

Haspel Hearing Testimony -- Rodriguez Quotes and Other Facts -- Side by Side

HASPEL HEARING, MAY 9

WYDEN: *According to a press story today about the destruction of the interrogation video tapes, Jose Rodriguez told you in advance that he was going to take matters into his own hands. Did that conversation happen?*

HASPEL: *Senator, no. It did not. Mr. Rodriguez indicated to me that he planned to discuss it with the then Director Goss.*

JOSE RODRIGUEZ, AS REPORTED, MAY 9

JOSE RODRIGUEZ: *"I met with Gina and I told Gina, 'I'm going to make this decision myself.'"*¹

Haspel Hearing Testimony	<u>Rodriguez</u>
<p>[To Burr] Mr. Rodriguez asked me to prepare a cable [Note: Cable drafted on Nov. 7, per Senator Warner] because <u>he was going to have another conversation with the director of the agency to talk about this issue again.</u></p> <p>WYDEN: According to a press story today about the destruction of the interrogation video tapes, Jose Rodriguez told you in advance that he was going to take matters into his own hands. Did that conversation happen?</p> <p>HASPEL: <u>Senator, no. It did not. Mr. Rodriguez indicated to me that he planned to discuss it with the then Director Goss.</u></p>	<p>On Thursday, Nov. 3, the day after The Washington Post story, Brinkema again ordered the government to search for video or audio of captured militants.</p> <p>As the pressures mounted, Rodriguez had an epiphany. "I finally came to the realization that <u>nobody was going to make this decision for us,</u>" he recalled in an interview. "<u>Not the director. Not John Rizzo. Not the White House. Who are we kidding? This thing would just go on.</u>"</p> <p>Back at his seventh-floor office at CIA headquarters, Rodriguez conveyed his realization to Haspel. "<u>I met with Gina and I told Gina, 'I'm going to make this decision myself. Who are we kidding? No one is going</u></p>

¹ "Haspel, Spies and Videotape," ProPublica, May 9, 2018. <https://www.propublica.org/article/haspel-spies-and-videotape>

<p>[To King] HASPEL: I explained that Mr. Rodriguez wanted to get resolution on this issue and that <u>he was planning to have a conversation with the director about it</u> and he needed to have revalidation of those two points.</p> <p>HASPEL: I was aware that there were some objections and that is why that <u>Jose was going to go back to the Director.</u></p>	<p><u>to make the decision.</u> People are just kicking the can down the road.”</p>
<p>[to Burr] HASPEL: I asked him if he had had the <u>consultation with the director</u> at the time <u>as planned</u> and he said he decided to take the decision on his own authority.</p>	<p>“She was concerned that I was taking this risk on my own — that I was putting myself in this situation,” Rodriguez recalled. “<u>She didn’t say, ‘Don’t do it.’</u> She may have thought I was going to talk to more people about it before hitting ‘send,’ but <u>I had made up my mind that I was going to follow through.</u>”</p>
<p>[to Warner] Senator Warner, what I recall were the security issues surrounding the tapes. <u>I don't recall pending legislation.</u></p> <p>[to King] HASPEL: Senator, I don't believe in the directorate of operations front office we were aware of legislation; the lawyers may have been aware. I do not believe we were aware.</p>	<p>From May 9 article: “As the Senate debated what would become known as the Detainee Treatment Act, Sen. Carl Levin, the Michigan Democrat who chaired the Armed Services Committee, also began pushing for a non-partisan commission that would examine the treatment of terror detainees — including by the CIA. As the proposal gained support, Rizzo warned his colleagues that such an inquiry would ‘obviously surface the tapes’ existence.”</p>
<p>KING: Final question, was a matter of coincidence that you -- that this decision was made to destroy the tapes in the same week the two major stories appeared in American newspapers. The Levin Amendment was being considered in the McCain amendment was on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Was it a mere coincidence that that was after three years of delay, the decision was taken to destroy the tapes.</p> <p>HASPEL: Senator, I don't believe in the directorate of operations front office we</p>	<p>From May 9 article: “Around the same time, officials said, The Washington Post informed the agency that it was preparing an extensive report on the black sites. Rodriguez was among those enlisted to try to dissuade the paper from publishing some details, but the story appeared on Nov. 2, and it <u>sent shock waves through CIA headquarters.</u></p> <p>‘It was something only <u>a little bit less than a full nuclear explosion,</u>’ one former senior official recalled.”</p>

<p>were aware of legislation; the lawyers may have been aware. I do not believe we were aware.</p> <p>KING: There's a broader question, not -- not legislation. I'm talking about stories in the newspapers. There was a great deal of public interest just that week in the whole interrogation question. Were you aware of that when you made this decision?</p> <p>HASPEL: Senator, <u>I do not recall being aware of that.</u></p>	
	<p>Other facts that demonstrate Haspel did not anticipate that Rodriguez was only going to go forward with permission from the Director:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not show draft cable destroying the tapes to Office of General Counsel (OGC) lawyers • Asked CTC lawyers (not OGC) if Rodriguez had the authority to destroy the tapes <i>on his own</i>. • Did not include OGC on coordination line • No explanation as to why Rodriguez would need a draft cable ordering the tapes destroyed to discuss the issue with the Director
	<p>Rodriguez Memoir:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discusses preparing to order the tapes destroyed in his memoir. Nowhere does he suggest that he intended to discuss the issue again with Director Goss.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discusses Haspel’s role and her draft cable in detail. Never suggests that they had any misunderstanding about his intentions.
	<p>Morell Review:</p> <p>Merely repeats Haspel’s “claims” of a misunderstanding with Rodriguez. The reason for the absence of corroboration now appears clear.</p> <p>“Ms. Haspel claims – incorrectly, as it turned out – that Mr. Rodriguez was going to obtain approval from the Director Goss before releasing the cable and that she took action after the release of the cable to ascertain from Mr. Rodriguez whether he had obtained that approval.”</p>