

(b)(1)

~~ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED INFORMATION~~

(U) Hamdan v. Rumsfeld

(b)(1)
(b)(3) NatSecAct
(b)(5)

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


~~ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED INFORMATION~~

(b)(1)

(b)(3) NatSecAct

~~ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED INFORMATION~~

(b)(5)



~~ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED INFORMATION~~

(b)(1)

(b)(3) NatSecAct

[Redacted]

~~ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED INFORMATION~~

[Large redacted area]

(b)(1)
(b)(3) NatSecAct
(b)(5)

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

(TS/ [Redacted])

Implications for Our Current Detention Program

[Redacted]

(b)(1)
(b)(3) NatSecAct
(b)(5)

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

(TS/ [Redacted]) The impact of this holding on current CIA interrogation practices could be significant. Steve Bradbury's preliminary view is that the opinion "calls into real question" whether CIA could continue its CT interrogation program involving enhanced interrogation techniques. According to Bradbury, many, if not all, of CIA's enhanced interrogation techniques (including the seven techniques that would comprise the new, downsized EIT program) could be construed as inconsistent with the

~~ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED INFORMATION~~

[Redacted]

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

~~ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGED INFORMATION~~

provisions of Common Article 3 prohibiting "outrages upon personal dignity" and "violence to life and person."

(b)(1)
(b)(3) NatSecAct
(b)(5)

~~ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGED INFORMATION~~

~~TOP SECRET~~ (b)(1) ~~SECRET~~
(b)(3) NatSecAct