

Exhibit D-b

#19

Written Statement to CSRT

Meeting #4 with PR#4

Tuesday, 20 Feb 07

(Translated and type-written from hand-written statement from #19)

Titled: Answer to the Evidence

- I. It is my opinion that points a, b, c, f, i, j are not in accordance with the definition of an enemy combatant because:
 - a. Points a, b, c, f all deal with or are connected with the bombing of churches
 - i. They occurred in 2000 before the "war on terrorism" was declared
 - ii. The victims of the churches were not Americans, Europeans, Australians or other foreigners
 - iii. The communal violence between Muslims and Christians that was usually occurring began after the fall of President Soeharto and did not only consist of the church bombings but on the part of Christians who killed Muslims and set fire to them after taking shelter in a mosque
 - iv. The Taliban and al Qaida were not mixed up in this conflict
 - b. With regard to point b, it is written "Singapore operation against the US embassy" -- I have never discussed this matter at all
 - c. With regard to point ~~e~~, the first time that I heard of the Malaysia Mujahadin group was after 9/11 from Malaysian newspapers. For years before that I lived in Malaysia and I never heard or never read about MMG. I do not know who they are. Is it true they really exist or are they made up. I only heard about them from stories in the mass media and partly from propaganda. Because of that, I am surprised that I am accused of being the head of MMG. At the same time the existence of this group is in question and I have never read in the mass media or no one else has said that the goal of the MMG was to overthrow the government of Indonesia.
 - d. With regard to point j, Al-Ghuraba is only a study group for Malaysian students and only has a few members. It is not connected with the development of Jemaah Islamiyah (JI) in Pakistan. So I think

#19

20 Feb 07, Updated 8 Mar 07

1

15-L-1645/DOD/68

Exhibit D-b

that this point above does not have anything to do with the interest of America or its allies.

- II. Points d, h, I I have never heard of these 3 things whatsoever.
- a. Point d
- i. Usually if someone is the supervisor of something, he understands the method of work from a to z in whatever matter he is the supervisor of. If you ask me about where the embassy was, what its address was, color of the building, the shape of the building, how tall the walls were, how many exits and entrances there were, what time they started work, what time the office closed, how many kilometers distant were the three embassies from each other, how many security guards there were and so on. I cannot answer all of these questions let alone to be able to go into greater detail. Why don't I know? Because I was never the supervisor of the above planning.
- b. Point h
- i. In order to carry out the planning as written in point h, I would need to have a lot of skills and manpower would be needed and even more to carry this out in several different countries that have different levels of security. It would really be a difficult endeavor and we would need many different things to support these activities. Meanwhile, in 2000, I had already resigned from the JI and I no longer participated in the activities of the JI and no longer knew anything about the development of the JI except from the mass media. After 9/11 many people were captured and imprisoned. So how would it be possible for me to discuss this large undertaking with them that I myself was not capable of doing or carrying out because I did not have the friends and the skills and the other things that were needed.
 - ii. I never possessed explosives in any form whatsoever and I do not know where to buy or how to buy explosives because that was not my work.
- c. Point I
- i. Regarding the charge in this point, this is also something new to me. I don't know anything about a document like that when I was captured and I am not an expert bomb maker. I remember one charge that was almost the same when I was interrogated in the CIA prison. There was one interrogator who showed me a document that contained some kind of a rudimentary plan for

Exhibit D-b

some kind of operation but I don't remember all of the contents of that document. I only remember that it was about carrying explosives from Mombassa to Pakistan and also then buying a 4x4 vehicle and so on until there was an explosion. That document was written in the computer. The interrogator said that document was found in my apartment when I was arrested. I replied that I had never had any document like that. In addition to that, it was written on the computer and you know that I do not have a computer. He replied that wasn't important. What was important was the contents like that. I kept repeating no and it was true that I did not have any kind of document like that. Then he gave me a night to think it over and remember. When I returned to and I was in my cell, I tried to remember but I still thought that I did not have that document. And that I remembered that maybe this was a kind of trap because this matter was something that could happen anywhere and is usually found in fiction or in non-fiction and it was a classic trick. The next day the interrogator asked me again. I still replied no a number of times. After that I was not asked about this document again even up until the time I left the CIA prison and I was not tortured or given a sentence for this matter. Just like that, I have never been questioned about this point and after that I think it was a trap. A few months after that there was another interrogator after I was taken to another country, he showed me another document that was different but he did not say it was from my apartment. That document contained a schedule of activities of the JI. It was written in Malay and used the kind of phrases usually used by JI members. It also referred to the locations usually used by the JI in peninsular Malaysia. But in other respects there were a lot of differences. I told the interrogator that this was not a JI document and I am convinced it was not something that the JI had. Then he told me to examine it again in my cell. After I read it over repeatedly I became increasingly convinced that it was not a JI document. A few days later, he questioned me again and I said it was not a JI document even though it imitated the style and the locations. After that I was not questioned about this document again.

III. Point e

Exhibit D-b

- a. Before this, I have never heard of the term "Singapore plot". If there is something involved in this story, I don't know for sure if it is like that or if it is different. I think that the person referred to in this point is not me.

IV. Point g

- a. When I was in Cambodia around the middle of the day, it was the first time I heard of the Bali bombing from the mass media. It is difficult for others to believe I was not involved in this operation but the truth is I was not involved. Even though I am an Indonesian, I have never been to Bali for any reason at all. And as I have stated in point h, since 2000 I have not been active in the JI. Earlier I have considered asking for testimony from a witness from someone who was involved in that operation but there are several reasons that make for problems and I think this will be difficult. My thoughts on why this is so difficult for a witness to attend are in this answer below.

V. Point k

- a. As far as I know in the JI there is no special department that is called head of operations of JI and I have never been selected by anyone to be the head of operations. So as far as this matter is concerned it is not I, there are other people more suited for that work. Also, I have never felt as the point man of al Qaida in South East Asia. Usually the person who is called the head of operations or another important person is protected by bodyguards who are strong and big or at least they are protected by a circle of comrades all ready to die. And also they have people who are always assessing the situation and getting information or have other things that they need. While I don't have any of those things at all. One proof of that is when I was arrested at that place and at that time there was only myself and my wife that were arrested. I was at the office apartment ground floor and my wife was above on the 6th floor. There were no bodyguards or comrades to help us. I think that this matter is like the one in Point i. I have read in the mass media all kinds of rumors like that, also all kinds of accusations that I am the big fish, the most wanted man in Asia and things like that. If people ask why it is like that, it was because when my comrades were captured I was still free and in hiding so many people thought that Hambali had this and had that, did this and did that so they frightened themselves and made other people panic. You should know that the members of JI in Malaysia and Singapore were

Exhibit D-b

arrested under the provisions of the internal security act (ISA) without being judged in court.

VI. Witnesses

- a. To be sure in order to prove the truth of some matter evidence or witnesses are needed or some other method like that that can be accepted. In order to select witnesses that are relevant or irrelevant is a little difficult for me. In the case of matters that have already occurred, such as the Bali bombing it is easy because just ask someone who was involved in the operation so that they can provide testimony as to whether I was involved or not. But for those things that haven't happened yet it is somewhat difficult because maybe it is still in the imagination or is a rough idea or is just some idle talk while drinking tea or somebody else is just saying this or that or part of it is a story from a, part from b, part from c, and so on. So then it is all put together and becomes a complete story and scares someone. To select a witness that is relevant in a matter like this is difficult for me because that person may have already forgotten and so forth. But there are other matters which make it difficult for me to request written testimony from a witness and the reasons are as follows:
 - i. It has been about 3.5 years since I've been in jail and I don't know anymore about how these people are or what their condition is. In order for them to become a witness for me, it is obvious that I need to know that they are in good condition because in 3.5 years those people may have changed.
 - ii. Maybe they are afraid because if they hear about Guantanamo or the CIA and that they are going to be a witness for Hambali they don't want to take the risk. This is even more so if these people have been previously arrested or are still in detention.
 - iii. And thirdly, I think that there is information that is most important, that is that after 3.3 years of being imprisoned my contacts with my family have been broken and after 3 months I have been in jail on Guantanamo island I got my first letter from my wife via the ICRC (International Committee of the Red Cross). The first time I saw that letter I was surprised because that letter was not written by my wife. It was written by someone else. I do not know who wrote it. Since my wife is not illiterate I know what her writing looks like because we have not been together for one or two days but for years. And also, I know how she would write because I know the character

Exhibit D-b

of my wife just as other people know their wives. Considering my position now as a detainee I am going to say this is "fake letter" for the following reasons:

1. I am 100% sure it is not my wife's writing.
2. If you look at the writing in the first page, it is not the same as the writing on the 2nd page. And it is written with a different color pen. Usually the writer of something who sends it and the one who receives the message as well as the message has it written by the same person.
3. On the first page the name of the sender is NUR ALWIZAH which is written in capital letters. But then on the upper right-hand corner, KUA Ref No: KUA TA 2006/09 RCM 06/1019 is written. But then in the column of the receiver there is (US-10019). I think that all of this was written by the same person because the method of writing the capital letters U and A inside NUR ALWIZAH and the letter U and A in the Reference Number and also the U in the column for the recipient are all the same and were written in the same color pen. Usually the sender doesn't know the reference number only the ICRC official knows it, just as when I wrote that letter I didn't know the reference number.
4. There is no address written for the sender.
5. On the 2nd page, the message that is written is not complete more or less only ¼ of a page. Usually when a person who hasn't met someone for a long time and misses them will write a complete page just as I did and my wife's message doesn't answer my questions. That message was written on a Malaysian ICRC form and in Malay. Even though it is like that, this is just my suspicion because it is obvious I can't further investigate the letter. And until now I haven't met the ICRC official again and I haven't gotten information from the ICRC regarding their true position on this letter. But what is certain it's not my wife's writing and when I met with the ICRC official the last time he said that the Jakarta ICRC representative had encountered some difficulties in Jakarta (that had to do with me). I did not ask him what

Exhibit D-b

were the problems but it was clear that the problems were from the Indonesian authorities. There was one message I received from Indonesia that had one oral request. I do not completely remember what it was but more or less it was like this "may you quickly be freed and be returned to Indonesia and don't forget the 5 times" (that means to pray 5 times every day). It was said that that request was from my younger brother. But according to me a request like that is very strange because it is not usual in my family to give advice like that. But that's my suspicion and not a conclusion. Finally now if I receive a message from outside, I have some doubts about it. You have to be very careful and investigate it and understand its true position, which is just the nature of mankind. I remain suspicious because imagine that if there is something like a personal message that is disturbing, what about something more important like testimony in order to determine my status as an enemy combatant or not and other matters. A matter like this makes it difficult for me to request written testimony from witnesses but on the other hand I also want to prove to you that what I am saying is the truth, and this is my dilemma. If I force an issue maybe this will be something that will make more problems for me than solve problems for me. Maybe with the second method of having the witnesses coming, this is a better method but I think there isn't anyone who wants to come to Guantanamo. They are afraid they will not return to their native place. At the time I do not understand the conditions outside, so I can't make any conclusions because it would be making conclusions without supporting information that is true and so it would only make further problems for me. So this is my answer to the evidence above based on my ability now in this condition.