

White Team Project – Interrogation & Torture

1. **CASE STUDY: Hypothetical situation reflecting reality** (*framework for position and paper*)
 - a. **PRIOR:** On September 5, 2001, the United States' Central Intelligence Agency captured 4 Middle-Eastern terrorists.
 - i. Abiding by domestic and international laws, does the US have the right to interrogate the terrorists and on what legal basis? Should the US interrogate them?
 - ii. How should the United States go about extorting information out of the terrorists without necessarily "interrogating" them?
 - b. **ATTACK:** On September 11, 2001, (*as history would have it*) terrorists attacked America.
 - i. In retrospect, should the US have interrogated the terrorists?
 - ii. What information did the terrorists contain/know that could have prevented the attacks?
 - iii. Would such information prevent the attack? If not, then was the US justified in interrogating the terrorists?
 - c. **POST:** After September 11, 2001, the US revamped homeland security
 - i. How did the US perspective(s) on interrogation and torture change, if any?
 - ii. What is the US's current outlook/stance on interrogation and torture?
 - d. Other examples for case study:
 - i. Abu Ghraib
2. **HISTORY / DEFINITION – what is it?** (**ADEEL**)
 - a. Interrogation and torture techniques and practices – *What do they (really) do?*
 - i. Valid, governmentally accepted standards
 - b. History of interrogation and torture
 - i. Transition of practices
 - ii. Transition of ethics
 - c. Current usage of interrogation and torture
 - i. Objectives – what information is valuable?
 - ii. Results of interrogation – what to do with the information?
 - d. Disparities in prisoner profiles:
 - i. How do you interrogate/torture someone who is a high-profile prisoner (i.e. Milosevic, Saddam Hussein, etc.)?
 - ii. Do you follow a different standard when you are torturing a low-profile prisoner?
 - e. A real life examples:
 - i. Guantanamo Bay prisoners
 - ii. Falun Gong (China)
 - iii. Cambodian Pol Pot
 - iv. World War I and II
 - v. The Spanish Inquisition
3. **ETHICS / LAW – ethics and law involving validity/appropriateness of interrogation and torture** (**ALEX**)
 - a. History of Geneva Convention
 - b. Domestic vs. International:
 - i. Laws
 - ii. Perspectives and point-of-views / condemnation or acceptance / approaches to interrogation and torture.
 - iii. Ethical standpoints
 - iv. Third party practices
 - v. Compare/contrast of US and the international community
 - c. Jurisdictional consequences:
 - i. Which codes of law do you follow, and how do you prosecute people who violate codes/standards of interrogation?
 - ii. How do you compensate people who were wrongly interrogated and tortured?

- iii. EXP: Abu Ghraib
 - d. Democratic influences:
 - i. Interrogation and torture practices under *authoritative* regimes
 - ii. Interrogation and torture practices under *democratic* regimes.

4. IMPACTS – on human individuality and society (TREVOR)

- a. Psychological
 - i. Interrogator
 - 1. Motivation to enact interrogation and torture
 - a. Institutional training?
 - b. Experiential training?
 - 2. Mental stability and endurance
 - ii. Subject
 - 1. The “breaking point”
 - 2. Mental stability and endurance
 - iii. Severity of interrogation and training
 - 1. Which is worse: mental or physical?
- b. Societal
 - i. Country’s response and reaction to the government’s use of interrogation and torture
 - 1. Announcing practices to the media and public
 - 2. Keeping practices classified
 - ii. International community’s response and reaction to the government’s use of interrogation and torture
 - 1. One country’s practices as an impact on another

STANCE: Granted there are financial costs and debatable legal and ethical issues concerning the interrogation and torture of enemy combatants and political prisoners; however, the societal and national-security benefits of protecting the United States (or any other country) outweigh the costs. Instead, main issue should be where does the United States government draw the boundary between ethical and unethical practices of interrogation and torture. In our paper, we review the history of interrogation and torture, outline ethical concerns and domestic/international laws, and propose possible practical boundaries.