



The Activist Files Episode 46: Guantánamo at 20 - you asked, we answered

Aliya Hana Hussain:

Welcome to the Activist Files, the Center for Constitutional Rights podcast. I'm Aliya Hussain, an advocacy program manager, and I'm here with two friends and colleagues, Shayana Kadidal and Wells Dixon, both senior staff attorneys at the Center for Constitutional Rights. Welcome guys.

Shayana Kadidal:

Thank you Aliya.

J. Wells Dixon:

Thanks Aliya.

Aliya Hana Hussain:

As many of our listeners know the Center for Constitutional Rights has been at the forefront of the legal battle against indefinite detention and torture at Guantanamo since the prison's opening. Representing dozens of currently and formerly detained men. This past week, we marked 20-years since the prison opened in 2002 with a virtual rally, op-eds, media interviews and an event that we organized Guantanamo Off the Record, 20-years in the Fight. If you weren't able to join that event, you can check out the recording on our Facebook page. We'll add a link to the show notes. In anticipation of this big anniversary we collected questions from supporters who've been following our work for years. The three of us have been doing this work for more than a decade. So it was great to get a sense of what people really wanted to know about CCR and the prison. There were so many great ones, and we're gonna try in this episode to answer as many as we can. All right Shane and Wells, you guys ready? Okay. Let's go. We'll try to, we'll try to do RA rapid fire style, which I know can be challenging sometimes with lawyers. Let's see how many questions we can get through. So the first one for you Shane, can you give a snapshot of the current population? How many are still there and what's the outlook for them?

Shayana Kadidal:

The Activist Files Episode 46: Guantánamo at 20 - you asked, we answered

Sure. So there were 780 men over the history of the prison who were held there at some time, but there's only 39 left. Twelve of those people are charged and are in some phase of the military commission process either they've been tried or their awaiting trial or something like that. Right? So there's 12 guys who are charged then outta the other 27, 18 of them are cleared for a lease, which means that every single agency involved, the CIA, the FBI justice state, the military, they all agree unanimously that they can be released. And then there's another nine guys who aren't charged, but haven't been cleared yet. Sometimes we call this the Indefinite Detention category, the Forever Prisoners. Sometimes I like to call them people who are waiting for release.

Aliya Hana Hussain:

Wells. Does torture still occur at Guantanamo? And if, why is it so hidden from the world stage?

J. Wells Dixon:

That is an excellent question, Aliya. You know, when I think back to the beginning of Guantanamo 20-years ago, one of the images that comes to mind for me is the image of hooded men in orange jumpsuits, kneeling in the ground, out there in the sun. And it brings back to mind what I experienced the first time I went to Guantanamo 16-years ago, which was encountering men. Who'd been physically beaten and physically abused for years, and that was torture. And yet we saw over time that the treatment of the men changed, you know, by the mid to late 2000's, these men were being held for the most part in strict isolation, you know, 22, 23 hours a day in a small room that is devoid of any sort of human stimulation. And that also is torture. And if you think about Guantanamo today, the men are held very much the same way that they once were.

J. Wells Dixon:

That is most of these men are held without charge and without foreseeable end. And I think if you think about that being held for 20-years and having no foreseeable end to your detention, that itself is torture by any definition. So, so yes, I'm sad to say, I think the men continue to be tortured.

Shayana Kadidal:

I think, you know, one thing to add to that Aliya is that for guys who are hunger striking the force feeding regimes that have been used at Guantanamo, I think have always constituted torture, and they hadn't changed radically under Obama from what we'd seen before. And also there are a lot of guys who had preexisting psychiatric conditions or psychiatric conditions they develop because of what happened to them at Guantanamo and being denied real treatment for that, I think really also constitutes a form of torture. And it's one of the worst things that we see day-to-day in dealing with our clients.

Aliya Hana Hussain:

And keeping on the theme of torture. I think many people remember President Obama's remarks, quote, "we tortured some folks." I have a great question here. Why were president Obama and Attorney General Holder so resistant to instituting any accountability processes for torture? Wells?

J. Wells Dixon:

Well, I think that there are a couple of reasons you know, the first challenge in terms of accountability for torture is understanding exactly what happened, right? What exactly happened to these men,

The Activist Files Episode 46: Guantánamo at 20 - you asked, we answered

including in particular, how were these men treated while a lot of them were held in secret CIA detention? I mean, that is information that's still not public and absent the ability to make that information public there isn't really much momentum toward accountability. You know, if people don't know what happened, then, you know, it's, it's very hard to convince people that there's a need for accountability. You ask about President Obama and Attorney General Holder. I think the, the failure of accountability, there is a failure of leadership. It is an unwillingness to, to look back at, at what happened. You remember what President Obama said at the beginning of his term, we're gonna, we're gonna look forward. We're gonna move forward. And there really hasn't been a desire to reckon with the past and the torture and abuse of detainees in particular. But the other thing I'll say on a somewhat more optimistic note is that if you look at, if you look at torture accountability from a broader perspective, and you look for just this one example at the account of ability for torture that has just begun to emerge in places like Latin America, the one thing you realize is that it takes a long time for there to be accountability. You know, it's sort of, you begin to see it kind of 15, 20-years after the fact, historically, and that's really the point where we are now with Guantanamo 20-years. And so I would look to the future and I would not be surprised if there is a greater movement toward accountability, particularly as more information about, the torture and abuse of detainees in the CIA program becomes public. I mean, just in October of, of 2021, Majid Kahn was able to talk about what happened to him in CIA detention. He spoke for two hours to a military jury and that jury was appalled. And so I think if we look to the future that is beyond 20-years of Guantanamo, I remain optimistic that they'll be justice and accountability for what happened to these men. Certainly we're gonna continue to demand that.

Aliya Hana Hussain:

Shane when you were giving your sort of snapshot picture of Guantanamo now you talked about how the overwhelming majority of people at Guantanamo are not charged with a crime. And this is both kind of a big and a simple question at the same time. What legally has allowed the US to imprison people without charging them with a crime?

Shayana Kadidal:

Well, it's this it's this kind of fabricated concept that, that all of these people that we swept up in these kind of raids that really were led by profiling criteria, right? If you were Arab and Afghanistan, you were immediately a suspect in 911 and the people on the ground, whether it's corrupt warlords in Afghanistan or corrupt police in Pakistan or hungry villagers, they knew they could turn people over in exchange for really big payments from the US government. But the, you know, we took that and kind of, you know, morphed it into this idea that somehow these people were like prisoners of war, like German soldiers in uniform captured, you know, on the battlefield in 1944. And that the rule in wars between states had always been, you can keep holding people until the war is over. Well, you know, that rule that you can keep holding them, even if they haven't committed a crime because they were fighting for the other side, that's kind of premised on the, the idea that the war will end sometime, that there are two countries that can negotiate a piece, right?

Shayana Kadidal:

And that there are uniforms. And you can tell who's who, that's the complete opposite of what, you know, <laugh> the conflict, the chaotic conflict in which all these guys were swept up really was. And you know, it's that kind of, that blurring of lines between the traditional kind of law of war concept of detaining people in warfare between states and mixing that up, you know, what was kind of essentially, you know, much closer to kind of a big criminal justice operation, except that it was, you know, not

The Activist Files Episode 46: Guantánamo at 20 - you asked, we answered

premised on evidence. It was just, if you were Arab and Afghanistan, you're a suspect and were gonna arrest you and hold you until we figure out what to do with you. It's that blurring of lines between to schemes that allows the, the US to kind of keep holding on people, the courts bought into it, unfortunately from the very get go in 2002 and 2003, and that's kind of why we're where we are now.

Aliya Hana Hussain:

And what would you say are some of the legal arguments that government is making now in 2022 in Habeas litigation to argue that people should remain at Guantanamo?

Shayana Kadidal:

You know, as of about 2011 or 2012, it was, you know, the rules had been set up by the very conservative court of appeals for DC to make it impossible to win a case. Partly because the courts really kind of brought in, in a big way to this kind of amorphous notion that everybody could be, to be a Law of War prisoner, but also because the rules around evidence were so permissive that, you know, stuff that would get laughed out of court in ordinary domestic criminal proceedings could, you know, land, somebody could mark someone as detainable for life at Guantanamo. So the government really doesn't have to make more arguments. Now the existing kind of law has kind of set things up to make it impossible for us to argue our way out of our clients to argue their ways out of detention in court.

Shayana Kadidal:

Right. but we are trying to change the ground rules. And really one of the biggest things that's pending right now is the argument that the due process clause, which is the clause of the constitution, guarantees fair procedures, anytime the government tries to take your liberty or your stuff away from you that that clause should apply at Guantanamo. Because Guantanamo, the Supreme court has said is effectively kind of the same as any of the 50 states in terms of, you know, the extension of kind of constitutional provisions there. If the DC circuit, which is completely swung around and is relatively liberal now agrees with us, agrees with our side that the due process clause applies. Then I think it'll revolutionize the law that applies to these cases. And then people can start actually using the courts to force their way out past the, the political log jam between the president and Congress. And that's something that hasn't been possible hasn't even looked like it's possible since, you know, since the last time we won at the Supreme court in 2008, I think that always surprises people to hear, but it's a reality.

Aliya Hana Hussain:

Speaking of courts, you know, there are many lawyers who are involved in this work in addition to those of us here at the Center for Constitutional Rights and Shane, you had mentioned 780 men have passed through Guantanamo since it opened, Wells, Can you talk about the different kinds of lawyers that have represented men over the years? And you know, what sort of drew those folks to, to this fight with us,

J. Wells Dixon:

Shane was talking about the essentially the lifelong detention of men held without charge at Guantanamo. And you know, that idea that human beings could be held without charge in an offshore prison is one that the Center for Constitutional Rights challenged from the get go that is from the time Guantanamo is established in 2002, we pushed back on this notion of indefinite potentially lifetime military detention. And it was very controversial at the time. You know, this was, this was months after 9-11 and the detainees at Guantanamo were, were not popular. And we persisted and we challenged the entire indefinite detention regime at Guantanamo and won in the US Supreme court in 2004 in a

The Activist Files Episode 46: Guantánamo at 20 - you asked, we answered

case called *Russell versus Bush* no one expected us to win, but we did. And the most significant aspect of that ruling, I think in retrospect, looking back over the past 20-years or so was the right to go to Guantanamo and to learn who was there, what had happened to them and, and why they were still being detained. And what happened when CCR lawyers started to go down to the base is that more and more prisoners wanted to have legal representation to challenge their detention. You know, you'd meet with a client and they would show up with a list of 10 other men detained in, in a cell block near them and say, hey, can you represent these men too? And it became quickly a parent that CCR and the small group of lawyers that worked with us from the start were not gonna be able to handle all of those cases. And so one of the things that CCR did in addition to representing detainees is we recruited lawyers from all over the country to represent these men and to challenge their detention. We comprised what, what came to be known as the, the Habeas Bar or the, the Gitmo Bar, which was a group of about 600 lawyers.

J. Wells Dixon:

I believe from some of the biggest law firms in the United States. There were solo practitioners, there were law professors, there were federal public defenders and all of these lawyers got together and worked in coordination to represent the men detained at Guantanamo. And in addition to that, with respect to, to the small number of men who are charged by a military commission, there were a number of, and there continued to be a number of Military Defense Council that is military JAG lawyers who undertook the representation of the small number of men charged by military commission. And they too joined the fight and together pushed back on the notion of indefinite detention, the notion of lawlessness, of secrecy and I think in retrospect have been pretty successful. I mean, the number of men detained at Guantanamo is a lot, a lot smaller. Now there's certainly secrecy that persists around Guantanamo, but a lot less. And there may be fewer men detained at, at the, but, but the lawyers are still there. Law firms like Covington and Burling, Jenner and Block, they're still in this fight with CCR. They've been in this fight with us for, for a very long time and are gonna be there with us until Guantanamo closes.

Aliya Hana Hussain:

So Shane, we got a lot of questions about Guantanamo and not just the prison and also about Cuba. So this question is, is Guantanamo a town, a city or only a prison site? Who lives there besides the prisoners and the US military personnel? And then there's a second part to that, which is besides working to close a prison, what can be done to return the Naval base to Cuba?

Shayana Kadidal:

Oh sure. Yeah. People always have this impression that it's actually kind of in Cuba <laugh> and that, you know, you maybe like can walk down the street and, and cross the border or something like that. And, and hang out in, you know, a village where everyone is speaking Spanish or something. That's not the case. I mean, it's a, it's a Naval base that we decided we wanted. When Cuba was effectively our colony after the Spanish American war we won the war, we took Puerto Rico and, and Cuba created a Cuban fledgling Republic. And then leased this, you know, one deep water port in the Southeastern hinterlands of the country where it's very dry. It doesn't rain. This it's not much grid for growing crops and there's not that many people that live right around it. So it looks like it's, you know, this big, deep water Harbor in the middle of, of the desert, basically there is a, a city called Guantanamo, but it's a good bit over the border and nobody ever gets to cross the border. It's super heavily militarized and guarded. There used to be a few workers in the sixties who were grandfathered and got to come across and so forth, not the

The Activist Files Episode 46: Guantánamo at 20 - you asked, we answered

case anymore. So it's basically like America, you land there and you think you're in like, you know, the central valley in California in Fresno or something like that. There's no sense at all, really that you're in Cuba and it looks like small town America from like 40, 50-years ago. Really it's about 10,000, 11,000 soldiers and their family members, I think on the base about 1400 involved in detention operations. I'm forgetting the second question.

Aliya Hana Hussain:

It's about returning the Naval base to Cuba.

Shayana Kadidal:

Sure. You know, unlike the canal zone in Panama, where there was something actually useful <laugh>, you know, so there was, you know, it was quite a useful bit of property that we had, you know held onto in our kind of, you know, was one of our last vestiges of, you know, colonial empire. The military base Guana was utterly useless. It was a military base. I mean, it's held onto though, we, we wanted it during the age of when battleships were the means of projecting power. So, you know, deep water, you know, port where it could stash some coal to fuel your ships was great. It's not useful anymore for any purpose. The only reason we keep it is because we don't want to hand it back to Cuba because our, you know, diplomatic relations with Cuba are so lousy. So I think what has to happen is that the politics of the Cuban community in the US have to change. They have to be less dominated by exile community who are still bitter about the loss of their property and nationalization to the, the communist regime in Cuba. Instead have to be taken over by the, the younger people who really don't care that much about the politics who came over, whose families came over in the eighties and nineties.

Aliya Hana Hussain:

So we're gonna sort of move towards the, the big question eventually of, of how we could close Guantanamo. But this question is a really good one, which is what is the, of other countries and helping to close Guantanamo? Wells?

J. Wells Dixon:

If you think back to when Guantanamo opened, it was supposed to be a place entirely outside the law. It was supposed to be the legal equivalent of outer space. I believe it was the term that was used and that was viewed as exceptional. Now historians can debate whether that is accurate or not, but that's how it was perceived in a lot of corners of the globe. And a lot of countries, a lot of strong US allies were very critical of that. And early on when these countries saw or learned for example, that their citizens were detained at Guantanamo, they demanded their immediate release. And so if you look for example, at the Bush administration, during the Bush administration, a lot of the European countries came forward and said, you have to release our citizens. So it's no surprise, right? That the Europeans were the first released from Guantanamo along with a lot of the Pakistanis.

J. Wells Dixon:

This is a time when the US was heavily reliant on Pakistan in connection with the Afghanistan conflict, you know, the effort and the pressure from countries other than the United States to, to close Guantanamo it has continued. And you saw during Obama years in particular, a lot of countries stepped up to accept men from Guantanamo that is to, to repatriate their own citizens, but also to accept non citizens into their countries for purposes of resettlement. And that was really an essential component of president Obama's strategy to try to close Guantanamo and a, and a very large number of detainees

The Activist Files Episode 46: Guantánamo at 20 - you asked, we answered

were transferred out of Guantanamo as a consequence of that. So today as we, we move beyond 20-years of Guantanamo it's essential that other countries continue to come forward and continue to agree to resettle men from Guantanamo because it's not enough to just say Guantanamo is a human rights disaster, which of course it is. And a lot of countries have said it, it's not enough to do that. That's not gonna close Guantanamo and men have to have somewhere to go. And so it's important for, for strong US allies to, continue to take these men. I mean, that's the way forward from Guantanamo. That's the way to close Guantanamo,

Shayana Kadidal:

You know Aliya, it's funny. I mean, I think back to those early days when there were still European detainees at Guantanamo, and it always seemed like it had more, the lawlessness had a bigger impact over there. And you know, it's always struck me that maybe this is just kind of a quirk of our American experience. We've always had a big immigrant population in the US. This country is about 10% non citizens right now. And you know, one of the things that made what the Bush administration was doing acceptable was that it was always being done to them.

Shayana Kadidal:

It was always being done to non-citizens the bad things that happened at home in the war on terror and abroad, always being done to non-citizens and people at home didn't feel like it was a threat or a problem because of that. Whereas you look at say, England, you know, their extreme reactions to the terrorism threats, you know, ended up being directed at the domestic Muslim community, which was mostly second and third generation Britain's namely, you know, so citizens and therefore there was much more of a pushback, you know, on the legal violations and could see that it was coming for them also, right. That their rights were being threatened. And I think there was a little bit of that feeling everywhere and, and it's, you know, it's partly a product of the fact that the US is one of the few developed countries with an enormous immigrant population, but it's also partly a symptom of our pathologies about our immigrant and non-citizen population. Right. I mean, we see those on display with the Trump administration in bold relief.

Aliya Hana Hussain:

Yeah. I'm glad you, you both brought up bit of resettlement and repatriation in other countries because we received a lot of questions asking about people once they're released. So Shane, you know, how have men integrated or reintegrated into places they've been released to? And then a question of like what can the public do to improve the lives of people who've been released? If anything?

Shayana Kadidal:

Yeah. I think it's always been enormously difficult for people who go home to their home countries. You know, very often the story is I'm regarded with suspicion, you know, they've been writing about me here for a long time before I came back, nobody wants to associate with me the security services, follow me so closely that nobody else wants to be seen with me. So that kind of thing, you're a pariah for people who are resettled in a third country because they were torture concerns or things. If they were sent to their, their country to citizenship, then it's just being a complete fish outta water with no help from the United States. Right? I mean the ones who succeeded the most have gone to countries that had a strong social welfare system set up, but that's mostly Western Europe. A lot of guys went to Eastern Europe where they just weren't the resources.

The Activist Files Episode 46: Guantánamo at 20 - you asked, we answered

Shayana Kadidal:

And then the language gap is enormous. And you know, if you are unemployable because you're a pariah, at least you wanna be able to rely on your family. And a lot of times these guys, you know, they haven't been reunited with their families. They don't have anybody. So it's terrible. And honestly I think like the most valuable thing that people can do, I mean, we've had some, you know, supporters who've actually made direct financial support and that's great, but not everyone can do it really just letting people know that they're not forgotten. I think goes a long way. A lot of the former detainees are kind of coming out publicly and speaking and they're on social media and just letting people know. So we remember them and that there are people in the US who still care about them. I think that's a huge, big deal.

Aliya Hana Hussain:

And, you know, taking a step a little further back, you know, obviously our focus is to close Guantanamo. But in, in terms of like a longer term strategies on reparations for survivors, what are your thoughts on that? And the person who asked this question said, you know, reparations could include financial reparations, but also apologies other forms of care, whether they'd be medical, psychological for both of you. Maybe with Wells first, what are some thought on more long term, how to support these people who have been released from Guantanamo?

J. Wells Dixon:

That's a really important question. Because as Shane said, you know, the stigma of Guantanamo is real and it's far reaching and for, for men who've been detained in Guantanamo. It can at times be difficult to, to adjust to life after Guantanamo. And you know, it's been challenging for some, it's also been very successful for other formerly detained men. And I think that's a function of the kind of support that they get. Now we do know from prior experience that medical care and social support and so on is all is often the subject of bilateral or multilateral negotiation between the United States and, and, and the receiving country. And it's essential for that to continue. But I think in the long term, you know, when we think about justice and accountability for what happened to these men, there has to be reparation these men and that reparation, unfortunately I can say with some competence is likely not going to come from the United States. I mean, you know, efforts to obtain, you know, recompense from the United States have failed. I don't know how else to say it. They failed, but I think formerly detained men and even some currently detained men have had some degree of success looking for relief outside of the United States. You know, there have been lawsuits by formerly detained men in, in places like the United Kingdom that have been successful. But you know, I'll just say for most men, that's not really to be candid sort of foremost in their minds, you know, and the men who are detained need to get out and a lot of the men who, who have been released just really wanna move on, they wanna stop thinking about Guantanamo. They just wanna restart their lives. And so, you know, it's very important that we respect their wishes in that regard. And I think there's really no kind of one-size-fits-all approach for, for these men.

Shayana Kadidal:

Yeah. There are, you know, a few guys who tried to keep their lawsuits going in order to clear their names and the courts didn't want to have anything to do with that, which is kind of a running theme here. Right? I think the vast majority of the men who I represented left are not holding their breath for anything approaching, even an apology. You know, I mean, I always think about the Japanese-American internments, I think, which were recognized as kind of a fraud and sort of public relations theater even

The Activist Files Episode 46: Guantánamo at 20 - you asked, we answered

while they were happening in the mid 1940s. And and yet when did the compensation and the apologies really sort of come? 1980? Clinton administration? You know, afterwards it took forever in cases that, you know, maybe weren't quite as fraught as these are.

J. Wells Dixon:

Yeah. One, one thing I'll just add too, you know, thinking about how to help people who have been detained at Guantanamo. I think one, you know, one issue that comes up a lot for us working with formerly detained men is their legal status. You know, whether they've been returned to their own country or whether they've been resettled in another country, these men often confront the challenge of being undocumented. That is not having any sort of legal status, whether that's refugee status or, or residents or citizenship. Even if they have some status not having the ability to to obtain a passport or a driver's license. And so that's something that, that needs to be addressed. I think for a lot of men, as, as Guantanamo closure efforts continue something that really needs to be paid close attention to because that can really help these men with their effort to, to adjust to life after Guantanamo.

Aliya Hana Hussain:

Alright. Here's the, here's the million dollar question. What will it take to finally shut it down? Shane you're first.

Shayana Kadidal:

Yeah, I gotta turn the question around on you. The it's a definitional issue, right? I mean, closing Guantanamo for Obama meant closing the physical facility and, you know, charging some people releasing a bunch of others and then taking that in between category and, and picking everybody up and moving them to Illinois. That's not what closing Guantanamo I think has ever meant to us attorneys. It's been about closing the system of pretending that these are like law of war detainees, shutting down the system of whole people perpetually without charging them. Right. That is a, a doable thing, right? All it requires is to release the cleared guys. Most of whom can go well, a lot of whom can go to their home countries. The others, I think can be resettled in third countries pretty easily. It's just a matter of kind of bureaucratically getting organized and getting it done.

Shayana Kadidal:

And this administration's very, you're disorganized about Guantanamo. Then there are, you know, the nine guys in that, in between category. And that's really, once you release the clear guys, that's the remaining Guantanamo system, right? The, those are the people who are being held without charge. I think pretty much all of them are gonna be cleared before the year is over. I know that's why we talk about them as awaiting clearance rather than in this weird nether category. Right? So then that leaves the 12 people who are charged and you know, for a long time we thought the solution was bring 'em to the United States, charge them in criminal court. That makes sense from a legal perspective, from a justice perspective, I think, you know, an awful lot of them might prefer to kind of negotiate plea deals and serve out their sentences at Guantanamo because, you know, frankly, the prison conditions, there are probably preferable to the, the horrific conditions in federal supermaxes. But that means the facility would stay, but the system of charging of not charging people, holding them indefinitely would end and that's all doable.

Aliya Hana Hussain:

Wells? Do you have anything to add?

The Activist Files Episode 46: Guantánamo at 20 - you asked, we answered

J. Wells Dixon:

Just say, I think with respect to the 12 who are involved in military commissions, there is a way forward. One of those men is Maji Khan. Who's gonna be completing a sentence in February of 2022. Will that need to be transferred, but with respect to the others, you know, there seems to be bipartisan consensus. The military commissions have failed to achieve any form of justice or accountability for anybody, whether for the victims of terrorism or for the defendants who are tortured. And that as a consequence, really the only viable way forward is to try to negotiate the resolution of those cases. And you know, what those negotiations would look like. Well, you know, certainly details would have to be worked out on a case-by-case basis, but it would certainly address issues like, you know, where are they where do they serve sentences for how long are they serving sentences? What are the conditions? But again, you know, those are details. I think there is at this point, the beginning of 2022 consensus that negotiated resolution is the only way forward. And as Shane said, with respect to the other 27, who are awaiting transfer is they need to be returned home, or they need to be resettled. As simple as that, they're never gonna be charged. They've been held for 20-years. They need to go home.

Aliya Hana Hussain:

And I'll just sad for folks listening who wanna know how they can play a role in helping close the prison. You know, I'd say continue to learn, continue to seek out information from organizations like ours or partner organizations like Amnesty International's Center for Victims of Torture, Witness Against Torture, September 11th Families for a Peaceful Tomorrow. And the list goes on of people who are doing really great work to both pressure, the Biden administration, but to tackle some of the issues we've talked about today in terms of accountability, transparency, and then also uplifting the stories of those most directly impacted. There's a lot of great documentaries and films and books out there where you can and go straight to the source and hear directly from former detainees and also learn more about the stories of our clients as well. So thank you so much.

Aliya Hana Hussain:

Shane Kadidal and Wells Dixon for joining me. I think we did a pretty good job on the, the rapid fire though. There are a lot more questions that we couldn't get to, but I encourage people to find the resources that we mentioned in today's episode on the Center for Constitutional Rights websites, CCRjustice.org and that'll include some of the Op-ed writing media hits and also the event that we put together to mark the 20th anniversary. There's a lot of great stuff online, and we hope that you will check it out. Thank you for joining us. Thanks.

Shayana Kadidal:

Thanks Aliya.

J. Wells Dixon:

Thanks Aliya