

CIA advisor: Extraordinary rendition legal

By [Global Research](#)

Global Research, November 05, 2010

PressTV 5 November 2010

Theme: [Crimes against Humanity](#),
[Intelligence](#), [Law and Justice](#)

The notorious Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq exposed the US military practice of torturing detainees. A top lawyer for the CIA has claimed that the practice of extraordinary rendition is legal, even in cases that lead to the torture of a suspect.

Daniel Pines, an assistant general counsel at the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), has claimed that the practice of abducting terror suspects overseas and sending them to a third country for interrogation is legal under US law.

Writing in the Loyola University Chicago Law Journal, Pines stated, "There are virtually no legal restrictions on these types of operations... Indeed, US law does not even preclude [the] rendering [of] individuals to a third country in instances where the third country may subject the rendered individual to torture."

"The only restrictions that do exist under US law preclude US officials from themselves torturing or inflicting cruel and unusual punishment on individuals during rendition operations," he added.

The American Civil Liberty Union (ACLU), however, says that Pines failed to disclose the most extreme cases of renditions that involved torture.

The ACLU also points out that Washington has carried out renditions in the past where Americans were the jailers and torturers.

"The article does not even address the most extreme form of rendition carried out under the Bush administration: renditions to US run 'black-site' prisons, where Americans, not foreign intelligence services, were the jailers and the torturers," Ben Wizner, litigation director of the ACLU's National Security Project, told SpyTalk.

Moreover, the issue's legality has never been tried in US courts.

"Every case to date brought by a victim of the Bush administration's rendition policies has been dismissed by US courts, but none of those courts addressed the legality of the challenged practices. Rather, the cases were dismissed on the basis of overbroad secrecy and immunity claims," Wizner noted.

The original source of this article is PressTV
Copyright © [Global Research](#), PressTV, 2010

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Global Research](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca