Exhibit Z

Date: 20020828

TO: ALEC

FROM:

SUBJECT: EYES ONLY - STATUS OF THE INTERROGATIONS

[redacted]

TOR: 280820Z AUG 02 [redacted] 10700

~~S E C R E~~ T 280817Z AUG 02 STAFF

CITE [redacted] 10700

TO: IMMEDIATE ALEC INFO IMMEDIATE DIRECTOR, [redacted]

FOR: CTC [redacted] INFO CHIEF/CTC, CTC [redacted] [redacted] CTC/LGL, [redacted]
[redacted] OMS [redacted] OTS [redacted]

[redacted]

SUBJECT: EYES ONLY - STATUS OF THE INTERROGATIONS

REF: A. ALEC 185413 [redacted]
B. [redacted] 10667 [redacted]

TEXT:

1. ACTION REQUIRED: PLEASE NOTE PARA 7 AND WELCOME COMMENTS.

2. APPRECIATE ALEC'S ASSESSMENT IN REF (A) THAT ABU ZUBAYDAH HAS NOT TOLD US ALL THAT HE KNOWS, EVEN ON THE REQUIREMENTS ALREADY COVERED. WE LOOK FORWARD TO RESULTS OF ALEC/HQS ANALYSIS OF THE TAKE SO FAR IN AN EFFORT TO IDENTIFY AREAS WHERE WE ARE CONFIDENT--BASED ON ACTUAL OTHER REPORTING--THAT HE IS LYING OR HOLDING BACK.

3. DURING THE AGGRESSIVE PHASE OF THE INTERROGATION, COB AND

DCOS ALEC QUESTIONED SUBJECT AFTER HE HAD BEEN CONDITIONED AND DEEMED COMPLIANT AFTER 12 DAYS OF INTENSIVE WALLING AND WATERBOARDING, USE OF SMALL BOX, AND OTHER AGGRESSIVE TECHNIQUES. WE HAVE CONTINUED TO TEST THIS COMPLIANCE BY BROADENING THE SCOPE OF QUESTIONING AND PRESSING HIM ON PREVIOUS UNANSWERED ISSUES.

4. WHILE WE HAVE NO PRETENSE THAT THIS IS THE SUM TOTAL OF WHAT AZ KNOWS, BELIEVE WE ARE MAKING A DENT IN THAT KNOWLEDGE.

5. OF COURSE, BASED ON HIS DIRECT ACCESS TO THOSE PLANNERS, WE CORRECTLY ASSUMED HE WOULD HAVE SOME KNOWLEDGE OF OPERATIONAL PLANNING AND HE DOES, INDEED, HAVE THIS KNOWLEDGE. HE ADMITS THIS EVEN FOR 9/11, , BUT HE STILL INSISTS THAT HE HAS NO KNOWLEDGE OF THE BIG FOLLOW-ON ATTACK INTENDED FOR AFTER 9/11.

--IS HE LYING OR WITHHOLDING? POSSIBLE, BUT WE BELIEVE UNLIKELY GIVEN THE INTENSIVE PHSYICAL AND MENTAL PRESSURES USED.

--IS HIS ANSWER PLAUSIBLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE AVAILABLE INTELLIGENCE? YES.

--MOST IMPORTANTLY, ARE WE SATISFIED AT THAT WE HAVE

APPLIED THE TECHNIQUES AGGRESSIVELY AND CONDITIONED SUBJECT TO THE POINT THAT WE CAN ASSESS HE IS COMPLIANT? YES.

--OUR BOTTOM LINE IS THAT WE DON'T KNOW WHAT WE DON'T KNOW. WE CAN ONLY OPERATE ON WHAT WE DO KNOW, AND THAT INTELLIGENCE SO FAR IS CONSISTENT WITH AZ'S STORY.

6. AT THIS POINT, WE SHARE THE GOAL OF BOTH ALEC AND HQS TO IDENTIFY SOMETHING CONCRETE THAT WE CAN USE TO CONFRONT HIM IN A LIE OR A SIGNIFICANT OMISSION. IF WE SUCCEED, BASE WILL RETURN TO THE AGGRESSIVE PHASE TOOLS AND USE EVERY AVAILABLE TECHNIQUE ALLOWED US. ABSENT THAT SCENARIO, HOWEVER, WE PLAN TO CONTINUE THE STRATEGY AS LAID OUT IN REF (B) TO SYSTEMATICALLY DRAIN HIM DRY OF ANY USEFUL INTELLIGENCE. FOR THAT, WE WILL CAREFULLY CONTINUE TO OBSERVE HIM TO ENSURE HE REMAINS "COMPLIANT" AND IC PSYCHOLOGISTS WILL STAND BY TO "TUNE HIM UP" AS REQUIRED. IT IS OUR ASSESSMENT THAT IF WE PROCEED AGAIN TO THE WATERBOARD, ON A GENERAL THREAT QUESTION WITH NOTHING CONCRETE TO FOCUS ON, WE WILL RISK LOSING EVEN MINIMAL COOPERATION AFTERWARDS. IF AZ BELIEVES HE CANNOT AVOID THE WATERBOARD NO MATTER WHAT HE SAYS, PSYCOLOGISTS BELIEVE IT LIKELY HE MAY SIMPLY MOVE INTO A STATE WHERE WE COME CLOSE TO THE THRESHHOLDS ESTABLISHED BY CTC/LGL. OF COURSE, IF WE DO DEVELOP INFORMATION THAT HE IS LYING, THEN WE BELIEVE IT'S WELL WORTH THE RISK TO PRESS HIM HARD TO GET THAT ONE NUGGET.

7. SHOULD OUR REVIEW OF AZ'S REPORTING TURN UP INDICATIONS OF SUBSTANTIVE LIES AND/OR WITHHOLDING, [redacted] IF BASE AND HQS COLLECTIVELY ASSESS THAT WE HAVE NOT YET GOT THE BOTTOM LINE ON AZ'S THREAT INFO, AND WE REMAIN CONVINCED THE WATERBOARD APPLIED ONLY TO AZ IS UNLIKELY TO PRODUCE RESULTS THAT DIFFER FROM WHAT WE HAVE NOW, [redacted] AT PRESENT, OUR ASSESSMENT REMAINS THAT IF AZ DOES HAVE THAT NUGGET, HE'LL TAKE IT WITH HIM IF ONLY FACED WITH THE WATERBOARD.

8. FILE: [redacted]

CABLETYPE: [redacted]

END OF MESSAGE SECRET