

# Geneva Contention

---

The printable version is no longer supported and may have rendering errors. Please update your browser bookmarks and please use the default browser print function instead.

This is an opinion item.

**Author(s)** The Wall Street Journal editorial board

**Source** The Wall Street Journal

**Date** September 18, 2006

**URL** <http://www.opinionjournal.com/editorial/feature.html?id=110008959>

**Quote**

“ What's more, the definition of an "outrage" is context-dependent. What's outrageous when dealing with the likes of 9/11 mastermind Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, or a terrorist who might know about imminent plots, is clearly different than what's outrageous when dealing with a lawful combatant or prisoner of war.”

Add or change this opinion item's references

This item argues against the position Supreme Court was correct in its ruling on the topic Hamdan v. Rumsfeld.

This item argues for the position Act should be passed on the topic Military Commissions Act of 2006.

This item argues against the position Competing Graham-McCain-Warner bill should be passed on the topic Military Commissions Act of 2006.

---

Retrieved from "[https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=Geneva\\_Contention&oldid=3130](https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=Geneva_Contention&oldid=3130)"

---

**This page was last edited on September 18, 2006, at 15:47.**

All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License.