing. **What took place in the Iraqi prison does not reflect the character of the more than 200,000 military personnel who have served in Iraq since the beginning of Operation Iraqi Freedom.**

All Americans know the goodness and the character of the United States Armed Forces. No military in the history of the world has fought so hard and so often for the freedom of others. Today, our soldiers and sailors and airmen and Marines are keeping terrorists across the world on the run. They're helping the people of Afghanistan and Iraq build democratic societies. They're defending America with unselfish courage. And these achievements have brought pride and credit to this nation.

I want our men and women in uniform to know that America is proud of you, and that I'm honored to be your Commander-in-Chief.

Thank you.

Text Of Rumsfeld Opening Statement
WASHINGTON, May 7, 2004

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, in recent days there has been a good deal of discussion about who bears responsibility for the terrible activities that took place at Abu Ghraib. These events occurred on my watch. As secretary of defense, I am accountable for them and I take full responsibility.

It's my obligation to evaluate what happened, **to make sure that those who have committed wrongdoing are brought to justice**, and to make changes as needed to see that it doesn't happen again. I feel terrible about what happened to these Iraqi detainees. They are human beings. They were in U.S. custody. Our country had an obligation to treat them right. We didn't, and that was wrong.

So to those Iraqis who were mistreated by members of the U.S. armed forces, I offer my deepest apology. It was inconsistent with the values of our nation. **It was inconsistent with the teachings of the military, to the men and women of the armed forces. And it was certainly fundamentally un-American.**

Further, I deeply regret the damage that has been done. First to the reputation of the honorable men and women of the armed forces, who are courageously and responsibly and professionally defending our freedoms across the globe. They are truly wonderful human beings. And their families and their loved ones can be enormously proud of them.

Second to the president, the Congress and the American, I wish I had been able to convey to them the gravity of this before we saw it in the media.

And finally to the reputation of our country.

The photographic depictions of the U.S. military personnel that the public has seen have offended and outraged everyone in the Department of Defense. If you could have seen the anguished expressions on the faces of those in our department upon seeing those photos, you would know how we feel today.
It's important for the American people and the world to know that while **these terrible acts were perpetrated by a small number of U.S. military,** they were also brought to light by the honorable and responsible actions of other military personnel…

However terrible the setback, this is also an occasion to demonstrate to the world the difference between those who believe in democracy and in human rights, and those who believe in rule by terrorist code… Above all, ask them if the willingness of Americans to acknowledge their own failures before humanity doesn't light the world as surely as the great ideas and beliefs that made this nation a beacon of hope and liberty for all who strive to be free.

We know what the terrorists will do; we know they will try to exploit all that is bad, and try to obscure all that is good. That's their nature. And that's the nature of those who think they can kill innocent men, women and children to gratify their own cruel wills to power. We say to the world, we will strive to do our best, as imperfect as it may be.

On Tuesday, ***60 Minutes II*** asked Brig. Gen. Mark Kimmitt, deputy director of coalition operations in Iraq, what went wrong:

"Frankly, I think all of us are disappointed by the actions of the few," says Kimmitt. "Every day, we love our soldiers, but frankly, some days we're not always proud of our soldiers."

For decades under Saddam Hussein, many prisoners who were taken to the Abu Ghraib prison never came out. It was the centerpiece of Saddam's empire of fear, and those prisoners who did make it out told nightmarish tales of torture beyond imagining – and executions without reason.

"What can the Army say specifically to Iraqis and others who are going to see this and take it personally," Rather asked Kimmitt, in an interview conducted by satellite from Baghdad.

"The first thing I'd say is we're appalled as well. These are our fellow soldiers. These are the people we work with every day, and they represent us. They wear the same uniform as us, and **they let their fellow soldiers down,"** says Kimmitt.

"Our soldiers could be taken prisoner as well. And we expect our soldiers to be treated well by the adversary, by the enemy. And if we can't hold ourselves up as an example of how to treat people with dignity and respect … We can't ask that other nations to that to our soldiers as well."

"So what would I tell the people of Iraq? **This is wrong. This is reprehensible. But this is not representative of the 150,000 soldiers that are over here,"** adds Kimmitt. "I'd say the same thing to the American people... **Don't judge your army based on the actions of a few.**"

One of the soldiers facing court martial is Army Reserve Staff Sgt. Chip Frederick.

Frederick is charged with maltreatment for allegedly participating in and setting up a photo, and for posing in a photograph by sitting on top of a detainee. He is charged with an indecent act for observing one scene. He is also charged with assault for allegedly striking detainees – and ordering detainees to strike each other.

60 Minutes II talked with him by phone from Baghdad, where he is awaiting court martial.

Frederick told us he will plead not guilty, claiming the way the Army was running the prison led to the abuse of prisoners.

"We had no support, no training whatsoever. And I kept asking my chain of command for certain things...like rules and regulations," says Frederick. "And it just wasn't happening."

Six months before he faced a court martial, Frederick sent home a video diary of his trip across the country. Frederick, a reservist, said he was proud to serve in Iraq. He seemed particularly well-suited for the job at Abu Ghraib. He's a corrections officer at a Virginia prison, whose warden described Frederick to us as "one of the best."

Frederick says Americans came into the prison: "We had military intelligence, we had all kinds of other government agencies, FBI, CIA ... All those that I didn't even know or recognize."

Frederick's letters and email messages home also offer clues to problems at the prison. He wrote that he was helping the interrogators:

"Military intelligence has encouraged and told us 'Great job.' "

"They usually don't allow others to watch them interrogate. But since they like the way I run the prison, they have made an exception."

"We help getting them to talk with the way we handle them. ... We've had a very high rate with our style of getting them to break. They usually end up breaking within hours."

According to the Army's own investigation, that's what was happening. The Army found that interrogators asked reservists working in the prison to prepare the Iraqi detainees, physically and mentally, for questioning.

What, if any actions, are being taken against the interrogators?

"I hope the investigation is including not only the people who committed the crimes, but some of the people that might have encouraged these crimes as well," says Kimmitt. "Because they certainly share some level of responsibility as well."

But so far, none of the interrogators at Abu Ghraib are facing criminal charges. In fact, a number of them are civilians, and military law doesn't apply to them.

Attorney Gary Myers and a judge advocate in Iraq are defending Frederick. They say he should never have been charged, because of the failure of his commanders to provide proper training and standards.

"The elixir of power, the elixir of believing that you're helping the CIA, for God's sake, when you're from a small town in Virginia, that's intoxicating," says Myers. "And so, good guys sometimes do things believing that they are being of assistance and helping a just cause. ... And helping people they view as important."

Frederick says he didn't see a copy of the Geneva Convention rules for handling prisoners of war until after he was charged.

The Army investigation confirms that soldiers at Abu Ghraib were not trained at all in Geneva Convention rules. And most were reservists, part-time soldiers who didn't get the kind of specialized prisoner of war training given to regular Army members.

Frederick also says there were far too few soldiers there for the number of prisoners: "There was, when I left, there was over 900. And there was only five soldiers, plus two non-commissioned officers, in charge for those 900 -- over 900 inmates."

Rather asked Kimmitt about understaffing. "That doesn't condone individual acts of criminal behavior no matter how tired we are. No matter how stretched we are, that doesn't give us license and it doesn't give us the authority to break the law," says Kimmitt.

"That may have been a contributing factor, but at the end of the day, this is probably more about leadership, supervision, setting standards, abiding by the Army values and understanding what's right, and having the guts to say what's right."

Kimmitt says the Army will not let what happened at Abu Ghraib just pass. What does he think is the most important thing for Americans to know about what has happened?

"I think two things. No. 1, **this is a small minority of the military**, and No. 2, they need to understand that is not the Army," says Kimmitt. "The Army is a values-based organization. We live by our values. Some of our soldiers every day die by our values, and **these acts that you see in these pictures may reflect the actions of individuals, but by God, it doesn't reflect my army.**"

Mailbag: Court Martial In Iraq
April 29, 2004

As the sister of a brother who just returned from a year long tour in Iraq, and the wife of a warrant officer currently serving in Iraq, I am disgusted with the soldiers' treatment of Iraqi prisoners. I'm not sure why, but I was especially shocked by the female soldier's behavior. These soldiers bring dishonor to our country. I would be disappointed and ashamed of my husband and brother if I ever discovered that they treated another human being in that manner.
... At some point, these soldiers need to accept responsibility for their actions. It is not the Army's fault. Being prior military, I know I was taught to bring honor and respect to my country. These soldiers should be sent to prison and dishonorably discharged from the military.
--T. Schurr

There is no excuse for this action. I don't care about the Geneva Convention. We should treat any prisoners as we would want to have been treated. It is called being humane. I don't want to hear any excuses about "no guidelines." Anyone involved in this, including the female commander, should be brought before a tribunal, dishonorably discharged and stripped of all benefits. What a blot to our country. I am so ashamed of us.
--Smagnuson

The reservist charged with the atrocities at the Iraqi prison, who works as a civilian prison guard, needs to be investigated for his treatment of American prisons here at home. It's obvious that he has no standards of decency and doesn't know the appropriate ways to treat prisoners. After he serves his court martial sentence, he should face the same charges that Saddam will face for crimes against humanity.

Saying that he didn't have the Geneva Rules of Convention is no excuse for the atrocities that he participated in. People have basic human rights even if they are prisoners. Even though his family may suffer, he knew the difference between right and wrong.
--Craig Whitehead

I'm shocked that the tone of this story seems to be trying to help this particular staff sergeant make excuses for his personal conduct. Bottom line is that there is no excuse for an individual to pose for the kind of pictures that that Staff Sgt. Frederick coordinated and participated in. He needs to be held accountable for his personal actions.
In my entire military career, I never ran into any soldier that would have any doubt as to just how inappropriate and unlawful something like this is -- and the excuse that he wasn't properly trained just doesn't cut it. Please don't help this individual try to blame others for misconduct of this nature. The soldiers involved need to be held accountable for their actions.
--Ret. Lt. Col. Mike Dorohovich

To say they never had a Geneva Convention book is no excuse for what these soldiers did. Lack of humanity is what these soldiers had. No one deserves to be stripped and made fun of for someone's cruel pleasure. There is always a rotten apple somewhere in the barrel. I am sure the court martials will pass out the punishment they deserve.
--Marsha C. Whittaker

Social Psychologists' Perspectives

Op Ed Essay

Philip G. Zimbardo

[Zimbardo is emeritus professor of psychology at Stanford University; his Stanford Prison Experiment is found on www.prisonexp.org]

Pathological Power of Prisons: Parallel Paths at Stanford and Baghdad

The horrifying photos of young Iraqi men abused by young American men and women have shocked the world in their vivid depiction of human degradation, just as did the explosive televised images of the terrorists' destruction of the World Trade Center on September, 11th. The "unthinkable" became imaginable in both scenarios. We realized then that some people hated America enough to commit suicide in the process of killing thousands of innocent victims and demolishing cherished national symbols. But instead of asking the "Why" question, to try to understand how this could have happened, our leaders asked only the "Who" question. That person-centered framing motivated the search-and-destroy mission for those evil individuals responsible for spreading terror in our homeland. But we are no closer to understanding the conditions that breed terrorism, so that we can work to prevent or modify them.

Now we are forced to acknowledge that some of our beloved soldiers have committed barbarous acts of cruelty and sadism when they should have been on a mission of maintaining law, order, and democracy, and modeling the best of American values. Again, there is the same rush to the person-centered analysis of human behavior, which blames flawed or pathological individuals for evil and ignores the host of contributing factors in the situation in which they were embedded. Unless we learn the dynamics of "Why," we will never be able to counteract the powerful systemic forces that can transform ordinary people into evil perpetrators.

It is easy and expedient for the military brass to point accusing fingers at the soldiers identified as the culprits in this abuse. Similarly, the President and his staff have weighed in with the pledge to get "to the bottom of this." I believe rather, it is time to get to the top of this ugly affair. We need to focus on the root causes of this abuse of power by all those implicated -- starting with the President and all his men. Of course, those responsible should suffer severe sanctions if found guilty upon careful investigation by an impartial non-military team. However, we must separate guilt from blame.

Should these few Army reservists be blamed as the "bad apples" in a good barrel of American soldiers, as our leaders have rushed to characterize them? Or, are they the once-good apples who have been soured and corrupted by an evil barrel? For me, that evil barrel is filled with the vinegar of needless war and maintained by infusions of deceptive rhetoric from those charged with guiding these soldiers. I argue for the latter situational perspective on evil after having engaged for decades in systematically studying the conditions that

can induce good people to do bad things to others.

Like Brigadier General Janis Karpinski, who was in charge of the Iraqi prison at Abu Ghraib, I was once a prison superintendent with no experience or training in corrections. My guards soon began doing terrible things to their prisoners that were comparable to many of the reports of the horrors inflicted on the Iraqi citizens, who were being detained, in "pre-trial detention," for vague security reasons, without recourse to legal counsel or family. My guards repeatedly stripped their prisoners naked, hooded them, chained them, denied them food or bedding privileges, put them into solitary for the least infractions of arbitrary rules, made them clean toilet bowls with their bare hands, and then things got worse. As the boredom of their job got to some of the guards, they began using the prisoners as their playthings, devising ever more humiliating and degrading games for them to play. Over time, these amusements took a sexual turn, such as having the prisoners simulate sodomy on each other. Once aware of such deviant behavior, I closed down the Stanford prison. Perhaps the military should follow suit in Iraq.

My prison has come to be known as the Stanford Prison Experiment, in which ordinary, intelligent college student volunteers filled the ranks of randomly assigned prisoners and guards. Although everyone knew it was just an experiment and all participants were other students from all over the U. S. and Canada, the line between simulation and reality was breached, as it became a psychological prison of incredible intensity. The planned two-week study had to be terminated after only six days because it was out of control. Good boys chosen for their normality were having emotional breakdowns, as powerless prisoners in a setting that made them feel totally helpless and hopeless. Other young men chosen for their mental health and history of positive values eased into the character of sadistic guards, able to inflict suffering on their fellow students without moral compunction. And those guards who did not personally debase the prisoners failed to confront the worst of their comrades, they were good guards by looking the other way and allowing emerging evil to ripen.

Human behavior is much more under the control of situational forces than most of us recognize or want to acknowledge. In a novel situation that implicitly gives permission for suspension of usual moral values, many of us can be morphed into creatures alien to our usual natures. My research, and that of my social psychological colleagues, has catalogued the conditions for stirring the crucible of human nature in negative directions. Some of the necessary ingredients are: diffusion of responsibility, anonymity, dehumanization, peers who model harmful behavior, bystanders who do not intervene, and a setting of power differentials.

Those situational processes were apparently also operating in that little Iraqi shop of horrors. But in addition, there was secrecy, no accountability, no visible chain of command, conflicting demands on the guards from civilian interrogators, no clear rules enforced for prohibited acts, encouragement for breaking the will of the detainees, and no challenges by bystanders who observed the evil but did not blow the whistle. Understanding the How of this evil does not excuse the What, just as blaming the Who avoids understanding both

the How and the Why.

We must learn from this tragic event some lessons essential for not repeating it. And we must not permit the authorities to deflect the blame and responsibility that they must share for these terrible acts by pointing accusing fingers at those sweet apples who went into the administration's pre-emptive war as proud Americans and return as disgraced, sadistic prison guards. The arrogance of power that spawned the "shock and awe" of military might has been humbled by the dismay and disgust over these revelations of abuse. It is time for all Americans to reflect deeply on the justification for continuing the war in Iraq that is killing, maiming and demeaning our young men and women who have been put in harm's way for spurious reasons.

Pressure to Go Along With Abuse Is Strong, but Some Soldiers Find Strength
to Refuse

May 14, 2004
By ANAHAD O'CONNOR

The images of prisoner abuse still trickling out of Iraq show a side of human behavior that psychologists have sought to understand for decades. But the murky reports of a handful of soldiers who refused to take part bring to light a behavior psychologists find even more puzzling: disobedience. Buried in his report earlier this year on Abu **Ghraib** prison in Iraq, Maj. Gen. Antonio M. Taguba praised the actions of three men who tried to stop the mistreatment of Iraqi detainees. They are nowhere to be seen in the portraits of brutality that have touched off outrage around the world.

Although details of their actions are sketchy, it is known that one soldier, Lt. David O. Sutton, put an end to one incident and alerted his commanders. William J. Kimbro, a Navy dog handler, "refused to participate in improper interrogations despite significant pressure" from military intelligence, according to the report. And Specialist Joseph M. Darby gave military police the evidence that sounded the alarm.

In numerous studies over the past few decades, psychologists have found that a certain percentage of people simply refuse to give in to pressure - by authorities or by peers - if they feel certain actions are wrong.

The soldiers have been reluctant to elaborate on what they saw and why they came forward. In an interview with The Virginian-Pilot in Norfolk, Va., Lieutenant Sutton, a Newport News police sergeant, said, "I don't want to judge, but yes, I witnessed something inappropriate and I reported it."

The public will assume that there was widespread corruption, he told another local paper, "when in reality, it's just one bad apple."

In the noted experiment 40 years ago when Dr. Stanley Milgram showed that most people will deliver a lethal dose of electricity to another

subject if instructed to do so by a scientist in a white lab coat, a minority still said no.

"These people are rare," said Dr. Elliot Aronson, a professor of psychology at the University of California, Santa Cruz, who studies social influence. "It's really hard for us to predict in advance who is going to resist by looking at things like demographic data or religious background."

The men singled out by General Taguba dissented despite the threat of being ridiculed or even court-martialed for not following orders. Psychologists believe they may have been guided by a strong moral compass and past experiences with conformity.

"It is sometimes the case that they themselves have been scapegoated or turned on by the crowd, "said Dr. John Darley, a professor of psychology and public affairs at Princeton. "If you go back into the lives of these people you can often find some incident that has made very vivid to them the pressures of conformity working on the others in the group."

People who break from the crowd to blow the whistle, history shows, are often the most psychologically distanced from the situation. In 1968, Hugh Thompson, a helicopter pilot, was flying over Vietnam as G.I.'s were killing civilians. The soldiers on the ground had been told that the vilage, My Lai, was a Vietcong stronghold. But from above Mr. Thompson could see there was no enemy fire. He landed his helicopter, rescued some villagers, and told his commanders about the massacre.

What happened there, and what ocurred at Abu **Ghraib**, Dr. Darley said, was a slow escalation.

Referring to reports that the guards were told to "soften up" the prisoners for interrogation, he said that it apparently "drifted more and more toward humiliation."

"Perhaps they thought they were doing the right thing, he said. "But someone who didn't get caught up at the start, someone who walks in and hasn't been involved in the escalation, like the pilot Thompson, can see the process for what it really is."

Mr. Thompson was supported by his gunner, Larry Colburn, who helped him round up civilians and radioed for help.
It is not clear when the three men cited in General Taguba's report tried to interfere with the interrogations or whether they had contact with one another. But a transcript of a court-martial hearing on May 1 suggests that additional officers who knew one another also tried to pass reports of the scandal up the chain of command.

Dr. Solomon E. Asch showed in experiments on compliance half a century ago that people are more likely to break from a group if they have an ally. Subjects in his experiment were asked to look at different lines on a card and judge their lengths. Each subject was unknowingly placed in a group of "confederates" who deliberately chose a line that was obviously wrong. About a third of the time, the subjects would give in and go along with the majority.

But if one confederate broke from the group and gave another answer, even a wrong answer, the subjects were more likely to give the response they knew was correct.

"The more you feel support for your dissent, the more likely you are to do it," said Dr. Danny Axsom, an associate professor of psychology at Virginia Tech.

A lack of supervision, which General Taguba pointed out in his report, and confusion over the chain of command, Dr. Axsom said, may have also emboldened the three soldiers.

"There was less perceived legitimacy," he said. "If it's clear who the authority is, then you're more likely to obey. If it's not, then the legitimacy of the whole undertaking is undermined."

The power to resist coercion reflects what psychologists call internal locus of control, or the ability to determine one's own destiny. People at the other end of the scale, with external locus of control, are more heavily influenced by authority figures. They prefer to put their fate in the hands of others.

"If they fail a test, it's the teacher's fault; if they do poorly at a job, it's the boss's fault," said Dr. Thomas Ollendick, a professor of psychology at Virginia Tech. "They put the blame for everything outside of themselves. They are high in conformity because they believe someone else in charge."

The average person, research shows, falls somewhere in the middle of the scale. People who voluntarily enlist in the military, knowing they will take orders, Dr. Ollendick suggested, may be more likely to conform. "These are people who are being told what to do," he said. "The ones who are conforming from the outset feel they can't change the system they're in. Those who blow the whistle can go above the situation and survive. They can basically endure whatever negative consequences might come from their actions."