

English translation by Vebjörn Ekroll of:

Mausfeld, R. (2009). Psychologie, ‚weiße Folter‘ und die Verantwortlichkeit von Wissenschaftlern, *Psychologische Rundschau*, 60, 229–240.

Psychology, 'white torture' and the responsibility of scientists

Rainer Mausfeld

In 2008 and 2009 further documents on the kind of 'innovative interrogation techniques' routinely employed in Guantánamo, Abu Ghraib and Bagram have become public. These interrogation techniques are - also in the opinion of the current US government - to be classified as torture. As these techniques are tailored for the purpose of leaving no traces immediately recognisable to the general public, they are also known as 'white torture', 'clean torture' or 'no-touch torture'. The most important among these documents are the four secret memoranda of the *Department of Justice*¹ released in April 2009 by President Obama, the November 2008 report of the Senate², as well as the confidential Guantánamo report of the *Red Cross*³, which had been kept classified since 2007 and became known only later. These documents reveal further details about how deeply psychologists were involved in the development and use of 'white torture' techniques. *Physicians for Human Rights* concluded on the basis of the available evidence that “the Senate Armed Services Committee report confirms that psychologists were central to the Bush Administration's use of torture”.⁴ Furthermore, these documents show the pivotal role psychological experts played in the juridical efforts of the Bush Administration towards labelling these techniques as 'harmless', and hence, as not being in conflict with the legal prohibition of torture. Already in the years before, more and more details became known about the contribution of psychologists to the development of 'novel interrogation techniques' by means of which the will of an interrogatee can be broken in an 'efficient manner' – as well as about their direct participation in such interrogations. Between 2005 and 2008, the *American Psychological Association* (APA) played a significant role in the efforts to lend ethical legitimation to these techniques. Essentially, this has been known for some years now, and in May 2009, it was reaffirmed in detail through the publication of the complete email correspondence of an internal task force of the APA which had been established to formulate ethical standards for the contribution of psychologists to these interrogation techniques (Fink, 2009)⁵. The efforts of the APA towards providing professional ethical legitimation for the participation of psychologists in the particular interrogation practice exercised in Guantánamo were coordinated with the Pentagon in order to make them comply with the requirements of the Bush administration. The connections were so tight, and the role of the psychologists so central to the development and use of 'innovative interrogation techniques', that, after evaluation of these documents, *Psychologists for Social Responsibility* as well as *Physicians for Human Rights* called for independent investigation of the relations between the APA and the Pentagon.⁶

1 http://www.aclu.org/safefree/general/olc_memos.html

2 <http://levin.senate.gov/newsroom/supporting/2009/SASC.DetaineeReport.042209.pdf>

3 <http://www.nybooks.com/icrc-report.pdf>

4 <http://www.physiciansforhumanrights.org/library/news-2009-05-05.html>

5 <http://documents.propublica.org/e-mails-from-the-american-psychological-association-s-task-force-on-ethics-and-national-security#p=1>

6 <http://www.physiciansforhumanrights.org/library/news-2009-05-05.html>,
http://www.psypsr.org/about/pubs_resources/Questions_for_APA.php

In 2007, these developments attracted wider public interest when the APA declared that with respect to the development of 'alternative interrogation techniques' and the training of interrogation experts "psychologists have valuable contributions to make toward the goals of preventing violence and protecting our nation's security through interrogation processes ." Since not only the particular case of Guantánamo is at issue here, but also an entire era in the history of psychology, in which the psychological profession was instrumental to the development of 'white torture' techniques, I will begin with a brief reminder of some aspects that are crucial for a proper understanding of these developments.

The absolute prohibition of torture in international law

The *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, Article 5 proclaims that "No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment." Accordingly, the *European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms* from 1953, *The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* from 1976 and the *UN Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment* from 1984 prohibit acts of torture including threats of torture. Furthermore, a person must not be transferred into "another state where there are substantial grounds for believing that he would be in danger of being subjected to torture."

Torture is "any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person". Such a definition is without doubt fuzzy, incomplete and hence deficient both in terms of the legal theory and practice. This, however, is a rather common state of affairs that is also encountered in the development of legal frameworks for dealing with slavery, genocide and other crimes against humanity. With its focus on an extreme form of cruel and degrading treatment, though, this definition of a violation of human rights is a first attempt to reach, in face of the historical experiences, a legal consensus beyond which the international community should under no circumstances fall back. Thus, it is the brute facts of our history rather than theoretical considerations of legal theory that make it mandatory to prohibit any exceptions to the prohibition of torture. The absolute nature of the prohibition of torture is unequivocally formulated in the *UN Convention* from 1984: "No exceptional circumstances whatsoever, whether a state of war or a threat or war, internal political instability or any other public emergency, may be invoked as a justification of torture" (cf. Nowak & McArthur, 2008). The *absolute* prohibition of torture constitutes an indispensable and inalienable core element both of the universal protection of human rights and international humanitarian law.

Between the intent of these normative laws and the actual state of affairs remains, however, a deep gap. As *Amnesty International* concluded in their 1973 *Report on Torture*, the practice of torture has reached epidemic proportions. Torture, which was relegated to a niche existence for a long period of time, "has suddenly developed a life of its own and become a social cancer." In 2007, *Amnesty International* documented cases of systematic torture in more than 81 countries.

The absolute prohibition of torture stems from a concept of law and constitution according to which only such methods for establishing the truth can be employed which enable the interrogatee to participate. The truth must not be pursued at any cost and with all means but must be sought within the bounds of regulated, fair proceedings governed by the rule of law, within which the defendant is respected as an autonomous subject rather than being reduced to a mere vehicle for ascertaining the truth. The act of torture reduces a person to a mere tool for the purposes of the state. Due to this complete instrumentalisation, the dignity and autonomy of the victim are violated or annihilated to such an extent that the mere possibility of it being sanctioned by law would undermine the very

foundations of a constitutional democracy. The absolute priority of the prohibition of torture can therefore never be questioned within a democratic rule of law without jeopardising the democratic rule of law itself. The absolute prohibition of torture is the very defining feature that set democratic constitutions apart from totalitarian regimes.

Thus, torture is an assault on a legal right that is of *absolute*, not of *relative* value. The prohibition of torture does not allow for any exceptions – not even in a state of emergency threatening the existence of the nation – and it cannot be traded off against other legal rights. Accordingly, it draws an absolute constitutional line that cannot be transgressed by a nation's right to self defence and its quest for security. Due to the totalitarian temptation inevitably inherent in a state's claim to sovereignty, this absolute priority is bound to appear as unreasonable demand viewed from the perspective of a state, as it puts constraints on governmental actions that are beyond its own authority and control. Since even democratic states are prone to view the absolute character of the prohibition of torture as an unreasonable limitation of their claims to power and security, different efforts have been directed towards softening or disposing of it. The most radical move is to label the absoluteness of the prohibition of torture as unwarranted – a lapse of reason in legal philosophy, as it were. The Harvard professor of law Alan Dershowitz criticised the “smug, self-satisfied willingness to condemn torture openly” (McCoy, 2006, p 178). Given that torture happens to be in widespread use and had to be regarded as unavoidable in situations of extreme threats to security, one ought to regulate its practice by law. The prohibition of balancing other legal interests against the prohibition of torture is considered quixotic and unrealistic and the state should have the opportunity subordinate issues of human rights to security needs when human lives can be saved. To impart apparent credibility to this view, hypothetical extreme situations – ticking-bomb scenarios – are construed to create a conflict between moral and legal questions (see Brecher, 2007, and Ginbar, 2008, for critical discussions of ticking-bomb arguments). With their appeal to a moral 'common-sense', such scenarios aim to make preventive torture as a precaution against an imagined threat appear justified. At the same time, the general public is accustomed to governmental norm-breaking by inducing, via the mass media, a state of anxiety. Dershowitz and others propose the introduction of court-ordered torture (“rescue torture”) that is only to be used when strict criteria are met – by which, of course, always those criteria are meant that are tailored to the state's own interests.⁷ Although the idea to legally regulate preventive torture by deriving general legal norms from fictitious extreme cases is an abstruse jurisprudential construction, and although a corresponding 'torture law' would be such that one could determine only in hindsight whether its application was legal, this idea has found numerous supporters also in German jurisprudence (e.g. Brugger, 2006; Erb, 2005; Merkel, 2008). These jurisprudential efforts aim to create conceptual distinctions and 'nuances' that are suitable for providing a conceptual framework which opens up the possibility of trading off violations of human dignity against national security interests.

Euphemisms for torture

A further strategy used by democratic states to rid themselves of the restrictions on security demands is to sidestep the absolute prohibition by introducing suitable definitions. Given the absolute prohibition of torture, advocates of an interrogation practice that approves of torture-like

⁷ Amnesty International (1973, p. 22) again makes clear that justification attempts appealing to strictly regulated exceptional scenarios are but mere propaganda: “History shows that torture is never limited to 'just once'; 'just once' becomes once again – becomes a practice and finally an institution. As soon as its use is permitted once, as for example in one of the extreme circumstances like a bomb, it is logical to use it on people who might plant bombs, or on people who might think of planting bombs, or on people who defend the kind of person who might think of planting bombs ...”.

methods are impelled to construe the methods of interrogation such that they can slip through the semantic chinks between proper torture and cruel, degrading treatment. This definitional moves aim at providing conceptual frameworks by which certain interrogation techniques are supposed to escape a legal categorisation as proper torture. The US *Department of Justice* during the Bush government, for instance, maintained that actions must be of an extreme kind in order to qualify as proper torture; physical pain under torture had to be just as intense as the pain from severe physical injuries or organ failure; the application of pain less extreme, would be, technically speaking, not proper torture but rather mere inhuman and degrading behaviour, and would therefore not fall under the legal sanctions against torture. The UN *Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment* from 1984, however, makes it plain, that there is no such distinction (Novak & MacArthur, 2006; Nowak & MacArthur, 2008) by which the absoluteness of the legal prohibition of torture can be circumvented.

Amnesty International (1973, p. 30) observed that: “Given that the word 'torture' conveys an idea repugnant to humanity, there is a strong tendency by torturers to call it by another name.” The same holds for the notions of 'terrorism', 'crimes of war', or 'crimes against humanity'. These concepts are tacitly used in an asymmetric manner: They denote the crimes of *others*, while different concepts are used for the same actions of one's own. Also in the case of torture: It is always the *others* who torture. *We* merely revert to 'extraordinary measures' and see ourselves legitimated by motives that carry their justification in themselves, such as 'self defence', 'the promotion of democratic values', or 'national security interests'.

Thus, the use of interrogation techniques that amount to torture in democratic states is always accompanied by efforts to obfuscate it by using euphemisms. France labelled its use of mass torture in the Algerian War as “special interrogation techniques” that were necessary to gain “vital informations” in the war against the “terrorism” of the FLN (see Maran, 1996; Branche, 2004; Rejali, 2007; Lazreg, 2008). Israel describes its interrogation techniques as “moderate physical pressure” and “non-violent psychological pressure” (see Biletzki, 2001; B'Tselem, 2007; PCATI, 2007, 2008). Great Britain labelled their interrogation techniques used in the Northern Ireland conflict as “interrogation in depth”. In the course of these interrogation techniques, also known as the “five techniques”, the men were forced to stand with their legs apart for up to 16 hours (so called “stress positions”), their heads covered with opaque hoods, while their cells were flooded with noise similar to that of a jack-hammer (Rejali, 2007, p. 373). As the *British Medical Association* (1986, p. 16) observed, the “hooding and the continuous noise were designed not to isolate the men from each other but as a deliberate method of producing mental disorientation and confusion.” Furthermore, they were not allowed to sleep for up to 70 hours. According to Shallice (1972), psychologists were significantly involved in the development of these techniques. In the conception of the “five techniques”, a strategy for side-stepping the prohibition of torture becomes apparent: The interrogation techniques are assembled from modular parts that each on its own is designed to not yet qualify as torture, but in a suitable combination will be able to break the willpower of the captive (see Rejali, 2007, p. 568 on this “systematic clustering of clean torture techniques”).

The efforts to make torture invisible to the general public through the modular assembly of suitably designed components that, taken in isolation, not immediately recognisable as torture, is a consequence of the more comprehensive public control in democratic states. Accordingly, the development of the interrogation techniques known as *clean torture*, *no-touch torture*, *stealth torture*, *white torture* or *psychological torture* are closely tied to the development of the democratic state. “Historically, clean torture and democracy go hand in hand” as a comprehensive study by Rejali (2007, p. 44) shows. The face of torture has changed in the course of these developments: “Every effort is made to leave no marks.” (*Amnesty International*, 1973, p. 29).

This is the background against which the interrogation techniques used by the US between 2002 and 2008 – that were labelled as “enhanced” and “hard” interrogation techniques, or “alternative set of procedures” – must be considered. According to the *Bybee-Gonzales Memorandum* (Greenberg & Dratel, 2005, p. 151 ff.; Sands, 2008, p. 73 ff.), an interrogation technique can only be classified as torture when it involves pain “equivalent in intensity to the pain accompanying serious physical injury, such as organ failure, impairment of bodily function, or even death”, and even then only when the pain was not merely a consequence of the interrogation techniques but rather their “precise objective”. Accordingly, there would be a broad spectrum of techniques “that though they might constitute cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment fail to rise to the level of torture”. The *Department of Justice* drew on the expertise of psychologists when it declared these “enhanced interrogation techniques”, including *waterboarding*, as harmless and scientifically well-founded in terms of efficiency. This definition of torture was also tacitly adopted by the APA in their resolution from August 2007⁸, as they limited the list of interrogation techniques psychologists should not participate in to those “that represents significant pain or suffering in a manner that a reasonable person would judge to cause lasting harm.”

Meanwhile, the “innovative interrogation techniques” considered legal by the US administration are also known to the general public and encompasses a plethora of different modular components by means of which the personality of the captive was to be shattered. Beyond the systematic use of techniques involving cultural and sexual degradation – such as forcing Muslim captives to undress in the presence of female soldiers, wear lingerie and perform dog tricks – techniques had been employed that were described in the 2007 classified Guantánamo report of the *Red Cross* under headings such as *suffocation by water, prolonged stress standing, beating and kicking, confinement in a box, prolonged nudity, sleep deprivation and use of loud music, exposure to cold temperature/ cold water, threats, and deprivation/restricted provision of solid food*. The corresponding techniques in the interrogation instructions for Guantánamo are treated under the headings of “*Degradation Tactics*“, “*Physical Debilitation Tactics*“, “*Isolation and Monopolization of Perception Tactics*“ and “*Demonstrated Omnipotence Tactics*“. The *Behaviour Management Plan*⁹ was essentially designed by psychologists.

The contributions of psychology to the development of techniques of 'white torture'.

Which contributions can psychology make for the development of 'interrogation techniques' that do not necessarily qualify as torture when used in isolation but which yield at least the same result as physical torture when suitably combined?

Among these contributions, of particular relevant are those provided by research on sensory deprivation. Most notably Donald O. Hebb (see McCoy, 2005, p. 41 ff., 2007), who was one of the leading figures in psychology at the time, was heavily involved in the the studies of sensory deprivation performed in the fifties. Hebb reported that the identity of the subject began to disintegrate after he was blindfolded and wore soundproof ear muffs and clothing designed to block the sense of touch for 2-3 days. In this way, Hebb was able to put, within 48 hours, the person in a state akin to psychosis which usually started off with hallucinations and ended with psychological or

8 Reaffirmation of the *American Psychological Association* Position Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and Its Application to Individuals Defined in the United States Code as „Enemy Combatants“. <http://www.apa.org/governance/resolutions/councilres0807.html>.

9 [http://www.wikileaks.org/wiki/Changes_in_Guantanamo_Bay_SOP_manual_\(2003-2004\)](http://www.wikileaks.org/wiki/Changes_in_Guantanamo_Bay_SOP_manual_(2003-2004)), http://wikileaks.org/wiki/Guantanamo_document_confirms_psychological_torture.

even physical breakdown. The actual intention behind Hebb's confidential experiments – which were initially funded by the *Canadian Department of National Defence* – were disguised by allegedly studying the effect of very monotonous work on the workers' performance.

Although Hebb's works is a particularly important example, it is merely one among a plethora of studies that aimed at understanding how the psychological resistance and the willpower of a person can be broken (see e.g. Benjamin, 2007 a, b). In the early fifties, in an atmosphere shaped by the cold war, the Secret Service and the Pentagon provided generous funding for investigating the opportunities both for the manipulation of the masses and of individual minds. Psychology played a central role in this so-called MKUltra programme (McCoy, 2005, p. 36 ff.). As early as 1977, as the first details of this program became known through investigations of the Senate, the participation of many reputable psychologists were published in an article in the *APA Monitor* (Greenfield, 1977). Later, further insights into the classified MKUltra project were gained, showing how broadly academic psychology was involved (see Marks, 1979). Within MKUltra there was also interest in drugs and rather bizarre means which one regarded as promising for systematically manipulate consciousness. Psychological research now suggested that this can be accomplished in a much simpler way. Albert Biderman, in his work on the development of “improved interrogation techniques” from 1959, which summarised the pertinent psychological research from the fifties, observed that psychological torture is the ideal means to break a captive, because “isolation has the same effect on the brain function of the captive as physical violence, hunger or sleep deprivation” (Biderman, 1959, see also 1960). The relevant work of Biderman were also used in the training of interrogation specialists - “an in-depth class on Biderman's Principles - in Guantánamo (*New York Times*, July 2nd, 2008). To break a person's will, it suffices to deprive him of all human contact, to disorient him, to disrupt his biological rhythms and subject him to great stress. By using a suitable combination of very simple elementary techniques, such as disorientation, sleep deprivation, sensory deprivation, or degrading, the subject's psychological integrity swiftly disintegrates, he quickly regresses to an infantile stage and his will is broken.

Biderman's work was recommended as fundamental in the authoritative CIA interrogation manual KUBARK, which appeared in 1963 and became known through the *Freedom of Information Act*. This manual takes advantage of the results of long-time and intensive psychological research. According to KUBARK, Biderman's book has “the added advantage of incorporating the findings and views of a number of scholars and specialists in subjects closely related to interrogation. As the frequency of citation indicates, this book was one of the most useful works consulted; few KUBARK interrogators would fail to profit from reading it” (CIA, 1963, XI, 3).

The KUBARK manual (CIA, 1963; see also McCoy, 2005, p. 49 ff.) describes meticulously and at the forefront of psychological research how a persons will may best be broken, and how the emotional and affective vulnerability of the individual may be used to this end when his personality structure and his infantile history of bonding is carefully considered. There is evidence suggesting that this manual was written in cooperation with psychologists (see Gray & Zielinski, 2006). The *Human Resource Exploitation Training Manual* (CIA, 1983; see also McCoy, 2005, p. 66 ff.), which was primarily used in the training of South American 'interrogation specialists' is also based on KUBARK:

„The purpose of all coercive techniques is to induce psychological regression in the subject by bringing a superior outside force to bear on his will to resist. Regression is basically a loss of autonomy, a reversion to an earlier behavioral level. As the subject subject regresses, his learned personality traits fall away in reverse chronological order. He begins to lose the capacity to carry out the highest creative activities, to deal with complex situations, or to cope with stressful interpersonal relationships or repeated frustrations“ (CIA, 1983).

The KUBARK manual serves as the basis for the training of interrogation techniques until this day. In a more recent report, the experts of the US *Department of Defence* recommended the use of the KUBARK manual as a starting point for the development of new interrogation techniques. “A careful examination of the KUBARK manual yields a wealth of potentially valuable concepts that either have the potential for immediate application in the development of a next generation of tactics, techniques, and procedures for educing information or that warrant further study by relevant professionals“ (Kleinman, 2006, p. 137).

The KUBARK manual begins by stating that the scientific work on interrogation techniques “is of sufficient importance and relevance that it is no longer possible to discuss interrogation significantly without reference to the psychological research conducted in the past decade” (CIA, 1963, p. 2). And it assures the trainees in 'innovative interrogation techniques' that these psychological techniques can be learned easily; to become a “craftsman” of interrogation “sounds harder than it is.” The KUBARK manual describes in detail the 'optimal' combinations and effects of the recommended techniques. Among these techniques is “by persistent manipulation of time, by retarding and advancing clocks and serving meals at odd times -- ten minutes or ten hours after the last food was given. Day and night are jumbled.” These manipulations will likely drive the interrogatee “deeper and deeper into himself, until he is no longer able to control his responses in adult fashion.”

„The capacity for resistance is diminished by disorientation. The subject may be left alone for days; and he may be returned to his cell, allowed to sleep for five minutes, and brought back to an interrogation which is conducted as though eight hours had intervened. The principle is that sessions should be so planned as to disrupt the source’s sense of chronological order“ (CIA, 1963, VII, C, 5, p. 49 ff.).

Once the interrogatees have lost orientation, one may proceed to the second level – self-inflicted pain – for instance by forcing them to maintain unnatural bodily postures for hours. In this phase, the aim is to convince the interrogatee that he is himself responsible for his pain, and that it is up to himself to free himself from it. Further recommended techniques are sleep deprivation, hooding, loud music as well as sexual and cultural humiliation.

„A subject who is cut off from the world he knows seeks to recreate it, in some measure, in the new and strange environment. He may try to keep track of time, to live in the familiar past, to cling to old concepts of loyalty, to establish – with one or more interrogators – interpersonal relations resembling those that he has had earlier with other people, and to build other bridges back to the known. Thwarting his attempts to do so is likely to drive him deeper and deeper into himself, until he is no longer able to control his responses in adult fashion“ (CIA, 1963, VIII, C).

According to KUBARK, it is particularly important to make the world experienced by the interrogatee as unpredictable and chaotic as possible. Corresponding techniques, by means of which experiences similar to psychosis can to be induced, are referred to as *Alice in Wonderland techniques*.

“The aim of the Alice in Wonderland or confusion technique is to confound the expectations and conditioned reactions of the interrogatee. He is accustomed to a world that makes sense, at least to him: a world of continuity and logic, a predictable world. He clings to this world to reinforce his identity and powers of resistance. The confusion technique is designed not only to obliterate the familiar, but to replace it with the weird...as the process continues, day after day as necessary, the subject begins to try to make sense of the situation, which becomes mentally intolerable...he is likely to make significant admissions, or even to pour out his story“ (CIA, 1963, VIII, C, 9).

The objective of an interrogation is to trigger a process of regression, in which the interrogatee falls

back to earlier developmental stages. To achieve this, sensory deprivation is recommended as particularly well-suited.

„The deprivation of stimuli induces regression by depriving the subject’s mind of contact with an outer world and thus forcing it in upon itself. At the same time, the calculated provision of stimuli during interrogation tends to make the regressed subject view the interrogator as a father-figure. The result, normally, is a strengthening of the subject’s tendencies toward compliance“ (CIA, 1963, IX, E, 4).

In suitable combination with further techniques, sensory deprivation swiftly leads to disintegration of a person's identity and breaks his will: “The interrogatee's mature defenses crumbles as he becomes more childlike”.

After the events of 2001, the psychological research efforts directed towards the development of 'optimal' interrogation techniques were intensified again, using the KUBARK manual as a basis. An interrogation technique is considered to be optimal when it the will of even the strongest personalities can be broken by it and when, at the same time, its component are not regarded as proper torture by the general public. In this manner, considerable 'refinements' regarding the 'optimal' combination of different techniques were made. Particularly the realm of sexual and cultural humiliation provided a broad spectrum of 'creative' innovations. In the Guantánamo protocols, some of these 'creative methods' are referred to as *Pride and Ego down*, *Fear Up Harsh*, *Futility* or *Invasion of Space by a Female*. The harsh reality behind these terms can be gleaned from the meticulously recorded interrogation protocols of the captive Mohamed al-Kahtani (who was deprived of sleep for 50 days, only interrupted by the smallest intervals).¹⁰ The module *Pride and Ego Down* includes such 'innovative' interrogation techniques as “forced urination on self, forced nakedness, sexual humiliation, religious humiliation humiliation, being led naked on a leash, being forced to bark like a dog“. Mayer (2009, p. 275) cites a “former US former U.S. Official, with access to details of the interrogation program“ stating that „What mattered was things done in combination“, and emphasising „that few outsiders truly understood the overwhelming power of the program.“

The nature of these techniques reveals yet again what is discernible in all situations of systematic governmental practice of torture: Behind the rhetoric that torture is in the service of gaining security relevant intelligence information, torture predominantly aims to discipline, humiliate and demean certain – mostly ethnically defined – groups (see e.g. Rejali, 2007; Lazreg, 2008) and to destroy their social and cultural identity. While attempts to justify 'enhanced interrogation techniques' typically refer to alleged needs of gaining security information, history shows that the use of torture is primarily in the service of the state's control of power and as a tool for controlling those who pose a threat to the the current system. A corresponding loophole for the application of 'interrogation techniques' can also be found in the August 2007 APA resolution which prohibits the participation in the use of interrogation techniques similar to torture only in the case that the techniques are used “for the purposes of eliciting information in an interrogation process“.

The interrogation technique used in Guantánamo were devised by psychologists, primarily by a psychological firm, *Mitchell, Jessen & Associates*, in which also a past president of the *American Psychological Association* – Joseph Marazzo – was involved. Marazzo also served in a CIA committee at the same time¹¹. This company specialised in the training of interrogation experts and had presumably devised the interrogation programs for the 'black sites', to which captives are transferred to make the use of special interrogation practices possible. This constitutes an outsourcing of torture

10 <http://www.time.com/time/2006/log/log.pdf>; regarding al-Kahtani see Mayer (2008, p. 190 ff.).

11 see Eban (2007), Soldz (2008).

to states in which public reactions are not likely to be an issue. The company drew on the training programme “*Survival, Evasion, Resistance and Escape*” (SERE) which was developed during the Korean War to enable soldiers to resist extreme forms of mistreatment and interrogations in captivity. Mitchell, Jessen & Associates reverse-engineered this program and used it as a basis for developing 'innovative interrogation techniques' (see Eban, 2007; Benjamin, 2007b; Soldz, Olson, Reisner, Arrigo & Welch, 2008; Mayer, 2008, p. 157 ff.; Miles, 2009, p. 187 ff.). In September 2002 a meeting between psychologists from the SERE program (some of which were members of the APA) and the interrogation specialists responsible for Guantánamo bay took place in a SERE training camp in Fort Bragg in Alabama.

Mitchell and Jessen had participated in a symposium on 'innovative' interrogation techniques prompted by the detention of the (low-ranking) Al-Qaeda member Abu Zubaydah (who, as recently became known, was subjected to waterboarding 83 times) and organised by the Pentagon and the CIA. A major event at this symposium was a three-hour talk given by Martin Seligman on 'learned helplessness' and on techniques by which it can be induced¹². On the basis of this, Mitchell and Jessen developed an interrogation concept for Abu Zubaydah – amongst other things a 'dog box', in which he was forced to lie in fetal position, his ability to move and breathe extremely impeded for several days. James Mitchell proclaimed that inducing a state of 'learned helplessness' (in fact it was about the even more devastating state of 'learned hopelessness') was a central part of 'innovative interrogation techniques'. The importance of inducing such a state of helplessness and loss of control in interrogations has already been pointed out by Orne (1961, p. 206):

“... conditions of interrogation are sometimes conducive to a regression on the part of the source. The interrogator can exercise complete control of the source’s physical being – his primitive needs such as elimination, eating, and sleeping, and even bodily postures. He is also in a position to reward or punish any predetermined activity on the part of the captive. This tends to create a situation where the individual feels unable to observe any control over himself. This extreme loss of control is handled in a variety of ways, one of which is regression to a childlike state of dependence on and identification with the aggressor. ... Complying “voluntarily“ for such cases is less threatening, and may be regarded by them as less shameful, than losing control completely over their actions.“

Not only the development of 'innovative interrogation techniques' but also the interrogations themselves were performed under the supervision of psychologists. As an example, the interrogations of Mohamed al-Kahtani, which mostly went on for 20 hours a day, was, according to the protocols, supervised by the APA member John Leso (see also Olsen, Soldz & Davis, 2008).

Torture and the American Psychological Association

After it became increasingly known how much the system of 'innovative interrogation techniques' in worldwide use rested on the participation of psychologists, from 2005 on, the APA was put under public pressure to comment on whether this kind of participation were compatible with the professional principles of psychologists. As can be expected, the APA repeatedly proclaimed that they strongly disapprove of any kind of torture. However, they stressed that there is not only a moral obligation to protect individuals from harm, but also the nation.¹³ In cases of conflict, both were to be weighed against each other (“need to balance psychologists' responsibility to individuals and to society”). And concerning the welfare of the nation, psychologists have, in the view of the APA, quite

12 Mayer (2008, p. 164).

13 It is a principle gained from the Nürnberger Doctor's Trial that no form of collectively oriented ethic can suspend or be weighed against the healthcare profession's commitment to the individual (see e.g. Amnesty International French Medical Commission, 1989; Ebbinghaus & Dörner, 2001).

a lot to offer by means of which security-relevant intelligence may be obtained. In June 2006, the director of APA's ethics office, Stephen Behnke, said that “helping military interrogators made a valuable contribution because it was part of an effort to prevent terrorism“ (New York Times, June 7th, 2006). In their September 2007 statement *Psychology and Interrogations*, the APA stressed that “Psychologists have important contributions to make in eliciting information that can be used to prevent violence and protect our nation’s security.”¹⁴ As late as May 2009, the APA member and as of 2005 member of the *Task Force on Psychological Ethics and National Security* Bryce Lefever defended the SERE-based interrogation techniques and stated that: “Any time the rights of the individual are placed above what is best for the community, it is, by definition, unethical or immoral.”¹⁵

In 2005, prompted by the enduring public and professional discussions about the role of psychologists in these kind of interrogations, the APA directorate decided to establish a *Task Force on Psychological Ethics and National Security (PENS)* that was to formulate ethical standards for the participation in these interrogations. In the report of this task force, published in June 2005, torture and inhumane and degrading treatment was condemned, and the participation of psychologists was declared incompatible with the profession's ethical principles. Tacitly, though, the limited definition of torture used by the *Department of Justice* was used. Consequently, interrogation techniques declared legal by the *Department of Justice* were not affected. Furthermore, in cases of doubt – i.e. the purported ethical conflict between the welfare of the individual and the security interest of the nation – the option to act according to national requirements was considered justified (“if the conflict cannot be resolved ... psychologists may adhere to the requirements of the law”).¹⁶

The position of the designated president of the APA Gerhard P. Koocher concerning international conventions on human rights is revealed by an in-house email of the task force from July 30th 2005:

„I have long had a sense of frustration with ‚international law‘. In particular, many nations have shown a preoccupation to promulgate grand statements of human rights principles, with no teeth, no financial support, and contradictory actions. ...I have zero interest in entangling APA with the nebulous, toothless, contradictory, and obfusatory treaties that comprise ‚international law‘. Rather, I prefer to see APA take principled stands on policy issues where psychology has some scientific basis for doing so.“

In another in-house email dated May 6th, Koocher yet again circumscribed the goal of the assignment of the task force by stating his position on the role of psychologists in interrogations:

„The goal of such psychologists’ work will ultimately be the protection of others (i. e., innocents) by contributing to the incarceration, debilitation, or even death of the potential perpetrator, who will often remain unaware of the psychologists’ involvement.“

The staffing of the task force was successfully kept secret for a fairly long period of time. Only later it became known how the members of the committee were selected, what connections they had with the Pentagon and how the work and the recommendations of the task force were manipulated and determined by the Pentagon and the APA chair (Soldz, 2006; Arrigo, 2007; Fink, 2009). Five out of the nine voting members of the task force were army psychologists and recognised experts on 'innovative interrogation' and SERE techniques; some were in charge of the planning and supervision of interrogations in Iraq, Afghanistan and Guantánamo. For instance, the leader of the *Behavi-*

14 <http://www.apa.org/ethics/statement092107.html>.

15 <http://psychoanalystsopposewar.org/blog/2009/05/04/apaethics-policy-maker-endorses-torture/>.

16 <http://www.apa.org/releases/PENSTaskForceReportFinal.pdf>; s. a. Miles (2009, S. 190).

oral Science Consultation Team (BSCT) in Guantánamo belonged to the task force.¹⁷ According to APA president Koocher the task force members were selected because of their expertise – “they had special knowledge to contribute”.

In his his February 2006 *President's Column 'Speaking against torture'*, Koocher called those who did not share the position of the APA concerning the involvement of psychologists in 'innovative interrogation techniques' “opportunistic commentators masquerading as scholars.”

In accordance with the recommendations of the *Task Force*, a resolution was passed at the yearly conference of the APA in June 2007, that – like earlier resolutions against the use of torture techniques in interrogations – militated against the participation of psychologists. At first sight, the resolution and the press releases of the APA may convey the impression that the APA always have maintained an unequivocal position regarding the involvement of psychologist in the use of interrogation techniques similar to torture. In actual fact, though, the APA did not deem it necessary to declare the participation of psychologists as unethical, even after details about the kind of interrogation techniques used in Guantánamo became known. A closer look at the carefully chosen formulations in the APA statement reveals the loopholes allowing for such a participation (see Benjamin, 2007c; Woolf, 2007; Valtin, 2007). In its definition of torture, the resolution followed the terminology prescribed by the Bush administration exactly, defining torture so extremely narrowly that the resolution does *not* apply to all of the already mentioned so-called 'innovative interrogation techniques' such as those used in Guantánamo (even though, at this point of time, many lines of evidence already documented the grave and systematic acts of torture committed in Guantánamo). The persisting public pressure forced the APA to make further clarifications (see Olsen, Soldz & Davis, 2008; Arrigo & Long, 2008). Early in 2008, the APA deemed it necessary to state their position on the participation of psychologists in 'enhanced interrogations' more precisely, but again their formulations left so much room for interpretation that nothing would rule out the participation of APA psychologists in Guantánamo or Bagram. After an increasing amount of details regarding the participation of psychologists in interrogations amounting to torture became known and the public pressure increased, the APA announced – as a 'significant change' in its position, that psychologists may no more be involved in the violation of captives' human rights.¹⁸

In the announcements published since then, however, the APA gave the impression that the discussion about 'white torture techniques' does not concern them – that only misconduct on the part of individual 'black sheep' are at issue, and that their disapproval of such techniques has always been unambiguous. At the same time, though, the APA has expressed that it does not share the position of the *American Psychiatric Association* and other professional organisations in the health sector¹⁹ – who forbid their members the participation in such interrogations because it violates ethical principles of their profession – and does not regard this resolution against the participation of psychologists in interrogations amounting to torture as a binding constituent of their guidelines: “The petition would not become part of the APA Ethics Code nor be enforceable as are prohibitions

17 <http://www.webster.edu/peacepsychology/tfpens.html>; see also <http://valtinsblog.blogspot.com/2009/04/how-apa-made-pactwith-dod-cia-over.html>, <http://valtinsblog.blogspot.com/2009/05/apa-ethics-policymaker-clarifies.html>.

18 Letter from APA president Alan E. Kazdin to Bush: „...I am writing to you to inform you and your administration of a significant change in our association’s policy that limits the roles of psychologists in certain unlawful detention settings where the human rights of detainees are being violated ...“. <http://www.apa.org/releases/kazdin-to-bush1008.pdf>.

19 „In the 7 years since the American Psychological Association adopted an ethics code that set aside the Nuremberg ethic, neither the American Medical Association nor the American Psychiatric Association has followed its lead. Other major health care organizations have continued their leadership in the opposite direction, reminding their members and the world of the moral necessity of Nuremberg’s fundamental ethic for health care professionals.“ (Pope & Gutheil, 2009)

set forth in the Ethics Code.“²⁰

On the occasion of 2009 yearly conference of the APA, the *U. N. Special Rapporteur on Torture* Manfred Nowak requested that the APA should start taking their own resolutions seriously and draw the necessary conclusions.²¹ In a letter to the APA president James Bray, he once again reminded of the „now public record of psychologists‘ involvement in the design, supervision, implementation, and legitimization of a regime of physical and psychological torture at US military and intelligence facilities.“ Given the efforts of the APA leaders to bypass the extant resolutions, and their reluctance to take professional legal action even in unambiguously proven cases of psychologists participating in torture²², Nowak warns that: „Every day that you delay invoking the referendum is another day where psychologists are, by their presence and participation in these operations, acquiescing in human rights violations.“

To this day, the APA has failed to take responsibility for their legitimation of the torture techniques used.²³ Rather, their arguments follow a path well-trodden in the history of the subject: When the state uses torture, the members of participating professions supporting this activity devote substantial efforts towards downplaying their actions and creating a “culture of impunity” (Rejali, 2007).

McCoy (2007) sees these patterns perpetuating themselves over decades: „For over half a century, from the Cold War to the War on Terror, psychology has served the U.S. Intelligence community as a secret weapon in wars against its ideological enemies.“ This intimate tie is still there. In particular the so-called cognitive neurosciences have caught the interest of the CIA and the Department of Defence. The report *Emerging Cognitive Neuroscience and Related Technologies* of the *National Research Council* (2008) details the ”potential intelligence and military applications of cognitive neuroscience“ (p. 100 ff.). The *U. S. Army Research Office* and the *Defence Advanced Research Projects Agency* (DARPA) support neuroscience research projects on a large scale as a part of the “war against terrorism”. These projects are among other things designed to explore ways of 'mind reading' and 'brain fingerprinting' using fMRI techniques. Cognitive scientists argue that torture techniques will become superfluous when the thoughts of terrorists can be detected with fMRI techniques (Marks, 2007).

Psychological torture and the responsibility of the scientist

The techniques of psychological torture labelled 'innovative interrogation techniques' were devised to bypass the absolute prohibition of torture in international law. This can only be done by confining the notion of torture to the strongest intentionally inflicted pain. Such a redefinition, however – as

20 <http://www.apa.org/governance/resolutions/qa-work-settings.html>. In a letter to the APA president James A. Bray dated August 4th 2009 a number of former intelligence and army officers declare: „If the American Psychological Association (APA) retains Section 1.02 in its Ethics Code, the APA will place itself in opposition to some of the best traditions of the American military profession. Section 1.02 of the APA Ethics Code undermines not only the good order and discipline of military and intelligence professionals who happen also to be psychologists, but also their responsibilities under official military doctrine and professional military ethics. This section of the APA code entails an exemption that a psychologist can follow an order from a government employer even if it is otherwise contraindicated by the APA code. This section of the APA code disregards the Nuremberg Principles as recognized in 1950 by UN General Assembly Resolution 177 and incorporated into American military doctrine in the 1956 publication of Field Manual 27-10, The Law of Armed Conflict.“ (<http://www.opednews.com/articles/Military-letter-to-the-APA-by-Stephen-Soldz-090805-820.html>).

21 <http://www.ethicalapa.com/index.html>.

22 see <http://whenhealersharm.org/category/the-psychologists/>.

23 <http://www.zmag.org/znet/viewArticlePrint/21828>;

http://www.psyst.org/about/pubs_resources/Questions_for_APA.php.

attempted by the Bush administration – obscures the defining feature of torture. Both physical and psychological torture cannot merely be comprehended by pointing to the concrete level of the strength of the inflicted pain. Rather, the key to understanding what constitutes torture lies in the interpersonal situation it creates. The tortured person experiences himself as deprived of all rights. The complete loss of control and being completely at the mercy of someone else constitutes the definite climax of the totalitarian. This is why international law considers the total instrumentalisation of a person as a means to the state's ends, as instantiated in the act of torture, to be one of the gravest violations of the dignity and the autonomy of man in international law. Only on the basis of this understanding, the absoluteness of the prohibition of torture, and the closely related notion that torture and constitutional democracy are in irreconcilable opposition, becomes comprehensible.

It is also impossible to consider 'innovative interrogation techniques' in isolation and outside the totalitarian interpersonal contexts in which they are practised. The consequences of severe psychological torture are at least as grave as those of physical torture.²⁴ Physical torture always is also psychological torture. But physical torture is not attacking the psychological integrity of the person directly and therefore leaves at least a small chance of an intact ego distancing itself from the torturer and thus maintaining a territory of its own, over which the torturer has no total power. As long as the instances providing personal integrity remain at least partially intact, at least some possibilities for coping with the trauma remain. Psychological torture, on the other hand, destroys the person, not only a part of his body, because it aims directly at the core of the victim's personal identity. The personalities of some of the detainees in Guantánamo were so thoroughly shattered that they were deemed 'unfit' for prosecution. The *Los Angeles Times* (March 30th 2009) described the consequences of the "experiments"²⁵ performed on Abu Zubaydah thus: „Abu Zubaydah paid with his mind. ... Abu Zubaydah's mental grasp is slipping away. ... Gradually, his past, like his future, eludes him.“ An in-house report on al-Kahtani states: “the detainee was evidencing behavior associated with extreme psychological trauma (talking to non-existing people, hearing voices, crouching in a corner of the cell covered in a sheet for hours on end)“ Mayer (2008, p. 203). It is known in the clinical and therapeutical literature that the consequences of extreme psychological torture are at least as dramatic and long-lasting as those of physical torture (see e.g. Bettelheim, 1980; Somnier, Vesti, Kastrup & Genefke, 1992; Doerr-Zegers, Harmann, Lira & Weistein, 1992; Başoğlu, Livanou & Crnobarić, 2007; Campbell, 2007; see also van der Hart, Nijenhuis & Steele, 2008). Patsalides (1999) describes the typical consequences of the ensuing traumatisation from a therapeutical point of view:

„As the gap between the ‚I‘ and the ‚me‘ deepens, dissociation and alienation increase. The subject that, under torture, was forced into the position of pure object has lost his or her sense of interiority, intimacy, and privacy. Time is experienced now, in the present only, and perspective – that which allows for a sense of relativity – is foreclosed. Thoughts and dreams attack the mind and invade the body as if the protective skin that normally contains our thoughts, gives us space to breathe in between the thought and the thing being thought about, and separates between inside and outside, past and present, me and you, was lost.“

Modular 'innovative interrogation techniques' are torture techniques, and there is no latitude for alternative interpretations. The *Red Cross* made this clear already in their 2004 Guantánamo report, and this is also accepted by the current US administration. Since APA psychologists were immediately involved in the development and use of 'innovative interrogation techniques' in Guantánamo,

24 In our everyday understanding of torture, we intuitively tend to focus on the physical aspect and the restraints on autonomous choice of actions. Because we are prone to underestimate the complexity of our psychological nature and the possibilities of traumatisation gravely, we have difficulty developing an adequate understanding of the consequences of 'white torture'.

25 Miles (2009).

the APA can not claim that they were unaware of the exact nature of these techniques. The participation of psychologists in the development and use of 'white torture' techniques and the position of the APA on the issue raise a number of general questions that go beyond the specific case. The procedures described can be classified as torture according to established international legal standards. Thus, the question arises: To what extent can established international legal principles that have been developed in the context of other historical and political situations be applied in the legal judgement of psychologists contributing to the institutional support, conception, preparation and practice of 'innovative interrogation techniques'? Over and beyond the purely legal evaluation our profession is faced with the question: What standards of valuation do we wish to use for scientists "who participate in torture, whose names, rank, and branch of service are published, or whose job resumes or memberships reveal their history in torture? Will they be accepted at international symposia, will their papers be published, will they be given university posts, fellowships, or other jobs?" (Gray & Zielinsky, 2006, p. 132). The direct and indirect participation in violations of human rights described above may involve only a small number of psychologists. The question, however, of how we deal with these violations of legal and moral principles and professional ethical standards is a concern for us all.

References

- Amnesty International (1973). *Report on Torture*. London.
- Amnesty International French Medical Commission & Valérie Marange (1989). *Doctors and Torture. Resistance or Collaboration?* London: Bellew Publishing.
- Arrigo, J. M. (2007). APA interrogation task force member Dr. Jean Maria Arrigo exposes group's ties to military. *Democracy Now!* 20. August 2007
[\[http://www.democracynow.org/2007/8/20/apa_interrogation_task_force_member_dr\]](http://www.democracynow.org/2007/8/20/apa_interrogation_task_force_member_dr)
- Arrigo, J. M. & Long, J. (2008). APA: denunciation and accommodation of abusive interrogations: A lesson for world Psychology. *Psicologia: Teoria e Prática*, 10, 186–199.
- Basoglu, M., Livanou, M., Crnobaric, C. (2007). Torture vs other cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment: is the distinction real or apparent? *Archive of General Psychiatry*, 64, 277–285.
- Benjamin, M. (2007 a). The CIA's favorite form of torture. *Salon.com*, 7. Juni 2007.
[\[http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2007/06/07/sensory_deprivation/print.html\]](http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2007/06/07/sensory_deprivation/print.html)
- Benjamin, M. (2007 b). The CIA's torture teachers. *Salon.com*, 21. Juni 2007.
[\[http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2007/06/21/cia_sere/print.html\]](http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2007/06/21/cia_sere/print.html)
- Benjamin, M. (2007c). Will psychologists still abet torture? *Salon.com*, 21. August 2007.
[\[http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2007/08/21/psychologists/index.html\]](http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2007/08/21/psychologists/index.html)
- Bettelheim, B. (1980). *Erziehung zum Überleben. Zur Psychologie der Extremsituation*. Stuttgart: DVA.
- Biderman, A. D. (1959). *A Study for Development of Improved Interrogation Techniques : Study SR 177-D (U)*, Secret, final report of Contract AS 18 (600) 1797, Bureau of Social Science Research Inc., Washington, D. C., March 1959.
- Biderman, A. D. (1960). Social psychological needs and 'involuntary' behavior as illustrated by compliance in interrogation, *Sociometry*, 23, 120–147.
- Biletzki, A. (2001). The judicial rhetoric of morality: Israel's High Court of Justice on the legality of torture. [\[http://www.sss.ias.edu/publications/papers/papernine.pdf\]](http://www.sss.ias.edu/publications/papers/papernine.pdf)
- Branche, R. (2004). Torture and other violations of the law by the French army during the Algerian war. In A. Jones (Ed.), *Genocide, War Crimes and the West* (pp. 134–145). London: ZED BOOKS.
- Brecher, B. (2007). *Torture and the Ticking Bomb*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- British Medical Association (1986). *The Torture Report: Report of a Working Party of the BMA Investigating the Involvement of Doctors in Torture*. London: BMA

- Brugger, W. (2006). Einschränkung des absoluten Folterverbots bei Rettungsfolter? *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung), 36, 9–15.
- B'Tselem (2007). *Absolute Prohibition. The Torture and Ill-Treatment of Palestinian Detainees*. Jerusalem.
- Campbell, T. A. (2007). Psychological assessment, diagnosis, and treatment of torture survivors: a review. *Clinical Psychological Review*, 27, 628–641.
- CIA (1963). *KUBARK Counterintelligence Interrogation*.
[<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB122/index.htm#kubark>]
- CIA (1983). *Human Resource Exploitation Training Manual*
[<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB122/index.htm#hre>]
- Danner, M. (2009). US Torture: Voices from the Black Sites. *The New York Review of Books*, 9. April.
- Doerr-Zegers, O., Hartmann, L., Lira, E. & Weinstein, E. (1992). Torture: Psychiatric sequelae and phenomenology. *Psychiatry*, 55, 177–184.
- Eban, K. (2007). Rorschach and awe. *VANITY FAIR*, 17. Juli 2007.
- Ebbinghaus, A. & Dörner, K. (Hrsg.). (2001). *Vernichten und Heilen. Der Nürnberger Ärzteprozess und seine Folgen*. Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag.
- Erb, V. (2005). Folterverbot und Notwehrrecht. In P. Nitschke (Hrsg.), *Rettungsfolter im modernen Rechtsstaat. Eine Verortung* (p. 149–167). Bochum.
- Fink, S. (2009). Tortured profession: Psychologists warned of abusive interrogations, then helped craft them. *ProPublica*, 7. Mai 2009. <http://www.propublica.org/article/torturedprofession-psychologists-warned-of-abusive-interrogations-505>
- Ginbar, Y. (2008). *Why Not Torture Terrorists? Moral, Practical and Legal Aspects of the Ticking Bomb Justification for Torture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gray, G. & Zielinski, A. (2006). Psychology and US psychologists in torture and war in the Middle East. *Torture*, 16, 128–133.
- Greenberg, K. J. & Dratel, J. L. (Eds.). (2005). *The Torture Papers: The Road to Abu Ghraib*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenfield, P. (1977). CIA's behaviour caper. *APA Monitor*, December, 10–11.
- Heron, W. (1957). The pathology of boredom. *Scientific American*, 196, 52–56.
- Kleinman, S. M. (2006). KUBARK Counterintelligence Interrogation. Review: Observations of an Interrogator – Lessons Learned and Avenues for Further Research. In Intelligence Science Board (Eds.), *Educating Information. Interrogation: Science and Art. Foundations for the Future* (pp. 95–140). National Defense Intelligence College. Washington, DC: NDIC Press.[<http://www.ndic.edu/press/3866.htm>]
- Lazreg, M. (2008). *Torture and the Twilight of Empire. From Algiers to Baghdad*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Maran, R. (1996). *Staatsverbrechen, Ideologie und Folter im Algerienkrieg*. Europäische Verlagsanstalt.
- Marks, J. (1979). *The Search for the 'Manchurian Candidate'*. New York: Norton.
- Marks, J. H. (2007). Interrogational neuroimaging in counterterrorism: A „no-brainer“ or a human rights hazard? *American Journal of Law and Medicine*, 33, 483–500.
- Mayer, J. (2008). *The Dark Side. The Inside Story of How the War on Terror Turned into a War on American Ideals*. New York: Doubleday.
- McCoy, A. W. (2006). *A Question of Torture: CIA Interrogation, from the Cold War to the War on Terror*. New York: Henry Holt.
- McCoy, A. W. (2007). Science in Dachau's shadow: Hebb, Beecher, and the development of CIA psychological torture and modern medical ethics. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 43, 401–417.
- Merkel, R. (2008). Folter als Notwehr, *DIE ZEIT*, 11/2008, S. 46.

- Miles, S. H. (2009). *Oath Betrayed: America's Torture Doctors*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- National Research Council (2008). Emerging Cognitive Neuroscience and Related Technologies. Committee on Military and Intelligence Methodology for Emergent Neurophysiological and Cognitive/Neural Research in the Next Two Decades. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.
- Nowak, M. & McArthur, E. (2006). The distinction between torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, *Torture, Journal on Rehabilitation of Torture Victims and Prevention on Torture*, 16, 147–151.
- Nowak, M. & McArthur, E. (2008). *The United Nations Convention against Torture: A Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olsen, B., Soldz, S. & Davis, M. (2008). The ethics of interrogation and the American Psychological Association: A critique of policy and process. *Philosophy, Ethics, and Humanities in Medicine*, 3:3. [<http://www.peh-med.com/content/3/1/3>]
- Orne, M. T. (1961). The potential uses of hypnosis in interrogation. In A. D. Biderman & H. Zimmer (Eds.), *The Manipulation of Human Behavior*. New York: Wiley.
- Patsalides, B. (1999). Ethics of the unspeakable: Torture survivors in analytic treatment. *The Journal of the Northern California Society for Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 5, 1.
- PCATI (Public Committee against Torture in Israel). (2007). *Ticking Bombs: Testimonies of Torture Victims in Israel*, Jerusalem, May 2007.
- PCATI (Public Committee against Torture in Israel). (2008). 'Family Matters'. *Using Family Members to Pressure Detainees Under GSS interrogation*. Jerusalem, April 2008.
- Physicians for Human Rights (PHR). (2007). *Leave No Marks: Enhanced Interrogation Techniques and the Risk of Criminality*. [<http://physiciansforhumanrights.org/library/report-2007-08-02.html>]
- Pope, K. S. & Gutheil, T. G. (2009). Psychologists abandon the Nuremberg ethic: Concerns for detainee interrogations. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 32, 161–166. [<http://kspope.com/nuremberg.php>]
- Rejali, D. M. (2007). *Torture and Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sands, P. (2008). *Torture Team. Rumsfeld's Memo and the Betrayal of American Values*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shallice, T. (1972). The Ulster depth interrogation techniques and their relation to sensory deprivation research. *Cognition*, 1, 385–405.
- Soldz, S. (2006). Psychologists, Guantanamo and torture. *COUNTERPUNCH*, 1. August 2006. [<http://www.counterpunch.org/soldz08012006.html>]
- Soldz, S. (2007). Psychology and coercive interrogations in historical perspective: Aid and comfort for torturers. *Common Dreams.org*, 15. April, 2007. [<http://www.commondreams.org/archive/2007/04/15/527>]
- Soldz, S. (2008). The torture trainers and the American Psychological Association. *COUNTERPUNCH*, 24. Juni 2008. [<http://www.counterpunch.org/soldz06252008.html>]
- Soldz, S., Olson, B., Reisner, S., Arrigo, J. M. & Welch, B. (2008). Torture and the strategic helplessness of the American Psychological Association. *COUNTERPUNCH*, 22. Juli 2008. [<http://www.counterpunch.org/soldz07232008.html>]
- Somnier, F., Vesti, P., Kastrup, M. & Genefke, I. K. (1992). Psychosocial consequences of torture: Current knowledge and evidence. In M. Basoglu (Ed.), *Torture and Its Consequences: Current Treatment Approaches* (pp. 56–71). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Valtin, J. (2007). Postmortem: APA torture resolution puzzle. *Daily Kos*, 20. August 2007. [<http://www.dailykos.com/storyonly/2007/8/20/235410/889>]
- van der Hart, O., Nijenhuis, E. R. & Steele, K. (2008). *Das verfolgte Selbst. Strukturelle Dissoziation und die Behandlung chronischer Traumatisierung*. Paderborn: Jungfermann.

Woolf, L. M. (2007). A sad day for psychologists. *COUNTERPUNCH*, 1./2. September 2007.
[<http://www.counterpunch.org/woolf09012007.html>]