

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Torture and other abuses come in different shapes and forms. Centuries ago, the methods of mistreatment were more transparent and overtly violent. Today, medieval devices like the rack and the screw have largely been replaced by less conspicuous methods such as prolonged isolation, sensory deprivation, and indefinite confinement without charge. While these new tactics do not necessarily leave visible marks, the pain and damage they inflict is just as pernicious, just as damaging, and just as illegal.

For nearly five years, Plaintiff Ali Saleh Kahlah Almarri (“Mr. Almarri”) has been imprisoned without charge in virtual isolation at the U.S. Naval Consolidated Brig (“the Brig”) near Charleston, South Carolina. Mr. Almarri was initially held completely *incommunicado* and subjected to a brutal interrogation regime. Complaint (“Compl.”) ¶¶ 34-38, 50-52, 68-73; Certification of Andrew J. Savage, III (“Savage Cert.”) ¶¶ 23-25, attached hereto as Exhibit A. He was forced to endure painful stress positions, extreme sensory deprivation, and threats of violence and death. The window in Mr. Almarri’s cell was deliberately obscured so that no natural light could enter and so that Mr. Almarri could not see the world outside. Compl. ¶ 45; Savage Cert. ¶ 11. Mr. Almarri was also denied all books and news, prevented from practicing his religion, and denied items as basic as water, soap, clothing, and toilet paper. Compl. ¶¶ 53-56, 74-87, 89-99; Savage Cert. ¶¶ 16, 18-21, 30-31. Matters became so grave that Mr. Almarri began to feel he was losing his mind and faced an imminent mental breakdown. Compl. ¶¶ 108-111; Savage Cert. ¶¶ 37-47.

In August 2005, Mr. Almarri commenced this lawsuit to remedy these cruel, unlawful, and barbaric conditions of confinement. Only then—with his claims of mistreatment before a federal court—did conditions begin to improve, albeit gradually and unevenly. *Savage Cert.* ¶¶ 48-53. None of these improvements, however, alters these fundamental facts.

First, Mr. Almarri still remains in virtual isolation, denied any meaningful contact with his family or the world outside except for his attorneys and occasional visits by the International Committee for the Red Cross (“ICRC”). Mr. Almarri has not spoken to his wife, his five children (two sons aged 7 and 14; and three daughters aged 9 and twins aged 11), or his elderly parents since he was confined at the Brig. Correspondence by mail, the only form of communication with immediate family members available to Mr. Almarri, takes 10-12 months on average due to the government’s review process. *Id.* ¶¶ 54-59. Last year, the government took more than five months to review a DVD sent to Mr. Almarri by his family which contained pictures of Mr. Almarri’s wife and children, and updates on his family’s life back home. *Id.* ¶ 58. Further, Mr. Almarri’s access to news remains severely restricted, heightening his sense of isolation and feelings of despair. *Id.* ¶ 63. In addition, the government subjects Mr. Almarri’s access to religious texts to excessive delays and sometimes arbitrarily denies him that access altogether without explanation or basis. *Id.* ¶ 64.

Second, the government still maintains that everything Mr. Almarri receives down to the mattress and blanket in his cell is a “privilege.” As “privileges,” those items can be removed at will, as has happened repeatedly in the past. *Id.* ¶¶ 65-68. Deeming

everything a privilege not only facilitates manipulation of basic conditions for unlawful purposes, but also imposes unbearable psychological pressure. Mr. Almarri lives from day to day without knowing what new onerous conditions each day will bring.

Third, Mr. Almarri's continued isolation and other unlawful conditions of confinement are irreparably harming his health and jeopardizing his ability to participate meaningfully in his legal defense. *Id.* ¶¶ 69, 85-86; Declaration of Stuart Grassian, M.D. ("Grassian Decl.") at 15-17, attached hereto as Exhibit B. Recently, Mr. Almarri has exhibited marked signs of deterioration common to individuals subjected to isolation for long periods of time, and "[h]is ability to tolerate this confinement is clearly eroding severely." Grassian Decl. at 16; Savage Cert. ¶¶ 74-86. Although Mr. Almarri has not yet reached the "agitated, confusional, hallucinatory psychosis" that is the most severe consequence of prolonged isolation, his deterioration will worsen the longer he is held under current conditions, further endangering both his health and his ability to work with counsel. Grassian Decl. at 15-17.

In short, Mr. Almarri has been confined in virtual isolation at the Brig now for more than 1,700 days, suffering egregious abuses during much of that time. No person can continue to withstand that kind of deprivation of meaningful human contact without permanent damage. Mr. Almarri is no exception. His prolonged isolation and other unlawful conditions of confinement are irreparably harming his health and safety, endangering what remains of his psychological resilience, and jeopardizing his ability to participate meaningfully in his legal defense.

Mr. Almarri, accordingly, respectfully requests that the Court enter an interim order remedying his prolonged isolation and other unlawful conditions of confinement. At a minimum, that order should direct the government to allow Mr. Almarri regular (monitored) telephone calls with immediate family members (now in Saudi Arabia); ensure rapid processing of Mr. Almarri's correspondence with those family members (including letters and DVDs); grant Mr. Almarri unrestricted access to news (in newspapers, in magazines, and on television); and ensure Mr. Almarri's prompt access to religious texts for the exercise of his faith.¹

STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

June 2003 to October 2004

Mr. Almarri has been held in virtual isolation at the Brig since he was first imprisoned there as an "enemy combatant" on June 23, 2003, almost five years ago. Compl. ¶¶ 32-35; Savage Cert. ¶ 3. For the first sixteen months of his confinement at the Brig, Mr. Almarri was detained *incommunicado*. He was denied any contact with the world outside, including his family, his lawyers, and the ICRC. All requests to see, speak to, or communicate with Mr. Almarri were ignored or refused. Compl. ¶¶ 34-38, 50-52, 57-58; Savage Cert. ¶ 6. Mr. Almarri's only regular human contact during that period was with government officials during interrogation sessions, or with guards when they delivered trays of food through a slot in his cell door, escorted him to the shower, or took

¹ Undersigned counsel have repeatedly urged the government to take these steps to mitigate the harmful effects of Mr. Almarri's continued isolation. But the government has refused to do so.

him to a concrete cage for “recreation.” The guards had duct tape over their name badges and did not speak to Mr. Almarri except to give him orders. Savage Cert. ¶ 7.

Mr. Almarri was also subjected to brutal interrogation measures, including stress positions, prolonged exposure to extremely cold temperatures, extreme sensory deprivation, and threats of violence and death. Interrogators, for example, told Mr. Almarri they would send him to Egypt or to Saudi Arabia to be tortured and sodomized and forced to watch as his wife was raped in front of him. They also threatened to make Mr. Almarri disappear so that no one would know where he was. Compl. ¶¶ 68-71; Savage Cert. ¶¶ 23-25. On several occasions interrogators stuffed Mr. Almarri’s mouth with cloth and covered his mouth with heavy duct tape. The tape caused Mr. Almarri serious pain. One time, when Mr. Almarri managed to loosen the tape with his mouth, interrogators re-taped it even more tightly. Mr. Almarri started to choke until a panicked agent from the FBI or Defense Intelligence Agency removed the tape. Savage Cert. ¶ 29. In addition, for periods of up to eight days at a time, Mr. Almarri would be placed in a completely bare and cold cell simply for refusing to answer questions. When Mr. Almarri asked for extra clothing or a blanket because he was freezing, his requests were denied. *Id.* ¶ 24.

In addition, Mr. Almarri’s observance of Islam was restricted and degraded so severely that he could not adhere to the most basic tenets of his faith. He was denied water to purify himself and a prayer rug to kneel on when praying. Mr. Almarri was also denied a *kofî* to cover his head during prayer; when he used his shirt as a substitute, he was punished by having his shirt removed. Mr. Almarri was prohibited from knowing the

time of day or the direction of Mecca, which prevented him from praying properly, as Muslims must do five times a day. The only religious item that he was permitted was a Koran, and his copy of the Koran was sometimes taken away to facilitate interrogation and at other times degraded and abused. Compl. ¶¶ 74-87; Savage Cert. ¶¶ 19-21.

Mr. Almarri was also denied basic necessities, including adequate clothing, recreation, and hygienic items such as a toothbrush, toothpaste, soap, and toilet paper. Sometimes, the water to his cell was cut off for up to 20 days. If Mr. Almarri needed water to drink or to wash himself, he had to ring a buzzer. Brig staff often would not respond for several hours. Compl. ¶¶ 90-91; Savage Cert. ¶¶ 30-33.²

October 2004 to August 2005

In October 2004, Mr. Almarri was finally allowed access to counsel, even though that access initially was monitored and severely restricted, and even though the government refused to recognize that Mr. Almarri had a legal right of access to counsel (and still refuses to recognize that right to this day). Compl. ¶¶ 24-27, 65-67; Savage Cert. ¶¶ 6, 34-35.³ Although direct interrogations of Mr. Almarri ceased after he was finally allowed access to his lawyers, Mr. Almarri's conditions remained unbearably

² Mr. Almarri has been told that there are cabinets full of recordings documenting his interrogation and other treatment at the Brig. Savage Cert. ¶ 33. Although Mr. Almarri has sought discovery of those recordings and all other evidence of his interrogation and treatment at the Brig, the government has refused to provide it.

³ Initially, all meetings with counsel were tightly controlled by the Defense Intelligence Agency, whose agents remained in the room for the duration of every meeting. All meetings took place in a non-contact visitation room, and were video and audio recorded. Throughout the meeting, Mr. Almarri remained shackled around both his stomach and legs, and a chain was attached to the floor so that Mr. Almarri could not move his legs at all or bend his knees. All visits were time-restricted, and Mr. Almarri's counsel were debriefed by the Defense Intelligence Agency after each meeting. Savage Cert. ¶¶ 34-35.

brutal and harsh. Mr. Almarri continued to be confined to a 9 by 6 foot cell and denied regular opportunity for physical exercise. On those occasions when he was allowed the opportunity to exercise, that exercise took place either in an outdoor cage or indoors, where Mr. Almarri was kept in hand and leg irons. Compl. ¶¶ 37, 89; Savage Cert. ¶¶ 8-10.

The single window in Mr. Almarri's cell was darkened with an opaque covering that prevented Mr. Almarri from seeing the outside world or knowing the time of day. His cell had only a sink, toilet, and hardened (metal) bed affixed to the wall. Mr. Almarri had no chair on which to sit and no blanket, pillow, or any other soft item inside his cell. Compl. ¶¶ 41, 45; Savage Cert. ¶¶ 11, 13. For more than two years, Mr. Almarri was denied a mattress, causing him discomfort and pain whenever he lay down on the hard and jagged metal surface of his bed. He was finally given a thin mattress at night, but the mattress was removed every morning. As a result of these conditions, Mr. Almarri began to experience persistent tingling and pain in his leg, neck, and other parts of his body. When a doctor finally examined Mr. Almarri, the doctor said that Mr. Almarri should be given a foam mattress, a cushioned chair, and a table (to lean on when sitting to alleviate the pressure). But none of those items was provided, and Mr. Almarri continued to suffer. Compl. ¶¶ 43-44; Savage Cert. ¶¶ 14-15, 17.

On several occasions, Mr. Almarri was confined to his cell for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for months at a time. Once Mr. Almarri was forced to spend more than 20 days in his metal bed in his freezing cell, shivering under a thin, stiff "suicide blanket,"

unable even to stand because the floor was too cold and his socks and footwear had been taken away from him. Compl. ¶ 42; Savage Cert. ¶ 16.

Mr. Almarri also continued to be denied all external stimuli and physical, social, and temporal reference points, including all books, news, magazines, TV, and radio, increasing his sense of isolation and hopelessness. Compl. ¶¶ 37, 89; Savage Cert. ¶ 18. Over the course of his confinement, virtually every aspect of Mr. Almarri's physical environment was manipulated to cause disorientation, discomfort, and despair, from the temperature in his cell to loud noises and constant banging intended to wake him at night. Compl. ¶ 64; Savage Cert. ¶¶ 38-39.

Mr. Almarri's isolation and other conditions of confinement wore away his health and safety. Mr. Almarri became increasingly paranoid and unable to tolerate ordinary stimuli. For example, he repeatedly complained about an industrial fan that had been placed near the door of his cell and that remained on continuously. Mr. Almarri believed that the speed of the fan—and thus the volume of the sound it emitted—was adjusted to torment him. Compl. ¶ 47; Savage Cert. ¶ 42; Grassian Decl. at 9, 12. Mr. Almarri also believed noxious odors were being introduced into his cell, and began stuffing his vents with food to try to block the smell. As a result, Mr. Almarri would be declared “non-complaint” and punished with even harsher restrictions. Savage Cert. ¶ 41; Grassian Decl. at 12.

In early 2005, matters became so bad that Mr. Almarri started losing his grip on reality. He told his counsel he was losing his mind and spoke of possible imminent death. Savage Cert. ¶¶ 46-47.

August 2005 to Present

In August 2005, Mr. Almarri commenced this action challenging his conditions of confinement.⁴ Virtually the moment suit was filed, conditions began to improve, albeit slowly and unevenly. Mr. Almarri is now permitted to move about his cell block (though he remains the only prisoner there) and is given adequate time for recreation. *Id.* ¶¶ 49-50, 54. He now has a mattress in his cell all the time. *Id.* ¶ 50. Mr. Almarri's religious practices are no longer degraded, and he can conduct his daily prayers properly, though he continues to be denied religious texts important to his observance and study of Islam. *Id.* ¶¶ 51, 64. Attorney visits are now unsupervised and comfortable chairs are provided. Mr. Almarri is also allowed to speak with his attorneys by telephone. *Id.* ¶ 55. Recently, Mr. Almarri was provided with a computer. *Id.* ¶ 50.⁵

But none of these improvements changes the fundamental, irreducible fact that Mr. Almarri remains virtually isolated and devoid of all meaningful familial and social contact, and that this isolation is irreparably harming his health and safety.⁶ Mr. Almarri still has no contact or verbal communication with anyone outside the U.S. government other than his lawyers and representatives of the ICRC. *Id.* ¶¶ 54-55. Mr. Almarri's contact with his immediate family, who live in Saudi Arabia, is virtually non-existent.

⁴ Mr. Almarri had previously filed a separate habeas action in July 2004 challenging the lawfulness of his detention as an "enemy combatant." That case is currently pending before the full Fourth Circuit. *See Almarri v. Wright*, 487 F.3d 160 (4th Cir. 2007), *rehearing en banc granted sub nom. Almarri v. Pucciarelli* (argued Oct. 31, 2007).

⁵ The computer does not have internet access.

⁶ The United States has detained Mr. Almarri for almost six-and-one-half years including the period from December 12, 2001, when Mr. Almarri was arrested by the FBI at his home in Peoria, Illinois, until June 23, 2003, when he was designated an "enemy combatant" and transferred to the Brig.

His only communication with those family members is through letters that are subject to extraordinary and excessive delays from the government's review process. During 2006-2007, several letters from Mr. Almarri's family took more than twenty months to reach him. In 2007, two letters from his wife and twelve-year-old daughter took more than four months to reach him. Last year, the government took more than five months to review a DVD that Mr. Almarri's family had sent him containing pictures of Mr. Almarri's wife and children and news of their life back home. And a one-page letter Mr. Almarri's wife sent him more than seven months ago is still being reviewed by the government. *Id.* ¶¶ 56-59.

Further, while Mr. Almarri now has some access to news, the news is heavily censored even though increased access would help at least mitigate the harmful effects of his isolation. Some days, the newspaper is redacted so heavily that all that remains is the sports or obituary pages. Mr. Almarri is also prohibited from watching news on television. *Id.* ¶ 63. Mr. Almarri's access to books, including religious texts, also remains severely censored. Mr. Almarri was recently denied books on Islam written more than six centuries ago, including an Arabic-Arabic dictionary used for translating and deciphering Hadith, the oral traditions relating to the words and deeds of the Islamic prophet Mohammed, which are important to Mr. Almarri's practice and study of his faith. The government, moreover, has refused to say what, if any, criteria govern the restrictions on Mr. Almarri's access to news, books, and religious texts, and provides no explanation when that access is denied. *Id.* ¶ 64.

In addition, there are still no rules addressing Mr. Almarri's treatment at the Brig. Instead, the government maintains that everything Mr. Almarri receives is a "privilege" that the government can remove at will, which is exactly what the government has done repeatedly in the past. *Id.* ¶¶ 65-69. Deeming everything a privilege not only facilitates the manipulation of basic conditions for illegal purposes, but also imposes excruciating psychological pressure. For Mr. Almarri must live from one day to the next without ever knowing whether what he has will be taken away or why.

The Continued Danger and Irreparable Harm to Mr. Almarri

Mr. Almarri's prolonged isolation, years of abuse and continued uncertainty over the length and terms of his indefinite confinement are damaging his ability to think, to concentrate, and even to sleep. *Id.* ¶¶ 69, 82-84; Grassian Decl. at 14-15. Recently, Mr. Almarri has exhibited distressing signs of further deterioration. Savage Cert. ¶¶ 74-79; Grassian Decl. at 13-15. He has become increasingly fixated on mundane aspects of his surroundings, from the humming noise of a fluorescent light to the preparation of his food. Mr. Almarri has also become more paranoid about those around him. Savage Cert. ¶¶ 80, 84-85; Grassian Decl. at 13-15.

Stuart Grassian, M.D., an expert on the psychiatric effects of stringent conditions of confinement, notes that he has "only very uncommonly encountered an individual whose confinement was as onerous as Mr. Almarri's, except for individuals who had been incarcerated brutally in some third-world countries." Grassian Decl. at 15. And Mr. Almarri, Dr. Grassian says, "clearly is suffering quite profoundly from increasingly severe symptoms related to his prolonged incarceration in solitary"—symptoms that are

both “strikingly specific and detailed.” *Id.* at 16. As Dr. Grassian observes, Mr. Almarri’s increasing hypersensitivity to ordinary stimuli, his worsening perceptual problems, his “increasing difficulty with obsessive preoccupations,” and his growing manifestation of paranoid thoughts are all the direct result of his continued isolation. *Id.* at 15-16.

As Dr. Grassian also notes, Mr. Almarri’s ability to tolerate his confinement has already eroded “to a worrisome degree” and is “clearly eroding severely.” *Id.* at 16-17. Mr. Almarri is becoming “increasingly irritable and impulsive, and increasingly obsessional.” *Id.* at 17. He will likely “become more agitated, more impulsive, and more distrustful and isolative” the longer his present conditions of confinement continue. *Id.* at 16. The continued stress of this isolation, in turn, will inflict further harm that may last “for a prolonged period of time, or even indefinitely.” *Id.* at 17.

In addition, the impairments caused by Mr. Almarri’s continued isolation will increasingly compromise his ability to work with his attorneys, “potentially hobbling his ability to pursue any appropriate legal remedy.” *Id.* And as Mr. Almarri becomes “more irritable, distrustful, and withdrawn,” he is more likely to be deemed “non-compliant” by Brig staff, leading to yet further environmental deprivation. This is “the classic ‘vicious cycle’ in solitary,” a cycle that is both “enormously harmful” and inevitable. *Id.* at 16-17.

ARGUMENT

Mr. Almarri’s continued isolation, denial of meaningful contact with his family, and restrictions on news and religious texts violate his rights under the Constitution and laws of the United States. First and foremost, these conditions of confinement violate the

Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment because they create unsafe conditions that are irreparably harming Mr. Almarri and jeopardizing his ability to participate meaningfully in his legal defense and because they exceed the permissible limits of whatever justification the government has for Mr. Almarri's purportedly non-punitive detention as an "enemy combatant." Indeed, Mr. Almarri's continued isolation and other conditions of confinement would violate due process even if they were imposed on a convicted prisoner, and not on someone who is merely being detained in protective custody as a "simple war measure," as the government insists Mr. Almarri is. Further, the restrictions on Mr. Almarri's access to news and books violate his rights under the First Amendment while the restrictions on Mr. Almarri's access to religious texts also violate his rights under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. In light of the irreparable harm to Mr. Almarri, the balance of hardships, Mr. Almarri's likelihood of success on the merits, and the public interest at stake, Mr. Almarri easily meets the test for the modest interim relief requested here.

I. Mr. Almarri's Prolonged Isolation and Other Conditions of Confinement Violate the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

As a resident alien, Mr. Almarri is entitled to the protections of the U.S. Constitution. *See, e.g., Sanchez-Llamas v. Oregon*, 548 U.S. 331, 126 S. Ct. 2669, 2681-2682 (2006); *Plyer v. Doe*, 457 U.S. 202, 210 (1982); *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 369 (1886); *Wong Wing v. United States*, 163 U.S. 228, 237-238 (1896). Though the United States has deprived Mr. Almarri of his liberty at the Brig for almost five years, it has not charged him with, let alone convicted him of, any offense. Mr. Almarri is

accordingly entitled to significantly greater constitutional protections than convicted prisoners who are being punished for their misdeeds or detainees charged with crimes and awaiting trial. *See, e.g., Youngberg v. Romeo*, 457 U.S. 307, 321-22 (1982); *Rhodes v. Chapman*, 452 U.S. 337, 347, (1981); *Haitian Ctrs. Council, Inc. v. Sale*, 823 F. Supp. 1028, 1043-1044 (E.D.N.Y. 1993) (persons in nonpunitive detention have the right to a “demonstrably higher” level of care than under the Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference standard that protects convicted prisoners); *see also* 10 U.S.C. § 813 (2006) (pretrial detainee may not be subjected to confinement “any more rigorous than the circumstances required to ensure his presence” at trial). Mr. Almarri’s *incommunicado* detention, mistreatment, continued isolation and denial of meaningful social and familial contact, and denial of access to news, books, and religious texts create unsafe conditions and grossly exceed any justifiable limits for his non-punitive detention in violation of the Due Process Clause. Indeed, these conditions would be unconstitutional even if they were imposed on convicted prisoners confined for the express purpose of punishment.⁷ They are certainly unconstitutional when imposed for the purportedly non-punitive purpose of Mr. Almarri’s detention here.

A. Mr. Almarri’s Continued Isolation and Other Mistreatment Create Dangerous Conditions of Confinement.

Mr. Almarri’s continued isolation and other conditions of confinement deny him safe conditions in violation of the Due Process Clause. *See Youngberg*, 457 U.S. at 315;

⁷ Mr. Almarri continues to press the other claims raised in his Complaint. But resolution of the narrow issues presented to the Court on this motion for interim relief does not require decision of those matters.

see also DeShaney v. Winnebago County Dep't of Soc. Servs., 489 U.S. 189, 200 (1989); *Cameron v. Toomes*, 783 F. Supp. 1511, 1515 (D. Mass. 1992).

As the Supreme Court recognized more than a century ago, isolation is “punishment of the most important and painful character.” *In re Medley*, 134 U.S. 160, 171 (1890); *see also Chambers v. Florida*, 309 U.S. 227, 237 (1940) (prolonged isolation itself is a technique of “physical and mental torture”); *United States v. Stiles*, 9 U.S.C.M.A. 384, 386 (C.M.A. 1958) (invalidating U.S. Navy’s practice of sentencing convicted sailors to solitary confinement). The reasons are obvious and well-documented. “[T]he pain and suffering caused by extreme levels of psychological deprivation are equally, if not more, cruel and unusual than a lashing by a cat-o’-nine tails. The wounds and resulting scars, while less tangible, are no less painful and permanent when they are inflicted on the human psyche.” *Ruiz v. Johnson*, 37 F. Supp. 2d 855, 914 (S.D. Tex. 1999).

Modern medical and scientific research overwhelmingly confirms the severe and irreparable harms prolonged isolation can inflict:

Social science and clinical literature have consistently reported that when human beings are subjected to social isolation and reduced environmental stimulation, they may deteriorate mentally and in some cases develop psychiatric disturbances. These include perceptual distortions, hallucinations, hyperresponsivity to external stimuli, aggressive fantasies, overt paranoia, inability to concentrate, and problems with impulse control. This response has been observed not only in the extreme case where a subject in a clinical setting is completely isolated in a dark soundproofed room or immersed in water, but in a variety of other contexts. For example, similar effects have been observed in hostages, prisoners of war, patients undergoing long-term immobilization in a hospital, and

pilots flying long solo flights. While acute symptoms tend to subside after normal stimulation or conditions are returned, some people may sustain long-term effects. . . . There is also an ample and growing body of evidence that this phenomenon may occur among persons in solitary or segregated confinement—persons who are, by definition, subject to a significant degree of social isolation and reduced environmental stimulation.

Madrid v. Gomez, 889 F. Supp. 1146, 1230 (N.D. Cal. 1995); *see also Davenport v. DeRobertis*, 844 F.2d 1310, 1313 (7th Cir. 1988) (“[I]solating a human being from other human beings year after year or even month after month can cause substantial psychological damage, even if the isolation is not total.”); *Ruiz*, 37 F. Supp. 2d at 910 (prisoners in prolonged solitary confinement “begin to decompensate not only in the sense of not being able to control themselves but also not to be able to control their actions”); Grassian Decl. at 2-6.

This isolation has already harmed Mr. Almarri severely and, as his recent deterioration makes clear, is placing him in danger of further permanent harm with each passing day. According to Dr. Grassian, Mr. Almarri “clearly is suffering quite profoundly from increasingly severe symptoms related to his prolonged incarceration in solitary.” Grassian Decl. at 16. In particular, Mr. Almarri’s “increasing inability” to tolerate ordinary stimuli like the buzzing of a fluorescent light, his worsening perceptual problems, his “increasing difficulty with obsessive preoccupations,” and his growing manifestation of paranoid thoughts are all the result of his continued isolation at the Brig. *Id.* Mr. Almarri’s resilience has already “eroded to a worrisome degree,” and his “ability to tolerate this confinement is clearly eroding severely.” *Id.* at 16-17. Unless the situation is remedied, Mr. Almarri will likely “become more agitated, more impulsive,

and more distrustful and isolative,” eroding any remaining psychological resilience he still has. *Id.* at 16. And these harms can be irreparable, permanently impairing Mr. Almarri’s mental and physical health long after his current isolation has ended. *Id.* at 17.

Moreover, Mr. Almarri’s continued isolation is impairing his ability to work with his attorneys. *Id.* And as Mr. Almarri inevitably becomes “more irritable, distrustful, and withdrawn,” he will increasingly be deemed “non-compliant” by Brig staff, leading to yet further environmental deprivation, further damage, and further obstacles to his meaningful participation in his legal defense. *Id.* at 16-17. Such unlawful and dangerous conditions of confinement should be remedied forthwith.

B. Mr. Almarri’s Prolonged Isolation and Other Conditions of Confinement Exceed the Permissible Limits of Non-Punitive Detention.

Even assuming the validity of the government’s justification for Mr. Almarri’s detention as an “enemy combatant” (the issue now before the full Fourth Circuit), his continued isolation and other conditions of confinement are also unlawful because they exceed the permissible limits of non-punitive detention. The Supreme Court has made clear that “captivity in war is neither revenge, nor punishment, but solely protective custody, *the only purpose* of which is to prevent the prisoners of war from further participation in the war.” *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507, 518 (2004) (plurality opinion) (internal quotation marks, citation omitted, and emphasis added). And the government itself claims that Mr. Almarri is being detained merely as a “simple war measure” to “prevent his return to the battlefield.” Answer to Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus 8, *Almarri v. Hanft*, No. C/A No. 02:04-2257-26AJ (D.S.C.). But preventing a

combatant's "return to the battlefield" does not require imprisoning him in virtual isolation for years on end or denying him access to news and religious texts. On the contrary, Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions mandates that detainees "in all circumstances be treated humanely" and categorically prohibits cruel treatment of any kind. *Hamdan v. Rumsfeld*, 126 S. Ct. 2749, 2795 (2006). This bedrock guarantee prohibits not only the egregious abuses to which Mr. Almarri has been subjected at the Brig, but also any act that "seriously endanger[s]" his health, including prolonged isolation. Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Prisoners of War, art. 13, Aug. 12, 1949, 6 U.S.T. 3516, 75 U.N.T.S. 287 ("Third Geneva Convention"); Army Regulation 190-8, *Enemy Prisoners of War, Retained Personnel, Civilian Internees, and Other Detainees* ("AR 190-8"), § 3.4e (prisoners of war "shall in no case" be subjected to conditions "prejudicial to their health"); AR 190-8, § 5.1a(6)(a) (prohibiting any measure that causes a detainee's physical suffering); Human Rights Committee, General Comment 20, Article 7 (Forty-fourth session, 1992), U.N. Doc. HRI/GEN/1/Rev.6 at 151 (2003)) ("prolonged solitary confinement" can constitute inhumane treatment).

The law of war also permits isolation of combatants only "in execution of penal or disciplinary sanction." Third Geneva Convention, art. 21. Yet, Mr. Almarri's nearly five-year-long isolation has not been imposed as a result of any alleged misbehavior at the Brig. It is instead a permanent, unchanging, and irreducible condition of his

confinement.⁸ It therefore contradicts the law of war principles the government invokes to justify Mr. Almarri's detention for that reason as well.

In addition, the law of war mandates "respect for...[a detainee's] family rights." *See id.* art. 27. Among other things, the Geneva Conventions require that family letters be delivered "by the most rapid method" available. *Id.* art. 71; *see also* Geneva Convention Relative to the Protections of Civilian Persons in Time of War, Aug. 12, 1949, art. 25, 6 U.S.T. 3516, 75 U.N.T.S. 287 ("Fourth Geneva Convention") (family "correspondence shall be forwarded speedily and without undue delay"). The government's failure to provide Mr. Almarri anything approaching meaningful communication with his family flouts those rules. That Mr. Almarri is being held in a state of complete social isolation makes his denial of meaningful family contact that much more egregious.

Making matters worse, the government maintains that everything Mr. Almarri receives is a "privilege" that it can remove at will. And the government has done so repeatedly in the past. *Savage Cert.* ¶¶ 65-69. Treating everything as a privilege not only

⁸ Interrogation, of course, can never justify the prolonged isolation and other mistreatment to which Mr. Almarri has been subjected at the Brig. The Due Process Clause prohibits indefinite detention for purpose of interrogation under any circumstances, let alone under the conditions Mr. Almarri has had to endure there. *Hamdi*, 542 U.S. at 521 (plurality opinion). Indeed, the Army Field Manual on Human Intelligence Collector Operations itself imposes a 30-day cap on the initial application of isolation when used for purposes of interrogation and requires approval for any additional periods, while also establishing specific limits on its duration. *See* Army Field Manual 2-22.3 (FM 34-52): Human Intelligence Collector Operations, Appendix M: Restricted Interrogation Technique—Separation; *see also* MG George R. Fay, AR 15-6 Investigation of the Abu Ghraib Detention Facility and 205th Military Intelligence Brigade (2004) (describing the use of prolonged isolation at the Abu Ghraib prison as an "abuse" and illegal under the Geneva Conventions and AR 190-8), *available at* <http://news.findlaw.com/hdocs/docs/dod/fay82504rpt.pdf>.

facilitates manipulation of basic conditions for unlawful purposes, *Hamdi*, 542 U.S. at 521 (plurality opinion), but also imposes unbearable psychological pressure. Mr. Almarri lives from day to day with heavy doubt as to what any given day will bring in terms of new and more onerous conditions. Due process prohibits this kind of lawless vacuum.

In short, Mr. Almarri's prolonged isolation, which already exceeds 1,700 days, bears no resemblance to the law of war principles the government has invoked to justify his purportedly non-punitive detention. Mr. Almarri remains alone day after day, without any contact with the outside world, except his attorneys and occasional visits from the ICRC. Mr. Almarri has not spoken with his wife, five children, or parents since before he was declared an "enemy combatant" almost five years ago. Meanwhile, letters between Mr. Almarri and his immediate family—the only form of communication with them he is allowed—often take up to a year to reach the intended recipient (and sometimes more) because of the excessive delays from the government's review process, rendering that communication meaningless. Last year, moreover, the government took more than five months to review and deliver a DVD to Mr. Almarri from his family which contained pictures of Mr. Almarri's wife and children and news about his family's life back home. Savage Cert. ¶¶ 57-58.

In addition, Mr. Almarri remains subject to arbitrary and senseless censorship which severely restricts his access to news of the world outside, heightening his sense of isolation and feelings of despair. And there is no limit on how long this confinement may continue. On the contrary, the government recently indicated that Mr. Almarri's detention at the Brig "could go on for a long time." See Unofficial Transcript of Oral Argument,

Almarri v. Pucciarelli, at 85 (4th Cir. en banc, Oct. 31, 2007), available at http://brennan.3cdn.net/e75ca720b7416fd646_bym6vjh5i.pdf.

If anything, Mr. Almarri's continued isolation, denial of meaningful family contact, and censorship of news and books resembles an extreme form of punishment that the government may not impose even on convicted criminals, let alone those in non-punitive detention like Mr. Almarri. Indeed, courts have found violations of due process where convicted prisoners as well as pre-trial detainees were isolated for significantly shorter periods of time than Mr. Almarri. *See, e.g., Lock v. Jenkins*, 641 F.2d 488, 494 (7th Cir. 1981) (confining pretrial detainee in a 37-square-foot cell for 22 hours a day amounts to punishment); *Iqbal v. Hasty*, 490 F.3d 143 (2d Cir. 2007) (keeping prisoner in prolonged isolation sufficient to allege confinement punitive in nature); *McClary v. Kelly*, 4 F. Supp. 2d 195 (W.D.N.Y. 1998) (four-year isolated confinement of prisoner for security reasons and not misbehavior violates due process); *United States v. King*, 61 M.J. 225 (2005) (segregated confinement of pretrial detainee in isolation for two weeks constitutes impermissible punishment); *Magluta v. Samples*, 375 F.3d 1269 (11th Cir. 2004) (confining pretrial detainee in solitary confinement for 500 days violates due process). Mr. Almarri's continued isolation and other conditions of confinement exceed any justifiable limit, and flout the purported non-punitive justification for his continued confinement at the Brig.

C. Mr. Almarri's Prolonged Isolation and Other Conditions of Confinement Would Violate the Fifth Amendment Even Under the Heightened Standard Applicable to Convicted Prisoners.

Mr. Almarri's prolonged isolation and other mistreatment would still be unconstitutional *even under* the standard applicable to convicted prisoners who are being punished for wrongdoing and not merely being detained in "protective custody" as a "simple war measure," as the government insists Mr. Almarri is. Restrictions on convicted prisoners must still be "reasonably related to legitimate penological objectives." *Turner v. Safley*, 482 U.S. 78, 87 (1987) (internal quotation marks omitted); *Overton v. Bazzetta*, 539 U.S. 126, 132 (2003). In evaluating constitutional challenges in this context, courts must determine: (i) whether there is a "valid rational connection between the prison regulation and the legitimate governmental interest put forward to justify it"; (ii) whether there are "alternative means" of exercising the right at issue that remain open to the inmate; (iii) what impact "accommodation of the asserted constitutional right will have on guards and other inmates, and on the allocation of prisoner resources generally"; and (iv) whether there are "ready alternatives" for furthering the government interest available. *Turner*, 482 U.S. at 89-90 (internal quotation mark and citations omitted). Here, all four factors point to the violation of Mr. Almarri's due process rights through his continued isolation and other mistreatment.⁹

First, the government has not advanced any legitimate interest to justify Mr. Almarri's prolonged isolation and other mistreatment, nor could it. There is no legitimate justification, for example, for holding Mr. Almarri *incommunicado* for sixteen months, subjecting him to abusive interrogations and extreme sensory deprivation, denying him

⁹ Mr. Almarri's right to meaningful contact with his family is also protected by the First Amendment right of association. *Overton*, 539 U.S. at 131-132; *Roberts v. United States Jaycees*, 468 U.S. 609, 617-18 (1984); *Feeley v. Sampson*, 570 F.2d 364, 372 (1st Cir. 1978).

adequate recreation and basic hygiene items, denying him all books, news, and contact with the outside world, and preventing him from practicing his religion and degrading his religion. Compl. ¶¶ 53-56, 74-87, 89-99; Savage Cert. ¶¶ 16, 18-21, 30-31. Nor is there any legitimate justification for continuing to hold Mr. Almarri in virtual isolation, denying him regular phone calls with immediate family members, and taking up to—and sometimes more than—a year to review letters between him and those family members. Savage Cert. ¶¶ 56-58. Such restrictions are grossly excessive in relation to any legitimate government interest, let alone the non-punitive ones the government invokes here.¹⁰

Second, there are no other means open for Mr. Almarri’s exercise of his right to be free from the harmful effects of prolonged isolation, his right to meaningful family contact, and his right of access to news and books. There is simply no substitute for the meaningful human and social contact that Mr. Almarri has been denied for almost five years and that he may continue to be denied potentially for the rest of his natural life. Mr. Almarri’s prolonged isolation, moreover, is causing severe harm from which he may

¹⁰ Indeed, federal regulations require that convicted prisoners must be provided at least one non-legal phone call per month. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 540.100 (“Telephone privileges are a supplemental means of maintaining community and family ties that will contribute to an inmate’s personal development.”); *id.* § 541.12 (“[Inmates] have the right to visit and correspond with family members, and friends.”). Those regulations also guarantee convicted prisoners “the right to a wide range of reading materials” including “magazines and newspapers.” *Id.* § 541.12; *see also id.* § 540.71 (prohibiting prison officials from rejecting publications based upon their political, religious, or social content). Convicted prisoners, moreover, cannot be subjected to prolonged isolation without a hearing and further review. *Id.* § 541.43 (hearing required before placement in most restrictive non-disciplinary housing); *id.* § 541.20 (hearing required upon placement in disciplinary segregation); *id.* § 541.23 (hearing required for placement in protective custody).

never recover and which is impeding his ability to vindicate his rights. Grassian Decl. at 16-17.¹¹

Finally, as to the third and fourth prongs, there are “ready alternatives” to mitigate the harmful effects of Mr. Almarri’s continued isolation with only *de minimis* cost to the government. *Turner*, 482 U.S. at 90. Brig staff members have indicated that accommodating Mr. Almarri’s request for frequent and regular telephone calls with immediate family members from those family members’ home in Saudi Arabia would present no problem from a financial, operational, or security perspective. *Savage Cert.* ¶ 86. The government has also been notified that the International Federation for the Red Crescent will verify the identity of Mr. Almarri’s immediate family members so that these calls (which would be monitored) can take place from the family’s home. *Id.* ¶ 60.¹² Also, review of family letters and DVDs (of Mr. Almarri’s family) should be expedited in light of his precarious situation so that they take only weeks to be approved and not months (or years, as has sometimes been the case). *Id.* ¶ 57. Brig staff have suggested that Mr. Almarri’s family mail be reviewed in Norfolk, Virginia, rather than

¹¹ The government has indicated that, in its discretion, it would allow Mr. Almarri one family phone call every six months. But the government would compel Mr. Almarri’s family to travel approximately 175 miles to a U.S. embassy to make the call. As undersigned counsel have explained to the government, Mr. Almarri’s parents are elderly and in poor health, and cannot make the trip without putting their lives in jeopardy. *Savage Cert.* ¶ 60. The trip would also constitute a severe burden on Mr. Almarri’s wife and five young children. Further, a call once every six months hardly constitutes meaningful communication between intimate family members and is far too little even to begin to compensate for Mr. Almarri’s virtual isolation from the outside world and complete absence of any social contact at the Brig.

¹² In Saudi Arabia, where Mr. Almarri’s family is located, the Red Crescent serves the same function as the Red Cross, which does not operate there.

sent to Guantánamo, where it is reviewed now, but the Defense Department has rejected this alternative. *Savage Cert.* ¶ 59.¹³

In short, there is no valid justification for Mr. Almarri's continued isolation and other unlawful conditions of confinement, and the government has never offered one. And the availability of straightforward alternatives suggested by Brig staff only underscores that Mr. Almarri's conditions of confinement at the Brig serve no legitimate interest, penological or otherwise.

II. Restrictions on Mr. Almarri's Access to News and Books Violate the First Amendment.

The First Amendment "right to receive information and ideas . . . is fundamental to our free society." *Stanley v. Georgia*, 394 U.S. 557, 564 (1969). Yet, for more than two years, Mr. Almarri was denied all access to any news, books, television, or magazines. And, after almost five years in the Brig, he still remains virtually cut-off from the world outside. Although Mr. Almarri was finally allowed access to some books and news after he filed this lawsuit, that access remains severely restricted. The news that Mr. Almarri receives is heavily censored, and he is prohibited from watching any news on television. Further, Mr. Almarri's requests for approval for books routinely take more than six months to decide and then are sometimes denied arbitrarily and without explanation. The government has refused even to state what, if any, criteria, govern Mr.

¹³ Detainees at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, appear to receive family mail typically within four to six weeks.

Almarri's access to these books.¹⁴ Recently, the government inexplicably refused to allow Mr. Almarri access to four religious texts written from approximately 500-700 years ago that Mr. Almarri needs for his religious study and observance.¹⁵ As usual, the government provided no explanation for its action. And as usual, there was no legitimate basis for its decision. Compl. ¶¶ 55-56; Savage Cert. ¶¶ 63-64.

III. Restriction on Mr. Almarri's Access to Religious Texts Violates the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

The government must respect and accommodate the free exercise of religion by all individuals in the United States. In 1993, Congress enacted the Religious Freedom Restoration Act ("RFRA"), which provides that the "[g]overnment shall not substantially burden a person's exercise of religion." 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1(a). The law was enacted to restore the compelling interest test set forth in *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398 (1963), to "*all cases* where free exercise of religion is substantially burdened." See 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb(b)(1) (emphasis added); see also *Goodall v. Stafford County School Bd.*, 60 F.3d 168, 171 (4th Cir. 1995); cf. *Rasul v. Myers*, 512 F.3d 644, 671-672 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (recognizing RFRA's applicability to all persons within the United States). RFRA protects "any exercise of religion, whether or not compelled by, or central to, a system of religious belief." 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc-5(7)(A); see also *Madison v. Riter*, 355 F.3d 310,

¹⁴ As a result, the books must be purchased in advance (either by Mr. Almarri or the ICRC) without knowing the standards under which they will be reviewed.

¹⁵ The texts are: *Sahi Mawaridh al Dahman* (a book containing the Hadith or oral traditions relating to the words and deeds of the Prophet Mohammed); *Al Nihaya Fighareeb al Hadith* (an Arabic-Arabic dictionary used for difficult words in the Hadith); *Al Bath al Hadith* (a book used to determine the authenticity of Hadith); and *Bidayat al Mujtahid* (a comparison of the four major schools of Islam on disputed issues in Islamic jurisprudence).

315 (4th Cir. 2003). The government, however, has failed here to adhere to Congress's unequivocal command to protect religious freedom.¹⁶

The government has previously committed gross violations of RFRA, denying Mr. Almarri water to purify himself when he prays; prohibiting him from wearing a *kofi* to cover his head when praying (and then punishing him for using his shirt as a substitute); preventing him from knowing the time of day or the direction of Mecca and thus from praying properly; denying him any contact with an Imam or spiritual advisor; and taking away his Koran to facilitate interrogation as well as abusing and degrading it. Savage Cert. ¶¶ 19-21; Compl. ¶¶ 74-87.

The government, moreover, continues to violate RFRA by delaying and denying Mr. Almarri access to religious texts that are important to his exercise, study, and observance of Islam. Savage Cert. ¶ 64. These texts often take many months to review and are then sometimes denied without basis or justification. Although these restrictions substantially burden Mr. Almarri's religious freedom, they do not further "a compelling governmental interest" or represent "the least restrictive means" of furthering any such interest, as RFRA requires. 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1(b); *Goodall*, 60 F.3d at 171; *Kikumura v. Hurley*, 242 F.3d 950, 962 (10th Cir. 2001); *see also Jolly*, 76 F.3d at 479 (simply because prison officials "brandish the concepts of public health and safety" does not insulate their actions from RFRA's protections); *Charles v. Verhagen*, 220 F. Supp. 2d 937, 948-949 (W.D. Wis. 2002) (ban on Islamic prayer oil was not justified by

¹⁶ Although declared unconstitutional under the Fourteenth Amendment as applied to states and localities, *City of Boerne v. Flores*, 521 U.S. 507 (1997), RFRA still applies to the federal government, and encompasses every "branch, department, agency, instrumentality, and official . . . of the United States." 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-2(1).

defendants' "security concerns," which were "not related to any specific difficulties presented by the possession of prayer oil").

IV. Interim Relief Is Necessary to Prevent Mr. Almarri's Further Deterioration and Irreparable Harm and to Preserve His Ability to Participate Meaningfully in His Legal Defense.

Mr. Almarri's request for interim relief easily meets the familiar test. *See, e.g., Rum Creek Coal Sales, Inc. v. Caperton*, 926 F.2d 353 (4th Cir. 1991); *Blackwelder Furniture Co. v. Seilig Mfg. Co.*, 550 F.2d 189 (4th Cir. 1977). First and foremost, Mr. Almarri will suffer further irreparable harm from his continued isolation. He is already "suffering quite profoundly from increasingly severe symptoms related to his prolonged incarceration in solitary," and his "ability to tolerate this confinement is clearly eroding severely." Grassian Decl. at 16. Unless the situation is remedied, Mr. Almarri will "become more agitated, more impulsive, and more distrustful and isolative." *Id.* In addition to causing long-term damage from which Mr. Almarri may never recover, his continued isolation will make him increasingly unable to work with his attorneys, "potentially hobbling his ability to pursue any appropriate legal remedy." *Id.* at 17. Making matters worse, the government continues to use Mr. Almarri's "non-compliant" behavior as a basis for making his conditions harsher even though that "non-compliance" is itself the direct product of his prolonged isolation. *Id.* at 15-17.

Any harms suffered by the government, by contrast, would be *de minimis*, as Mr. Almarri is merely asking not to be held in virtual isolation, denied meaningful family contact, and denied access to books and news—rights that the government affords even to prisoners who have been tried and convicted on terrorism charges.

Mr. Almarri is also likely to succeed on the merits of his claim that the government cannot continue to imprison him in virtual isolation, particularly where he

has not even been accused of any crime, let alone convicted of any offense. *See supra* Points I-III. At a minimum, however, Mr. Almarri has “raised questions going to the merits so serious, substantial, difficult and doubtful, as to make them fair ground for litigation and thus for more deliberate investigation,” which is all that is required when the balance of hardships “tips decidedly” in the plaintiff’s favor, as it does here. *Rum Creek*, 926 F.2d at 359 (internal quotation marks omitted).

Finally, the public interest overwhelmingly favors granting the interim relief requested here. The government continues to maintain that it can designate more individuals in the United States “enemy combatants,” including American citizens, and there is every reason to believe such persons will be held in conditions as bad as or worse than those Mr. Almarri has endured. Moreover, given the importance of the legal issues at stake in Mr. Almarri’s challenge to his detention as an “enemy combatant”—issues the Fourth Circuit deemed sufficiently important to hear *en banc*—it is certainly of public interest to help prevent Mr. Almarri from deteriorating beyond repair before those issues can be definitively resolved.

At the same time, there is no public cost to such relief. The government has failed to advance a single reason why it is appropriate, let alone necessary, to continue imprisoning Mr. Almarri in virtual isolation in the face of the demonstrated and established harms such isolation causes. By contrast, if the Court does not grant relief, it virtually invites the government to detain other individuals under conditions similar to Mr. Almarri’s, whether by the current administration or by future administrations, thus leaving in place “a loaded weapon ready for the hand of any authority that can bring

forward a plausible claim of an urgent need.” *Korematsu v. United States*, 323 U.S. 214, 246 (1944) (Jackson, J., dissenting).

CONCLUSION

Mr. Almarri is a human being. But the United States has not treated him like one for the last five years. Instead, it has abused him by forcing him to endure conditions that are dangerous, damaging, and inhuman. Today, Mr. Almarri remains virtually isolated from the world (including from his own family), and that isolation is jeopardizing what remains of his health and safety as well as his ability to participate in his own legal defense. Mr. Almarri’s continued isolation and other conditions of confinement are unacceptable, unlawful, and un-American, and should be redressed through the modest interim relief requested here.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Andrew J. Savage, III
Federal ID Number 3734

Jonathan Hafetz
Aziz Huq
BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE
AT NYU SCHOOL OF LAW
161 Avenue of the Americas
12th Floor
New York, New York 10013
(212) 998-6289

Andrew J. Savage, III
SAVAGE & SAVAGE, P.A.
15 Prioleau Street
Post Office Box 1002
Charleston, South Carolina 29402
(843) 720-7470

Lawrence S. Lustberg
GIBBONS, P.C.
One Gateway Center
Newark, New Jersey 07102-5310
(973) 596-4500

Attorneys for Plaintiff Ali Saleh Kahlah Almarri

Dated: Charleston, South Carolina
March 13, 2008

EXHIBIT A

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

Ali Saleh Kahlah Almarri,

Plaintiff,

v.

Robert M. Gates, Secretary
of Defense, et al.,

Defendants,

C/A No. 2:05-cv-2259-HFF-RSC

CERTIFICATION OF ANDREW J. SAVAGE, III

I, ANDREW J. SAVAGE, III., ESQ., an attorney duly admitted to practice before the courts of the State of South Carolina, hereby certify as follows:

1. I am a partner at the law firm of Savage & Savage, P.A., attorneys for Plaintiff Ali Saleh Kahlah Almarri.
2. Our Firm has represented Mr. Almarri since July 2004. Since then, I have had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Almarri on average once every six weeks.
3. Mr. Almarri has been confined in isolation in the Special Housing Unit (SHU) in the Naval Consolidated Brig in Charleston, South Carolina ("the Brig"), since he was declared an "enemy combatant" on June 23, 2003.
4. This certification is based on statements made to me by Mr. Almarri and on my observations of Mr. Almarri since October 14, 2004, when he was first allowed access to counsel at the Brig.
5. Mr. Almarri, through counsel, has previously and repeatedly requested documents, records, and recordings pertaining to his detention and confinement at the Brig. But to date, the government has ignored or refused those requests.

Conditions in the SHU Prior to August 2005

6. From June 23, 2003, until October 14, 2004, Mr. Almarri was held completely *incommunicado* at the Brig. He was denied all access to the outside world, including to his attorneys who had been representing him in his criminal proceeding, his family, and to the International Committee for the Red Cross ("ICRC").
7. During this 16 month period, Mr. Almarri had virtually no human contact except during interrogations, in which he was threatened and abused, and very brief interactions with

military personnel when they delivered trays of food through a slot in his cell door or when they escorted him to the shower or to a concrete cage for "recreation." Military personnel had duct tape over their names and did not speak to Mr. Almarri except to give him orders.

8. Prior to August 2005, Mr. Almarri was confined to a 9 by 6 foot cell, and was not permitted outside the SHU or given regular opportunity for physical exercise.
9. When Mr. Almarri was allowed opportunity for exercise outside, it took place in an outdoor cage (approximately 40 square feet in area). When the exercise was inside, Mr. Almarri was kept in hand and leg irons. Mr. Almarri remained alone for the entire time, whether the exercise was outdoors or indoors.
10. When Mr. Almarri was deemed "noncompliant," he was confined in his cell for 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and denied any opportunity to exercise or shower. On several occasions, Mr. Almarri was confined to his cell for long periods of time without recreation or shower.
11. The single window in Mr. Almarri's cell was painted with a dark color so that he was unable to see the outside world or perceive the time of day.
12. Mr. Almarri had no control of the lighting in his cell, and fluorescent lights remained on in his cell from 5:00 AM until 10:00 PM every day.
13. Mr. Almarri's cell contained only a sink, toilet, and a hard, concrete-like bed affixed to the wall. There was no chair, no desk, no table and no pillow or any other soft item inside his cell. He was given only a thin blanket which only partially covered his body.
14. For more than two years, Mr. Almarri was not provided with a mattress in his cell. The bed on which he was forced to sleep had a hard and irregular surface, causing him discomfort and pain whenever he lay on it.
15. After two years, Mr. Almarri was given a thin mattress at night from 10 PM to 5 AM after doctors had recommended it. But the mattress was removed at all other times.
16. Mr. Almarri was denied socks or any footwear for months at a time, including during the winter, forcing him to spend as long as over 20 days in his bed because the floor in his cell was too cold to step or stand on without socks or shoes. Mr. Almarri described the tremendous coldness if he tried to stand or walk and how scared it made him feel to be confined all day and night to his bed, lying under a thin and stiff "suicide blanket."
17. Following his incarceration at the Brig, Mr. Almarri began to experience persistent tingling pain in his leg, neck, and other parts of his body. Although doctors said Mr. Almarri should be given a foam mattress, a cushioned chair, and a table (to lean on when sitting), those items were not provided to him.

18. Mr. Almarri was denied all books, news, magazines, TV, and radio. He had no physical, social, and temporal reference points, and often went days without ever seeing the light of day. He described how hopeless it made it him feel to be so isolated and cut off from the entire world.
19. Mr. Almarri's observance of Islam was severely restricted and degraded. Mr. Almarri's copy of the Quran was periodically removed as part of interrogations and was debased by guards who deliberately threw it on the floor of Mr. Almarri's cell and threw things on top of it. Mr. Almarri's religious practices were also mocked with derogatory comments.
20. Mr. Almarri was denied copies of all other religious texts besides the Quran. He was also denied a prayer rug; denied a cover for his head for use during prayer; denied water to purify himself before prayer; and denied contact with an Imam (or Muslim cleric). When Mr. Almarri attempted to use his shirt as a head cover during prayer, his shirt was taken away as punishment.
21. In addition, Mr. Almarri was not told the direction of Mecca (where Muslims must face while praying) nor was he provided with a prayer schedule, clock or watch. As a result, Mr. Almarri was never sure which way to face when praying or when to pray, which Muslims must do five times per day.
22. Mr. Almarri frequently expressed his feelings of helplessness, frustration, and despair about being prevented from practicing his religion and seeing his religion degraded.
23. Mr. Almarri was repeatedly interrogated before October 2004. During interrogations, Mr. Almarri was forced to remain in painful stress positions, subjected to extreme sensory deprivation, and exposed to extremely cold temperatures for long periods of time.
24. For periods as long as eight days, Mr. Almarri would be placed in a completely bare and cold cell for refusing to answer questions. When Mr. Almarri asked for extra clothing or a blanket because he was freezing, his requests were denied.
25. Mr. Almarri was also threatened during interrogations. Interrogators said they were going to send Mr. Almarri to Egypt or to Saudi Arabia where they would torture and sodomize him and rape his wife in front of him.
26. Interrogators also falsely told Mr. Almarri that four of his brothers and his father were in jail because of him, and promised that they would all be released if he "cooperated" and provided information.
27. In addition, interrogators told Mr. Almarri that they could plant a false story about his escape in the news and then make him disappear so no one knew where he was. They told him the U.S. had made prisoners disappear before and would do so again if he refused to provide information.

28. These threats terrified Mr. Almarri. He feared that the United States had harmed his wife and his children, and was unable to talk to them to find out if they were safe.
29. On several occasions interrogators stuffed Mr. Almarri's mouth with cloth and covered his mouth with heavy duct tape. The tape caused Mr. Almarri serious pain. One time, when he managed to loosen the tape with his mouth, interrogators re-taped it even more tightly. Mr. Almarri started to choke until a panicked FBI or DIA agent in the room removed the tape.
30. Mr. Almarri was denied basic hygienic products, including a toothbrush, toothpaste, soap, toilet paper, and clean clothes.
31. The supply of water to Mr. Almarri's cell was also cut off, sometimes for more than three weeks at a time. During those times, Mr. Almarri could not flush his toilet or wash himself after defecating. When Mr. Almarri wanted water to drink or to wash, he had to press a buzzer in order to call the Brig staff. Often he would have to wait for several hours before any water would be given to him.
32. Mr. Almarri remained under personal and/or video surveillance 24 hours a day, seven days a week, including while using the toilet in his cell or showering.
33. Mr. Almarri has been told that there are cabinets full of tapes of recordings of his confinement at the Brig.

Observations of Mr. Almarri's Mental and Physical State before August 2005

34. My first meeting with Mr. Almarri in the SHU occurred in October 2004. Our early meetings were tightly controlled by the Defense Intelligence Agency, which remained in the room during the entire meeting. These meetings all took place in a non-contact visitation room, and were video and audio recorded. The meetings were conducted through security glass, and I was not permitted to take notes.
35. Throughout these meetings, Mr. Almarri remained handcuffed and shackled around both his stomach and legs, and one chain was attached to the floor so that he could not move his legs at all, preventing him from even bending his knees. The visits were time-restricted. I was debriefed by the Defense Intelligence Agency following my visit with Mr. Almarri.
36. After several visits, Brig personnel began to allow me and Mr. Almarri's other counsel to meet with Mr. Almarri privately and to take notes during our meetings. Those meetings, however, remained subject to continuous audio and video surveillance.
37. During these early encounters, Mr. Almarri told me he was having a difficult time maintaining his grip on reality. He said that he would become angry for no apparent reason and was unable to control his temper, which had never been a problem for him

before he was brought to the Brig, including when he was incarcerated as a material witness and criminal defendant from December 2001 to June 2003.

38. Virtually every aspect of Mr. Almarri's physical environment caused him disorientation, isolation, discomfort, and sometimes pain.
39. When Mr. Almarri was forced to endure wide fluctuations in temperature, including periods when his cell was kept extremely cold. His sleep was continually disrupted, including by guards' banging on the walls and bars of his cell or by opening and shutting doors to empty cells adjacent to his cell.
40. Mr. Almarri frequently complained that noxious odors were being introduced into his cell, which Mr. Almarri compared at various times to car exhaust or sewage.
41. When Mr. Almarri focused his attention on these noxious odors in conversation, they would dominate his thoughts. He would speak about it incessantly in our communications, often preventing us from getting to work on his case. He also began stuffing his vents with food to try to block the smell, which led to his being declared "noncompliant" and punished by the Brig staff.
42. Mr. Almarri also became very disturbed by a portable industrial fan that had been placed near the door of his cell and that remained on 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The fan served no purpose for "moving" air for the benefit of Mr. Almarri. Mr. Almarri said that the speed of the fan—and thus the volume of the sound to which Mr. Almarri was subjected—was randomly adjusted from high to low. Mr. Almarri said that the fan made it difficult for him to think or to sleep. The air would not circulate any differently. Only the pitch of the sound would change.
43. Mr. Almarri also described his vision as "flickering." He said he would see white spots in front of him, and that he would see things out of the corner of his eye that were not there.
44. Mr. Almarri frequently complained to Brig staff about his treatment and conditions. He filled out complaint forms (or "chits"), often several times a day. His complaints and requests were routinely denied or ignored.
45. As a result of his oppressive conditions of confinement and mistreatment, Mr. Almarri's mental and physical health became progressively worse.
46. By early 2005, Mr. Almarri told me he thought he was losing his mind.
47. On several occasions during that winter and spring, Mr. Almarri spoke of possible imminent death. He said that he did not know how much longer he could take his current situation and feared that something bad was going to happen to him at any time.

Improvement in the Conditions of Confinement after August 2005

48. In August 2005, Mr. Almarri filed a lawsuit challenging his mistreatment and conditions of confinement at the Brig.
49. After the lawsuit was filed, restrictions on Mr. Almarri grew less severe and his conditions gradually began to improve.
50. Mr. Almarri was given a mattress for his cell that he could use during the day. He was allowed daily outdoor recreation and was eventually given access to exercise equipment in the cellblock. Mr. Almarri was also allowed some access to books and newspapers, though that access was heavily restricted. Eventually, he was permitted to construct a makeshift privacy screen around his toilet so he is no longer observed by Brig personnel while showering or going to the toilet. And recently, he was allowed a computer.
51. Restrictions on Mr. Almarri's religious practice began to lift. For example, he was permitted to have a watch and permitted to have a prayer schedule so that he could conduct his daily prayers properly.
52. Mr. Almarri's attorneys were permitted to bring him food and occasionally attorney visits were allowed to be held outdoors. I began to receive regular briefings about Mr. Almarri from Brig personnel whenever I visited the Brig.
53. After August 2005, there was a gradual improvement in the interaction between the Brig staff and Mr. Almarri. Members of the Brig staff helped implement measures to mitigate the harsh effects of Mr. Almarri's complete isolation and other conditions of confinement.

Limits of Post-August 2005 Improvements

54. Despite improvements in the physical conditions of his confinement since August 2005, Mr. Almarri remains completely isolated and is deprived of virtually all human contact. He is the only person housed in the cellblock in which he resides. He remains alone day after day after day, as he has been for his almost five years at the Brig.
55. Mr. Almarri's only contact with non-military personnel is with my assistant Cheryl Savage, my co-counsel in New York, Jonathan Hafetz, representatives from the ICRC, and me. Ms. Savage and I see Mr. Almarri approximately once every six weeks and are allowed telephone contact. Mr. Hafetz speaks with Mr. Almarri by telephone approximately once a week and sees him about once every four months. The ICRC representative sees Mr. Almarri approximately once every three months. This is the entire extent of his contact with the world outside the Brig.
56. The restrictions on Mr. Almarri's contact with his family have not changed materially since he was first incarcerated in the Brig in June 2003. Mr. Almarri's family has not been allowed to visit or speak with him, and aside from one video and a few photocopied photographs of his family, Mr. Almarri has been denied any other visual or audio contact with members of his family, including his parents, his five children, and his wife.

57. Letters to and from Mr. Almarri's family continue to be subject to extraordinary delays due to the government's screening/review process, which takes place at Guantanamo. For example, on December 6, 2007, Mr. Almarri received a package of a few letters from his family members that had been mailed 21 months earlier. Those letters were collected from his wife, children, siblings, and cousins, and sent together in March 2006. They were not approved by the United States at Guantanamo until October 22, 2007, 19 months later. Mr. Almarri did not receive the letters until December 6, 2007, approximately six weeks after they had been approved. On July 30, 2007, Mr. Almarri's wife and 12-year old daughter each sent him a letter. Mr. Almarri did not receive the letter for more than four months due to government's review/screening process. And, a one-page letter Mr. Almarri sent his wife six months ago is still being reviewed by the government.
58. Other correspondence from Mr. Almarri's family suffers from lengthy delays. On or around April 5, 2007, we received a DVD from Mr. Almarri's family containing images of his wife and children and personal family news to help mitigate Mr. Almarri's loneliness and isolation. The government took five months to review the DVD, which Mr. Almarri did not receive until on or around September 6, 2007. We recently received another DVD from Mr. Almarri's family and submitted it to the government for review on or around February 11, 2008. At the current rate, Mr. Almarri will not receive the DVD until the middle of July.
59. Brig staff have suggested that Mr. Almarri's family mail be reviewed in Norfolk, Virginia, rather than being sent to Guantánamo, where it is reviewed now. But the Defense Department has refused.
60. Mr. Almarri was recently informed that he would be permitted one phone call with his family every six months if the calls were made from a U.S. embassy in Saudi Arabia, the country in which his family now resides. However, the nearest embassy to his family is located in Riyadh, approximately 175 miles from Mr. Almarri's family's residence in Hofuf. Mr. Almarri's father (aged 85) and mother (aged 75) are unable to travel to Riyadh safely due to their failing health. The government has refused Mr. Almarri's request to make alternative arrangements, including placing the call, which would be monitored, from the offices of the International Federation of the Red Crescent. The Red Crescent has said that it could verify the identity of the family members. Staff members of the Brig have indicated that accommodating Mr. Almarri's request for regular telephone calls with immediate family members from those family members' home in Saudi Arabia calls would have a minimum impact from a financial, operational, or security perspective.
61. Although Mr. Almarri is now given regular outdoor recreation and fitness equipment, he still remains completely alone when he exercises, as he does at all other times of day.
62. Mr. Almarri remains under personal or video surveillance 24 hours a day, seven days a week except when visiting with counsel or the International Committee for the Red Cross.

63. The newspapers Mr. Almarri receives are heavily redacted, and he is not permitted to watch any news programs. These restrictions increase Mr. Almarri's feelings of isolation from the world.
64. Mr. Almarri's access to books is also restricted. Any book he requests is subject to a review process that can take more than six months to complete. There do not appear to be any standards or guidelines governing this process, and books are denied arbitrarily and without explanation. Recently, for example, Mr. Almarri was denied access to books on Islam written more than five centuries ago, including an Arabic-Arabic dictionary used for explaining different meanings in Hadith, the oral traditions relating to the words and deeds of the Islamic prophet Mohammed, which are the second source of Islamic jurisprudence and practice after the Quran.
65. Moreover, improvements in Mr. Almarri's conditions of confinement fluctuate depending on discretionary decisions by the government.
66. After almost five years, there are still no rules or regulations that govern Mr. Almarri's conditions and treatment at the Brig.
67. Everything Mr. Almarri is allowed to receive or to do is literally considered a "privilege" that can be withdrawn or taken away at will.
68. On numerous occasions since August 2005, many of these "privileges" have been taken away, sometimes for extended periods of time, because of Mr. Almarri's so-called "non-compliance." For example, Mr. Almarri has been denied access to books and newspapers, denied recreation, and locked down in his cell. His doctor-recommended mattress and cushion have both been taken away. And he has been denied access to his legal materials.
69. The absence of fixed rules and the discretionary nature of decisions that govern everything in his life, along with his prolonged and complete social isolation, have increased Mr. Almarri's feelings of hopelessness, despair, and utter vulnerability.

Observations of Mr. Almarri's Mental State Since August 2005

70. After conditions began to improve in August 2005, Mr. Almarri's mental and physical condition began to improve as well.
71. Mr. Almarri's sleep cycle returned to normal, his interactions with Brig staff became more positive, and he stopped becoming fixated on aspects of his immediate environment, such as the noxious smells in his cell or the industrial fan outside his cell door.
72. Mr. Almarri's complaints about the tingling and pain in his back and legs became less frequent and severe.

73. Our visits with Mr. Almarri became more relaxed. Sometimes they were held outdoors. Mr. Almarri began to smile and laugh more, as he became more hopeful about his life. Communications became freer, and it became easier for us to focus on the issues in Mr. Almarri's case rather than on some aspect of his environment at the Brig.
74. However, nothing was done to address Mr. Almarri's isolation and, by the Spring-Summer of 2006, Mr. Almarri began to deteriorate again.
75. After the Summer of 2006, Mr. Almarri started become fixated on mundane aspects of his environment and daily life, just as he had before August 2005. He also became increasingly paranoid that Brig staff were intentionally manipulating his surroundings.
76. Typically, these fixations occur abruptly and last for weeks, if not several months. The fixations dominate his thinking and inevitably lead to his engaging in behavior that is noncompliant or harmful to his own physical and mental health, which are reminiscent of his behavior before August 2005. They also dominate our communications and interactions with him, often to the exclusion of our discussion of his legal case.
77. Mr. Almarri periodically becomes fixated on the surveillance camera in his cell. In October 2007, Mr. Almarri attempted to obscure the camera lens with a ball of bathroom tissue soaked in toilet water. Mr. Almarri had previously engaged in this behavior on a number of occasions prior to August 2005, causing the Brig to deem him "noncompliant" and to punish him. This behavior does not appear to be in response to any particular physical or mental mistreatment by the staff or any other provocation.
78. Also, within the last year, Mr. Almarri has developed an intense preoccupation with his food and its preparation. Before then, Mr. Almarri had never expressed concern about his food or any doubts regarding its Halal preparation that he follows as part of his religious observance. Although the galley food has not changed at all over time, Mr. Almarri has become increasingly worried that his food is deliberately being prepared in a manner inconsistent with his religious beliefs. When he becomes fixated on the food preparation, it will dominate his thoughts and our conversation with him, often to the exclusion of all other matters.
79. Mr. Almarri's fixation on food preparation has also affected his behavior. For example, twice within the last year, Mr. Almarri refused to eat the meals provided for him by the brig switching to an exclusive diet of military-issue Meals Ready to Eat ("MREs") for months because of his fears about food preparation. Mr. Almarri lost weight, had difficulty sleeping, lost color in his skin, and became increasingly irrational. During the Spring of 2007, Mr. Almarri subsisted on MREs for two-and-a-half months without eating anything else. Although his concerns subsided, they returned in the Fall of 2007, and became increasingly severe. Brig staff tried to allay his concerns by describing the food preparation. But Mr. Almarri remained distrustful of how they were preparing his food and once again refused to eat anything but MREs. On one occasion last month, Brig staff became so concerned about Mr. Almarri's increasing paranoia that they granted him an escorted tour of the kitchen at 2:00 AM in an effort to allay his concerns.


80. Mr. Almarri's behavioral shifts often appear to come out of the blue. In early November 2007, I contacted the Brig staff to check on Mr. Almarri's status before leaving the country on a two-week trip. Brig staff told me they were increasingly concerned about Mr. Almarri. I was advised that he was becoming more and more socially isolated, verbally belligerent, and non-cooperative in his interactions with Brig staff. I was also told his sleep was disrupted and that he was not eating galley meals. I requested and was granted permission to see Mr. Almarri on short notice. During my visit, Mr. Almarri seemed happy to see me and we had a pleasant interaction. We talked about his family, life at home, daily routine at the Brig, and other matters. After I left, however, Mr. Almarri wrote me a letter saying he knew that the government was using me as a tool, that they had sent me to manipulate him. This was the first and only time he has expressed suspicion about my relationship to him.
81. I have also noticed how Mr. Almarri becomes fixed on other mundane things, such as a particular book that he wants or a particular Brig staff member who he alleges is mistreating or insulting him. This type of behavior had occurred a number of times before August 2005, and started occurring again with increasing frequency in the Summer of 2007. It inevitably disrupts Mr. Almarri's thoughts and pattern of conversation. We will spend almost an entire visit discussing the issue that is troubling him, making it difficult to discuss matters relevant to his case. During these times, it becomes extremely difficult to break Mr. Almarri's thought pattern and direct his attention elsewhere.
82. Since the Summer of 2006, Mr. Almarri's sleep cycle has again become erratic, as it was before August 2005. He often sleeps in the daytime, including during his recreation period, and refuses to leave his bed. In October and November of 2007, Mr. Almarri had difficulty sleeping at night and would sleep past noon the next day. In the Summer of 2006, his sleeping pattern became so disturbed that some days he would go to sleep at 7:00 AM, other days at 12 PM, and sometimes at 5 PM.
83. Mr. Almarri's tingling and pain tend to increase during times when he has difficulty sleeping, is troubled by the food preparation, or is fixated on some other aspect of his environment. In the Fall of 2007, Mr. Almarri complained that his tingling sensation and pain had become so severe that he would try to "drive himself to exhaustion" so that he could finally fall asleep, which often did not happen until the early hours of the morning.
84. Mr. Almarri also has become focused on the noise from the fluorescent light in his cell block. In December 2007, he started describing a persistent buzzing noise emanating from the light which he says he cannot get out of his head and which makes it difficult to read or concentrate. He complained to Brig staff about the buzzing. Staff examined the light, and told him there was no problem with it. But Mr. Almarri continues to hear the buzzing.
85. Mr. Almarri has started suffering from severe headaches everyday, and has become increasingly fixated on the most mundane aspects of his surroundings. Recently, for example, he has become preoccupied with the fact that his sink is not draining well and

that the mirror on his cell wall was slightly crooked. Mr. Almarri suggested that staff deliberately created problems with the sink and the mirror "to play games" with him. When Mr. Hafetz and I try to point out that the staff have tried to respond to his concerns, we get the sense that Mr. Almarri suspects that we are on their side and part of a general plot to play with his mind.

86. Recently, the government has said Mr. Almarri will be allowed one telephone call every six months with his family. Mr. Almarri, who has longed to speak to his parents, five children, and wife, suddenly expressed a reluctance to speak with his closest family members. He never expressed this reluctance before, and it was very alarming to me. When I asked him about it, Mr. Almarri said he feared that the pain of his isolation might be redoubled by this brief and fleeting contact.

87. Mr. Almarri has repeatedly told me how difficult it is to be imprisoned alone and without any sense of when, if ever, he will be released. He has said that he wants to return to Qatar or Saudi Arabia, even if it meant being beaten or tortured because at least the uncertainty and indefiniteness of his current situation would end. He says he tries to live day to day but cannot block the terrifying thought from his mind that he may spend years, even decades, alone.

I hereby certify that the following statements made by me are true. I am aware that if any of the statements made by me are willfully false I am subject to punishment.



ANDREW J. SAVAGE, III


Dated:  Charleston, South Carolina
March 10, 2008

EXHIBIT B

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

Ali Saleh Kahlah Almarri,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	C/A No. 2:05-cv-2259-HFF-RSC
v.)	
)	Declaration of Stuart Grassian M.D.
Robert M. Gates, Secretary)	
of Defense, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants,)	
)	

I am a Board-certified psychiatrist, licensed to practice medicine in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. My curriculum vita is attached hereto.

I have had extensive experience in evaluating the psychiatric effects of stringent conditions of confinement. My observations and conclusions regarding the psychiatric effects of solitary confinement have been cited in a number of federal court decisions, for example: *Davenport v. DeRobertis*, 844 F.2d 1310, and *Madrid v. Gomez*, 889F.Supp.1146. I prepared a written declaration for Madrid describing the medical literature and historical experience concerning the psychiatric effects of solitary confinement and of other conditions of restricted environmental and social stimulation. I have prepared the general (non-institution specific) and non-redacted (non-inmate specific) portions of that declaration into a general Statement, which I have entitled "Psychiatric Effects of Solitary Confinement". This paper was published in the Washington University Journal of Law and Policy, 2006, a copy of this paper is attached hereto. It describes the extensive body of literature, including clinical and experimental literature, regarding the effects of decreased environmental and social stimulation, as well as specifically, observations concerning the effects of solitary confinement on prisoners.

In 2005 I was initially consulted by attorneys for Mr. Almarri regarding the conditions of confinement which he had experienced since his incarceration in the naval brig in Charleston, S.C. as well as information regarding observations which Mr. Almarri's attorneys had made of his mental state during this period of confinement. I was consulted again in December 2007 because of his attorneys' increasing concern about

what they perceived as a significant deterioration in his mental state. I was provided a certification prepared by Attorney Andrew Savage concerning these issues, and have been asked to provide an expert declaration regarding these issues. This declaration is thus based upon the information provided in Attorney Savage; as a result, for the sake of clarity and readability, I am incorporating herein material contained in Attorney Savage's certification. I note that some of the information provided by Attorney Savage regarding Mr. Almarri's conditions of confinement comes directly from Mr. Almarri, without other sources of information.

This report will be in four sections:

1. Observations generally regarding the psychiatric effects of solitary confinement.
2. Mr. Almarri's Conditions of Confinement. (This is largely taken from Attorney Savage's certification.)
3. Observations of Mr. Almarri's psychiatric difficulties since incarceration. (Again, mostly taken from Attorney Savage's certification.)
4. Discussion and Expert Opinion.

1. Overview regarding psychiatric effects of prolonged solitary confinement.

It has long been known that severe restriction of environmental and social stimulation has a profoundly deleterious effect on mental functioning; this issue has, for example, been a major concern for many groups of patients including, for example, patients in intensive care units, spinal patients immobilized by the need for prolonged traction, and patients with impairment of their sensory apparatus (such as eye-patched or hearing impaired patients). This issue has also been a very significant concern in military situations and in exploration - polar and submarine expeditions, and in preparations for space travel.

In regard to solitary confinement, the United States was actually the world leader in introducing prolonged incarceration - and solitary confinement - as a means of dealing with criminal behavior; the "penitentiary system" began in the United States in the early 19th century, a product of a spirit of great social optimism about the possibility of rehabilitation of individuals with socially deviant behavior. This system, originally embodied as the "Philadelphia System", involved almost an exclusive reliance upon solitary confinement as a means of incarceration, and also became the predominant mode of incarceration - both for post conviction and also for pretrial detainees - in the several European prison systems which emulated the American model.

The results were catastrophic. The incidence of mental disturbances among prisoners so detained, and the severity of such disturbances, was so great that the system fell into disfavor and was ultimately abandoned. During this process, a major body of clinical

literature developed which documented the psychiatric disturbances created by such stringent conditions of confinement. The paradigmatic disturbance was an agitated confusional state which, in more severe cases, had the characteristics of a florid delirium, characterized by severe confusional, paranoid and hallucinatory features, and also by intense agitation and random, impulsive violence - often self-directed.

The psychiatric harm caused by solitary confinement became exceedingly apparent. Indeed, by 1890, in *In re Medley*, 10 S.Ct. 384, the United States Supreme Court explicitly recognized the massive psychiatric harm caused by solitary confinement: "This matter of solitary confinement is not ... a mere unimportant regulation as to the safekeeping of the prisoner [E]xperience [with the penitentiary system of solitary confinement] demonstrated that there were serious objections to it. A considerable number of the prisoners fell, after even a short confinement, into a semi-fatuous condition, from which it was next to impossible to arouse them, and others became violently insane; others still, committed suicide; while those who stood the ordeal better were not generally reformed, and in most cases did not recover sufficient mental activity to be of any subsequent service to the community." 10 S.Ct. at 386.

The consequences of the Supreme Court's holding were quite dramatic for Mr. Medley. Mr. Medley had been convicted of having murdered his wife. Under the Colorado statute in force at the time of the murder, he would have been executed after about one additional month of incarceration in the county jail. But in the interim between Mr. Medley's crime and his trial, the Colorado legislature had passed a new statute which called for the convicted murderer to be, instead, incarcerated in solitary confinement in the State Prison during the month prior to his execution. Unhappily, simultaneously with the passage of the new law, the legislature rescinded the older law, without allowing for a bridging clause which would have allowed for Mr. Medley's sentencing under the older statute.

Mr. Medley appealed his sentencing under the new statute, arguing that punishment under this new law was so substantially more burdensome than punishment under the old law, as to render its application to him *ex post facto*. The Supreme Court agreed with him, even though it simultaneously recognized that if Mr. Medley was not sentenced under the new law, he could not be sentenced at all. Despite this, the Court held that this additional punishment of one month of solitary confinement was simply too egregious to ignore; the Court declared Mr. Medley a free man, and ordered his release from prison.

Dramatic concerns about the profound psychiatric effects of solitary confinement have continued into the twentieth century, both in the medical literature, and in the news. The alarm raised about the "brainwashing" of political prisoners of the Soviet Union and of Communist China - and especially of American prisoners of war during the Korean War - gave rise to a major body of medical and scientific literature concerning the effects of

sensory deprivation and social isolation, including a substantial body of experimental research.

This literature, as well as my own observations, has demonstrated that, deprived of a sufficient level of environmental and social stimulation, individuals will soon become incapable of maintaining an adequate state of alertness and attention to the environment. Indeed, even a few days of solitary confinement will predictably shift the electroencephalogram (EEG) pattern towards an abnormal pattern characteristic of stupor and delirium.

This fact is, indeed, not surprising. Most individuals have at one time or another experienced, at least briefly, the effects of intense monotony and inadequate environmental stimulation. After even a relatively brief period of time in such a situation, an individual is likely to descend into a mental torpor - a "fog" - in which alertness, attention and concentration all become impaired. In such a state, after a time, the individual becomes increasingly incapable of processing external stimuli, and often becomes "hyperresponsive" to such stimulation; for example, a sudden noise or the flashing of a light jars the individual from his stupor, and becomes intensely unpleasant. Over time, the very absence of stimulation causes whatever stimulation is available to become noxious and irritating; individuals in such a stupor tend to avoid any stimulation, and progressively to withdraw into themselves and their own mental fog.

An adequate state of responsiveness to the environment requires both the ability to achieve and maintain an attentional set - to focus attention - and the ability to shift attention. The impairment of alertness and concentration in solitary confinement leads to two related abnormalities

The inability to focus, to achieve and maintain attention, is experienced as a kind of dissociative stupor - a mental "fog" in which the individual cannot focus attention, cannot, for example, grasp or recall when he attempts to read or to think.

The inability to shift attention results in a kind of "tunnel vision" in which the individual's attention becomes stuck - almost always on something intensely unpleasant - and in which he cannot stop thinking about that matter; instead, he becomes obsessively fixated upon it. These obsessional preoccupations are especially troubling. Individuals in solitary easily become preoccupied with some thought, some perceived slight or irritation, some sound or smell coming from a neighboring cell, or - perhaps most commonly, by some bodily sensation - tortured by it, unable to stop dwelling on it. I have examined countless individuals in solitary confinement who have become obsessively preoccupied with some minor, almost imperceptible bodily sensation, a sensation which grows over time into a worry, and finally into an all-consuming, life-threatening illness.

In solitary confinement, ordinary stimuli become intensely unpleasant, and small irritations become maddening. Individuals in such confinement brood upon normally unimportant stimuli, and minor irritations become the focus of increasing agitation and paranoia.

Individuals experiencing such environmental restriction find it difficult to maintain a normal pattern of daytime alertness and nighttime sleep. They often find themselves during the day incapable of resisting their bed - incapable of resisting the paralyzing effect of their stupor - and yet incapable at night of any restful sleep. The lack of meaningful activity is far compounded by the effect of continual exposure to artificial light, and diminished opportunity to experience natural daylight. And the individuals' difficulty in maintaining a normal day-night sleep cycle is often far worsened by the constant intrusions on nighttime dark and quiet - steel doors slamming shut, flashlights shining in their face, and so forth.

There is, of course, substantial differences in the effects of solitary confinement upon different individuals. Those most severely affected - often individuals with evidence of subtle neurological or attention deficit disorder, or with some other vulnerability - suffer from states of florid psychotic delirium, marked by severe hallucinatory confusion, disorientation, and even incoherence, and by intense agitation and paranoia; these psychotic disturbances often have a dissociative character, and individuals so affected often do not recall events which occurred during the course of the confusional psychosis. Other individuals - generally, individuals with more stable personalities and greater ability to modulate their emotional expression and behavior, and individuals with stronger cognitive functioning - are less severely affected. However, all of these individuals will still experience a degree of stupor, difficulties with thinking and concentration, obsessional thinking, agitation, irritability and difficulty tolerating external stimuli (especially noxious stimuli).

Individuals with stronger cognitive capabilities will often struggle to ward off stupor by generating their own stimulation internally - that is, by their own intellectual processes - but such individuals will almost invariably struggle against the inexorable pull towards obsessional thinking. It is very common for an inmate who spends virtually his entire day alone and without meaningful environmental, social, or occupational stimulation to become obsessively fixated on particular - even minor - features of his environment, and to become increasingly incapable of tolerating any change or increased deprivation in that environment. The inmate has very little to distract his attention from some, even minor, noxious event or stimulus. Inmates in solitary not only experience a deprivation of stimulation, but also experience a sense of helplessness - of loss of control over their environment. They become intolerant of change, of uncertainty, of their own passivity and helplessness in the face of their environment.

Over time, individuals in solitary confinement become increasingly intolerant of stress, increasingly irritable, fearful, impulsively angry - even paranoid. Very commonly, a

vicious cycle develops; the longer the individual is in solitary, the less capable he becomes of maintaining behavioral control. Impulsive anger, sudden destructive or self-destructive outbursts, become increasingly frequent. Eventually, the inmate may "max out" – become caught in a cycle of endless imposition of rigid solitary confinement as punishment for increasingly impulsive and chaotic behavior.

The combination of cognitive impairment, obsessional thinking, and increasing emotional irritability and hyperresponsivity all together create a climate in which the inmate becomes increasingly incapable of rationally cooperating with his attorneys in advancing his legal situation. I have spoken with countless attorneys about their despair that their client's conditions of confinement have made coherent, focused communication almost impossible.

Moreover, during the course of my professional work, I have at times been consulted by or treated individuals who were released from prison after having experienced a prolonged period in solitary confinement. From this clinical experience, I have come to realize that many of the psychiatric difficulties which began in solitary have continued even after release from prison. They continue to have difficulty interacting with people and find that they have become distrustful, withdrawn - "loners". Interactions with people almost invariably make them tense, and any little quirk they see in another person becomes intensely irritating. They also commonly describe a continuing aversion to any stimulation; noise, lights - the bustling world around them – has become unbearable loud and sharp and disturbing. They have a terrible time figuring out a way of surviving in the larger world outside their own room.

2. Mr. Almarri's Conditions of Confinement.

The terms "segregated confinement", "SHU" (Special Housing Unit) confinement, "solitary confinement", etc. all generally refer to confinement alone in a cell anywhere from about 56-90 square feet, with minimal opportunities for social interaction, conjoint recreation or religious services, minimal education or occupational programming, and very limited environmental stimulation. Administrative and environmental conditions can vary. Radio is often available, television sometimes; the opportunity for non-legal phone calls varies; social visitation, however, is almost invariably non-contact. Some cells have windows affording a view of the outside world, but in many, there either is no window to the outside, or the window is only translucent and affords virtually no opportunity to see the outside world.

From the information made available to me, it is my understanding that Mr. Almarri has been confined in solitary confinement since December 2001, and has been housed in solitary confinement in the Navy Brig in South Carolina continuously since June 2003.

2.1 Conditions of Confinement From June 2003 to August 2005.

Mr. Almarri was first allowed limited access to his attorneys in October 2004. In August 2005, his attorneys filed a lawsuit challenging the conditions of confinement under which he was being held. This began a process by which conditions gradually improved during the next many months.

2.1.1 Conditions in General.

It is my understanding that prior to August 2005, Mr. Almarri was confined in a 9x6 foot cell, with windows blacked out or made sufficiently opaque so that he had no view whatsoever of the world outside his cell. Mr. Almarri also claims that during this period of time, he was denied all books, news, magazines, TV, and radio. He had no physical, social, or temporal reference points. Mr. Almarri remained under personal and/or video surveillance 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, including while using the toilet in his cell or showering. He had no control of the lighting in his cell; fluorescent lights were on from 5:00 AM until 10:00 PM. The cell has only a sink, toilet, and steel plate bed bolted to the wall; there is no chair or table. Moreover, during more than the first two years of his confinement, he was not even provided a mattress or pillow, and when he was eventually provided a mattress, it was a very thin one, not providing relief of the pressure of the metal plate bed.

As a consequence, he developed symptoms of nerve compression causing him to suffer from chronic neuropathic pain. In 2005, after approximately two years, a physician finally examined Mr. Almarri, and recommended diagnostic testing along with the provision of a soft cushion for sitting, a thicker mattress, and a table on which he could lean while sitting. None of these physician recommendations were followed, and Mr. Almarri has continued up to the present to be continuously in pain with peripheral neuropathies.

2.1.2. Interrogations.

During approximately the first 16 months of his confinement in the Brig, he had virtually no human contact except for interrogations and for very brief interactions with military personnel. Mr. Almarri was repeatedly interrogated before October 2004. He described to his attorneys that he was subjected to extremely harsh conditions during these interrogations. He stated that during interrogations, he was forced to remain in painful stress positions and exposed to extremely cold temperatures for lengthy periods of time. For periods as long as eight days, Mr. Almarri would be placed in a completely bare and cold cell from 5 AM to 10 PM for refusing to answer questions. When Mr. Almarri asked for extra clothing or a blanket because he was freezing, his requests were denied. Mr. Almarri was also threatened during interrogations. Interrogators said they were going to send Mr. Almarri to Egypt or to Saudi Arabia where they would torture and sodomize him and rape his wife in front of him. Interrogators also falsely told Mr. Almarri that four

of his brothers and his fathers were in jail because of him, and promised that they would all be released if he cooperated with them. Interrogators told Mr. Almarri that they could plant a false story about his escape in the news and then make him disappear so no one knew where he was. They told him the U.S. had made prisoners disappear before and would do so again if he refused to provide information. Several times, interrogators stuffed Mr. Almarri's mouth with clothing and covered his mouth with heavy duct tape. One time, when he managed to loosen the tape with his mouth, interrogators re-taped it even more tightly. Mr. Almarri started to choke until a panicked FBI agent in the room removed the tape.

2.1.3 Visitation, Exercise, Hygiene, Punishment.

During that period of time, he was allowed no visits whatsoever, even with his attorneys or with representatives of the International Committee for the Red Cross. Mr. Almarri states that during approximately the first two years of his confinement, he had virtually no contact even with the military personnel guarding him; that they even put duct tape over their name tags and never spoke to Mr. Almarri except to give him orders.

I have been informed that during that period of time, he was not provided any regular opportunity for exercise, and even when this was provided, it was provided either outside, in a tiny, bare concrete cage without any exercise equipment or opportunity to have any sight of his environment, or else inside, where he would be required to "exercise" while bound in hand and leg irons. Even while exercising, he was entirely alone. Moreover, whenever Mr. Almarri was deemed "noncompliant," he was confined in his cell for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and denied any opportunity to exercise or shower. On several occasions, Mr. Almarri was confined to his cell for months at a time without recreation or shower.

I have been informed that after he finally was allowed access to his attorneys, he and his attorneys requested that he be provided with some document explaining what he must do to be deemed "in compliance", but the staff refused to provide him with this. He and his attorneys were informed that the list of requirements for compliance were, instead, posted in the Day Room of his tier. However, there was no accommodation made for the fact that Mr. Almarri had never been allowed into that area of the tier, and thus had no opportunity whatsoever to read the document.

Yet the consequences for being deemed to be out of compliance were extremely harsh. When deemed to be out of compliance, he was often deprived of virtually everything - toothpaste, toothbrush, any clothes other than boxer shorts, toilet paper and soap, as well as access to shower, to exercise, to water in his cell for washing or flushing the toilet.

At times the air conditioning thermostat would be turned to a very low setting in order to further punish him by rendering the cell very cold. Deprived of even shoes and socks

for months at a time, including during the winter months, he had no choice but to lie on his bunk all day under a thin, stiff "suicide blanket". Mr. Almarri described the tremendous coldness if he tried to stand or walk and how scared it made him feel to be confined all day and night to his metal bed.

Water would be turned off from his toilet for periods which ranged up to 20 days in a row; he at times resorted to defecating onto his food tray so that he would not have to live with his own filth lying in an empty toilet, without any ability to flush it away. He reports that at times he was even deprived of access to toilet paper. He stated that he spent up to 20 days in a row in his cell in such conditions, and that even when he did have access to water, he had to press a buzzer for the staff, often having to wait hours in order to receive any soap with which to wash himself. As a result of the deprivation of basic hygienic materials, he developed a rash on his buttocks which itched and burned, tormenting him.

Mr. Almarri described other techniques used to further "punish" him. An industrial fan was kept on 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, just outside his cell. It provided no air circulation, but created a great deal of noise, and the Brig staff increased the speed and noise level when they deemed him to be "noncompliant". At times, a staff member would go into the adjacent cell and flush the toilet repeatedly, or bang on the walls, or shake Mr. Almarri's door, in order to wake him up and disturb him.

2.1.4 Religious Observance.

Mr. Almarri stated that his observance of Islam was severely restricted and degraded. According to Mr. Almarri, his copy of the Quran was periodically removed as part of interrogations and was debased by guards who deliberately threw it on the floor of Mr. Almarri's cell and threw things on top of it. Mr. Almarri's religious practices were also mocked with derogatory comments. Mr. Almarri informed his attorneys that he was denied copies of all other religious texts besides the Quran. He was also denied a prayer rug; denied a cover for his head for use during prayer; denied water to purify himself before prayer; and denied contact with an Imam (or Muslim cleric). When Mr. Almarri attempted to use his shirt as a head cover during prayer, he was punished by taking his shirt away. In addition, Mr. Almarri was not told the direction of Mecca (where Muslims must face while praying) nor was he provided with a prayer schedule or clock or watch. As a result, Mr. Almarri was never sure which way to face when praying or when to pray, which Muslims must do five times per day. Mr. Almarri frequently expressed his feelings of helplessness, frustration, and despair about being prevented from practicing his religion and seeing his religion degraded.

2.2 Improvement in the Conditions of Confinement after August 2005, Limitations Thereof.

Mr. Almarri was finally given the opportunity to meet with counsel beginning in October 2004, and in August 2005, Mr. Almarri filed a lawsuit challenging his mistreatment and conditions of confinement at the Brig. After the lawsuit was filed, restrictions on Mr. Almarri gradually grew less severe and his conditions gradually began to improve.

Thereafter, Mr. Almarri was given a mattress for his cell that he could use during the day. He was allowed daily outdoor recreation and was eventually given access to exercise equipment in the cellblock. Mr. Almarri was also allowed access to books and newspapers, though that access was heavily restricted. Restrictions on Mr. Almarri's religious practice began to lift. For example, he was given a watch and permitted to have a prayer schedule so that he could conduct his daily prayers properly.

After August 2005, there was a gradual improvement in the interaction between the Brig staff and Mr. Almarri. Members of the Brig staff helped implement measures to mitigate the harsh effects of his complete isolation and other conditions of confinement. Mr. Almarri's attorneys were permitted to bring him food and occasionally attorney visits were allowed to be held outdoors.

Despite improvements in the physical conditions of his confinement since August 2005, Mr. Almarri remains completely isolated and is deprived of virtually all human contact. He is the only person housed in the cellblock in which he resides. He remains alone day after day after day, as he has been for the almost five years.

Mr. Almarri's only contact with non-military personnel is with his counsel - in person approximately every six weeks, and by phone approximately weekly - and with representatives from the International Committee for the Red Cross approximately once every three months. This is the entire extent of his contact with the world outside the Brig.

The restrictions on Mr. Almarri's contact with his family have not changed materially since he was first incarcerated in the Brig in June 2003. Mr. Almarri's family has not been allowed to visit or speak with him, and aside from one video and a few photocopied photographs of his family, Mr. Almarri has been denied any other visual or audio contact with members of his family, including his parents, his five children, and his wife. Letters to and from Mr. Almarri's family continue to be subject to extraordinary delays due to the government's screening/review process, which takes place at Guantanamo. For example, on December 6, 2007, Mr. Almarri received a package of a few letters from his family members that had been mailed twenty-one months earlier. Those letters were collected from his wife, children, siblings, and cousins, and sent together in March 2006. They were not approved by the United States at Guantanamo until October 22, 2007, nineteen months later. Mr. Almarri did not receive the letters until December 6, 2007, approximately six weeks after they had been approved. On July 30, 2007, Mr. Almarri's wife and twelve-year old daughter each sent him a letter. Mr. Almarri did not receive the letter for more than four months due to government's

review/screening process. And, a one-page letter Mr. Almarri sent his wife seven months ago is still being reviewed by the government.

Other non-legal mail also suffers from extensive delays. For example, a Muslim woman from Pennsylvania who had read about Mr. Almarri's case in the newspaper mailed Mr. Almarri a one-page letter in English on January 18, 2007. The letter was not cleared and delivered to Mr. Almarri until July 13, 2007, almost six months later.

Although Mr. Almarri is now given regular outdoor recreation and fitness equipment, he still remains completely alone when he exercises, as he does at all other times of day. Mr. Almarri remains under personal or video surveillance 24 hours a day, 7 days a week except when visiting with counsel or the International Committee for the Red Cross. The newspapers Mr. Almarri receives are heavily redacted, and he is not permitted to watch any news programs. These restrictions increase Mr. Almarri's feelings of isolation from the world. Mr. Almarri's access to books is also restricted. Any book he requests is subject to a review process that can take more than six months to complete. There do not appear to be any standards or guidelines governing this process, and books are denied arbitrarily and without explanation. Recently, for example, Mr. Almarri was denied access to books on Islam written more than five centuries ago, including an Arabic-Arabic dictionary used for explaining different meanings in Hadith, the oral traditions relating to the words and deeds of the Islamic prophet Mohammed, which are the second source of Islamic jurisprudence and practice after the Quran.

Moreover, improvements in Mr. Almarri's conditions of confinement fluctuate depending on discretionary decisions by the government. After almost five years, there are still no rules or regulations that govern Mr. Almarri's conditions and treatment at the Brig. Everything Mr. Almarri is allowed to receive or to do, including his access to his attorneys, is literally considered a "privilege" that can be withdrawn or taken away at will. On numerous occasions since August 2005, many of these "privileges" have been taken away, sometimes for extended periods of time, because of Mr. Almarri's so-called "non-compliance." For example, Mr. Almarri has been denied access to books and newspapers, denied recreation, and locked down in his cell. The mattress and cushion recommended by his doctor have both been taken away. And he has been denied access to his legal materials. Mr. Almarri's attorneys have described how the absence of fixed rules and the discretionary nature of decisions that govern everything in his life, along with his prolonged and complete social isolation, have increased Mr. Almarri's feelings of hopelessness, despair, utter vulnerability, and his increasing irritability.

3. Observations of Mr. Almarri's Mental and Physical State

3.1 Before August 2005

Mr. Almarri was first allowed to have contact with his attorneys in October 2004. Initially, these meetings all took place in a non-contact visitation room, through security glass, though eventually this restriction was lifted and contact meetings were allowed. All these meetings were, however, subject to continuous audio and video surveillance. At these meetings, Mr. Almarri told his attorneys that he was having a difficult time maintaining his grip on reality. He stated that he feared he was losing his mind. He said that he would become angry for no apparent reason and was unable to control his temper, which had never been a problem for him before he was brought to the Brig, including when he was incarcerated as a material witness and criminal defendant from December 2001 to June 2003. On several occasions Mr. Almarri spoke of possible imminent death. He said that he did not know how much longer he could take his current situation and feared that something bad was going to happen to him at any time.

He stated that virtually every aspect of his physical environment caused him disorientation, isolation, discomfort, and sometimes pain. He reported that he was forced to endure wide fluctuations in temperature, including periods when his cell was kept extremely cold. His sleep was disrupted, including by guards' banging on the walls and bars of his cell or by opening and shutting doors to empty cells adjacent to his cell.

Mr. Almarri frequently complained that noxious odors were being introduced into his cell, which Mr. Almarri compared at various times to car exhaust, sewage, and cigarette smoke. When Mr. Almarri focused his attention on these noxious odors in conversation, they would dominate his thoughts. He would speak about it incessantly in his communications with his attorneys, often preventing them from getting work done on his case. He also began stuffing his vents with food to try to block the smell, which led to his being declared "noncompliant" and hence punished by the Brig staff with increasingly harsh and stringent conditions of isolation.

Mr. Almarri also became very disturbed by the industrial fan that had been placed near the door of his cell and that remained on 24 hours a day, seven days a week. He reported that the fan made it difficult for him to think or to sleep. Mr. Almarri also described his vision as "flickering." He said he would see white spots in front of him, and that he would see things out of the corner of his eye that were not there.

3.2 Observations of Mr. Almarri's Mental State Since August 2005.

After conditions began to improve in August 2005, Mr. Almarri's mental and physical condition began to improve as well, at least for a number of months. Mr. Almarri's sleep cycle returned to normal, his interactions with Brig staff became more positive, and his visits with his attorneys became more relaxed; especially after the staff allowed those meetings to be held outdoors, Mr. Almarri seemed to begin to relax, even smile and laugh, and to become more hopeful about his life.

At the same time, he stopped becoming fixated on aspects of his immediate environment, such as his preoccupation with what he experienced as noxious smells in his cell or the industrial fan outside his cell door. And although he continued to suffer from neuropathic pain in his back and legs, his preoccupation with these complaints became less frequent and severe. During attorney visits, he was more able to focus on the issues in Mr. Almarri's case rather than on some aspect of his environment at the Brig.

However, nothing was done to fundamentally address Mr. Almarri's isolation and by the Spring-Summer of 2006, Mr. Almarri's mental state began to deteriorate again. He began again to become fixated on mundane aspects of his environment and daily life, just as he had before August 2005. He also became increasingly paranoid that Brig staff were intentionally manipulating his surroundings.

These fixations would occur abruptly and last for weeks, if not several months. The fixations would dominate his thinking and inevitably would lead to his engaging in behavior that was deemed noncompliant or harmful to his own physical and mental health; this is a pattern which is reminiscent of his behavior before August 2005. Anger and obsessional preoccupations have again dominated his attorneys' communications and interactions with him, often to the exclusion of any meaningful discussion of his legal case.

For example, Mr. Almarri would periodically become fixated on the surveillance camera in his cell. In October 2007, Mr. Almarri attempted to obscure the camera lens with a ball of bathroom tissue soaked in toilet water. Mr. Almarri had previously engaged in this behavior on a number of occasions prior to August 2005, causing the Brig to deem him "noncompliant" and to punish him. This behavior does not appear to be in response to any particular physical or mental mistreatment by the staff or any other provocation.

Also, within the last year, Mr. Almarri has developed an intense preoccupation with his food and its preparation. Before then, Mr. Almarri had never expressed concern about his food or any doubts regarding its Halal preparation that he follows as part of his religious observance. Although the galley food has not changed at all over time, Mr. Almarri has become increasingly worried that his food is deliberately being prepared in a manner inconsistent with his religious beliefs. When he becomes fixated on the food preparation, it will dominate his thoughts and his conversations with his attorneys, often to the exclusion of all other matters.

Mr. Almarri's fixation on food preparation has also affected his behavior. For example, twice within the last year, Mr. Almarri refused to eat the meals provided for him by the Brig, switching to an exclusive diet of military-issue Meals Ready to Eat ("MREs") for months at a time because of his fears about food preparation. Mr. Almarri lost weight, had difficulty sleeping, lost color in his skin, and became increasingly irrational. During the Spring of 2007, Mr. Almarri subsisted on MREs for two-and-a-half months without

eating anything else. Although his concerns subsided, they returned in the Fall of 2007, and became increasingly severe. Brig staff tried to allay his concerns by describing the food preparation. But Mr. Almarri remained distrustful of how they were preparing his food. On one recent occasion, Brig staff became so concerned about Mr. Almarri's increasing paranoia that they granted him an escorted tour of the kitchen at 2:00 AM in an effort to allay his concerns.

Mr. Almarri's emotional shifts are generally abrupt and without any clear cause. In early November 2007, Brig staff informed Attorney Savage they were increasingly concerned about Mr. Almarri, that he was becoming more and more socially isolated, verbally belligerent, and non-cooperative in his interactions with Brig staff; his sleep was erratic and that he was not eating galley meals. His attorney was granted an emergency visit with his client. During the visit, Mr. Almarri seemed comfortable and had a pleasant interaction with the attorney. Yet after the attorney left, Mr. Almarri wrote him a letter reflecting paranoid concerns - that he knew that the government was using his attorney as a tool, sent me to manipulate him. Attorney Savage was stunned; Mr. Almarri had never before expressed such distrust of his own attorney.

Moreover, Mr. Almarri became fixated again on other mundane things, such as a particular book that he wanted to obtain or a particular Brig staff member who he felt was mistreating or insulting him. This type of behavior had occurred a number of times before August 2005, and started occurring again with increasing frequency in the Summer of 2007. It inevitably disrupts Mr. Almarri's thoughts, and thus impairs attorney-client communication. Sometimes an entire visit would be spent discussing such an issue, instead of focussing on matters central to his case. His attorneys report that during these times, it becomes extremely difficult to break Mr. Almarri's thought pattern and direct his attention elsewhere.

Since the Summer of 2006, Mr. Almarri's sleep cycle has again become erratic, as it was before August 2005. He often sleeps in the daytime, including during his recreation period, and refuses to leave his bed. For example, in October and November of 2007, Mr. Almarri had difficulty sleeping at night and would sleep past noon the next day. In the Summer of 2006, his sleeping pattern became so disturbed that some days he would go to sleep at 7:00 AM, other days at 12 PM, and other days at 5 PM.

Mr. Almarri's preoccupation with his neuropathic pain, or with the food preparation, or with some other aspect of his immediate condition, has increased again, especially during times when he is more agitated. In the Fall of 2007, Mr. Almarri complained that his neuropathic pain had become so severe that he would try to "drive himself to exhaustion" so that he could finally fall asleep, which often did not happen until the early hours of the morning. Mr. Almarri also became fixated on the noise from the fluorescent light in the day room in his cell block. In December 2007, he started describing a persistent buzzing noise emanating from the light which he became an oppressive preoccupation; he cannot get out of his head and this makes it difficult to read or

concentrate. He complained to Brig staff about the buzzing; they were actually quite responsive, examining the light and informing him that there was no problem with the light. His preoccupation with the buzzing sound was not relieved by this feedback.

He has begun suffering from headaches everyday, and his obsessional preoccupations have become more widespread. He has recently become obsessively preoccupied with relatively trivial issues regarding his cell – that his sink is not draining well, and the mirror on his wall was slightly crooked. Of increasing concern, too, is a growing paranoia. He expressed suspicion that the slow sink draining and the crooked mirror were done intentionally by the staff, “to play games” with him. His attorneys try to point out that the staff have actually been fairly responsive to his plight, but they fear that if they push this point with too much vigor, Mr. Almarri will come to believe that they, too, are part of a plot to cause him psychological harm.

Attorney Savage reports that recently, the government has said Mr. Almarri will be allowed one telephone call every six months with his family. Mr. Almarri, who has consistently expressed his longing to speak to his parents, five children, and wife, suddenly expressed a reluctance to speak with his closest family members. He never expressed this reluctance before. Attorney Savage found this change quite alarming. When Attorney Savage asked his client about this change in decision, Mr. Almarri expressed an increasing fear that he could not bear the emotional impact of his continuing confinement, and he was frightened that the pain of his isolation might be redoubled by this brief and fleeting contact with family. Mr. Almarri has repeatedly confided to his attorney that it is becoming increasingly unbearable for him to be imprisoned alone and without any sense of when, if ever, he will be released. He has said that rather than being maintained in the Brig, he would prefer to be extradited to Qatar or Saudi Arabia, even if he might be beaten or tortured in those countries; at least then the uncertainty and indefiniteness of his current situation would end. He says he tries to live day to day but cannot block the terrifying thought from his mind that he may spend years, even decades, alone. The endless years of confinement, the lack of any goal, any time limit, any hope, has become utterly unbearable.

4. Discussion, Expert Opinion.

During the course of my professional experience, I have evaluated quite a large number of individuals incarcerated in solitary confinement, but have only very uncommonly encountered an individual whose confinement was as onerous as Mr. Almarri's, except for individuals who had been incarcerated brutally in some third-world countries.

In my writings, I have described the most severe psychiatric consequence of such prolonged confinement - an agitated, confusional, hallucinatory psychosis. Mr. Almarri's psychiatric condition clearly has not reached such a state of disintegration, a fact which likely in part reflects fairly strong premorbid emotional and cognitive functioning. Yet he

clearly is suffering quite profoundly from increasingly severe symptoms related to his prolonged incarceration in solitary. Moreover, the symptoms which he manifests are strikingly specific and detailed, and they are indeed symptoms which, while quite rare in other settings, are very specifically associated with the psychopathological effects of solitary confinement.

For example, in my article in The American Journal of Psychiatry, I described "hyperresponsivity to external stimuli, with an increasingly dysesthetic (painful) response to stimuli". Mr. Almarri's increasing inability to tolerate the buzzing of a fluorescent light is a very typical example of this phenomenon, and I have in fact seen precisely the same problem with other inmates whom I have evaluated. Indeed, at times I have witnessed an inmate literally incapable of engaging in conversation with me because he could not distract himself from his maddening fixation on the slight buzzing of an overhead light - a buzzing sound which I literally had not noticed at all.

Similarly, when Mr. Almarri is more symptomatic, he begins complaining about noxious odors in his cell, and over time he has become increasingly - maddeningly - preoccupied with them. Once again, this is a typical example of the hyperresponsivity to external stimuli specifically associated with solitary confinement, and is virtually unheard of in the more typical psychiatric illnesses.

Mr. Al-Marri has also described other perceptual difficulties typical of solitary - for example, white spots and flickering lights.

Even in regard to his neuropathic pain, it is clear that during the period of several months beginning August 2005, when Mr. Almarri seemed brighter and more alert, he was more able to distract himself from the pain - less obsessively focused on it.

As stated in the first section of this report, disturbing obsessional preoccupations are exceedingly common in solitary. Mr. Almarri has demonstrated severely increasing difficulty with obsessive preoccupations about the preparation of his food, and with perceived slights by Brig staff (perceived insults, the difficulty obtaining a book, etc.) His capacity to maintain an adequate level of attention and orientation to the environment is clearly becoming increasingly impaired.

As an individual increasingly succumbs to the neuropsychological stress of solitary confinement, he will typically become more agitated, more impulsive, and more distrustful and isolative. Over time, there is an inevitable wearing away of whatever resilience the individual had when he first entered solitary. Mr. Almarri has been subjected to solitary confinement continuously for almost seven years (including his initial 16 months detention in MCC New York and in Peoria, prior to being transferred to the Charleston Brig), and has experienced some of the most severe conditions seen in any American prison setting. His ability to tolerate this confinement is clearly eroding severely.

Thus, for example, it is very worrisome that Mr. Almarri has recently begun manifesting paranoid thoughts, both about the Brig staff (especially, regarding food preparation) and even about his own attorneys. There has been increasing concern that he is becoming more irritable, distrustful, and withdrawn. And with this, his behavior has increasingly been deemed "noncompliant", leading to punishment by even

further environmental deprivation. This is the classic "vicious cycle" in solitary, an enormously harmful situation.


Over time, individuals in solitary actually become increasingly intolerant of stimulation – hyperresponsive to it. This is quite commonly especially the case in regard to social stimulation; the individual becomes a loner; he begins withdrawing from people, finding it increasingly difficult to interact with people. It is thus worrisome that Mr. Almarri has suddenly chosen to decline pursuing the possibility of being able to speak with his family by phone. His need to numb himself, to withdraw, is clearly worsening.

Another point should be raised. As described in the general discussion above (the first section of this report) the psychiatric impairments associated with solitary confinement will almost inevitably compromise the inmate's ability to cooperate with and assist counsel in pursuing his legal rights. Clearly, the very fact of Mr. Almarri's indefinite confinement without specific charge has raised very significant legal questions, and yet his ability to work together with his attorneys in pursuing relief is becoming increasingly compromised, potentially hobbling his ability to pursue any appropriate legal remedy..

In summary, Mr. Almarri has experienced extremely severe and prolonged conditions of incarceration in solitary, and there is clear evidence that his psychological resilience has eroded to a worrisome degree; he is becoming increasingly withdrawn, at times paranoid, as well as increasingly irritable and impulsive, and increasingly obsessional. As described above, this symptomatic presentation is strikingly consistent with published descriptions of the particular psychopathologic disturbance associated with solitary confinement.

This is of especial concern because my experience has shown that individuals exposed to such prolonged stress will not fully recover even after their release from incarceration. Impairments – especially, social withdrawal, irritability, and intolerance of stimulation - continue for a prolonged period of time, or even indefinitely.

Signed under pains and penalties of perjury, this 6th day of March, 2008.



Stuart Grassian, M.D.

Stuart Grassian, M.D.
401 Beacon Street
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467-3976
Phone (617)244-3315
Fax (617) 244-2792

Born: June 29, 1946

EDUCATION, TRAINING, FACULTY POSITIONS.

1963-1967	Harvard Club Scholar, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA
1967	B.A. Cum Laude, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA
1967-1969	NIMH Fellow in Sociology, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA
1969	M.A., Sociology, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA
1970	NSF Fellow in Psychiatry, Bellevue Hospital, NY
1973	M.D., New York University School of Medicine, NY
1973-1974	Intern (Medicine), New York University Medical Center, NY
1974-1977	Resident in Psychiatry, Beth Israel Hospital, Boston, MA. Teaching Fellow in Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School.
1977-2003	Clinical Instructor in Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School.
1978-1980	Assistant Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, Tufts University School of Medicine.
1982-1986	Suffolk University Law School; J.D. 1986; Daniel Fern Award.
1986	Bar Examination completed; entry into Massachusetts Bar.(remain on "retired" status through present.)

LICENSURE.

1974- Massachusetts Medical License #37749.

BOARD CERTIFICATIONS

- 1979 Diplomat, American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology (ABPN) in Psychiatry.
- 1994 Diplomat Certification, ABPN, Added Qualifications in Addiction Psychiatry.
- 1996 Diplomat Certification, ABPN, Added Qualifications in Forensic Psychiatry

MAJOR PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

- 1977 - Private practice in Psychiatry: Cambridge, MA (1977-1979), Chestnut Hill, MA (1979-), Stoneham, MA (1980-2003)
- 1977-1978 Clinical Director, Inpatient Service, Dorchester Mental Health Center, Boston, MA
- 1978-1980 Director, Inpatient Service, WestRosPark Mental Health Center, Boston, MA
- 1979-1983 Medical Staff, Lecturer, Glover Memorial Hospital, Needham, MA
- 1980-1994 Attending Psychiatrist, Adult & Adolescent Inpatient Services, New England Memorial Hospital, Stoneham, MA
- 1980-1983 Director, Adult & Adolescent Inpatient Services, Department of Psychiatry, New England Memorial Hospital, Stoneham, MA
- 1983-1994 Attending Psychiatrist, Addictions Treatment Unit, New England Memorial Hospital, Stoneham, MA
- 1987-1993 Supervising Psychiatrist, Outpatient Department, New England Memorial Hospital, Stoneham, MA

1992-1994 Psychiatric Director, Partnership Recovery Center, Melrose-Wakefield Hospital, Melrose, MA (Day treatment program for Addiction rehabilitation)

CONSULTATIONS, AFFILIATIONS, BOARD MEMBERSHIPS

1979- Massachusetts Correctional Legal Services. (Psychiatric Effects of Solitary Confinement, Psychiatric Effects of Strip Search Procedures)

1980- Massachusetts Civil Liberties Union. (Psychiatric Effects of Strip Search Procedures, Psychiatric Effects of Solitary Confinement)

1993- Massachusetts Department of Corrections, Stress Management Unit. (Occupational Stress among Correctional Staff)

1993-4 Board of Trustees, New England Memorial Hospital, Stoneham, MA.

1995 Consultation to Psychiatric Expert/Special Master; Madrid v Gomez Federal District Court, Northern District, CA #C-90-3094TEH. (Psychiatric Effects of Solitary Confinement)

1995- Consultant to Massachusetts Professional Recovery Committee, and to Substance Abuse Rehabilitation Program of the Massachusetts Board of Registration in Nursing. (Addictive Disorders, Impaired professionals)

1997 Botech Corporation, Cambridge, MA. (Effects of Solitary Confinement)

1998 Psychiatric Expert in Compliance Monitoring; Eng v Coombe Federal District Court, Western District, NY, CIV #80-385-S. (Effects of Solitary Confinement)

2000-2 The Desisto School, Lenox MA

2001- Consultant, Florida Department of Corrections. (Solitary Confinement and Mental Health Issues in Florida State Prisons.)

2001- Board of Advisors, Correctional Association of New York, (Mental Health Issues in New York State Prisons).

2002-4 Board of Directors, Massachusetts 9/11 Fund.

2002-4 American Boyschoir School, Princeton, NJ.

2002-3 Poly Prep School, Brooklyn, NY.

(Note: As a result of my experience with the effects of stringent conditions of confinement, I have had a large number of other affiliations and consultations, which have not been separately listed. The following is not a complete list: American Friends Service Committee, Amnesty International, The Capital Habeas Unit of the Defender Services Division of the United States Courts, The Center for Constitutional Rights, The Correctional Association of New York, Federal Public Defender - of E. Dist VA, of Tennessee, of the State of Washington, and of Washington, DC, The Legal Aid Society of New York, National Defenders Investigators Association, The National Prison Project of the ACLU, Prisoners Legal Services of Michigan, of New Mexico, and of New York, Public Defenders Office of Connecticut, and of Maine, etc.)

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY/COMMITTEE/STAFF MEMBERSHIPS

1974-2003. Member, American Psychiatric Association &
Massachusetts Psychiatric Society

Committee Memberships.

Inpatient Psychiatry Committee (1981-1984)

Private Practice Committee (1992-1995)

Chair, Presidents Task Force on Managed Care (1993-1994)

Steering Committee, Managed Care Retreat (1993-1994)

1974-1977 Resident in Psychiatry, Beth Israel Hospital, Boston, MA.
Clinical Fellow in Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School.

1977-2003 Courtesy Staff, Beth Israel Hospital, Boston, MA
Assistant in Psychiatry (1977-1991)
Associate in Psychiatry (1991-2003)
Clinical Instructor in Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School.

1980-1999 Active Staff, Boston Regional Medical Center, Stoneham, MA

Committee Memberships
Credentials Committee (1986-1990)
Chair, Bylaws Committee (1987-1990)
Medical Staff Executive Committee (1989-1992)
Chief of Staff (1990-1992)
Board of Trustees (1990-1992)

1992 - Active/Courtesy Staff, Melrose-Wakefield Hospital, Melrose, MA

1993-2000 Psychiatric Network of Massachusetts
Committee Memberships
Steering Committee (1993-1994)
Chairman, Board of Directors (1994-1995)

AWARDS

2005. National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAMI). Exemplary Psychiatrist Award,
Presented at Annual Meeting, American Psychiatric Association, May 2005.

TEACHING APPOINTMENTS, PRESENTATIONS

1967 Teaching Fellow, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA

1967-1969 Teaching Fellow, Department of Sociology, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA

1973 Clinical Fellow in Psychiatry, New York University Medical Center, New York, NY

1974-1977 Clinical Fellow in Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

1975-1976 Consultant and Lecturer, Human Resources Institute, Brookline, MA

1977-2003 Clinical Instructor, Department of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

- 1978-80 Assistant Clinical Professor, Department of Psychiatry, Tufts University Medical Center, Boston, MA
- 1987 Faculty, Third International Conference on Restricted Environmental Stimulation, New York, NY: "Effect of REST In Solitary Confinement and Psychiatric Seclusion"
- 1987 Guest Lecturer, Suffolk University School of Law, Boston, MA: "Commitability and the Right to Refuse Treatment"
- 1988 Faculty, 32nd Institute on Hospital and Community Psychiatry, Boston, MA
- 1990 Massachusetts Bar Association Symposium, Boston, MA: "Drugs and Alcohol on Campus"
- 1992 - Faculty, American Academy of Psychiatry and Law, Boston, MA: "Effects of Childhood Sexual Abuse"
- 1993 Faculty, Massachusetts Department of Corrections Stress Unit, Statewide Seminar, MA: "Stress Awareness for Managers"
- 1993 Massachusetts Continuing Legal Education Seminar, Boston, MA: "Psychiatric Effects of Physical and Sexual Assault"
- 1994 Massachusetts Academy of Trial Attorneys Seminar, Boston, MA: "Psychiatric Evaluation of Victims of Violent Crime"
- 1994 Beth Israel Hospital/Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA: "Psychiatric Consequences of Solitary Confinement; "Effects of Sensory Deprivation and Social Isolation in a Vulnerable Population"
- 1994 Massachusetts Medical Society, Committee on Managed Care, Waltham, MA: "Ethics of Managed Care"
- 1994 Prison Psychiatric Group, Albany, NY: "Criminality and Mental Illness, Revisited: Disorders of Volition". (Lecture sponsored by Pfizer Pharmaceuticals)
- 1995 Suffolk University Advanced Legal Studies, Boston, MA: "Sexual Abuse: Memory, Truth and Proof"

- 1995 Massachusetts Association of Trial Attorneys Seminar, Boston, MA: "Premises Liability/Negligent Security: Psychiatric Testimony and the Role of the Psychiatric Expert"
- 1996 New England Society for the Study of Dissociation, McLean Hospital, Belmont, MA: "Impact of Forensic Issues on Treating Victims of Violence"
- 1996 Harvard Medical School, Children's Hospital Family Violence Seminar, Boston, MA: "Trauma and Memory"
- 1996 Trauma and Memory: An International Research Conference, Durham, NH: "Factors Distinguishing True and False Memory of Childhood Sexual Abuse"
- 1996 Trauma and Memory: An International Research Conference, Durham, NH: "Memory of Sexual Abuse by a Parish Priest"
- 1997 Correctional Association of New York, NY: "Psychiatric Effects of Solitary Confinement".
- 1998 Massachusetts Board of Registration in Medicine and Northeastern University Conference, Substance Abuse and The Licensed Professional, Boston, MA: "Addictions and Compulsions: Disorders of Volition"
- 2000 Human Rights Watch and American Civil Liberties Union Foundation Conference. Washington, D.C. "Super-Maximum Security Confinement in the United States."
- 2003 Capital Habeas Unit Training Conference of the Defender Services Division of the United States Courts, San Antonio, TX. (lecture regarding death row confinement and its effects on post-conviction appeal process.)
- 2003 NAACP Legal Defense Fund Conference, Airlie, VA. 7/03. Lecture regarding mental health issues and solitary confinement of prisoners.
- 2005 Vera Institute. National Commission on Safety and Abuse in Prisons. Newark NJ, July 2005. Effects of Isolation.

- 2005. NAACP Legal Defense Fund, Airlie Conference, Va. July 2005.
“Volunteers’ in Death Row”.

- 2006 University of California at Davis, Symposium - The Neurobiology of
Torture. “What is Known about the Neurobiological Effects of
Solitary Confinement.”

MEDIA, PUBLIC AFFAIRS PRESENTATIONS

- 1988 NBC-TV, Today Show “Small Group Confinement of Female
Political Prisoners at the Federal Penitentiary in Lexington, KY”

- 1990 NPR-TV, News Interview Program: “Psychiatric Effects of
Small Group Confinement”

- 1990 PBS-TV, Point of View “Through the Wire”, Documentary
regarding women confined for politically motivated crimes

- 1991 WBZ-TV, Boston, MA: Channel 4 Nightly News “Statute of
Limitations on Cases of Childhood Sexual Abuse”

- 1992 Boston Globe, New York Times, etc.: “Effects of Childhood
Sexual Abuse by a Catholic Priest”

- 1992 Boston Globe, New York Times, San Francisco Chronicle,
Los Angeles Times, etc.: “Psychiatric Effects of Solitary
Confinement”

- 1993 New England Cable News, Newton, MA: Commentator regarding
insanity defense in Kenneth Sequin trial

- 1993 Massachusetts House of Representatives, Judiciary Committee
testimony: Proposed change in Statute of Limitations in cases
of childhood sexual abuse

- 1993 CBS-TV, 60 Minutes “Pelican Bay – Psychiatric Effects of Solitary
Confinement in California’s High-Tech Maximum Security Prison”

- 1993 New England Cable News, Newton, MA: News Night “False

Memory and Recovered Memory of Childhood Sexual Abuse”

- 1993 WCVB-TV, Boston, MA: Chronicle “Sentencing of Father Porter – The Effect on the Victims”
- 1994 WHDH-TV, Boston, MA: Boston Common “False Memory Syndrome”.
- 1994 FOX-TV, Boston, MA: At Issue “Psychiatric Effects of Solitary Confinement”
- 1996 New England Cable News, Newton, MA: News Night “The Insanity Defense”
- 1998 ABC-TV, Nightline with Ted Koppel; Primetime Live “Crime and Punishment”
- 1998 WBZ-TV, Boston, MA: Channel 4 Nightly News “Perpetrators of Sexual Abuse: Dangers to the Community”
- 1999 ABC-TV, 20/20 “Effects of Solitary Confinement”
- 2003 Discovery Channel. “Mohammed Atta: Profile of a Terrorist”.
- 2003 Invited Testimony, Joint Legislative Hearing, New York State Assembly, New York City, November 2003. “Disciplinary Confinement and Treatment of Prison Inmates with Serious Mental Illness.”
- 2004 Invited Testimony, Massachusetts State Legislature. Joint Committee on Public Safety. “The Cost of Corrections”.

MAJOR INTERESTS IN FORENSIC PSYCHIATRY

1. Psychiatric Effects of Solitary Confinement

Psychiatric expert in large number of cases including several large class action suits and other lawsuits in Federal and State Courts in California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Massachusetts, Maine, New Mexico, New York State, Texas, Virginia, the State of Washington, and in Washington, D.C. Decisions in some of those cases, and my published findings, have been cited in Federal Appellate decisions, and have also generated significant national media interest. Issues have included: mental illness among inmates so confined; effect on ability to assist in inmate's own legal defense (both pretrial and postconviction); "volunteering" for execution; impact on inmate's ability to cooperate with government in debriefing and testifying.

Peer-Reviewed Medical Publications:

"Psychopathological Effects of Solitary Confinement", Am J Psychiatry 140:11, 1983.

"Effects of Sensory Deprivation in Psychiatric Seclusion and Solitary Confinement", Intl J Law & Psychiatry 8:49, 1986.

Law Journals:

"Psychiatric Effects of Solitary Confinement", Washington Univ. Journal of Law & Policy Vol 22: pp. 325-383, 2007.

2. Strip Search Procedures, Sexual and Physical Assault

Psychiatric expert in a number of strip search cases in Federal and Massachusetts state courts. Testimony has been cited by the Federal Appeals Court in *Cole v Snow*. Consulted in settlement of two class action suits.

Psychiatric expert in cases of rape, sexual and physical assault. Substantial experience in evaluating the effects of childhood sexual abuse, and the processing over time of memories of that abuse. Evaluated approximately 100 victims of childhood sexual abuse, including many of the plaintiffs in the clergy sex abuse scandals in Massachusetts. Consulted to private schools around such issues.

Research and Presentations:

Principal Investigator, Beth Israel Hospital, Department of Psychiatry, Boston, MA.

“Psychiatric and Addictive Problems in Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse Perpetrated by Father Porter.”

“Recovery of Memory of Childhood Sexual Abuse and Creation of False Memories; Can These Processes be Distinguished?”.

3. Addictive Disorders

Testimony in a number of criminal and civil cases. My testimony in a highly publicized case, *In re Cockrum*, helped to establish that an individual who was otherwise highly competent, was not competent to act in his own behalf in appealing his murder conviction, as a result of an underlying addictive suicidal compulsion.

4. Civil Rights Issues

Expert in a number of cases regarding racial and sexual harassment in employment and housing situations, including cases brought by Civil Rights Division of the United States Department of Justice, and by Greater Boston Legal Services, and in strip search procedures by law enforcement and prison personnel.

(updated 2/10/07)