

(b)(3) CIAAct  
(b)(3) NatSecAct

Date: 200304 [ ]

TO: DIRECTOR

(b)(1)  
(b)(3) CIAAct  
(b)(3) NatSecAct

FROM:

SUBJECT: EYES ONLY - [ ] APRIL 2003 INTERROGATION OF KHALID SHAYKH MUHAMMAD

(b)(1)  
(b)(3) CIAAct ----- BODY -----  
(b)(3) NatSecAct

[ ]

(b)(3) NatSecAct [ ]

~~TOP SECRET~~

(b)(3) NatSecAct [ ]

(b)(1)  
(b)(3) CIAAct  
(b)(3) NatSecAct

(b)(1)  
(b)(3) CIAAct  
(b)(3) NatSecAct

(b)(1)

(b)(3) NatSecAct [ ]

PAGE 001

(b)(3) CIAAct  
(b)(3) NatSecAct

[ ] APR 03

(b)(1) ~~TOP SECRET~~ [ ] APR 03 STAFF  
(b)(3) CIAAct  
(b)(3) NatSecAct [ ]

(b)(1)  
(b)(3) CIAAct  
(b)(3) NatSecAct

TO: IMMEDIATE DIRECTOR.

FOR: [ ] (b)(1)  
(b)(3) CIAAct

[ ] (b)(3) NatSecAct

SUBJECT: EYES ONLY - [ ] APRIL 2003 INTERROGATION OF KHALID SHAYKH MUHAMMAD

(b)(1)  
(b)(3) CIAAct  
(b)(3) NatSecAct

REF: A. DIRECTOR [ ] (b)(1)  
(b)(3) CIAAct  
B. DIRECTOR [ ] (b)(3) NatSecAct

TEXT:

(b)(1)  
(b)(3) CIAAct  
(b)(3) NatSecAct

1. ACTION REQUIRED: NONE, FYI.

2. ATMOSPHERICS:

A. ON [ ] APRIL 2003, ((KHALID SHAYKH MUHAMMAD)) (KSM) WAS INTERROGATED/DEBRIEFED BY HVT INTERROGATOR [ ] ALEC SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTS [ ]

(b)(3) CIAAct

(b)(1)  
(b)(3) CIAAct  
(b)(3) NatSecAct

B. KSM WAS QUESTIONED ON INFORMATION ABOUT ILYAS FERRIS, JOSE PADIA, AND THE HAMBALLI GROUP.

(b)(1)  
(b)(3) CIAAct  
(b)(3) NatSecAct

3. ENHANCED MEASURES: NONE.

4. ASSESSMENT: AS NOTED IN THE APRIL [ ] REPORT, IN CONTRAST TO OUR INITIAL FORAY'S FROM INTERROGATION AS WE TRANSITION TO DEBRIEFING, KSM'S PRODUCTIVITY HAS IMPROVED. HE ENGAGES IN DESIRED ATTENTION TO DETAIL, UNSOLICITED CLARIFICATIONS, AND RELATIVELY UNGUARDED DIALOGUE. HE CONTINUES TO MAKE PROGRESS TOWARD A SATISFACTORY DEBRIEFING COMPORMENT.

A. NOTE: THE FOLLOWING INTERACTION BETWEEN KSM AND HIS INTERROGATOR IS INCLUDED BECAUSE IT IS CONSIDERED HELPFUL IN TERMS OF PROVIDING A "BEHAVIORAL AND ATTITUDINAL SLICE" OF HIS CURRENT INTERROGATION STATUS AND PROGRESS. FOLLOWING HIS LAST DEBRIEFING SESSION TODAY KSM ASKED THE HVTI INTERROGATOR IF HE (KSM) WAS MAKING PROGRESS IN TERMS OF THE CONDITIONS HIS INTERROGATORS HAD DESCRIBED TO HIM WHICH ARE INDICATIVE OF PROGRESS. THE INTERROGATOR TOOK THIS OPPORTUNITY TO REINFORCE KSM'S CONDITIONING BY REVIEWING THE INTERROGATION RULES WHICH WERE INITIALLY GIVEN TO HIM AND HIS EXPECTED BEHAVIOR. KSM WAS REMINDED: 1. THE PURPOSE OF HIS INTERROGATION IS NOT PUNISHMENT RATHER IT IS TO ELICIT INFORMATION, 2. INTERROGATION IS BASED ON HARD JUSTICE BUT JUSTICE NONE THE LESS, 3. HE HAS CONTROL OF HIS TREATMENT IN THE SENSE THAT HE DETERMINES THE POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE DIRECTION THIS TREATMENT WILL TAKE BASED ON HIS BEHAVIOR, 4. INTERROGATORS WILL NOT USE GRATUITOUS VIOLENCE, TRICKERY, OR DECEPTION AND THEY WILL DO PRECISELY WHAT THEY HAVE TOLD HIM THEY WILL DO AND ENFORCE IMMEDIATE CONSEQUENCES (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) BASED ON HIS COMPORMENT AND PERCEIVED VERACITY, 5. HE WILL NOT BE PUNISHED FOR TELLING THE TRUTH EVEN WHEN THE TRUTH CONSISTS OF OPERATIONS, ASPIRATIONS, INTENTIONS, OR SENTIMENTS AGAINST THE US, 6. NO MATTER HOW MUCH PROGRESS HE HAS MADE SHOULD HE CHOOSE NOT TO BE HONEST OR PRODUCTIVE HIS STATUS WILL IMMEDIATELY REVERSE AND IF NOT CORRECTED HE WILL FIND HIM SELF IN THE SAME OR WORSE CONDITIONS THAN THOSE HE HAS EXPERIENCED HERE TO FORE. KSM ASSURED THE INTERROGATOR HE UNDERSTOOD THIS AND INTENDED TO BE TRUTHFUL. AT THAT POINT KSM STATED HE WAS CONCERNED ABOUT THE INTERROGATORS JUDGMENT OF HIS PROGRESS AND ASK IF IT HAD IMPROVED (NOTE: IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING KSMS ADMISSION TO THE KILLING OF DANIEL PEARL ON THE [ ] OF APRIL HE HAD ASKED THE INTERROGATOR ABOUT HIS PROGRESS AND THE INTERROGATOR HAD REPLIED ON A SCALE OF 1-100, 1 BEING COMPLETELY DISHONEST AND 100 COMPLETELY HONEST, HE VACILLATED BETWEEN 50 AND 60. KSM WAS DISTRESSED AT THIS ASSESSMENT AND SHORTLY THERE AFTER HAD DISCLOSED TO THE INTERROGATOR AND DEBRIEFER HIS COMPLICITY IN THE PEARL KILLING). KSM WAS TOLD OVER THE PAST THREE DAYS HIS COMPORMENT AND THE INFORMATION HE HAD PROVIDED WAS SOMEWHAT IMPROVED FROM THE ESTIMATE GIVEN HIM EARLIER. AT THIS POINT THE INTERROGATOR EXPLAINED TO KSM THE INTERROGATION AND DEBRIEFING PROCESS DESCRIBING EACH PHASE (INTERROGATION, TRANSITION, AND DEBRIEFING), KSM WAS TOLD HE WAS CURRENTLY MAKING PROGRESS ACROSS THIS CONTINUUM BUT COULD IMMEDIATELY BE RETURNED TO HIS INITIAL INTERROGATION PHASE AT ANY TIME DEPENDING

(b)(1)  
(b)(3)  
CIAAct  
(b)(3)  
NatSecAct

ON HIS BEHAVIOR, DAMNING INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM INTELLIGENCE (b)(1)  
 SOURCES, OR ADMISSIONS FROM OTHER DETAINEES. HE WAS CAUTIONED NEVER (b)(3) CIAAct  
 TO BECOME COMPLACENT AND IT WAS FURTHER EXPLAINED TO HIM THAT EVEN (b)(3) NatSecAct  
 DURING THE MONTHS OF DEBRIEFINGS WHICH ARE TO FOLLOW THIS SAME  
 CONSEQUENCE WOULD BE ENFORCED IF INDICATED. KSM AGAIN REITERATED HIS  
 INTENT TO TELL THE TRUTH. HE THEN ASKED IF IT WAS "TOO EARLY" TO ASK  
 ABOUT WRITING A LETTER TO HIS FAMILY. THE INTERROGATOR TOLD HIM THY (b)(1)  
 MAY NEVER BE A POSSIBILITY AND THAT IT WAS TOO EARLY TO MAKE SUCH (b)(3) CIAAct  
 REQUEST. KSM CONTINUED, EXPRESSING CONCERN ABOUT [REDACTED] (b)(3) NatSecAct  
 [REDACTED] HE ASKED IF THE  
 INTERROGATOR HAD ANY KNOWLEDGE OF [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED] THE INTERROGATOR REPLIED HE DID NOT  
 KNOW THIS INFORMATION. THE DIALOGUE CONCLUDED WITH THE INTERROGATOR (b)(1)  
 ADMONISHING KSM THAT HIS BEST COURSE OF ACTION WAS TO WORK (b)(3) CIAAct  
 EFFECTIVELY WITH HIS INTERROGATORS AND DEBRIEFERS TO TRUTHFULLY (b)(3) NatSecAct  
 PROVIDE ALL THE INFORMATION HE HAD.

5. PLANS: CONTINUE TO DEBRIEF, DECONFLICT PREVIOUSLY PROVIDED (b)(1)  
 INCONSISTENCIES, AND INTRODUCE ADDITIONAL DEBRIEFERS IN ORDER TO (b)(3) CIAAct  
 ASSESS HIS ADAPTABILITY AND WILLINGNESS TO SUSTAIN PRODUCTIVE (b)(3) NatSecAct  
 BEHAVIOR IN FUTURE DEBRIEFINGS.

(b)(1)  
 (b)(3) CIAAct  
 (b)(3) NatSecAct

END OF MESSAGE

~~TOP SECRET~~