Col. Stuart Couch, an officer in the Marines, lawyer in the JAG corps, and prosecutor assigned to a possible trial of Guantanamo detainee Mohamedou Slahi before a military commission, concluded that the evidence against him – including Slahi’s own statements – was inadmissible because obtained by torture. After much thought, Couch told the chief prosecutor, Col. Bob Swann, that he would not participate any further in the Slahi matter.

Couch has described his reasons for decision as resting on legal ethics, applicable law (including the Convention against Torture), and his Christian faith.

Jess Bravin, “‘Imagine the Worst Possible Scenario’: Why a Guantanamo Prosecutor Withdrew From the Case”
http://www2.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/torturingdemocracy/interviews/stuart_couch.html

What I did immediately was sort of seek out the advice of a senior Marine judge advocate at that time. I contacted them and asked if I could come over and see him. And we talked about it. I told him what I had seen. And I knew that he had been the position to know some of the -- some aspects of the Guantanamo operation. And I described for him what I'd saw. I'm sorry. I described for him what I had seen and how I felt about it. And he says, "Nope. You're not imagining things. You're not crazy. This is a real issue. This is a problem. And you need to work this -- you need to work this problem."

Meaning?
That I needed to, above all things, do the right thing when it came down to what was going to work for me. In other words that -- this is not one of those kinds of things you just -- you just check your morals at the door. You know, I describe myself as an evangelical Christian. I'm an Anglican by faith, but you know, a Christian by belief. And a very, you know, the very cornerstone of the faith, one of the essentials of the faith -- the Christian faith is the dignity of
human beings, the dignity of human life. And we believe that because as it says in the Bible, I mean, we were created in God's image. And there's -- there's, you know, it's a tough rub with these individuals. It's a tough thing to consider from that Christian perspective what to do with someone who has allegedly, themselves, taken human life in such a way that we saw demonstrated on September the 11th. And so that's difficult. You know, you get that human visceral reaction of vengeance or revenge or payback or whatever, and you also have that reaction of wanting to get information so that we can avoid this from happening again. I think those are very understandable human reactions. But there's another aspect to it, too, and is -- is that what God expects us to be doing to our fellow human being? That is, somebody that's been detained, they're off the battlefield, we are responsible for their care and feeding and their welfare, is it appropriate to treat them in a cruel and humane or degrading manner to get the information?

And your answer?

And my answer, it's not my answer, but you know, it's informed by faith. And that is, God means what he says. And we were created in his image, and we owe each other a certain level of dignity -- a certain level of respect. And that's just a line we can't cross. And my belief is that the Bible is the inspired word of God, and all of the words are there for a reason. There's -- there's no throwaway words in the Bible. And, you know, the Scripture talks a lot about human dignity and the sanctity of human life. And it's there for a reason. That's a big issue for God, it seems. And if it's a big issue for him, then we better have it as a big issue for us.
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My reservations as to what I saw in October of 2003, and then what I learned happened to Slahi, were all borne out of a variety—I think I talked about it in our last sitting. Three things. One, as a prosecutor, you're not going to get valid evidence like that. Two, as a military officer who knows about the Geneva Conventions and has had formal training in that, I clearly recognized it as a violation of the Geneva Conventions. You can make the argument all you want to about whether or not they represent a country that's a signatory to the Geneva Conventions, but at the end of the day—and I now know, under Common Article 3, but at that time I said, “This definitely violates if not the law the spirit of the UN Torture Convention. But, thirdly, I had a major problem with it as a self-avowed, evangelical Christian, because we don't treat other human beings like this.

So when I saw what was going on in Abu Ghraib, I was not surprised, and that's because, in my view, human beings are inherently sinful. This comes from my religious belief. I think when we have a policy in place that permits the inhumane treatment of other human beings, fundamental to that policy, that policy must be carried out by someone, and the someone it must be carried out by are other human beings who, as I've said, are inherently sinful. When you expect these inherently sinful human beings to carry out an inhumane policy, it's a slippery slope. It's like Pandora's Box. You will never be able to completely control who is conducting that interrogation, who is conducting the treatment of those detainees, and provide enough oversight, to make sure that it doesn't fall down the slippery slope. What I saw with the photographs from Abu Ghraib, when I ultimately learned the facts behind that—that it was the detention group that was doing that—my position was, “Well, obviously, they had some of this treatment by the intelligence guys, and thought it was okay for them to similarly mistreat detainees, and that's then why it ran amuck.” That's the problem with an inhumane policy, carried out by inherently sinful human beings.