

# MAN'S DISPOSITION TO BOTH JUSTIFY AND EXECUTE TORTURE

© P. SALIYA SUMANATILAKE, 2023.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Most nation-states have been found out as having paid only 'lip service' to the universal ban<sup>1</sup> on torture of all descriptions (*interrogative*,<sup>2</sup> *punitive*<sup>3</sup> and *oppressive*<sup>4</sup>). Moreover, professing respect for this prohibition has become a convenient means for securing international aid and/or patronage. Revelations of torture by France in Algeria in 1957 (Rejali 2007, 480); the United Kingdom in Northern Ireland in 1971 (Rejali 2007, 363); and, most recently, the United States in Iraq's Abu Ghraib prison in 2004 (Rejali 2007, 294) have made it explicit that even 'permanent members' of the United Nations' Security Council (so-called patrons of human rights) themselves could openly disregard and brazenly defy the same. Hence, for all the criminal sanctions that the world and its constituent nation-states have brought upon torture, those who perpetrate it remain for the most part undeterred.

In order to effect torture, one must not only be incited but also disposed toward it. Some form of inciting factor must prevail to liberate one's inhibited cruel disposition, each successful incitement progressively weakening the resolve to desist from cruelty.

## 2. SOCIETAL JUSTIFICATION

*Justifications*, when enacted by law, are obviously enforceable. Even when not so sanctioned, they tend to 'hold ground' whenever public sentiment lies in favor of them. Hence, torturing a suspect-terrorist to determine the location of a ticking bomb could be seen as *justified* by the greater populace of a nation whose laws might nevertheless prohibit this.

Not only society as a whole, but also individuals by themselves may have recourse to this *modus operandi* of *justification* to trump enacted law(s). To execute the role designated by *social contract*<sup>5</sup> is what qualifies for many individuals as their paramount duty owed to society. When one voluntarily adopts a role, one implicitly undertakes the duty to discharge that role to the fullest:

When an actor takes on an established social role, usually he finds that a particular front has already been established for it. Whether his acquisition of the role was primarily motivated by a desire to perform the given task or by a desire to maintain the corresponding front, the actor will find that **he must do both**. (Goffman 1956, 17, emphasis added.)

Since the role is deemed vital to the benefit of the whole, its propriety cannot be questioned. One may resign his role but cannot deliberately compromise its utility. A soldier, whence ordered to kill, must kill; society expects soldiers to both kill and be killed on behalf of their country. Likewise, citizens require the police *inter alia* to restore goods stolen by thieves. So policemen do comply, even at the cost of torturing a ‘few’ innocents. Prosecutors too are expected to win their cases, even by committing to jail a man whose guilt might sincerely be doubted. So long as society demands a *specific performance* from a defined role, its morality is deemed irrelevant, *societal utility* alone being paramount.

Despite salutary reverence being paid to religion by constitutions the world over, the virtues of morality have failed to alter the archaic role personifications prescribed by *utilitarian* ideals. All moral considerations are hence trumped by those based on ‘necessity.’ The world increasingly appears to submit to this new *stratum* of *justification*: neither moral nor legal, but essentially *societal*. One is *justified*, so long as the majority of society either says or implies so.

Accordingly, the policeman is *societally justified* in torturing suspect-offenders; the prosecutor in securing doubtful convictions; and the judge in awarding excessive exemplary sentences. If

the policeman, prosecutor and judge are so *societally justified*, it is obvious that the executioner is equally *justified* in executing an innocent 'convict.' Hence, all such *societal justifications* do carry with them a real risk of harm to truly innocent individuals.

All who undertake the aforementioned roles do so voluntarily, fully appreciating both the substantial risks involved and *societal justifications* operating to exonerate liabilities if incurred. Whenever confronted with questions of moral and/or legal responsibility, 'utilitarian worth to the secured perpetuation of society' is cited as precluding the same: 'It's a 'dirty job' but someone's got to do it.' Hence, society is deemed indebted to these 'fearless' officials for 'heroically' undertaking such 'dirty jobs' for the greater 'good' of man.

The policeman who elects not to investigate a theft but to arrest an individual whom the owner alone suspects (with the objective of torturing such arrestee into revealing the whereabouts of stolen goods) will surely state that he is doing no more than what society 'expects'; nay, 'demands.'

When it is one's own possessions that have been stolen, 'a blind eye' is often turned to the means that secure their recovery. This self-serving initiative is often opined to be reflective of the true expectation of every society the world over. Hence, whatever the constraints that should legally apply, societies consider themselves empowered to *veto* them whenever deemed expedient. Policemen (being public officials) by and large believe themselves entrusted with 'authority' (the public's confidence) to exercise this power of *veto* on behalf of society. Many a tale on how a huge haul of heroin 'could not have been detected' without beating smaller peddlers (or a bomb/arms cache 'could not have been located' without torturing suspect-terrorists) has been cited to both exemplify and *justify* 'due' recourse to such 'entrusted *veto* power.' Hence the perspective that torture is 'a necessary evil.'

Law is not synonymous with morality; immorality could easily constitute law. Only a minimum content of morality is subscribed to globally; this too with many an overriding legal exception. Whilst the premeditated killing of a human being is murder, the execution of an enemy combatant or a capital offender is not. The egocentricity of the human mind is such that leeway to create exceptions in law is (naively) thought capable of being extended to morality as well. Accordingly, the minds of men have been progressively conditioned toward accepting so-called ‘moral exceptions’ (that in effect *justify* gross immorality). Thus, a new criterion of validity has for some time been in the process of gaining societal acceptance: human exertions need only be *justified*, not moral. Such elective *vetoing* of morality in deference to *justification* is more and more viewed as both ‘logically expedient’ and ‘socially beneficial.’

Whether in discovering evidence toward prosecuting/preventing a crime or in ‘punishing an offender,’ the torturer appears virtually entitled to plead *societal justification* (as being impelled so to do by *societal expectations*). Thus, an apparent inciting factor for both *interrogative* and *punitive* ‘police torture’ is duly demarcated: ***societal justification***.

But are these aspersions cast both directly and indirectly on the citizenry – as ‘patrons’ of torture – in fact true? Two reported allegations serve to elucidate in this regard (the first from Cambodia and the second from Sri Lanka):

(a) After interrogating Phoeun, the police brought him to ... his sister’s house ... so they could search it for Kong Vy and the other ... accomplice. Neighbors watched as 20-30 police [officers], with motorcycles and two cars, arrived at the house in Russei Keo district. They dragged Phoeun out of one of the cars by his handcuffs and butted him with an AK47 on the head. The police stormed the house but found only Phoeun’s 70-year-old father. Searching the house, they found four license plates, mirrors and other motorcycle parts. They took photographs of Phoeun with the ‘evidence’ of robbery. They interrogated Phoeun about the gun, which the robbers had allegedly used, but he said he didn’t know where it was; he told them that maybe Kong Vy had it. The police didn’t believe Phoeun. They took him to a nearby street about 70 meters from his house and removed his handcuffs and pushed him away. He refused to run away, knowing that he

would be beaten or shot, and [hence] crouched down on the ground. **A group of moto-dops** (motorcycle taxi drivers) **edged closer, picking up pieces of wood and other weapons**. The police walked away from Phoeun. **The moto-dops**, knowing they had the police's permission, **moved in to attack him**. **Some kicked him, while others swung wooden sticks** (some of them with protruding nails) **over his head**. **They kicked and beat him on his head, body and legs**. Phoeun begged for mercy, cried, and pleaded for his father to help him ... . (Barber 2000, 42, parentheses and emphasis added.)

(b) ... Wijeratne ... belongs to the Veddha aboriginal community, and this summer he set up a small ice cream stall for a festival at the ... temple. While bathing in the adjacent ... river on 28 August at about midday, Wijeratne reports that he found a piece of wire buried in the sand, and thinking it useful, he took it with him. However, shortly afterward, a *grama* (village) officer ... stopped him in the crowd, pulled him by his shirt collar, and started to question him about the wire. He was taken to a police post near the temple, where the officer told two other officers that he had caught 'the wire thief.' One of the police officers fetched **the head priest**, who allegedly **ordered Wijeratne to sit on the floor, took the wire from him and beat him with it for around five minutes**. A crowd gathered. The priest [had] allegedly shouted at Wijeratne throughout the beating, accusing him of regularly cutting wire from the temple premises; ... [a] **younger priest then allegedly kicked the victim to the ground**. (Ed. Fernando 2012, 362, emphasis and parentheses added.)

In both the above accounts, members of the public are alleged to have voluntarily engaged in an open display of *punitive* torture: motorcycle taxi drivers in the first and two priests in the second. In both instances, policemen have deliberately refrained from stepping in to stop the beatings, leaving both victims to suffer at the hands of civilian perpetrators.

Such an uninhibited propensity to resort to brutality so openly perhaps could be expected of laymen but certainly not of clergymen. That these vile actions of unscrupulous men continued unobstructed by either the police or the public manifests the existence of a *societal* partiality for or *justification* of the same. Thus, it might be concluded that the said two incidents (at least diminutively) inure to the benefit of a presumption that members of the public do condone not only *interrogative* but also *punitive* 'police torture.'

However, much more is needed to render this presumption plausible. Hence, recourse is had to the following (Sri Lankan) allegations as well:

(a) ... Ms. Buddhika was at a friend's house when several of her cousins ... forced her into the van of a Mr. S... . ... They took her to the Baddegama police station and handed her over to Sub-Inspector ... A..., loudly announcing, '**We brought you the rogue.**' S.I. A... and another policeman ... began hitting Ms. Buddhika about the head and face and demanded, 'Where are the goods?' ... Ms. Buddhika fell to the ground. She pleaded with the policemen not to assault her and informed them that she was recovering from surgery and had not stolen anything. However, the policemen replied that they did not care whether she died or not and continued to kick her abdomen. Unable to bear the pain, the victim became unconscious. ... The victim further stated that **her cousins and Mr. S... were present while she was being tortured.** (Ed. Fernando 2012, 143-144, emphasis added.)

(b) ... Jayawardena was returning home when two policemen from the Mitiyagoda police station arrested him. At the time, his sister and brother-in-law were also present. ... He was told he was being arrested on suspicion of theft. ... Jayawardena was put into a jeep and taken to the Mitiyagoda police station. ... The police assaulted him with a wooden club in an attempt to make him confess to the theft. ... Jayawardena screamed in pain, insisting that he did not steal anything and that he was not aware of any theft. However, the policemen insisted that he had stolen jewelry and continued to inhumanly subject him to torture. ... They searched his house but did not find any incriminating evidence, so they returned him to the station and locked him in a holding cell. **It was at this time that he saw Ms. M... J..., the person who had accused him of theft. He noticed that Ms. M... and company remained at the station until around 7 p.m. and that they had brought drinks and cigarettes for the policemen.** (Ed. Fernando 2012, 146-147, emphasis added.)

(c) ... N... was riding in a three-wheeler on her way home when two unknown persons snatched her gold necklace and wristwatch ... . ... The police began questioning the ... [three-wheeler driver] based on N...'s complaint. ... Every time he denied any involvement, the policemen had him repeatedly beaten for 20 minutes. **The complainant was present when the police were torturing him.** (Ed. Fernando 2012, 233, parenthesis and emphasis added.)

(d) ... The victim ... Kumara Perera ... together with his cousin Danushka and his grandmother, visited the Piliyandala police station ... to lodge a complaint against a neighbor – [Ms.] ... S... – for harassing them and falsely accusing them of committing crimes. But when the victim reached the police station, the neighbor was also present. Upon seeing them, **the victim heard Ms. S...**

**pointing at them and telling the police to assault them.** Consequently, the Complaints Division Officer-In-Charge ... D... walked up to them and viciously kicked the victim and his cousin. After they fell on the floor, he trampled them with his boots. (Ed. Fernando 2012, 243-244, parenthesis and emphasis added.)

(e) ... When Shantha came home from work, his neighbor A... came demanding to know if he knew anything about the theft that had taken place in his house. A... insisted that Shantha knew about the theft. **He took hold of Shantha by the collar and assaulted him on the mouth, face and chest and shouted, 'Sub-Inspector! I have caught the thief.'** When he shouted this, a person dressed in civilian clothes, hiding ... nearby, came out. This person then threatened Shantha not to try and run and handcuffed him, saying that he is from the police. Taken aback, Shantha asked what all this was about. He was accused of taking stolen goods from A...'s house and was told to return them. Then, saying that they will look for the stolen goods, the Sub-Inspector ... and A... took Shantha to a house in the vicinity belonging to his brother-in-law, which was locked. They searched the empty house, all the while threatening Shantha to return the stolen goods. Shantha pleaded that he did not steal any goods and that he lived by picking coconuts. The S.I., taking a pole that he had picked up from Shantha's house, told Shantha to raise his manacled hands over his head and keep them on the wall. He then beat him on the spine and on the chest. (Ed. Fernando 2012, 342-343, emphasis added.)

(f) ... Sampath Perera ... was leaving church ... when **he was stopped and badly beaten with an iron bar by a group of churchgoers.** They accused him of stealing Rs.38/- ... from the church and called the police. While waiting for the police, the residents decided that another young man ... was the culprit instead, but when the police arrived, both were taken to Negombo police station. (Ed. Fernando 2012, 357, emphasis added.)

In '(a),' '(b)' and '(c)' above, the victims' accusers were physically present within the police station at or about the time of the alleged torture, at least tacitly approving the same. In '(d),' '(e)' and '(f)' above, they were clearly complicit in the alleged torture.

### 3. **LAWFUL ENFORCEABILITY OF SOCIETAL JUSTIFICATION**

Would the law and/or courts be willing to defer to *societal justification*?

Louis Gachelin, a Miami cab driver, picked up two passengers, Jean Leon and Frantz Armand, at the Miami International Airport and drove them to an apartment complex. Upon their arrival at the complex, the passengers requested that the driver carry their suitcases inside the building. As the driver approached the door of the apartment, he was forced at gunpoint to enter the apartment and remain quiet. They undressed and bound him. Leon and Armand then began making numerous phone calls to the driver's family, attempting to arrange a ransom. As soon as they received the first phone call, the Gachelin family contacted the police. Frank Gachelin, the cab driver's brother who was working with the police, agreed to meet Leon at the Northside Shopping Center and to bring \$4,000 in exchange for his brother's release. Leon and Frank Gachelin met in the shopping center parking lot at 2:00 a.m. During the confrontation, Leon drew a gun on Frank. The police officers who had accompanied Frank to the meeting immediately arrested Leon and demanded that he tell them where he was holding Gachelin. When he refused to tell them the location, he was set upon by several of the officers. ... **They threatened and physically abused him by twisting his arm behind his back and choking him until he revealed where ... Gachelin ... was being held.** ... **The officers went to the apartment, rescued Gachelin,** and arrested Armand. (*Leon v. Wainwright* [1984], 770, emphasis added.)

Circuit Judge Fay (sitting with Circuit Judge Anderson and Chief Judge of the Federal Circuit Markey) opined in this regard as follows:

... The police, motivated by the immediate necessity of finding the victim and saving his life, used force and threats on Leon in the parking lot. ... We do not, by our decision, sanction the use of force and coercion by police officers. Yet this case does not represent the typical case of unjustified force. We did not have an act of brutal law enforcement agents trying to obtain a confession in total disregard of the law. **This was instead a group of concerned officers acting in a reasonable manner to obtain information they needed in order to protect another individual from bodily harm or death.** (*Leon v. Wainwright* [1984], 770, emphasis added.)

The said *dicta*, however, must necessarily be deemed *obiter*, as the issue herein decided was the sustainability of the perpetrator's later confession in light of the force used on him, not the liability of the police for using such force (torture). Whatever persuasiveness thereby attaching to the proposition *immediacy to protect another individual from bodily harm or death excuses recourse to interrogative torture* would be verily negated by the *jus cogens* ban on torture proclaimed in *Siderman de Blake v. Republic of Argentina* [1992].



Pursuant to the recognition of the prohibition on *cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment*, as *jus cogens*, no form of ‘necessity’-based excuse or *justification*<sup>6</sup> could be either legislatively enacted or judicially determined in exception thereof. Regarding any form of law serving to aid, abet, counsel or procure torture as having existed prior to the recognition of the *jus cogens* status of its prohibition, *Prosecutor v. Anto Furundžija* [1998] expressly provides that:

Proceedings could be initiated by potential victims ... before a competent ... national judicial body, with a view to asking it to hold the national measure to be ... **unlawful** (60, para.155, emphasis added).

However, until such ‘national measure’ is so determined ‘unlawful’ it continues to enjoy full efficacy as law for the time being in force, *e.g.*, the implied warrant to torture being perpetuated by *Queen v. Murugan Ramasamy*’s interpretation of section 27(1) of the Evidence Ordinance of Sri Lanka.

The following account divulges tactics allegedly resorted to by Sri Lankan Army officer ‘Thomas’ in furtherance of exercising search and arrest (police) powers provisionally conferred on the armed forces *via Emergency Regulations* proclaimed under the Public Security Ordinance No.25 of 1947<sup>7</sup>:

Three individuals had been arrested on suspicion of having set up a time bomb in a public place. They were interrogated under threat of death (psychologically tortured) to reveal the location of the device but remained defiant. Since the lives of innocent people were at stake, ‘Thomas’ (the chief interrogator) decided to make good his threat and shot dead one of the suspect-terrorists in order to induce the others to talk; they promptly did. The bomb was discovered and neutralized, saving hundreds of civilian lives. (Hoffman 2002, 52.)

Thus, three human beings (albeit suspect-terrorists) were psychologically tortured<sup>8</sup> (with threats of imminent death) toward discovering the location of a ticking bomb; one was killed.

The bomb was located and neutralized, saving ‘countless lives.’ But was this ‘cost’ (the torture of 3 and death of 1) to ‘benefit’ (many lives saved) calculation employed by ‘Thomas’ morally *justifiable*? Certainly not, for it is none other than the deontological premise (Cohan 2007, 1589) that both killing and torture are prohibited under any circumstance that has found its way into customary international law (Cohan 2007, 1593). Would the public then condemn ‘Thomas’s’ said acts? The majority would perhaps approvingly condone the same. But could such *societal justifiability* ever be tantamount to *legal justifiability*?

Sections 89 and 90 of the Penal Code Ordinance No.2 of 1883<sup>9</sup> of Sri Lanka, when read together, convey *inter alia* that:

**Nothing is an offense** which is done in the exercise of the *right ... to defend ... the body of any other person* against any offense affecting the human body (emphasis added).

Furthermore, sections 93, 95, 99 and 92(4) of the same Code, respectively state among other things that:

[This] *right ...* extends ... to the **voluntary causing of death or of any other harm to the assailant**, if the offense which occasions the exercise of the *right* be ... an assault as may **reasonably cause the apprehension that death** will otherwise be the consequence ... [or] ... an assault as may **reasonably cause the apprehension that grievous hurt** will otherwise be the consequence ... (parentheses and emphasis added).

The *right ... commences* as soon as a reasonable apprehension of danger to the body arises from an attempt or threat to commit the offense, though the offense may not have been committed, and it **continues** as long as such apprehension of danger to the body continues (emphasis added).

If in the exercise of the *right* of private defense against an assault which reasonably causes the apprehension of death, the defender be so situated that he cannot effectually exercise that *right* without risk of harm to an innocent person, his *right* of private defense **extends** to the running of that risk (emphasis added).

The *right* ... in **no** case extends to the inflicting of more harm than it is necessary to inflict for the purpose of defense (emphasis added).

Accordingly, on a strict literal application of the above, 'Thomas' might find himself defended as follows:

- No sooner than his being made aware of the bomb threat, a 'reasonable apprehension of danger' in the nature of either 'death' or 'grievous hurt' to 'the bodies' of 'other persons' could have duly arisen in 'Thomas's' mind. Hence, he would in all probability have considered himself entitled to 'defend' such persons *via* his legal 'right' to do so, which 'right' could have been construed as available until such threat in fact abated.
- Either 'death' or 'grievous hurt' to many individuals being logically anticipated, the 'chief interrogator' might have presumed himself entitled to cause 'any harm to the assailants' in order to 'defend' all potential victims. However, questioning and even threatening the three suspect-terrorists with immediate death failed to yield the bomb's location.
- Seeing himself entitled to run a 'risk of harm' even to 'an innocent person,' 'Thomas' made good his threats by shooting dead one of the said suspect-terrorists, prompting the others to divulge immediately the whereabouts of the explosive device, thereby preventing 'death' or 'grievous hurt' to many civilians.
- 'Thomas' thus viewed himself as having inflicted no 'more harm than ... necessary ... for the purpose of defense' within the exigencies of the given situation.

Nonetheless, in view of Sri Lanka's Convention Against Torture Act's [1994]<sup>10</sup> declaring under section 3 that resorting to torture 'at a time when there was a state of war, threat of war,

internal political instability or any public emergency' shall not be a defense, 'Thomas's' recourse to the *justification* provided by section 93 of the Penal Code (above) toward exculpating himself from liability for psychological torture would certainly fail.<sup>11</sup> It is indeed ironic that terminating a life could be so *justified*, but compromising its condition could *not*.

But would the public veritably let their 'hero' ('Thomas') be prosecuted for *oppressive* psychological torture? Would the Attorney General truly be disposed toward filing an indictment against him? In both instances, the answer would be an emphatic 'no' (apparently, neither were 'Thomas's' aforesaid arbitrary actions publicized, nor was he ever charged or prosecuted for either murder or torture). Hence, such public or *societal justifiability* does in reality tend to overpower *legal justifiability*.

The unapparent insecurities of a police force overwhelmed by an apparent ever-increasing incidence of crime is what is conveyed by such an unceasing recourse to debasing torture, whether *punitive*, *interrogative* or even *oppressive*. However, police officials have not unilaterally arrogated such *supralegal* recourse unto themselves. The public has had much to do with conceding such discretion to dominate through their **(a)** overt ignorance of the law (in the majority) and **(b)** covert manipulations by way of bribes and other inducements offered to policemen toward fulfilling private ends (in the minority). Admittedly, members of the public (as taxpayers of a *welfare state*) do have a right to cry out for effective crime prevention. However, such outcry must be for legal as opposed to illegal measures, which, owing to societal ignorance (of the law), is indeed a difficult distinction to make.

Many are unaware that clobbering an alleged thief to ascertain the whereabouts of stolen property is illegal. Some even labor under the erroneous impression that police officers are empowered to inflict blows on those suspected of certain crimes. Thus, in the chance event of such deluded individuals falling into the hands of the police, they would willingly submit to

torture (or other forms of cruelty) on the premise that being so ill-treated constitutes ‘due process.’ As Jason Barber observes:

Torture is also perpetuated by an **attitude of acceptance** of the *status quo*: the belief that torture – and other violence and exploitation, and related crimes such as corruption and extortion – are ‘normal’ and **to be expected** (2000, 112, emphasis added).

#### 4. QUESTIONING THE PUBLIC

A test was conducted to determine whether or not *societal justification* could be empirically verified as inciting ‘police torture’ of all descriptions (*interrogative, punitive* and *oppressive*). An atypical questionnaire (see ‘Appendix’) was served on a ‘snowball sampled’ group of 300 individuals (158 females and 142 males), all being adults minimally educated up to Sri Lanka’s General Certificate of Education, Ordinary Level. Three ‘situational,’ ‘deep analysis’ and ‘closed response’ questions made up the said questionnaire:

- ‘**Question 1,**’ based on the already analyzed account pertaining to the alleged official acts of Sri Lankan Army officer ‘Thomas’ (above), probed the public’s approval of police recourse to *oppressive* torture within a ticking bomb setting.
- ‘**Question 2,**’ based on the Sri Lankan Supreme Court’s determination in *Roshana Michael v. Saleh O.I.C. (Crimes) police station Narahenpita and others* [2002], probed the public’s acceptability of complainant-instigated police *interrogative* torture.
- ‘**Question 3,**’ based on the famous ‘shock experiment’ conducted by Stanley Milgram (1963) at Yale University (elaborated in ‘7.’ below), probed the public’s willingness to engage in *punitive* torture for the advancement of scientific study.

Since all sampled members of the public were required to express themselves regarding three true-life situations (as opposed to mere hypothetical constructs), their responses constituted testaments to the behavioral standards they upheld in the real world. By soliciting responses from next-generation university students as well, the standards that they were inclined to commit themselves to were also ascertained.

All 300 individuals to whom the questionnaire was presented were able to answer all queries by choosing from the prescribed responses. Each prescribed response carried a specific score based on whether it represented a pro-torture (-2, -4, -8), anti-torture (+2, +4, +6, +8) or equivocal (0) stance:

Questionnaire Response Scores and Rationales			
Query	Response	Score	Rationale for the Score
1:	1. (a) only	-4	Accepts socially 'beneficial' <i>oppressive</i> 'police torture'
	2. (a) & (b)	-8	Endorses socially 'beneficial' <i>oppressive</i> 'police torture'
	3. (c) only	0	Equivocal
	4. (c) & (d)	+2	Legally correct
	5. (e) only	+4	Legally and morally correct
2:	1. (a) only	-8	Endorses socially 'beneficial' <i>interrogative</i> 'police torture'
	2. (b) only	+2	Legally correct
	3. (b) & (c)	+4	Legally and morally correct
	4. (b), (d) & (e)	+6	Lawful, moral and preventive
	5. (b), (c), (d) & (e)	+8	Lawful, moral, preventive and pragmatic
3:	1. (a) only	-4	Endorses <i>punitive</i> torture for mutual gains
	2. (b) only	-2	Accepts <i>punitive</i> torture based experimentation
	3. (c) only	0	Equivocal
	4. (d) only	+4	Legally and morally correct
	5. (d) & (e)	+8	Lawful, moral, preventive and pragmatic
<i>Highest possible anti-torture score</i>		+20	
<i>Highest possible pro-torture score</i>		-20	

Upon calculating each respondent's cumulative score, according to the scoring table above ('Table 1'), the following anti-torture to pro-torture (descending) gradient was arrived at:

Table 2

**Cumulative anti-torture to pro-torture (descending) Scores of 300 (three-hundred) respondents to the Torture Questionnaire**

Score	Individuals	Females	Males	Employed	Students
+20	3	0	3	3	0
+18	9	5	4	9	0
+16	18	5	13	14	4
+14	30	18	12	12	18
+12	36	20	16	18	18
+10	40	24	16	8	32
+8	20	10	10	13	7
+6	20	11	9	8	12
+4	17	6	11	5	12
+2	25	18	7	8	17
0	16	9	7	6	10
-2	24	11	13	16	8
-4	17	10	7	10	7
-6	9	5	4	6	3
-8	3	1	2	1	2
-10	1	0	1	1	0
-12	4	2	2	2	2
-14	2	0	2	2	0
-16	3	2	1	1	2
-18	2	1	1	2	0
-20	1	0	1	1	0
<i>Total</i>	300	158	142	146	154

At first sight, much complacency appears derivable from the fact that the total number of individuals who have scored  $\bar{2}$  (minus two) or less (being 66 or 22%) is much lower than those who have scored  $+2$  (plus two) or more (being 218 or 72.66%).

Nonetheless, owing to each optional response (within the questionnaire) being designed to evoke whatever modicum of sympathy or antipathy toward a particular conceptualized category of torture, the totality of responses (received from the same 300 above) when classified according to whatever pro-torture premise assented to reveals a drastically different picture:

Aggregates and percentages of individuals who have favored pro-torture responses (entailing minus scoring) as enumerated in the Torture Questionnaire				
Query	Response	Score	Rationale for the Score	Individuals
1:	1. (a) only	-4	Accepts socially 'beneficial' <i>oppressive</i> 'police torture'	83 (27.66%)
	2. (a) & (b)	-8	Endorses socially 'beneficial' <i>oppressive</i> 'police torture'	55 (18.33%)
2:	1. (a) only	-8	Endorses socially 'beneficial' <i>interrogative</i> 'police torture'	21 (7%)
3:	1. (a) only	-4	Endorses <i>punitive</i> torture for personal and mutual gains	21 (7%)
	2. (b) only	-2	Accepts <i>punitive</i> torture based scientific experimentation	45 (15%)
<i>Individuals who chose at least one of the above pro-torture responses</i>				168
<i>vis-à-vis the total sample of 300</i>				56%

As *per* the detailed questionnaire response scores, the following calculations have been made:

(a) 46% (138 out of 300) have expressed support for *oppressive* 'police torture' (by selecting either response option '1.' or '2.' to 'Question 1' of the questionnaire):

Breakdown of individuals who have favored <i>oppressive</i> 'police torture'				
Individuals	Female	Male	Employed	Students



138	79	59	64	74
-----	----	----	----	----

(b) 7% (21 out of 300) have expressed support for *interrogative* ‘police torture’ (by selecting response option ‘1.’ to ‘Question 2’ of the questionnaire):

Breakdown of individuals who have favored <i>interrogative</i> ‘police torture’				
Individuals	Female	Male	Employed	Students
21	9	12	14	7

(c) 4.33% (13 out of 300) have manifested support for both *oppressive* and *interrogative* forms of ‘police torture’ (by selecting either response option ‘1.’ or ‘2.’ to ‘Question 1’ along with response option ‘1.’ to ‘Question 2’ of the questionnaire):

Breakdown of individuals who have favored both <i>oppressive</i> and <i>interrogative</i> ‘police torture’				
Individuals	Female	Male	Employed	Students
13	6	7	8	5

(d) Therefore, 44.33% (133 ((138–13) + (21–13)) out of 300) have demonstrated clear support for either *oppressive* or *interrogative* forms of ‘police torture.’

(e) 22% (*i.e.*, 66 out of 300) have confessed their innate willingness to *punitively* torture another, minimally in furtherance of scientific experimentation and maximally for personal and mutual gains (by selecting either response option ‘1.’ or ‘2.’ to ‘Question 3’).

**56%** of all sampled individuals (*i.e.*, 168 out of 300) expressing assent unequivocally to at least one of the said pro-torture responses, that torture constitutes *justifiable* recourse to at least a

simple majority of a sufficiently representative sample of society (in Sri Lanka), becomes evident.

Moreover, the fact that no less than **22%** of respondents have had no inhibitions in declaring their willingness to directly engage in torturing (electrically shocking) another (in furtherance of personal fame and gain) is perhaps the most noteworthy revelation of this entire research exercise. Although the said percentage (22%) is low, the possibility that there might have existed others who did not wish to be so forthright in their disclosures (in fear of 'losing face') cannot be dismissed easily, especially considering that 44.33% did condone and/or *justify* either *oppressive* or *interrogative* 'police torture' (*per* calculation '**(d)**' above).

Impeding the *societal ignorance—justification* causal cycle of torture should do much to curb its incidence. But would this alone suffice?

## 5. CRUELTY: DEFINED AND EXEMPLIFIED

The term 'cruel' has been defined as follows:

**Disposed** to pain others; merciless. ... Causing pain, grief, or misery. (Webster 1895, 143, emphasis added.)

In *Ratnapala v. Dharmasiri, Headquarters Inspector Ratnapura and others* [1993], the petitioner (suspected of complicity in robbery) was during his interrogation (to elicit from him the location of hidden loot) allegedly subjected to the following:

He was made to squat, and his hands and legs were tied together. He was then hung with his head downward on a pole (passed behind his knees), the two ends of which were placed on two tables. While in this position, he was assaulted and kicked. 2 days later, the petitioner was again tied up and assaulted with a club. 8 days later, he was again assaulted with a club. His face was sprinkled with chili powder. 3 days later, he was assaulted with clubs and rubber hosepipes. 2-3 days later,

he was assaulted with hosepipes and leather belts. He was questioned as to where he had hidden the money and further assaulted. 6-7 days later, his head was struck with a brass padlock. ([1993], 226-227).

In his judgment, Justice Kulatunga reproduced verbatim the Judicial Medical Officer's report, which disclosed no less than 27 injuries along with the following conclusions:

'1. Scars and marks of injuries 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25 and 26 are those that could be **caused by blunt trauma**.

'2. Scars and marks of injuries 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 22, 23, 15 and 26 are consistent with those **caused by elongated blunt weapons like clubs, rubber hoses, batons and like weapons**.

'3. Scars and marks of injuries grouped under 4, 6 and 7 could be those of burns caused by a lighted cigarette.

'4. Scars of injury No.24 could be caused by the application of a ligature around the wrist.

'5. It is not possible to explain the totality of the injuries as a result of a fall or falls for the following reasons:

'(a) Very many of the scars and marks of the injuries have been identified as those likely to have been **caused by blunt weapons, lighted cigarettes and the application of ligatures**.

'(b) No scars or marks of injuries have been identified as those characteristic of fall/falls. *E.g.*, like grazed abrasions on projecting surfaces of the body.

'6. **Injuries** individually are non-grievous, but **taken collectively are of a grievous nature.**' (*Ratnapala v. Dharmasiri, Headquarters Inspector Ratnapura and others* [1993], 231-232, emphasis added.)

The following (now hallowed) *dictum* of Justice Atukorale in *Amal Sudath Silva v. Kodituwakku, Inspector of Police and others* [1987] provides an apt summation of the above case (and indeed of all other generic cases):

The facts ... have revealed disturbing features regarding **third-degree** methods adopted by certain police officers on suspects held in police custody. Such methods can only be described as barbaric, savage and inhuman. They are most revolting to one's sense of human decency and dignity, particularly at the present time when every endeavor is being made to promote and protect human rights. **Nothing shocks the conscience of a man so much as the cowardly act of a delinquent police officer who subjects a helpless suspect in his charge to deprived and barbarous methods of treatment within the confines of the very premises in which he is held in custody.** Such action on the part of the police will only breed contempt for the law ... . ([1987], 127, emphasis added.)

The question, then, is: what could move sentient beings believed 'humane' to unleash such barbarity?

Although rarely reported in Sri Lanka, engaging in apathetic animal experimentation appears to be quite common among children of the 'developed world.' In interviews had with twenty-five undergraduate students who claimed to have deliberately harmed or killed animals, the following (among many other like) illustrative independent accounts were elicited by Arnold Arluke (2006, 14 and 55-84):

(a) '... If it was something like a frog, we'd try to catch it and **experiment with it a little.** We used to play Frisbee with them ... not for any purpose, **not to learn anything, just to like harm it.** We would just throw it back and forth, and we didn't know if it was still alive or not because we would just keep tossing it. Yellow stuff would come out of it and stuff like that.' (Arluke 2006, 76, emphasis added.)

(b) ... After catching them with fishing poles ... '... John would spin the frog around and around the pole, so it would get some good momentum. I would take a paddle, and the next time the frog came around, I'd just sort of wind up and give him a good smack. And then you usually lose about half the frog. And we'd do that until the frog was all gone. It was like, '**Let's see what it can take.**' **Like an experiment.**' (Arluke 2006, 77, emphasis added.)

Whilst apathetic experimentation is clearly manifested in both the above accounts, it appears that harming *per se* constitutes both the ends and the means of the same. But why engage in

such aberrant behavior? The following response elicited from another interviewee apparently provides the generic answer to this question:

‘It was **fun** at the time, but I can’t answer why. ... We didn’t have anything to do besides having work and stuff. You were finished with your yard chores. You were finished with everything, and the adults wouldn’t let you be glued to the TV. It was like **we didn’t have anything to do** and we’re bored, so it’s like, ‘Okay, let’s go **torture** some cats.’’ (Arluke 2006, 60, emphasis added.)

There appears to have been some resentment on the part of this subject at not being permitted to indulge in watching television despite completing all assigned chores. Her averred inclination to ‘torture ... cats’ (a reference to drowning and burning kittens (Arluke 2006, 60)), however, is categorically implied as having been harbored in pursuance of ‘fun.’

Arluke records two other students as having expressed similar sentiments:

... *One* student reported ... ‘It was like, ‘We’re not going to skateboard; it’s too hot. Let’s fill the time up with something.’ **Shooting animals just appealed to us** for the day.’ *Another* said ... ‘On certain days, we’d **play** basketball, but on other days, we’d feel like **shooting** birds. I’d either ask friends to come over and **shoot** birds **or** come over to **play** basketball.’ (Arluke 2006, 60, emphasis added.)

Accordingly, in their minds, ‘shooting animals’ was comparable to ‘shooting hoops’ (playing basketball) or even ‘skateboarding.’ Hence, they regarded it synonymous with everyday play (Arluke 2006, 60). Their generic *justification* for trivializing such plainly heinous acts has also been somewhat elicited:

One reason [*justification*] they gave was that they **did not remember losing control of their emotions and becoming explosively violent**. Had they lost control of their emotions when harming animals, students claimed that it would have been harder to define their acts as mere **play**. (Arluke 2006, 60-61, parenthesis and emphasis added.)

Thus, in their view, cruelty/killing not occasioned by loss of self-control (*i.e.*, not provoked by rage or revenge) would not be culpable, the absence of supervening anger rendering such acts ‘innocuous.’ To them, both animal cruelty and animal destruction were merely alternative forms of trivial sport or ‘play.’ Those who engaged in lesser reprehensible types of cruelty asserted the ‘innocuousness’ of their actions by averring that they deliberately abstained from causing ‘serious’ harm (Arluke 2006, 61). But what did they actually sense when either harming or destroying animals? The following responses serve to elucidate:

(a) ‘You definitely **feel something different**’ ... ‘Just before you do it, you feel that difference. Right before you play a big game or something, you get this feeling, kind of a rush. That’s what it’s like. **It’s like a rush.**’ (Arluke 2006, 62, emphasis added.)

(b) ... A **similar rush** ... ‘might just be like playing around ... but then we get a little serious, and we started getting angry at each other and ... started wrestling – like trying to hurt each other. That’s when you get that feeling of a **super rush**, when you hit him and he hits you and you realize that it’s not like a game anymore.’ (Arluke 2006, 62, emphasis added.)

Not only is satisfaction in the form of ‘a rush’ or being ‘pumped up’ (Arluke 2006, 76) confessed to, but the same is also deemed similar to that felt when ‘hurting’ another human being. (Could this ‘rush’ then be the germ of *schadenfreude*?)

This ‘rush,’ though not necessarily addictive, appears incitive. That it is interpreted as ‘fun,’ seemingly *justifies* recourse to animal cruelty as a preferred means by which to derive the same, especially since it is not outlawed (unlike harming siblings, playmates and other human beings, which is).

Some tried to diffuse their responsibility for cruelty by alleging that they were either moved by group action or coerced into doing so by peers:

(a) 'I remember that part of the reason **I did it** was **because everyone else was**, and **I wanted to fit in with the group**' (Arluke 2006, 70, emphasis added).

(b) 'So one of the guys took out a BB gun one day and **dared each of us** to fire at it, and **we all did**' (Arluke 2006, 70, emphasis added).

However, it is clear that in both the above instances it was a selfish desire to gain acceptance that prompted compliance. Immoral choice thus founded such reprehensible actions.

Most interviewees were complacently convinced that their confessed apathetic behavior was 'normal' for children, a manifestation of mere childhood 'innocence' worthy of forgiveness. They believed that children indulged in animal cruelty because they were 'children,' wanting in maturity of understanding: 'When you are young, you don't really think of the social consequences ... **you don't think about the karma of it**' (Arluke 2006, 81, emphasis added). Nonetheless, several of Arluke's recorded accounts did reveal such abusive acts on the part of children to have been done both preferentially and purposefully (Arluke 2006, 68-69) rather than incidentally and impulsively.

The foregoing analysis more than serves to evince cruelty as a disposition both innate and germane to the human child, and hence the human being. It needs no prompting whatsoever from either desired domination or repressed rage to manifest. It resides within man by default, as illustrated by the unassumingly frank confessional accounts analyzed above. The truth of these confessional accounts too cannot be denied, as few (if any) would ever freely elect to depict themselves so vile.

Until moral conviction to the contrary is whensoever realized, cruelty remains 'part and parcel' of the natural human condition. Accordingly, whatever the factors that incite an individual to

torture, it is his **innate cruelty** that ultimately precipitates the same (desired domination and repressed rage serving only to situate and/or escalate).

Hence, despite the best efforts of renowned scholars to attribute economic, environmental, ethnic and gender/age-based reasons for the incidence of crime, it appears that man's innate untamed cruelty surpasses them all as the prime precipitator.

## 6. CRUELTY: AN INNATELY HUMAN TRAIT

Centuries ago, Michel de Montaigne opined as follows:

Those natures that are sanguinary toward beasts discover a natural proneness to cruelty. After they had accustomed themselves at Rome to spectacles of the slaughter of animals, they proceeded to those of the slaughter of men, of gladiators. **Nature has herself**, I fear, **imprinted in man a kind of instinct to inhumanity**; nobody takes pleasure in seeing beasts play with and caress one another, but everyone is **delighted** with seeing them dismember and tear one another to pieces. (1580, 187-188, emphasis added.)

Hence, rather than domination being construed as a facilitator of cruelty, Montaigne deems the latter the means by which the former is secured.

Victor Nell, more recently, has gone so far as to declare cruelty a trait unique to mankind (2006, 211). Whilst authority does exist to the contrary on inter-species cruelty,<sup>12</sup> regarding cruelty toward one's own kind (intra-species cruelty), Nell's opinion appears to hold true:

... Most rhesus monkeys refrained from operating a device for securing food if this caused another monkey to suffer an electric shock (Masserman, Wechkin and Terris 1964, 584).

[They] will consistently suffer hunger rather than secure food at the expense of electroshock to a conspecific (Masserman, Wechkin and Terris 1964, 585, parenthesis added).



In the several accounts of child animal cruelty (confessed to by university students) as noted earlier (under '5.' above), particular mention was made of a 'rush' (Arluke 2006, 62) or 'pumped up' (Arluke 2006, 76) feeling being experienced while engaging in the same. This resultant perception has been hypothesized as follows:

... The **infliction** of suffering produces the highest degree of happiness ... (Nietzsche 1887, 51). ...  
The **satisfaction** of being able to vent, without any trouble, his power on one who is powerless ...  
the joy in sheer violence ... (Nietzsche 1887, 50, emphasis added).

However, this 'satisfaction' once experienced does not appear to halt its further pursuit. It turns compulsive, at least temporarily, engendering intensifying inflictions of suffering in satiation thereof. The chances of surviving such a 'rapidly escalating' (Nell 2006, 219) assault are evidently remote:

(a) Around 7.30 p.m., I went to the police station again and sent my friend Nimal to see if my son was in the cell. I sat in the three-wheeler outside. I heard cries of '*budu ammo gahanna epa*' (do not assault). I ran past the barracks and went closer to the canteen. I saw my son hung by his legs and being assaulted. I saw M... entering the canteen with a black pole. There were about four or five others. I went back to the three-wheeler. ... I went home and thought about it, but since I had spoken to the police officer [earlier that evening], I thought there was nothing to worry [about]. Therefore, I went to sleep. The next morning I was told that my son [Gayan Rasanga] had been killed. (Gunasekara 2011, parentheses added.) The death ... was due to an **assault with a blunt weapon**, the Gampaha Judicial Medical Officer Dr. S.P.A. Hewage has ruled. (Gunasekara 2011, parentheses and emphasis added.)

(b) Charitha Chamara ... was found dead within five hours of his arrest. The father of two was arrested around 4 a.m. on February 25, and around 9 a.m. the same day his wife was informed that he was dead. According to the Judicial Medical Officer's (J.M.O.) report, the man had died of **assault injuries**. Five police officers, including a Sub-Inspector, were arrested. (Christopher 2017, emphasis added.)

'Satisfaction' from cruelty appears to be derived on a gradient, differing from individual to individual in accordance with the strength of 'shame and fear' (*Sukkadhamma sutta*<sup>13</sup> n.d.)

entertained by each. This gradient has been deemed (*per* Nell 2006, 223) to encompass ascendingly the ‘satisfaction’ gained from **(a)** observing cruelty, **(b)** assisting in the infliction of cruelty and **(c)** inflicting cruelty. Additionally, those who justify recourse to cruelty by key societal functionaries (policemen, prison guards, soldiers, *etc.*) constitute the majority in most communities; to so justify another’s cruelty, one must inherently be cruel.

Montaigne’s following declaration serves to sum up:

I could hardly persuade myself before I saw it with my eyes that there could be found souls so cruel and fell who, for the sole pleasure of murder, would commit it; would hack and lop off the limbs of others; sharpen their wits to invent unusual torments and new kinds of death, without hatred, without profit, and for no other end but only to enjoy the pleasant spectacle of the gestures and motions, the lamentable groans and cries of a man dying in anguish. For this is the utmost point to which cruelty can arrive: **‘That a man should kill a man, not being angry, not in fear, only for the sake of the spectacle.’** (1580, 186, emphasis added.)

This perhaps is what state torturers (especially the police) have and always will strive to perpetuate: ‘the spectacle’ of raw might toward instilling fear amongst the populace. Whether barefacedly showcased in public (as alleged in the following) or scantily veiled within the confines of a police station, the underlying intention is to communicate their merciless status to the public.

Averred in the last sentence of a particular university student’s confession of childhood animal cruelty (considered under ‘5.’ above) was the following: ‘You know, **you don’t think about the karma of it**’ (Arluke 2006, 81, emphasis added). If so, when does a human being start to ‘think about the karma’ of being cruel? The most obvious answer would be when s/he receives sufficient indoctrination in a moral philosophy that serves to instill ‘shame and fear’ (*Sukkadhamma sutta* n.d.) of acting, speaking and even thinking cruelly.

In this day and age, given that some form of moral influence by way of religion, custom, ethics or law is brought to be impressed upon almost every individual at some point in her/his life, it would be fair to assume that the majority do have a sufficient understanding of how (and why) to act righteously. However, the problem lies in their inability to convert such cognitions into convictions (perhaps owing to a lack of faith in gains from ethicality). Hence, pragmatic opportunism at whatever moral cost prevails instead.

Cruelty appears so primal and akin to man that even by much (mundane) effort one could only attenuate but not eradicate it. The value conflicts that incessantly plague this materialistic world only serve to make such a feat even more arduous. Animals are slaughtered to provide 'food' and harmed to determine the safety of consumables; enemy combatants are killed to 'save' a nation; offenders are tortured, incarcerated and even executed to 'protect' lives and property; and all persons associated with the above – from livestock farmers to executioners – must 'courageously' resolve to 'stomach' the cruelty of their livelihoods on behalf of themselves and their 'innocent' dependents. Setting off cruelty against benefit in these and other like contexts does constitute a moral dilemma for laymen who, unlike military personnel, have not been specifically trained to do so. Yet, they do 'manage' to yield to the benefit by *justifying* recourse to cruelty on the basis of 'popular morality.' This process of releasing oneself from the rigors of conventional morality is deemed facilitated by an adaptive mechanism termed 'selective – moral – disengagement' (Bandura 1990, 28).

*Societal justification* (expounded under both '2.' and 3.' above) may be said to connote a socially acceptable form of moral disengagement. Hence, the said gamut of societal functionaries – from livestock farmers to executioners – would be *societally justified via social contract* in executing their respective roles, notwithstanding any ensuing cruelty.

That a child wanting in (realized) morality is fully capable of torturing animals has been already evidenced by several accounts (under '5.' above). The policeman's as well as army officer's disposition to inflict torture consequent to her/his vocational training has also been evidenced. Yet, whether the run-of-the-mill individual of both reasonable and (some minimal form of) ethical understanding could in reality torture an innocent human being remains to be ascertained.

## 7. RE-EVALUATING THE MILGRAM RECORDS

From 1960-63, Stanley Milgram conducted an unparalleled array of experimental simulations using the resources available to him at Yale University, which in effect served to evince man's proclivity toward *punitive* torture:

Milgram's ... original studies were, among other things, an exploration of **people's willingness to physically harm others** (Miller 2009, 22, emphasis added).

His well-documented findings<sup>14</sup> (comprehensively presented in the celebrated work *Obedience to Authority: An experimental view*) have been incorporated into the writings of many a torture theoretician the world over. However, no one has proceeded to scrutinize those very firsthand observations and recordings made by Milgram toward determining whether they do in fact further his 'obedience to authority' hypothesis.

No less a reputed institution than Yale University was chosen by Milgram to host his foremost simulation: 'Experiment 2, Voice-Feedback' (Milgram 1974, 34). The local press advertised the same as requiring 1 hour's participation by freely consenting (non-student) adults of whatever description and/or occupation, each to be remunerated with \$4.50 upon presenting herself/himself at the designated venue:

You will be paid \$4.00 and (50c carfare) **as soon as you arrive** at the laboratory (Milgram 1974, 15, emphasis added).

The core experiment was devised to engage every individual who so volunteered in an exercise of penalty-based teaching. S/he was designated a 'teacher' charged with articulating a particular sequence of word pairs toward inducing a pre-designated 'learner' to recite the same accurately from memory. Any error on the part of the 'learner' was to be met with punishment in the nature of an 'electric shock' administered by the 'teacher,' commencing at '15 volts.' Succeeding errors were to be penalized with incremental '15-volt shocks' until the maximum '450-volt shock level' was reached. In order to prove such a shocking 'authentic,' each said 'teacher' was subjected to a mild sample shock of 45 volts.

An 'experimenter' (the apparent authority in charge of the experiment) was predesignated to acquaint 'teachers' with their assigned tasks. Any hesitation on a 'teacher's' part to administer the said 'shocks' would be met with a series of predetermined prods, sequentially enunciated by such 'experimenter' as follows:

**Prod 1:** Please continue or Please go on. **Prod 2:** The experiment requires that you continue. **Prod 3:** It is absolutely essential that you continue. **Prod 4:** You have no other choice; you must go on. (Milgram 1974, 21, emphasis added.)

Unbeknownst to the unsuspecting 'teacher' (who had volunteered her/his services in response to the advertisement), no shocking beyond the sample 45 volts ever took place. The 'learner' was in fact a mere actor hired by Milgram to both intentionally provide wrong answers and utter cries of discomfort, pain, disdain and anguish at specified intervals once the '75-volt shock' had been administered (but not before):

... At 150 volts, the victim cried out, '**Experimenter, get me out of here! I won't be in the experiment any more! I refuse to go on!**' Cries of this type continue[d] with generally rising

intensity ... . After 330 volts, he was not heard from ... . (Milgram 1974, 23, parenthesis and emphasis added.)

Only after the experiment's termination would a 'teacher' be told about the true *status quo* and introduced to the unharmed 'learner' (actor). The **subject** of the experiment was at all times the unsuspecting volunteer 'teacher.' The **object** of the experiment was to ascertain at which juncture (if any) such a 'teacher' would elect to withdraw from 'shocking' the protesting 'learner.'

Some initial conclusions may be made regarding the foregoing:

- Milgram designed the said experiment to test (above all else) his hypothesis on 'obedience to authority.' He endeavored *inter alia* to replicate a 'coercion to follow orders' scenario, pleaded in defense by Nazi officers prosecuted for complicity in the Holocaust. However, the advertised reward of \$4.50 being paid in full at the very outset (for 'coming to the laboratory'), regardless of a 'teacher's' electing to complete the experiment or not, departs considerably from being coerced to render performance for one's wages, as was the case with the said Nazi officers.
- Moreover, Milgram's experiment constituted a simple one-off contract *for* potential services, implying no form of extended engagement whatsoever. Contrastingly, the said Nazis were pursuing no less than their livelihoods as rooted in continuing contracts *of* service (*i.e.*, employment).
- Furthermore, there was nothing to stop any of Milgram's 'teachers' from accepting the \$4.50 and exiting the experiment no sooner than receiving the sample shock. They, unlike

the said Nazi officers, could withdraw from the experiment at any time in spite of whatever prods made to the contrary.

- Yale University, through the agency of the ‘experimenter,’ was the evident authority responsible for discharging the experiment. However, to presume either as having exercised coercive power over the ‘teachers’ (who at all times were free to do as they chose) would be plainly wrong. In short, neither did the ‘experimenter’ nor Yale University ever exercise any commanding authority entailing servile obedience by the ‘teachers.’ This constitutes a stark departure from the predicament that befell the said Nazis.
  
- As regards the experiment proper, any influence speculated as having been exerted by the ‘experimenter’ on the ‘teacher’ too could have had efficacy only after the ‘learner’ had expressed his unwillingness to continue by withdrawing consent to being ‘shocked’ (which stage was reached upon discharging ‘Level 10’: a ‘150-volt shock’). Until such time, the ‘teacher’ was free to assume that the ‘learner’ was both an equal and voluntary participant, having informedly given his prior consent to being so ‘shocked.’ The law does recognize several contexts (*e.g.*, sports, surgical procedures, tattooing, religious mortification, dangerous exhibitions, *etc.*) wherein no offense is committed despite there being an intentional infliction of pain and/or suffering, provided that the victim had given her/his prior informed consent thereto. Nevertheless, once the victim withdraws consent, any further infliction of pain or suffering certainly does constitute an offense.

34 out of 40 participants (in the said ‘Experiment 2, Voice-Feedback’) went beyond the ‘150-volt’ withdrawal of consent mark (*per* Milgram 1974, 35, Table 2). Hence, 85% of participants, as prodded by the ‘experimenter,’ decidedly chose to continue to ‘shock’ the manifestly non-consenting ‘learner.’ 25 of them, constituting 62.5% of total participants, even administered the highest ‘shock’ of ‘450 volts.’ (Had a true volunteer ‘learner’ been so subjected to non-

consensual electrical shocks, all said 85% of participants, along with the ‘experimenter’ and Yale University, would have found themselves criminally and civilly liable under the law.)

Despite the ‘learner’s’ expressed repudiation of the experiment (followed by his escalating cries of ‘anguish’), 62.5% of ‘teachers’ elected to ‘inflict’ what could properly be described as *punitive* torture on the former, notwithstanding the absence of any fierce ‘coercion’ to do so save for bland prodding by the ‘experimenter.’ This outcome might perhaps have been more acceptable had the majority of ‘teachers’ been sourced from heavily disciplined backgrounds (*e.g.*, ex-military, ex-police, ex-prison personnel). In fact, one rare instance of a man with such military training being so tasked a ‘teacher’ did reveal greater willingness on his part to comply, even when the prods to continue were not immediately forthcoming (Milgram 1974, 86). Jessica Wolfendale opines on such ‘military training’ as follows:

The reason that most systematic torture is performed by military personnel acting under orders is **not because of ... an innate tendency to obey authority** but because **military training at both basic and elite levels deliberately instills the[se] dispositions** ... (Wolfendale 2007, 2, emphasis and parenthesis added).

Yet by Milgram’s own admission, the majority of his test subjects did not constitute those who had been privy to any such ‘training’:

**Typical subjects were postal clerks, high school teachers, salesmen, engineers and laborers.** Subjects ranged in educational level from one who had not finished high school to those who had doctoral and other professional degrees. (Milgram 1974, 16, emphasis added.)

If so, how could 85% of a group definitively comprising the above have been so complacently disposed toward *punitively* torturing their ‘equals’? The following serves to explain:

... ‘Decent’ people **routinely** perform activities having **injurious** human effects **to further their own interests** or **for profit** (Bandura 1990, 43, punctuation and emphasis added).



Thus, the ordinary human being is deemed fully capable of electively inhibiting his 'shame and fear' for cruel recourse without any prior conditioning or 'training' whatsoever, so long as a personal expectation is fulfilled thereby. However, would s/he not incur protests from her/his very own conscience in doing so? Milgram's account of 'teacher Elinor Rosenblum's' reactions to 'shocking' the 'learner' (1974, 79-84) provides elucidation in this regard:

She expresses increasing concern as she moves up the voltage scale. ... While continuing to read the word pairs with a show of outward strength, she mutters in a tone of helplessness to the experimenter, 'Must I go on?' ... She regains her composure temporarily but then cannot prevent periodic outbursts of distress. (Milgram 1974, 80.)

Nonetheless, only at the 18<sup>th</sup> shock level did 'Mrs. Rosenblum' even indirectly attempt to assist the 'learner' by stressing the correct answer (cueing him to cite the same in reply). Barring this initiative, she exercised no other. 'Mrs. Rosenblum' did dutifully proceed to administer all 30 'shock' levels as requested. However, it is made clear that she was faced with a nerve-racking dilemma in having to choose such torturing over resigning from the experiment. This state of moral quandary receives scientific cognizance (see Festinger 1957, 3 and 260) as *cognitive* (psychologically perceived) *dissonance* (disharmony). Resolving such *dissonance* would more often than not involve having recourse to some excuse or *justification*; e.g., a person who persists in traveling on bus and train footboards, knowing such practice to be potentially deadly (accounting for many a commuter-death in Sri Lanka), might excuse or *justify* himself under the conviction that he would otherwise (**a**) be unable to meet his daily work commencement deadline and/or (**b**) be the victim of pickpockets who ply crowded public transportation. This reassessing of one's predicament toward appeasing one's conscience may be referred to as *cognitive reprioritization*.

It has already been noted that 'Mrs. Rosenblum' (above) did undergo much *cognitive dissonance* in deciding whether to 'shock' or not. As to how she was able to resolve her

*dissonance* and proceed with the ‘shocking’ (as prodded by the ‘experimenter’), is disclosed as follows:

... It is an experiment. I’m here for a reason. So I had to do it. You said so. ... I’m very interested in this ... this whole project. ... Well, I tell you. The choice of me as a woman doing this ... You certainly picked a pip. (Milgram 1974, 83.)

... I sometimes say to myself, ‘Why don’t you take a job as president of Woman’s Assembly and get acclaim, honor, newspapers, prestige enough to burn instead of working with ... absolutely no publicity?’ ... I’m much relieved now. I’m one for science; this is what I wanted to study anyway. ... I’m very glad I did this; **see how relaxed I am now?** (Milgram 1974, 83, emphasis added.)

It appears that both throughout the experiment and before administering each ‘shock,’ ‘Mrs. Rosenblum’ did resolve her *dissonance* by *cognitively reprioritizing* her **(a)** social contractual role of willingly contributing to science, **(b)** contractual obligation in consideration of \$4.50 already received, **(c)** pride from being chosen by the scientific community to assist in experimentation and **(d)** satiation of a yearning for due acclaim as cumulatively *justifying* a purge of all anxieties associated with ‘torturing’ the ‘learner.’

Furthermore, despite specifically admitting to compassionate inclinations on her part (Milgram 1974, 81), ‘Mrs. Rosenblum’ did reveal (perhaps inadvertently) a prior discharge of her innate cruelty:

When my daughter was little ... **I let her punish herself. I let her touch a hot stove.** She burned herself, and she never touched it again. (Milgram 1974, 82, emphasis added.)

‘Mrs. Rosenblum’s’ general disposition appears fittingly summed up by one of her own averments:

I will do whatever has to be done **regardless of who[m] I hurt** (Milgram 1974, 82, emphasis and parenthesis added).

It could be asserted that the 'teachers' of the said Milgram experiment did not act wholly on their own volition but were in fact influenced to a greater or lesser degree by both Yale University's grand patronage and the prods of the 'experimenter'; that such deference to 'authority' was what (above all else) disposed them to torture the 'learner.' However, a trait that was found common to the accounts of several 'teachers' (e.g., 'Batta' (Milgram 1974, 47), 'Washington' (1974, 50) and 'Prozi' (1974, 74)) was the attempt made either during or after the experiment to repudiate responsibility<sup>15</sup> for the 'learner's' ('shocked') condition, on the basis that the *onus* remained with the 'experimenter' at all times. Apparently, in the eyes of most 'teachers,' their original contracts made them responsible only for the due discharge of actions as instructed, not for the consequences of such discharged actions. Hence, when faced with the predicament of (possibly) having to accept responsibility for such consequences, they construed it a burden beyond the scope of their initial individual contracts. Such unilateral assertions of immunity from liability<sup>16</sup> manifested so defiantly, could not be reasonably viewed as typical of those engaged in gross 'obedience to authority.' However, they would be surely distinctive of individuals who unservilely assert their contractual protections and privileges, a legal sophistication that Milgram's said 'teachers' did plainly manifest.

Each 'teacher' rightly viewed herself/himself as having entered into a contract wherein 'valuable consideration' on the part of the *offeree* (Yale University and/or the 'experimenter') had been *executed* at the very outset (*via* the payment of \$4.50), legally obligating the *offeror* ('teacher') to honor her/his due discharge of 'valuable consideration' in the nature of *executory* services to be performed. Hence, during the course of each experiment, the 'teacher' would submit to the stipulations of the 'experimenter' predominantly in furtherance of duly honoring her/his outstanding contractual liability. By *cognitively reprioritizing* the contractual circumstances to *justify* attributing responsibility (blame) to the 'experimenter,'

the said 'teachers' were able to resolve their *dissonance* and sustain innate cruelty toward 'torturing' the 'learner.'

Why such a 'teacher' would continue to 'shock' in the face of vehement protests by the 'learner' is thus more explicable on the basis of due contractual discharge<sup>17</sup> than blind 'obedience' to the 'experimenter's' directive. Furthermore, 'teacher' expectations in the nature of gaining Yale's admiration for 'a job well done' or even being acknowledged as 'a duty-conscious member of society' appear to have been deemed contingent (only) upon the fullest rendering of contracted services. All of these self-serving objectives were apparently deemed sufficient to *justify* disengaging from morality toward 'torturing' another. Hence, attributing majority 'teacher' compliance to obedience *simpliciter* appears too presumptive.

Incidentally, Milgram did proceed to test whether 'contract doctrine' (rather than 'obedience') could have moved 'teachers' to 'shock' the 'learner.' He modified the experiment by requiring the 'learner' to insist (in the presence of both the 'teacher' and the 'experimenter') on a 'condition' that the experiment would be halted upon his (*i.e.*, the 'learner's') demanding so (Milgram 1974, 63-66). Admittedly, 'conditions,' though proclaimed orally, might be legally incorporated into a contract at any time before final signing. However, the 'learner's' said 'condition' could possibly have been incorporated only into *his* contract with the 'experimenter' (and/or Yale University), as *he* was privy only to the same. Such a 'condition' could not have enjoyed any force of law whatsoever within the contract between the 'teacher' and the 'experimenter' (and/or Yale University), to which the 'learner' was *never* privy. (Even modern-day acknowledgements of 'rights of third parties' do not enable the imposing of conditions by such *third* parties on *true* parties.) Hence, the 'teacher' was certainly not bound to honor the 'learner's' demand. Erroneously construing all 3 participants (the 'teacher,' the 'learner' and the 'experimenter') as privy to a common consolidated contract, Milgram proceeded to reckon the 'teachers'' continued 'shocking' (despite the 'learner's' demands for

release) as violating an ‘incorporated condition,’ evincing ‘... contract doctrine ... a feeble determinant of behavior’ (Milgram 1974, 66).

Although Milgram’s ‘teachers’ did seek to divest themselves of responsibility for ‘harming’ the ‘learner,’ no comparable efforts were taken by them to disavow liability for inflicting ‘unbearable pain’ on the latter. So long as they were meting out only ‘intolerable pain’ short of ‘harm,’ 85% of ‘teachers’ were willing to ‘force’ the ‘learner’ to undergo the same. Hence, 85% were willing to *punitively* torture in furtherance of **(a)** their legal contractual roles as service providers, in consideration of \$4.50 and whatever recognition bestowed by Yale; and/or **(b)** their *social contractual* roles as equal contributors to the advancement of science, in consideration of being acknowledged dutiful citizens.

‘Obedience to authority’ might have some bearing on why the militarily conditioned soldier executes plainly immoral orders. However, extending this *rationale* to all contexts of administered cruelty is indeed too presumptuous, especially in light of the myriad of torture allegations that have been leveled against police and other like public officials who were in no sense following orders but simply acting on their own initiatives.

Milgram’s ‘Experiment 2’ saw 85% of ‘teachers’ electing to ‘cause’ pain, and 62.5% maximum pain, to the protesting ‘victim.’<sup>18</sup> However, noteworthy exceptions did exist, both **(a)** acknowledging ‘responsibility’ for ‘shocking’ and **(b)** exercising moral choice toward resigning from the experiment. The following reply to the ‘experimenter’s’ prod that the ‘learner’ had ‘no other choice’ but to continue illustrates one such *defiance to authority*:

**I do have a choice. ... Why don’t I have a choice? I came here on my own free will.** I thought I could help in a research project. But if I have to hurt somebody to do that, or if I was in his place too, I wouldn’t stay there. **I can’t continue. I’m very sorry. I think I’ve gone too far already,**

**probably. ... I should have stopped the first time he complained.** (Milgram 1974, 51, emphasis added.)

In the above example, the 'teacher' electively executes a 'grinding halt' to his further participation in the experiment. He takes full responsibility for his actions, blaming neither the 'experimenter' nor Yale. To him, disobedience toward an instruction to torture 'is a simple and rational deed' (Milgram 1974, 85). His moral convictions, though somewhat delayed in manifesting, ultimately do serve to override all influences exerted to the contrary by the 'experimenter.'

The said 'delay' in manifesting evinces the presence of some form of initial resistance (analogous to static friction) that requires overcoming before moral convictions could be optimized. This initial resistance is obviously a force opposed to morality: a counter-morality of sorts, or (simply) innate cruelty. Furthermore, that it needs to be so overcome necessarily implies that such counter-morality does actively reside within the human psyche. Hence, the more morally indoctrinated one is, the easier it should be to overcome such innate cruelty.

Only 15% of Milgram's 'teachers' (in 'Experiment 2') were able to so inhibit their innate cruelty despite presumably being taught not to harm others or knowing harming to be illegal, or both; 85% of all participants gave in to their counter-morality/innate cruelty.

## **8. REPLICATING THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT**

Jerry M. Burger relatively recently revealed his having replicated in part Milgram's 'Experiment 5, A New Base-Line Condition' (Milgram 1974, 55-58) at the Santa Clara University campus. His experiment (Burger 2009, 1-11) is said to have involved 29 men and 41 women, ranging from 20 to 81 years, chosen after much psychological screening. They had all been contracted on

virtually the same terms as Milgram's 'teachers' save for their rewards being increased to \$50 each for two 45-minute sessions.

As in Milgram's 'Experiment 5' (not previously described herein), the 'learner' was instructed to announce prior to the experiment's commencement (in the presence of both the 'experimenter' and the 'teacher') that he had been diagnosed with 'a slight heart condition.' Furthermore, on the 'teacher's' pressing the 150-volt switch, the 'learner' was instructed to yell *inter alia*:

... Get me out of here, please. My heart's starting to bother me. I refuse to go on. Let me out.  
(Burger 2009, 7 and Milgram 1974, 56.)

70% of Burger's said 'teachers' went on to administer the next shock level despite the 'learner's' said vehement refusal to 'go on.' Though constituting an apparent reduction from the 82.5% result obtained by Milgram, Burger maintains that this difference falls short of any statistical significance (Burger 2009, 8). Hence, despite the lapse of nearly half a century, it appears that the run-of-the-mill individual's submissiveness to innate cruelty remained (almost) unchanged.

As was disclosed in '4.' above, one of the three questions that comprised the atypical questionnaire (see 'Appendix' below) served on 300 G.C.E. Ordinary Level (minimally) qualified Sri Lankan adults was in fact based on Milgram's 'Experiment 2, Voice-Feedback' simulation of *punitive* torture. For convenience of analysis, the said question is now reproduced:

### Question 3:

You receive an invitation from the Department of Criminology of a renowned local university to take part in an experimental simulation designed to demonstrate 'a suspect-criminal's proclivity to affirm suggested falsehoods under pain of 'Torture.'

On presenting yourself before the said Department of Criminology, the Head of the Department instructs you to assume the role of 'a police officer who administers physical pain *via* an electrical shocking device toward coercing a suspect-criminal to confess to a crime.' You are informed that *another* consenting adult invitee has already assumed the role of such 'suspect-criminal.'

The said 'shocking device' is one specially constructed to administer five-milliampere shocks, which can be sustained for periods of 2 seconds, 4 seconds and 6 seconds, as selected by pressing the buttons assigned to such specific durations. Hence, there are three buttons: the '2-second button,' the '4-second button' and the '6-second button.' A *single press* on any button will cause a five-milliampere shock to be sustainedly administered for the specified duration; *e.g.*, pressing the '4-second button' would cause the 'suspect-criminal' to be shocked continuously for 4 seconds.

You are informed that in general the said '2-second,' '4-second' and '6-second' shocks would respectively cause 'prickling,' 'discomfort' and 'pain' to an individual subjected to the same. You are further informed that the invitee playing the role of 'suspect-criminal' has already given his 'informed consent' to undergo such trauma.

At the commencement of this experimental simulation, the said Head of the Department (assuming the role of 'a police Officer-In-Charge') demands the (invitee playing the role of) 'suspect-criminal' to admit to his having stolen a valuable gold chain. Upon such 'suspect-criminal's' *denying* the same, you (in the role of 'police officer') are given the discretion to administer the shortest shock duration to such 'suspect-criminal' by pushing the '2-second button' on the 'shocking device.' On being asked again by the 'Officer-In-Charge' to admit to 'Theft,' if the 'suspect-criminal' *again denies* the same, you are given the discretion to administer the next (longer) shock duration by pushing the '4-second button.' On his *third denial*, you are permitted to administer the longest shock duration by pushing the '6-second button.' Every succeeding *denial* thereafter will permit you to repeatedly press the '6-second button.' You are informed that on average the ordinary/run-of-the-mill invitee would confess upon enduring five *consecutive* 6-second shocks. Both you and the invitee (assigned the role of 'suspect-criminal') are also informed that although *consecutive* 6-second shocks could be quite painful, they are generally unable to cause death or any serious injury.

Each time the '6-second button' is pressed by *you*, the *other* invitee (playing the role of 'suspect-criminal') becomes entitled to a Rs.1,000/- reward (from the said Department of Criminology) for enduring such shock. In the eventuality of a 'suspect-criminal's' electing to admit his having stolen the gold chain (to avoid being shocked any further), *you* become entitled to a reward of



Rs.25,000/- (from the said Department of Criminology) for coercing such disclosure. Even without this outcome, *you* (alone) become entitled to a reward of Rs.5,000/- for your persistence.

Which **one** or **more** of the following statements best summarizes **your perspective** regarding the above?

(a) You will not hesitate to take up the assigned role of ‘police officer’ and will dutifully administer the shocks to the volunteer ‘suspect-criminal’ toward coercing him to confess. This would be done in furtherance of securing (i) the rewards promised to both *you* and the *other* invitee (‘suspect-criminal’) and (ii) the *prestige* associated with being selected for such an unprecedented experiment by this renowned university.

(b) You will agree to participate, but with *great reluctance* owing to the need to administer painful shocks to another. Your sole motivation would be to render whatever assistance possible toward proving that ‘Torture’ only serves to elicit confirmation of suggested falsehoods.’ You would politely refuse *all* rewards.

(c) You will participate only under the *condition* that you may withdraw from this experimental simulation at any time you deem the administering of further shocks inhumane. You would nevertheless *accept* rewards falling due until such time.

(d) You will politely decline the invitation to participate because causing harm to another, irrespective of whatever mutual gains arising therefrom, is contrary to *your* personal ethics.

(e) You will report the said Department’s intended experimental simulation to both the university’s Ethics Committee and Senate to prevent it from being conducted.

**Your Answer:**

1. (a) only;
2. (b) only;
3. (c) only;
4. (d) only;
5. (d) and (e).

The total responses for each of the possible close-ended options above, as received from the 300 individuals to whom this question was posed, were as follows:

Aggregates for each Optional Response to 'Question 3:' of the Questionnaire				
1. (a) only	2. (b) only	3. (c) only	4. (d) only	5. (d) and (e)
21	45	35	116	83
66		35		
101			199	

Thus, as far as the Sri Lankan disposition to administer *punitive* torture for the advancement of scientific study is concerned, 33.66% (101 out of 300) were clearly willing to engage in the same, whilst 22% (66 out of 300) were willing to do so unconditionally.

Although this 33.66% willingness to *punitively* torture is admittedly a substantial drop from Milgram's 82.5% and Burger's 70%, it must be borne in mind that the sample sizes for those simulations were respectively 40 and 70, significantly lower than the 300 sampled above. In fact, when the Milgram and Burger simulations are compared with the above, a commensurate decrease in proclivity to *punitively* torture is seen with the random increase in sample sizes:

Disclosed proclivity to <i>punitively</i> Torture		
Study	Sample size	%
Milgram	40	82.5%
Burger	70	70%
Sumanatilake	300	33.66%

Furthermore, as has been already opined in '4.' above, the possibility that there might have existed 'others' among the remaining 66.33% who did not wish to be so forthright in their disclosures (in fear of 'losing face') cannot be dismissed easily, especially since it was observed

that no less than 44.33% of the very same 300 (*i.e.*, 10.33% in excess of the disclosed 33.66%) had manifested clear support for either *oppressive* or *interrogative* forms of ‘police torture.’

It is of significance to note that though the majority of both Milgram’s and Burger’s subjects did yield to their innate cruelty, the opportunity never arose for them to be either overwhelmed or consumed by the same owing to residual inhibiting influences exerted by (*a*) their own contracts, (*b*) the socially beneficial context of their scientific pursuit, (*c*) the University’s grandeur and, of course, (*d*) legal considerations. Hence, whether a keener focusing of innate cruelty would ensue upon the removal of some or all of these residual inhibitors remains to be ascertained.

### **9. REVISITING THE *STANFORD PRISON* EXPERIMENT**

In ‘Interpersonal Dynamics in a Simulated Prison’ (August 14<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup>, 1971) – more popularly referred to as the *Stanford Prison* experiment – many restrictions observed efficacious within the Milgram experiment were seen intentionally removed so as to provide subject ‘guards’ with greater discretion in discharging their ‘duties’ (Haney, Banks and Zimbardo 1973).

21 physically and mentally sound individuals were selected painstakingly from amongst a total of 75 who responded to a newspaper advertisement seeking male volunteers to take part in a prison simulation exercise. 11 were entrusted the roles of ‘prison guards’ whilst the remaining 10 served as ‘prisoners.’ Every participant was awarded a daily wage of \$15. None were previously known to each other. Stanford University housed the makeshift prison in a basement corridor of its psychology wing. While ‘prisoners’ were at all times confined to the said ‘prison,’ ‘guards’ were allowed to go home on completing their daily 8-hour shifts. Three ‘guards’ manned each shift.

Informed consent was obtained from all ‘prisoners’ (no less than contractually) in order to subject them to such civil disabilities as would be experienced under normal prison conditions. ‘Guards’ were likewise obligated to discharge all functions exercisable under *standard prison rules* toward maintaining orderly day-to-day functioning within the ‘prison.’ Save for a very clear prohibition on physically harming ‘prisoners,’ no prison rules or guard powers were specifically prescribed and/or otherwise assigned. To maintain a clear distinction between the predefined groups, generic uniforms were provided to both ‘guards’ and ‘prisoners.’

‘Guards’ were thus permitted to **(a)** demand any form of physical exertion, **(b)** inflict whatever mental torment they saw fit and **(c)** be remunerated \$15 *per* day for doing so, provided that they did not physically harm any ‘prisoner.’ These discretionary powers accorded to ‘guards’ consequently saw the manifestation of acts of focused innate cruelty, which, unlike in the Milgram experiment, were not feigned but genuinely both inflicted and suffered. Hence, notwithstanding any specific prods or contractual obligations so to do, ‘guards’ were more than willing to dispense cruelty at their ‘whims and fancies’:

**Not to be tough and arrogant was to be seen as a sign of weakness by the guards**, and even those ‘good’ guards ... respected the implicit norm of never contradicting or even interfering with an action of a more hostile guard on their shift (Haney *et al.* 1973, 94, emphasis added).

‘Not to be tough and arrogant was to be seen as a sign of weakness,’ implies that the ‘guards’ oriented their behavior decidedly to suit *social contractual* expectations of their assigned role (that ‘prison guards should be merciless toward their wards who are, after all, convicted criminals’):

Thus, guard aggression ... was emitted simply as a ‘natural’ consequence of being in the uniform of a ‘guard’ and asserting the power inherent in that **role** (Haney *et al.* 1973, 92, emphasis added).

When questioned after the study about their persistent affrontive and harassing behavior in the face of prisoner emotional trauma, most guards replied that they were ‘just playing the **role**’ of a tough guard ... (Haney et al. 1973, 92-93, emphasis added).

Even though the ‘guards’ knew full well that their ‘prisoners’ were merely feigned criminals, the impulse to exercise cruelty (*justified* as a socially acceptable due discharge of their assigned role) appears to have been so compelling as to occlude their minds from appreciating the reality of this stark fact.

It is implied that the majority of ‘guards’ exploited their discretionary powers virtually free from any inhibitory influences exerted by Stanford University, the experimenter or otherwise. Hence, not only the actuation of their innate cruelty but also the focused escalation thereof was made manifest.

Furthermore (confirming Nietzsche (1887, 51 and 50) in ‘6.’ above), much satisfaction appears to have been derived from the practice of administering cruelty, even to the extent of engendering it an addiction:

When the experiment was terminated prematurely after only six days ... most of the guards seemed to be **distressed** by the decision to stop the experiment, and it appeared ... that **they had ... enjoyed the extreme control and power which they exercised and were reluctant to give it up** (Haney et al. 1973, 81, emphasis added).

So were these ‘guards’ *sadists*, or otherwise congenitally deviant? Apparently, not:

The subjects were **normal**, healthy, males, attending colleges throughout the United States, who were in the Stanford area during the summer (Haney et al. 1973, 73, emphasis added).

Again, even if all 11 ‘guards’ were presumed to have had ‘repressed anger’ within them, they were certainly educated enough to ‘intellectualize’ (Miller 1980, xi) the same toward

preventing its venting. Hence, innate cruelty appears to have been the sole actuator of their reprehensible actions, both physical and verbal.

It is indeed of some consolation to note that (much like in the Milgram experiment) there did exist a few subjects (the 'good guards') whose moral convictions did in fact serve to temper their cruel inclinations despite both peer and environmental pressures to the contrary. This evinces that the mere taking up of a societally approved 'dirty job' does not necessarily transform a humane being into a brute.

The expressed prohibition on causing actual physical harm was undoubtedly the sole effective fetter on 'guard' discretion above. It remains to be seen what result would be obtained in circumstances where even this pivotal fetter were withdrawn.

### 10. RECALLING MARINA ABROMOVIĆ'S *RHYTHM 0*

To silence critics who were in the process of labeling performance artists like herself 'exhibitionists' and 'masochists,' Yugoslav born Marina Abramović designed *Rhythm 0* ('Rhythm Zero') and executed the same at Studio Morra, Naples, in 1974 (Abramović 2013 and Richards 2010, 88). She recalls the appertaining events as follows:

... I said ok I'm going to make the piece **to see how far public can go, if the artist himself doesn't do anything.**

And, there very simply ... I ... put on the table 72 objects with the instructions 'I'm an object, **you can do whatever you want to do with me,** and ... I will take all responsibility for six hours.'

On the table was a rose, perfume, a piece of bread and grapes and wine and, and then was objects like *really* scissors and nails and a, metal bar and, finally, was also pistol with one bullet. So basically if audience wanted to put a bullet into pistol can kill me.

And I really want to take this risk, **I want to know, what is the public about and ... what they going to do in this kind of situation?**

It was really difficult piece, because I just stood there in the front of that table, and in the beginning nothing really happened: public were calm, they would play with me, they would give me a rose, they would kiss me look at me, and then, public became more and more wild.

**They cut ... my neck and drink my blood**, they, carry me around put me on the table open my legs and put a knife between. **The one person took the pistol, put the bullet and see if I would really with my own hand push the target**; the *gallerist* came and completely *go* crazy, take this gun out of his hands throw out of the window. They took scissor, they cut my clothes, they put ... rose-pins into my body.

After six hours, which was like ... two in the morning, the *gallerist* come and say the performance is over. I ... start moving; and start being myself because I was there like a puppet just for them. And that moment: everybody ran away. People could not actually ... confront ... with me ... as a person ... . (Abramović 2013, transcribed verbatim.)

Thomas McEvilley's account of this 'performance' adds *inter alia* as follows:

**Faced with her abdication of will ... a protective group began to define itself in the audience.** When a loaded gun was thrust to Marina's head and her own finger was being worked around the trigger, a fight broke out between the audience factions. Perilously, Marina completed the six hours. (2005, 273-274, emphasis added.)

So were her assailants all *sadists*? Abramović notes as follows:

For the most part, these were just normal members of the Italian art establishment and their wives (2016, 68). ... Some of the audience obviously wanted to protect me; others wanted the performance to continue (2016, 69).

Much similarity is appreciated between what transpired during this *Rhythm 0* experiment and the accounts of animal cruelty recorded by Arnold Arluke as cited in '5.' above. In both instances: **(a)** perpetrators were vested with *carte blanche* to do as they wished; **(b)** innate

cruelty was actuated predominantly on elective apathy; and (c) victims (in addition to being tortured) ran the real risk of being killed.

*Rhythm 0* clearly demonstrates (as has been anticipated) the fact that ‘left to their own devices’ ordinary men and women would be naturally inclined toward cruelty, whatever the received (but not realized) moral exposure to the contrary.

Thus, it has been observed that:

... We have instances of **torture** being **freely practiced** in every relation of domestic life. **Servants** are *thus* treated by their masters and fellow servants; **children** by their parents and schoolmasters, for the most trifling offenses ... . (Elliot, Stokes and Norton 1855, 34, emphasis added.)

The following serves as a modern illustration of such ‘freely practiced’ cruelty:

... One C... A... and her daughter were indicted with having had the custody and charge of a 14-year-old girl M... ... as a domestic [servant] and willfully assaulting and ill-treating her so as to cause suffering and injury ... between May 1996 and May 1997. ... .. State Counsel Mr. Saliya Sumanatilake<sup>19</sup> argued by drawing the attention of the court to the medical certificate submitted by the J.M.O. [Judicial Medical Officer], who had indicated that [the] ‘overall picture was consistent with that of a **battered child**.’ (Wethasinghe 1998, parentheses and emphasis added.)

Some solace could be derived from knowing that there do exist individuals of realized righteous convictions who, having conquered their own (natural) counter-morality, are even willing to defend others against aggressors overwhelmed by innate cruelty; *e.g.*, the ‘protective group’ that intervened on Marina Abramović’s behalf virtually to save her life (McEvilley 2005, 273-274, above).



## 11. FOCUSED FORMS OF DIFFUSED INNATE CRUELTY

The cumulative effect of the observations made regarding the Milgram, *Stanford Prison* and *Rhythm 0* experiments is that a human being's innate diffused cruelty could easily be focused not only toward torturing but also dehumanizing, commodifying and/or enslaving another. This in turn serves to rationalize the modern day *ius cogens* ban on all forms of *cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment*.

In fact, torture, dehumanization, commodification and enslavement all constitute evident forms of focused cruelty. For cruelty to be exhibited so conspicuously, it must logically lie dormant. Hence, cruelty *simpliciter*, which naturally resides in a diffused state within every human being, necessarily founds these (and all other) focused forms.

To torture, dehumanize, commodify or enslave *another*, one must first be innately cruel; once such *other* is so tortured, dehumanized, commodified or enslaved, one could readily be intensely cruel. Hence, dehumanization, commodification, enslavement, *etc.* serve to counter the inhibitors ('shame and fear') of (consequent or secondary) intensified cruelty but not those of (founding or primary) innate cruelty.<sup>20</sup> This is implicit in the reply to a question asked from a former Nazi concentration camp commandant:

[*Question:*] ... 'If they were going to kill them anyway, what was the point of all the humiliation, why the cruelty?' [*Reply:*] 'To **condition** those who actually had to carry out the policies' [killing], he said. 'To make it possible for them to do what they did.' (Sereny 1974, 101, parentheses and emphasis added.)

Victor Nell reckoned vestigial predatory sentiment as the basis of a human being's innate cruelty (Nell 2006, 211). Theodor Adorno and Alice Miller, though failing to specifically recognize cruelty's innate existence within man, respectively advanced desire to dominate (Fischer 2005, 27, 28-29 and 30) and need to vent repressed anger (Miller 1980, 115-116) as

precipitating torture and other barbarities. Appreciating some truth in each of these hypotheses (and very much more in their combination), it is hereby deduced (in light of all factual accounts of police, military and layman cruelty considered within this work) that **man's diffused innate cruelty, or cruelty *simpliciter*, founds itself on a *reconstituting amalgam of desire, anger and apathy*, wherein one predominates (over the others) toward fulfilling the overt objective for which such covert cruelty is invoked:**

- The ***desire predominant cruelty amalgam*** (wherein **desire** constitutes the majority sentiment as sustained by apathy and supplemented by anger) is exemplified by 'ticking bomb torture' ('3.' above), in which the pivotal desire appears to be that of protecting innocent lives. This desire, though professedly altruistic, is often found tainted with self-serving and/or self-venerating attributes. That 'something has to be done' about an imminently disastrous *status quo* is opportunistically seized upon and exploited in pursuit of *justifying* outlawed brutality and generating self-acclaim for such 'brave' and 'heroic' recourse. Both the Milgram and *Stanford Prison* experiments evinced a majority as having manifested self-centered desires in choosing to disengage from morality. In the Milgram experiment, motivation for the same apparently emanated from the self-legitimizing pride of being able (beyond all repugnance) to fully execute all aspects of the assigned task, construed as being in furtherance of a 'noble' scientific initiative. The *Stanford Prison* 'guards,' on the other hand, appear to have continued with their designated work more in satisfaction of role-incited delusions of grandeur than otherwise.
- The ***anger predominant cruelty amalgam*** (wherein **anger** constitutes the majority sentiment as sustained by apathy and supplemented by desire) is found operative in contexts of predetermined or spontaneous revenge. In either mode, a vindictive conscience (harbored or repressed) is willingly unleashed and indulged.

- The ***apathy predominant cruelty amalgam*** (wherein **apathy** constitutes the majority sentiment as sustained by apathy and supplemented by desire or anger) is that generally indoctrinated *via* brutalized military training and hence the basis of many an atrocity in human history. Among the participants of Milgram's shock experiment, 'Pasqual Gino' (Milgram 1974, 86-88) did appear to exhibit the constituents of this particular amalgam. Nonetheless, it is Marina Abramović's *Rhythm 0* that manifests the lowest depths to which such apathy could be taken by even ordinary citizens.

Adolf Hitler was an individual in whom all three of the said ***cruelty amalgams*** did alternatively and extensively prevail, hence the hitherto unparalleled wanton destruction and degradation of mankind at his hands. (However, the development of a complexity of mind comparable to Hitler's must surely be rare.)

Given the extents to which police officers in Sri Lanka have demonstrated brutality by way of both *interrogative* and *punitive* torture, despite guidance to the contrary being received from at least one of four arguably pacifist world religions (Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism and Islam), the question arises whether some form of extraneous catalyst is availed of to ease the burden of bearing such vile dispositions. Apparently, 'yes': habitual alcohol consumption, prevalent amongst police officers the world over. The following sample allegations serve to evince this:

(a) On the night of 19 October 2007, Mr. Ghanshyam Choudhary ... was ... tortured to death in police custody at Heera Nagar police station in Indore of Madhya Pradesh. He was detained on suspicion of theft. Heera Nagar police station in-charge, Mr. D.P.A... and other police personnel who were drunk allegedly tied the deceased to a tree and beat him up. His condition deteriorated in the police lockup. ... He was taken to Maharaja Yashwantrao Hospital, Indore, where he died. (Ed. Chakma 2008, 14, citing *The Central Chronicle* 2007, 21 October, 'Custodial death: Irate mob torch police station.')

(b) At some point in the afternoon, someone ‘organized’ a supply of alcohol for the shooters. By the end of a day of nearly continuous shooting, the men had completely lost track of how many Jews they had each killed. (Browning 1992, 61.) As one non-drinking policeman noted, ‘Most of the other comrades drank so much solely because of the many shootings of Jews, for **such a life was quite intolerable sober**’ (Browning 1992, 82, emphasis added).

Alcohol’s potency to disinhibit an individual’s moral restraint has been perennially well known. Thus, its utility to induce *disassociation* from ethical considerations is seen exploited by many a law enforcement (as well as military) official across the globe.

Among 252 allegations of ‘police torture’ (in Sri Lanka) reported to the Asian Human Rights Commission between 1998 and 2012, no less than 30<sup>21</sup> disclose perpetrators to have consumed alcohol either prior to or while meting out the same.

Whether in a state of self-induced intoxication or not, actuating innate cruelty remains both an independent and personal choice, however compelling the attendant circumstances. As expressed in Principle IV<sup>22</sup> of the *Principles of International Law Recognized in the Charter of the Nürnberg Tribunal and in the Judgment of the Tribunal* [1950], ‘moral choice’ remains open to all and was ‘in fact possible’ for all participants of the Milgram, *Stanford Prison* and *Rhythm O* experiments.

Much has been elaborated on the psychological processes of *cognitive dissonance*, *cognitive reprioritizing* and moral disengagement as relate to torture. Accordingly, it has become apparent that the human mind employs a distinct mechanism – thought fit (by the present author) to be referred to as **elective disassociation** – by which innate cruelty is actuated toward neutralizing a stimulus that would otherwise (morally) invoke a shameful, fearful and/or empathetic reaction.

Swatting a mosquito undoubtedly is a cruel act, which is nonetheless *justified* on the basis that such an insect would otherwise harm an individual by stinging and/or infecting her/him with a disease. Although it is a sentient life that is being so destroyed (and hence morally reprehensible), innate cruelty is *electively* activated to *disassociate* the mind from prioritizing the same.

## 12. MORAL REALIZATION

What every human(e) being circumstanced as a Milgram, *Stanford Prison* or *Rhythm 0* experimental subject should have ideally done was to defend humanity's worth by asserting her/his moral responsibility<sup>23</sup> above all else. In fact, one Milgram participant, 'Professor of Old Testament' (Milgram 1974, 47-49), did do so quite exemplarily:

... I don't understand why the experiment is placed **above** this person's life. ... If he doesn't want to continue, I'm taking orders from him. ... Surely you've considered the **ethics** of this thing. ... Here he doesn't want to go on, and you think that the experiment is more important? (Milgram 1974, 48, emphasis added.)

After explaining the true purpose of the experiment, the experimenter asks, 'What in your opinion is the most effective way of strengthening resistance to inhumane authority?' The subject answers, 'If one had as one's ultimate authority **God**, then it trivializes human authority.'<sup>24</sup> (Milgram 1974, 49, emphasis added.)

'Professor of Old Testament' defiantly halted the experiment no sooner than hearing the 'learner's' intention to withdraw. He based his decision to do so firmly on 'ethics.' His statement in reference to the 'learner' that 'If he doesn't want to continue, I'm taking orders from *him*,' taken within its context, simply meant that he respected the 'learner's' decision to withdraw, and was not disposed to enforcing the experiment against the latter's will. (Milgram's explanation (1974, 49) to the effect that what this subject did was merely substitute the 'experimenter's' authority for the 'learner's' is oversimplified and hence

untenable.) Potential immorality alone sufficed for 'Professor of Old Testament' to repudiate his contract. He considers 'God'/morality the sole authority to whom/which man should answer in all contexts, relegating the efficacy of any lesser agency to a refutable state (which refutation he manifests by electing to abort the experiment). (Milgram again oversimplifies this to deem it a mere substitution of authority (1974, 49).) But what compulsions would exist to conform consistently to such morality? None: save for whatever subjective internal convictions thereof. If so, could such convictions alone serve to effectively prevent men from indulging their natural cruelty?

Commencing with the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (adopted on 10<sup>th</sup> December 1948), many a successive *declaration, covenant, convention, protocol* and domestic law has unequivocally prohibited all species of *cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment*, with a growing number of nations choosing to ratify and/or enforce the same. This generic prohibition has even come to command the status of *ius cogens*. However, if this prohibition were in fact compelling, a steady decline in both *punitive* and *interrogative* torture should have been observed (which has not). Perhaps the said prohibitions encouraged nations to do covertly what they once did overtly?

In short, without complementary internal righteous convictions being held by individuals, external legal compulsions fail to exert any regulatory effect on them. This is common to all law enforcement. In fact, habitual law abidance resides necessarily within the domain of internal convictions, as only when external compulsions match the former '*quasi-perfectly*' would a legal order be accepted without challenge (on 'the logic of simple reproduction') as being 'non-arbitrary,' 'self-evident' and 'natural' (Bourdieu 1972, 166).

Choosing to cater to the rational mind so as to facilitate internal convictions, as opposed to restraining the dynamic body by way of external compulsions, must logically be the more

productive initiative as it addresses the cause (mind, being the forerunner of all actions<sup>25</sup>) in preference to its effects. Jeremy Bentham's illustration (cited by him in relation to judge-made law) to the effect that teaching conduct to one's dog by waiting for it to do something objectionable and then beating it, though apt for dogs, is futile for men<sup>26</sup> (Bentham 1823, 235) appears to set out this point vividly.

Hence, indoctrinating righteous ideals from childhood onward appears to be the only viable means by which to accomplish both resolute realization of moral worth and sincere deference toward laws that enforce the same.

Remarkably, a majority construes the righteous life to yield only modest earnings, and one lived unrighteously to foster unlimited gains. Man is almost always willing to compromise one or more of his virtues for quick returns in money, power, reputation or property.

More often than not, an individual is seen engaged in a vocation that involves some form of moral turpitude (and even illegality) on the 'logic' that there exists 'no other means by which to feed his family.' Furthermore, responsibility for her/his part in perpetuating such immorality is often sought to be divested by way of distance, time and/or place. Moreover, identifying with a whole group of perpetrators serves to diffuse any 'shame and fear' of wrongdoing. Expressed sentiments such as 'we can't afford to have principles anymore'; 'can't get a job without using influence'; 'no gains without bending the rules'; and 'have to even kill dogs and make money' epitomize the present-day subverting of conventional faith in morality. These very assertions serve to proliferate and perpetuate immorality, the 'norm,' and morality, the 'exception.'

Among the myriad of sentient beings that inhabit this earth, only man is fully endowed with the faculty of choice, be it rational, irrational, moral, immoral, moderate or extreme.

Admittedly, if man were to value moral authority above all else, this would *ipso facto* ensure the inhibiting of immoral influences, both extrinsic and intrinsic. But who's or what type of morality should be so deferred to? The simple answer would be such morality as could never admit of any species of unrighteousness.

Hence, the morality that is common to all pacifist religions and philosophies of the world (*common denominator morality*) is what should be imbibed and actualized by every world citizen. However, doubt has been expressed on whether a common system of ethics could ever be fostered within our verily diversified world. J. M. Finnis responds to this as follows:

Students of ethics and of human cultures very commonly **assume that** cultures manifest preferences, motivations, and evaluations so wide and chaotic in their variety that **no values or practical principles can be said to be self-evident to human beings** ... . But those philosophers who have recently sought to test this assumption by surveying the anthropological literature (including the similar general surveys made by professional anthropologists) have found with striking unanimity that **this assumption is unwarranted**. (1980, 83, emphasis added.)

The *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* [1948], adopted soon after a devastating episode in human history, does in effect prescribe a minimum content of *common denominator morality*. Though the norms expressed therein<sup>27</sup> have secured virtual non-derogable legal status, their implied moral worthiness is yet to be authoritatively endorsed by the heads of the world's religious, philosophical or other like bodies. Perhaps it is the absence of such formal incorporation into morality that has prevented universal realization of the same.

For the opportunistic, domineering and egoistic creature that man naturally is, immorality becomes him; morality being but a fertile seed that lies dormant within him:

**Cruelty ... is natural to primitive man. Compassion, in contrast with it, is a secondary manifestation and acquired late.** The instinct to fight and destroy, so important an endowment in



prehistoric conditions, is long afterward operative, and in the ideas engendered by civilization, like that of 'the criminal,' it finds new objects ... . (Krafft-Ebing 1894, 86, emphasis added.)

A persistent need to control every aspect of one's life is typically imputed to every human being. This alights from the underlying insecurity engendered by insights into the unassailable truth that no thing, being or natural phenomenon could be wholly controlled. Sickness (damage), old age (decay) and death (destruction) are realistically and metaphorically common to all. Only the causal laws that perpetuate such ends appear exempt. Despite the incontrovertibility of these facts, human beings compel themselves to engage in a continuous battle with the very forces that oppose them. It appears that for every 'victory' gained, a 'defeat' serves to overwhelm the former. Though admittedly a most frustrating dilemma, the same never appears to diminish man's tenacity to prevail.

Ethical indoctrination serves to channel man's controlling urge into socially beneficial role orientations of mother; father; wife; husband; teacher; preacher; employer; law enforcer; judge; legislator; *etc.* Nevertheless, elective amenability to morality is what ultimately determines the extent to which such role players exercise their control, either cruelly or compassionately. Human beings do have the potential to be both divinely compassionate and devilishly cruel. Hence, no matter how 'noble' the roles they play, parents, teachers, preachers and law enforcers the world over have constantly featured as abusers of their conventionally entrusted custodial powers.

Whether it is for securing a justifiable or reprehensible end, torture cannot be effectuated without invoking and focusing one's innate cruelty. It is the prevalence of this congenital trait that renders every human being a potential torturer; hence the existence of torture. Moreover, it is the natural occurrence of such nascent evil within each successive generation of human beings that serves to propagate torture.

All human life should be valued equally and indiscriminately, wholly bereft of prejudices. Respect must be had for the gross worth of life that inhabits a physique, irrespective of its gender, age or description. Then, and only then, would the arbitrary devaluation of its dignity be attenuated and hopefully ended.

## REFERENCES

*Amal Sudath Silva v. Kodituwakku, Inspector of Police and others* [1987] 2 Sri.L.R., 119.

*Queen v. Murugan Ramasamy* [1964] 66 N.L.R. 265.

*Ratnapala v. Dharmasiri and others* [1993] 1 Sri.L.R. 224.

*Roshana Michael v. Saleh, O.I.C. (Crimes), police station Narahenpita and others* [2002] 1 Sri.L.R. 345.

*Caesar v. Trinidad and Tobago* [2005] Series C123 1-41, Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACtHR).

*The Prosecutor v. Anto Furundžija* [1998] IT-95-17/1-T 1-118, International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), Trial Chamber.

*Filartiga v. Pena-Irala* [1980] 630F.2d 876, United States Court of Appeals, 2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit.

*Leon v. Wainwright* [1984] 734F.2d 770, United States Court of Appeals, 11<sup>th</sup> Circuit.

*Siderman de Blake v. Republic of Argentina* [1992] 965F.2d 699, United States Court of Appeals, 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit.

**Abramović, M.**, (2013), *Marina Abramovic on Rhythm 0* (1974), vimeo [Online], available at <https://vimeo.com/71952791>, accessed 15 November 2019.

**Abramović, M.**, (2016), *Walk through walls: A memoir*, New York: Crown Archetype (Penguin Random House LLC).

**Adorno, T.W.**, (1966), *Negative dialektik*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, translated by E.B. Ashton, *Negative Dialectics*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited, 1973.

**Allhoff, F.**, (2011), 'Torture Warrants, Self-Defence, and Necessity,' *Public Affairs Quarterly*, volume 25 number 3 July, 217-240, © University of Illinois Press.

**Arluke, A.**, (2006), *Just a dog: Understanding animal cruelty and ourselves*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, © Temple University Press.

**Bandura, A.**, (1990), 'Selective Activation and Disengagement of Moral Control,' *Journal of Social Issues*, volume 46 number 1, 27-46, © Wiley (John Wiley and Sons Incorporated).

**Barber, J.**, (2000), *Less than human: Torture in Cambodia: A LICADHO project against torture report*, Phnom Penh: Cambodian League for the Promotion and Defense of Human Rights, © LICADHO, available at <https://www.licadho-cambodia.org/reports/files/232000%20torture%20report%20from%20Jason.pdf>, accessed 15 November 2019.

**Bentham, J.**, (1823), 'Truth versus Ashhurst; or, Law as it is, contrasted with what it is said to be,' in Bowring, J. (ed.), *The Works of Jeremy Bentham: Vol.5*, Edinburgh: William Tait, 1843, 231-237, available at <https://archive.org/details/BRes092084>, accessed 15 November 2019.

**Bourdieu, P.**, (1972), *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique, précédé de trois études d'ethnologie kabyle*, Switzerland: Libraire Droz S.A., translated by Richard Nice, *Outline of a theory of practice*, reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

**Browning, C.R.**, (1992), *Ordinary men: Reserve police battalion 101 and the final solution in Poland*, Penguin Books edn., London: Penguin Books Limited, 2001.

**Burger, J.M.**, (2009), 'Replicating Milgram: Would People Still Obey Today?,' *American Psychologist*, volume 64 number 1 January, 1-11, © American Psychological Association.

**Chakma, S.** (ed.), (2008), *Torture in India*, New Delhi: Asian Center for Human Rights, © Asian Center for Human Rights, available at <https://web.archive.org/web/20121214091658/http://www.achrweb.org:80/reports.htm>, accessed 15 November 2019.

**Christopher, C.**, (2017), 'Suspects in police custody have right to life, stress rights activists,' *Sunday Times* (Sri Lanka), 5 March [Online], available at <https://www.sundaytimes.lk/170305/news/suspects-in-police-custody-have-right-to-life-stress-rights-activists-231584.html>, accessed 15 November 2019.

**Cohan, J.A.**, (2007), 'Torture and the Necessity Doctrine,' *Valparaiso University Law Review*, volume 41 number 4, 1587-1632.

**Dhammapada** (n.d.), *Khuddhaka Nikaya*, translated by Narada Thera, *The Dhammapada: Pali text and translation with stories in brief and notes*, reprinted 4<sup>th</sup> edn., Taipei, Taiwan: Corporate Body of the Buddha Educational Foundation, 1993, available at <https://archive.org/details/DhammapadaWithNotes/page/n1/mode/2up>, accessed 15 November 2019.

**Elliot, E.F., Stokes, H., and Norton, J.B.**, (1855), *Report of the Commission for the Investigation of Alleged cases of Torture in the Madras Presidency*, Madras: Fort St. George Gazette Press.

**Fernando, B.** (ed.), (2012), *Narrative of justice in Sri Lanka told through stories of torture victims* [Online], Hong Kong: Asian Human Rights Commission, available at <https://web.archive.org/web/20130308081559/http://www.humanrights.asia/resources/books/narrative-of-justice-in-sri-lanka/narrativeofjusticesl.pdf>, accessed 15 November 2019.

**Festinger, L.**, (1957), *A theory of cognitive dissonance*, Illinois (Evanston): Row, Peterson and Company, reprint, California: Stanford University Press, 1968, © Stanford University Press.

**Finnis, J.M.**, (1980), *Natural law and natural rights*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

**Fischer, K.**, (2005), 'In the beginning was the murder: destruction of nature and inter-human violence in Adorno's critique of culture,' *Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory*, volume 6 number 2 spring, 27-38.

**Goffman, E.**, (1956), *The presentation of self in everyday life*, Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Center (Monograph 2).

**Gosling, P., Denizeau, M. and Oberlé, D.**, (2006), 'Denial of Responsibility: A New Mode of Dissonance Reduction,' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, volume 90 number 5, 722-733, © American Psychological Association.

**Gunasekara, M.**, (2011), 'Dompe death due to assault with blunt weapon: JMO,' *Sunday Times* (Sri Lanka), 30 October [Online], available at [https://www.sundaytimes.lk/111030/News/nws\\_17.html](https://www.sundaytimes.lk/111030/News/nws_17.html), accessed 15 November 2019.

**Haney, C., Banks, C. and Zimbardo, P.**, (1973), 'Interpersonal Dynamics in a Simulated Prison,' *International Journal of Criminology and Penology*, volume 1, 69-97, © Elsevier.

**Hoffman, B.**, (2002), 'A Nasty Business,' *The Atlantic Monthly*, volume 289 number 1 January, 49-52, © The Atlantic Monthly Group LLC, available at <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2002/01/a-nasty-business/302379/>, accessed 15 November 2019.

**Köhler, W.**, (1917), *Intelligenzprüfungen an Anthropoiden*, Berlin: Royal Prussian Society of Sciences, translated by Ella Winter, *The mentality of apes*, 2<sup>nd</sup> rev. edn. reprint, London: Keegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Company Limited, 1931, available at <https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.187610>, accessed 15 November 2019.

**Krafft-Ebing, R.V.**, (1886), *Psychopathia sexualis: Eine klinisch-forensische studie*, Stuttgart: Verlag von Ferdinand Enke, translated by Charles Gilbert Chaddock, *Psychopathia sexualis: With especial reference to contrary sexual instinct: A medico-legal study*, Philadelphia: F. A. Davis Company, 1892, available at <https://archive.org/details/psychopathiasexualis00kraf>, accessed 15 November 2019.

**Masserman, J.H., Wechkin, S. and Terris, W.**, (1964), 'Altruistic' Behaviour in Rhesus Monkeys,' *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, volume 121 number 6 December, 584-585, © American Psychiatric Association Publishing.

**McEvilley, T.**, (2005), *The triumph of anti-art: Conceptual and performance art in the formation of post-modernism*, New York: McPherson and Company, 273-284 ('Marina Abramovic/Ulay').

**Milgram, S.**, (1963), 'Behavioral Study of Obedience,' *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, volume 67 number 4, 371-378.

**Milgram, S.**, (1974), *Obedience to authority: An experimental view*, London: Tavistock Publications Limited.

**Miller, A.**, (1980), *Am anfang war erziehung*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, translated by Hildegard Hannum and Hunter Hannum, *For your own good – Hidden cruelty in child-rearing and the roots of violence*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1983, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. reprint, New York: Noonday Press (a division of Farrar, Straus and Giroux), 2001.

**Miller, A.G.**, (2009), 'Reflections on 'Replicating Milgram' (Burger, 2009),' *American Psychologist*, volume 64 number 1 January, 20-27, © American Psychological Association.

**Montaigne, M.de.**, (1580), 'Of Cruelty,' translated by Charles Cotton rev. William Carew Hazlett, *Essays of Montaigne: Vol.4, The works of Michel de Montaigne*, New York: Edwin C.

Hill, 1910, 162-193, available at <https://archive.org/details/worksofmicheldem04montiala>, accessed 15 November 2019.

**Nell, V.**, (2006), 'Cruelty's rewards: The gratifications of perpetrators and spectators,' *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, volume 29 issue 3 June, 211-257, © Cambridge University Press.

**Nietzsche, F.**, (1887), *Zur genealogie der moral*, Leipzig: C. G. Naumann, translated by Horace B. Samuel, *On the genealogy of morals*, New York: Boni and Liveright, (n.d.), available at <https://archive.org/details/genealogyofmoral00nietuoft/page/n5>, accessed 15 November 2019.

**Rejali, D.**, (2007), *Torture and democracy*, paperback reprint, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2009.

**Richards, M.**, (2010), *Marina Abramović*, Oxford: Routledge (Routledge Performance Practitioners).

**Sereny, G.**, (1974), *Into that darkness: An examination of conscience*, reprint, New York: Vintage Books (Random House Incorporated), 1983.

**Sukkadhamma sutta**, (n.d.), translated by John D. Ireland, *The Udāna: Inspired Utterances of the Buddha* and *The Itivuttaka: The Buddha's Sayings*, Kandy (Sri Lanka): Buddhist Publication Society, 1997, 2017 [Online], available at [https://www.bps.lk/olib/bp/bp214s\\_Ireland\\_Udana-Itivuttaka.pdf](https://www.bps.lk/olib/bp/bp214s_Ireland_Udana-Itivuttaka.pdf), accessed 15 November 2019.

**Swarup, J.**, (1968), *Legislation and interpretation*, Allahabad: Dandewal Publishing House, available at <https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.144833/page/n1/mode/2up>, accessed 15 November 2019.

**Waal, F.B.M. de.**, (1996), *Good natured: The origins of right and wrong in humans and other animals*, reprint, Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Press, 2003.

**Webster, N.**, (1895), *Webster's academic dictionary: A dictionary of the English language*, Springfield, Massachusetts: G. and C. Merriam Company, available at <https://archive.org/details/webstersacademi00websgoog/page/n7/mode/2up>, accessed 15 November 2019.

**Wethasinghe, K.**, (1998), 'Rtd. teacher gets R.I., suspended and ordered to pay Rs.75,000,' *Daily News* (Sri Lanka), 8 July.

**Wolfendale, J.**, (2007), *Torture and the military profession*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan Limited.

## APPENDIX

### TO TORTURE OR NOT?

(1) Please reserve approx. ½ an hour to answer this questionnaire. Please take time to carefully read each question and have no hesitation in providing your frank and sincere response. Your identity will at all times remain confidential.

(2) Please answer *all* questions, including 'A,' 'B,' 'C' and 'D,' with such responses as pertain to *you*.

(3) Please read the 'Sample Question and Answer' and note the two-stage answering process of: *firstly* identifying the response(s) you agree with (*e.g.*, by marking their respective letters only); and *secondly* selecting the answer that best corresponds with your said response(s).

(4) Please provide *only* 1 (one) preferred answer *per* question.

(5) In the chance event of your being *twice* furnished with this questionnaire, please perfect and remit *only* 1 (one) of the same.

### ABOUT YOU

**A. You are:**

- (1) Female.
- (2) Male.

**B. Your work/education is in:**

- (1) Accounting. (2) Business. (3) Engineering. (4) Health Services. (5) Information Technology.
- (6) Marketing. (7) Media. (8) Psychology. (9) Security Forces. (10) *Other*.

**C. Your highest academic qualification:**

- (1) G.C.E. Ordinary Level.
- (2) G.C.E. Advanced Level.
- (3) Undergraduate Diploma.
- (4) Bachelor's Degree.
- (5) Postgraduate Diploma.
- (6) Master's Degree.



**D. You** have been employed for:

- (1) Less than 1 year.
- (2) 1 to 5 years.
- (3) 5 to 10 years.
- (4) 10 to 20 years.
- (5) Above 20 years.
- (6) Have never been employed.

### SAMPLE QUESTION AND ANSWER

**Question:**

A rainbow's color spectrum is generally kept in mind *via* the abbreviation '**VIBGYOR**,' standing for: **V**iolet, **I**ndigo, **B**lue, **G**reen, **Y**ellow, **O**range and **R**ed.

Which **one** or **more** of the following statements best summarize(s) **your perspective** regarding the above?

**(a)** The two extremities of the color spectrum, Ultra Violet and Infra Red, are not represented in the abbreviation 'VIBGYOR.'

**(b)** In reality, a rainbow's colors appear in inverse VIBGYOR order as: Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, Blue, Indigo and Violet ('ROYGBIV'). Nonetheless, for ease of remembering, the mnemonic 'VIBGYOR' is used.

**(c)** The 'primary colors' are Blue, Green and Red.

**(d)** Yellow is also a 'primary color.'

**(e)** Orange is also a 'primary color.'

**Your Answer:**

1. **(a)** and **(b)**.
2. **(a), (b) and (c)**.
3. **(d)** and **(e)**.
4. **(a) only**.
5. **(b) only**.

**Question 1:**

An anonymous *tip* has been received that terrorists have set a bomb to explode somewhere in Central Colombo at 12-noon. 3 (three) terrorist suspects are arrested at approximately 10:00 a.m. Each is found to have a cyanide capsule around his neck. The passports found on their persons describe them 'electricians.' Furthermore, a box containing a set of mini screwdrivers, pliers, cutters, crocodile clips, copper wires, adhesive tape and a digital timer is found in their common possession.

Despite their being *vigorously* questioned until 11:00 a.m., no one reveals the location of the bomb. At approx. 11:05 a.m., the Officer-In-Charge pulls out his loaded service revolver, places its muzzle on the head of one suspect-terrorist and threatens to shoot if none of them divulges the location of the bomb immediately. No one responds, believing the Officer-In-Charge to be bluffing. At approx. 11:06 a.m. the said Officer pulls the trigger, killing the said terrorist suspect.

The remaining suspects at once reveal the bomb's location: 'the Colombo General Hospital.' The bomb is found and diffused, preventing death and injury to several hundreds of individuals.

Which **one** or **more** of the following statements best summarize(s) **your perspective** regarding the above?

- (a) The killing of a single terrorist to save the lives of hundreds was justified! Hence, the Officer-In-Charge should be exempted from all criminal liability for causing death and inflicting mental torture.
- (b) The Officer-In-Charge should receive a Presidential Commendation and his said actions officially endorsed as the 'standard practice' to be adopted in the face of such terrorist activity that risks the lives of civilians.
- (c) The Officer-In-Charge should have resorted *firstly* to offering rewards and clemency ('positive enforcement') and only *secondly* to inflicting death and mental torture ('negative enforcement') in proceeding to elicit the location of the bomb.
- (d) The Officer-In-Charge should be prosecuted for both 'Murder' and 'Torture,' but be 'conditionally discharged' (without imprisonment) in view of the lives saved.

(e) The Officer-In-Charge should have resorted to offering rewards and clemency ('positive enforcement') only and should *never* have resorted to killing and torturing ('negative enforcement') to elicit the location of the bomb, no matter how many lives were at stake. Hence, the Officer-In-Charge should be prosecuted for both 'Murder' and 'Torture' and be imprisoned for his crimes.

**Your Answer:**

1. (a) only.
2. (a) and (b).
3. (c) only.
4. (c) and (d).
5. (e) only.

**Question 2:**

A prominent lawyer and his wife return home to find it forcibly broken into and ransacked. The wife's '5-Sovereign 24-karat Gold Necklace' (a maternal heirloom) and the lawyer's Rolex 'Yacht Master' (Gold) Watch (a gift from a foreign dignitary) are both found missing.

Upon duly notifying the police, an investigation is launched promptly. Within 24 hours, a 17-year-old 'suspect' painter *cum* 3-wheeler driver is arrested; however, minus the stolen items. The lawyer's wife identifies *this* arrestee as an individual whose services were retained on several previous occasions to both paint the house and restore eroded masonry.

The Officer-In-Charge asks the lawyer whether to 'force' this arrestee to divulge the whereabouts of the stolen goods. The lawyer, with his wife's approval, consents. That night, the said arrestee is mercilessly tortured, being suspended and beaten with poles and batons all over his body. The arrestee pleads for his release by repeatedly asserting his innocence. Exhausted from torturing this arrestee, the police officers throw him into a cell. On the following morning, the said arrestee is found dead. The post-mortem report reveals his death to have been caused by 'internal bleeding' due to 'blunt force trauma administered to the body.'

On the very next day, the true thief, the lawyer's *newly hired* driver, surrenders to the Magistrate's Court, handing over both the stolen necklace and watch.

Which **one** or **more** of the following statements best summarize(s) **your perspective** regarding the above?

(a) The police should resort to ‘Torture’ only where a loss to life is threatened (as in ‘Question 1’ above). Where only a loss of property has occurred, ‘Torture’ should not be resorted to. However, since the motive of the police *in this case* was to expeditiously recover unique/irreplaceable goods stolen from two ‘respectable’ members of the public and *not* to kill the arrested suspect, the complicit officers should only be prosecuted for ‘Causing Death by a Rash or Negligent Act’ (not amounting to culpable homicide) and be held eligible for ‘conditional discharge’ (without imprisonment) on paying the victim’s next of kin such compensation as deemed ‘reasonable’ by Court.

(b) The police should never resort to ‘Torture’! No threat to life or property could ever justify recourse to Torture! Hence, all complicit police officers, including the Officer-In-Charge, should be prosecuted for both ‘Torture’ and ‘Culpable Homicide not amounting to Murder’ and be imprisoned.

(c) The said lawyer and his wife too should be prosecuted, for ‘Abetting Torture,’ but be eligible for ‘conditional discharge’ (without imprisonment) on paying the victim’s next of kin ‘exemplary’ compensation (of up to one million rupees) as deemed ‘appropriate’ by Court.

(d) Instead of ‘Torture,’ recourse should ideally have been had toward procuring a DNA profile of the unknown suspect *via* laboratory analysis of ‘trace evidence’ found at the scene of the crime. By comparing this unknown DNA profile with that of the arrestee’s, a ‘match’ or ‘mismatch’ could definitively have been made, respectively inculcating or exculpating him.

(e) Establishing at least one DNA profiling laboratory within each ‘Administrative District’ should be the foremost priority of the Ministries of Justice, Law and Order and Science and Technology toward precluding this habitual recourse to ‘Torture.’

**Your Answer:**

1. (a) only.
2. (b) only.
3. (b) and (c).
4. (b), (d) and (e).
5. (b), (c), (d) and (e).

**Question 3:**

You receive an invitation from the Department of Criminology of a renowned local university to take part in an experimental simulation designed to demonstrate ‘a suspect-criminal’s proclivity to affirm suggested falsehoods under pain of ‘Torture.’”

On presenting yourself before the said Department of Criminology, the Head of the Department instructs you to assume the role of 'a police officer who administers physical pain *via* an electrical shocking device toward compelling a suspect-criminal to confess to a crime.' You are informed that *another* consenting adult-invitee has already assumed the role of such 'suspect-criminal.'

The said 'shocking device' is one specially constructed to administer five-milliampere shocks, which can be sustained for periods of 2 seconds, 4 seconds and 6 seconds, as selected by pressing the buttons assigned to such specific durations. Hence, there are three buttons: the '2-second button,' the '4-second button' and the '6-second button.' A *single press* on any button will cause a five-milliampere shock to be sustainedly administered for the specified duration; *e.g.*, pressing the '4-second button' would cause the 'suspect-criminal' to be shocked continuously for 4 seconds.

You are informed that in general the said '2-second,' '4-second' and '6-second' shocks would respectively cause 'prickling,' 'discomfort' and 'pain' to an individual subjected to the same. You are further informed that the invitee playing the role of 'suspect-criminal' has already given his 'informed consent' to undergo such trauma.

At the commencement of this experimental simulation, the said Head of the Department (assuming the role of 'a police Officer-In-Charge') demands the (invitee playing the role of) 'suspect-criminal' to admit to his having stolen a valuable gold chain. Upon such 'suspect-criminal's' *denying* the same, you (in the role of 'police officer') are given the discretion to administer the shortest shock duration to such 'suspect-criminal' by pushing the '2-second button' on the 'shocking device.' On being asked *again* by the 'Officer-In-Charge' to admit to 'Theft,' if the 'suspect-criminal' *again denies* the same, you are given the discretion to administer the next (longer) shock duration by pushing the '4-second button.' On his *third denial*, you are permitted to administer the longest shock duration by pushing the '6-second button.' Every succeeding *denial* thereafter will permit you to repeatedly press the '6-second button.' You are informed that on average the ordinary/run-of-the-mill invitee would confess upon enduring five *consecutive* 6-second shocks. Both you and the invitee (assigned the role of 'suspect-criminal') are also informed that although *consecutive* 6-second shocks could be quite painful, they are generally unable to cause death or any serious injury.

Each time the '6-second button' is pressed by *you*, the *other* invitee (playing the role of 'suspect-criminal') becomes entitled to a Rs.1,000/- reward (from the said Department of Criminology) for enduring such shock. In the eventuality of a

'suspect-criminal's' electing to admit his having stolen the gold chain (to avoid being shocked any further), *you* become entitled to a reward of Rs.25,000/- (from the said Department of Criminology) for coercing such disclosure. Even without this outcome, *you* (alone) become entitled to a reward of Rs.5,000/- for your persistence.

Which **one** or **more** of the following statements best summarizes **your perspective** regarding the above?

(a) You will not hesitate to take up the assigned role of 'police officer' and will dutifully administer the shocks to the volunteer 'suspect-criminal' toward coercing him to confess. This would be done in furtherance of securing (i) the rewards promised to both *you* and the *other* invitee ('suspect-criminal') and (ii) the *prestige* associated with being selected for such an unprecedented experiment by this renowned university.

(b) You will agree to participate, but with *great reluctance* owing to the need to administer painful shocks to another. Your sole motivation would be to render whatever assistance possible toward proving that 'Torture' only serves to elicit confirmation of suggested falsehoods.' You would politely refuse *all* rewards.

(c) You will participate only under the *condition* that you may withdraw from this experimental simulation at any time you deem the administering of further shocks inhumane. You would nevertheless *accept* rewards falling due until such time.

(d) You will politely decline the invitation to participate because causing harm to another, irrespective of whatever mutual gains arising therefrom, is contrary to *your* personal ethics.

(e) You will report the said Department's intended experimental simulation to both the university's Ethics Committee and Senate to prevent it from being conducted.

**Your Answer:**

1. (a) only.
2. (b) only.
3. (c) only.
4. (d) only.
5. (d) and (e).

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup>**This prohibition has become part of customary international law** as evidenced and defined by the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, General Assembly Resolution 217 (III)(A) (Dec. 10, 1948), which states in the plainest of terms, ‘no one shall be subjected to torture’ (*Filartiga v. Pena-Irala* [1980], 882, emphasis added). ‘... **We conclude that the right to be free from official torture is fundamental and universal, a right deserving of the highest status under international law, a norm of *jus cogens*.** ... That states engage in official torture cannot be doubted, but all states believe it is wrong, all that engage in torture deny it, and no state claims a sovereign right to torture its own citizens. ... **Under international law, any state that engages in official torture violates *jus cogens*.**’ (*Siderman de Blake v. Republic of Argentina* [1992], 717, emphasis added.) ‘70. ... International instruments and its own case law lead the court to conclude that there is a universal prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, independent of any codification or declaration, since all these practices constitute a violation of peremptory norms of international law’ (*Caesar v. Trinidad and Tobago* [2005], 24, emphasis added).

<sup>2</sup>**Interrogative torture:** utilized in contexts where suspicions are raised by third parties or by policemen themselves that a particular individual has committed a crime in respect of which torture constitutes an expeditious means to extract his/her confession or other information deemed vital to the investigation (not necessarily the trial) thereof.

<sup>3</sup>**Punitive torture:** utilized in contexts where a prior (or even immediately prior) act or omission on the part of the tortured victim in respect of either the torturer or another in whom the torturer has an interest is construed an ‘affront’ deserving of prompt retaliatory ‘disciplining.’

<sup>4</sup>**Oppressive torture:** utilized in contexts where suspicions are raised by third parties or by policemen themselves that a particular individual maintains ties with those concerned in subversive and/or terrorist activities in respect of which torture constitutes an expeditious means by which to both (i) extract his/her confession thereon along with other revelations regarding anti state activity and (ii) execute summary punishment to deter him/her from engaging in the same in future.

<sup>5</sup>Citizens are regarded as being bound to each other and their government by an initial hypothetical agreement on a certain system of rules and method of enforcement, which must be justly enforced *via* agreed sanctions.

<sup>6</sup>‘... If someone is justified, then he did not do anything wrong; if he is ... excused, then he did something wrong, but it is not his fault.’ (Allhoff 2011, 226.)

---

<sup>7</sup>The members of any of the armed forces who are called out ... for the purpose of maintaining public order in any area shall for such purpose have the powers, including the powers of search and arrest, conferred on police officers by any provision of this... or ... any other written law, other than the powers ...' to conduct a formal investigation (Public Security Ordinance No.25 of 1947, section 12(2)). *E.g.*, The emergency regulations promulgated *via* the Gazette (Extraordinary) of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, No.843/12, dated Friday, 4<sup>th</sup> November 1994, provided *inter alia* under Regulation 18(1) as follows: 'Any police officer or any member of the armed forces may search, detain for purposes of such search or arrest without warrant, any person who is committing or has committed or whom he has reasonable grounds for suspecting to be concerned in, or to be committing or to have committed, an offense under any emergency regulation: and may search, seize, remove, or detain any vehicle, vessel, article, substance, or thing whatsoever used in, or in connection with, the commission of the offense ... .' Regulation 19(2) of the same provided *inter alia* that: 'Any person taken into custody ... may for the purpose of investigation of the offense in relation to which such person was arrested be kept in detention ... if the person had been taken into custody by a member of the armed forces ... upon an order made by an officer not below the rank of Brigadier, Commodore or Wing Commander of the Army, Navy or Air Force, as the case may be ... .'

<sup>8</sup>Thus, in addition to physical torture there can be psychological torture such as threatening to execute the suspect, putting a gun to his head and saying you will shoot, threatening to castrate him, telling him that you are going to kill his family members if he does not tell you the information you are seeking, and similar tactics that, while not physically painful, inflict mental pain or suffering even when there is no intent to carry out such threats.' (Cohan 2007, 1596.)

<sup>9</sup>Effective 1<sup>st</sup> January 1885.

<sup>10</sup>Effective 20<sup>th</sup> December 1994.

<sup>11</sup>'... Where having made the general Act the Legislature afterward makes a special Act in conflict with it, we must assume that the Legislature had in mind its own general Act when it made the special Act, and made the special Act in conflict with the general Act as an exception to the general Act.' (Swarup 1968, 266.) 'If there is an apparent conflict between two independent provisions of law, the special provision must prevail.' (Swarup 1968, 266.)

<sup>12</sup>This third game is as follows: the fowl is attracted to the bars with a slice of bread, but in the very moment when she is about to peck it, the free hand of the same chimpanzee (or of another beside him) thrusts a stick or – even worse – a strong pointed wire into her feathered body. When two chimpanzees take part in this (one as baiter and one as thruster) there has certainly been no previous agreement between them;



circumstances decree that the momentary activity of each happens to suit the other; they realize it and continue their ‘collusion.’ (Köhler 1917, 85.)

<sup>13</sup>... These **two bright principles protect the world**. What are the two? **Shame and fear of wrongdoing**’ (*Sukkadhamma sutta* n.d., Ireland translation, 138, emphasis added).

<sup>14</sup>First published: 1963, ‘Behavioral Study Of Obedience,’ *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, volume 67 number 4, 371-378.

<sup>15</sup>... By denying responsibility, they attempt to dissociate themselves from their behavior in order to reduce the resulting negative affect [*dissonance*]. (Gosling, Denizeau and Oberlé 2006, 730, parenthesis added.)

<sup>16</sup>Legally unenforceable, if the transaction were unfeigned.

<sup>17</sup>Which, however, would have become illegal by such time had the transaction been unfeigned.

<sup>18</sup>The majority of his modified experiments too yielded comparable results.

<sup>19</sup>P. Saliya Sumanatilake, author of the present work.

<sup>20</sup>Extant scholarship vacillates on this point.

<sup>21</sup>19. Sathasivam R.; 21. Nandini Heart; 25. Eric Kramer; 36. Chaminda Premelal; 55. Dawundage Pushpakumara; 56. C.P.S. Anthony and C.J. Lafaber; 67. Ashoka P. Kumara, Saman Puspakumara, N. Ratnayaka, W.P. Piyadasa, Nilantha K. Rajapakse, Chaminda Sureshkumar, U.N. Jayantha Premalal and S. Niyamaka; 68. Tennakoon Mudiyansele G.; 124. Chamara family; 139. Hevamarambage Premalal; 143. Suddage Sirisena; 171. Kuruthanthrige Lakshman Gunasekera; 201. M.A. Prasantha Ruwan Kumara; 270. Thalagala Pahalage Solomon; 278. Mudugamuwa Manage Piyal; 280. Wann Athapaththu Mudiyansele Nilantha Saman Kumara; 295. Hewawasam Sarukkalige Rathnasiri Fernando; 304. Indika Shashiranga Senevirathna; 311. P.G.W.G. Jayarathna; 314. Sampath Jasingha; 318. Suthisa Kumara Jayalath and Mahendra Uppalawanna; 323. Acharige Dinesh Priyankara; 327. Marasingha Arachchige Maithree Narada; 331. Welgamgoda Acharyage Upul Sanjeewa; 360. Jayasinghe Arachchige Chathura Manohara; 368. Sathira Dharshana Jayawickrama; 374. Sarath Keerthirathna; 375. M.M. Kushantha Janaka Herath; 376. Jayawardane Mudiyansele Chulani Thilakarathne; and, 392. J.P. Samson Kulatunga.’ (Ed. Fernando 2012.)

---

<sup>22</sup>The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his Government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a **moral choice was in fact possible** to him.’ (Emphasis added.)

<sup>23</sup>Taken here to connote, cumulatively, ‘outcome,’ ‘causative’ and ‘role’ responsibility.

<sup>24</sup>Herein lies the answer to Milgram’s quest for learning how to counter cruelty, which strangely enough does not seem apparent to him.

<sup>25</sup>1. Mind is the forerunner of (all evil) states. Mind is chief; mind-made are they. If one speaks or acts with wicked mind, because of that, suffering follows one, even as the wheel follows the hoof of the draught-ox.’ (*Dhammapada* n.d., Narada translation, 1, v.1.) ‘2. Mind is the forerunner of (all good) states. Mind is chief; mind-made are they. If one speaks or acts with pure mind, because of that, happiness follows one, even as one’s shadow that never leaves.’ (*Dhammapada* n.d., Narada translation, 5, v.2.)

<sup>26</sup>When your dog does anything you want to break him of, you wait till he does it, and then beat him for it. This is the way you make laws for your dog: and this is the way the judges make law for you and me. They won’t tell a man beforehand what it is he should not do - they won’t so much as allow of his being told: they lie by till he has done something which they say he should not have done, and then they hang him for it.’ (Bentham 1823, 235.)

<sup>27</sup>Article 1: All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood. Article 2: Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty. Article 3: Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person. Article 4: No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms. Article 5: No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. Article 6: Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law. Article 7: All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination. Article 8: Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law. Article 9: No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile. Article 10: Everyone is entitled

---

in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him. Article 11: 1. Everyone charged with a penal offense has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defense. 2. No one shall be held guilty of any penal offense on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offense, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offense was committed. Article 12: No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honor and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks. Article 13: 1. Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each State. 2. Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country. Article 14: 1. Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution. 2. This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations. Article 15: 1. Everyone has the right to a nationality. 2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality. Article 16: 1. Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution. 2. Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses. 3. The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State. Article 17: 1. Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others. 2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property. Article 18: Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance. Article 19: Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers. Article 20: 1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association. 2. No one may be compelled to belong to an association. Article 21: 1. Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives. 2. Everyone has the right to equal access to public service in his country. 3. The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures. Article 22: Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality. Article 23: 1. Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment. 2. Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal

---

pay for equal work. 3. Everyone who works has the right to just and favorable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection. 4. Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests. Article 24: Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay. Article 25: 1. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control. 2. Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection. Article 26: 1. Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit. 2. Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace. 3. Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children. Article 27: 1. Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits. 2. Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author. Article 28: Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized. Article 29: 1. Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible. 2. In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society. 3. These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations. Article 30: Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.'