

I think that in general there is no need for extreme torture since I've heard of some cases that people confess to a crime just to make the torture stop, when they really did not commit it, and serve a prison sentence for something they did not do.

However, as some described above, I think that each case should be reviewed and thought about with common sense. When someone above provided the scenario of a terrorist or kidnapper who places children somewhere and locks them away to die if they are not found, and that terrorist or kidnapper is found, I think I would say apply some pressure to that person in that case that may be torturous in nature, but only if you are 100% positive that this person knows where to find these poor children.

In general though, I am not in favor of torturing people to find out information, unless you are sure they have done something wrong and have information that will save lives not already lost if you do things to them that will save those people's lives not yet lost.

If they just torture a large group of people and they are not yet sure which ones are guilty and which ones are not guilty, then they could be torturing innocent people who may have been in the wrong place at the wrong time during an act of terrorism, and may have a look about them that might resemble some that are known to be terrorists, but in fact they are innocent people.

I heard in another class I took that overlapped a bit with this subject, International Criminal Law from CASE Western last fall online, they gave a few examples there where innocent people confessed to crimes they did not do when tortured, just to make the torture stop, and then served a prison sentence for a crime they did not commit. In that same class, they discussed that in some cases, compromises are done against people who have done terrible things, genocide, etc, that in order to bring order to that country, they have allowed that person to take asylum somewhere else, step down, in return for the conflict ending in some country, or they go to a fancy prison that might remind you more of a hotel in some of the things provided. Other times that does not happen and at the International Criminal Court in Prague has sent them to prison. But in some cases I have heard that they do not torture not do anything terrible to some characters known to have been in charge of terrible things in a country, but to make it stop, a compromise is created to get rid of the person who caused all the trouble.

However, to say that you would never apply a torturous method I think is unreasonable. If you are sure someone has information about in the above example, kidnapped children who will die, I think in this case I might allow it, to save the children's lives. But this is an example where you are 100% sure they are guilty, and also, that lives can be saved by doing it.

There was another example given in one more class I took that somewhat overlapped on this topic, Justice from Harvard's online last year, where they said that torture has been applied in some cases where large groups of people (for example if they were trying to prevent a bomb going off somewhere and many, many lives would be lost if not found). In that case too, I've heard that they use torture tactics to get information to prevent lives lost. However, I would not do it unless you were certain that person was guilty.

If you are not 100% sure of guilt, and if no lives can be saved by applying this method of torture for a confession of a terrible crime, then I would not be in favor of it.