

The resulting counter argument to this escalation in prisoner abuse often leads to the proposal of the institutionalized practice of torture, which would allow for regulations, highly specialized torturers, and personnel to oversee and scrutinize every aspect. To flirt with this idea would mean ignoring the most basic fact about humans, that they are irrational. **To dissect the idea of organized, government-sanctioned torture, one simply has to analyze Plato's theory of the three parts of the soul.** He believed the soul was essentially comprised of three governing bodies: the logical, the appetitive concerning pleasure, and the passionate, or the *thymos* in a person. While the rational part of the soul uses logic and thought processes to behave in a moral and socially acceptable manner, it is always in competition with the two other illogical parts of the soul. As a result, in the right situation, a person with an enormous thirst for vengeance against those who have impacted them directly or indirectly, such was the overwhelming feeling after 9/11, and the means to do so permissibly under the guise of foreign intelligence extraction, can enable their appetitive part to win against the rational part that tells them to follow the regulations restricting excessive torture in exchange for revenge. **The government cannot take this chance of employing people and trusting them to carry out a task riddled with emotion to the designated degree.**

Other problems associated with torture as a way to elicit information beg the question of its effectiveness and its constitutionality. **Submitting someone to such unbearable pain and suffering in order to obtain intelligence puts a value on human life, suffering, and dignity. Does one terrorist's life have equal worth to one American's, or does their dignity just serve as collateral?** As David Luban stated in his essay, *Liberalism, Torture, and the Ticking Bomb*, the extent to which torture works in getting truthful information is a dangerously grey area requiring extensive definitions and outlining of semantics, some of which include determining the point at which torture is deemed ineffective, and what to do next, how certain someone must be of a captive's information. Additionally, the limit and lies one might make up in order to stop their own pain are almost limitless, creating another flaw in credibility that debases the fifth amendment in addition to "cruel and unusual punishment" stated in the eighth. The fifth amendment outlines one's right not to incriminate themselves, and under the physical duress of torture, a confession or intelligence, whichever it might be, can be instantly fabricated in an effort to relieve one's own suffering.

John Locke and Thomas Hobbes believed in the right to defend oneself and one's property when in immediate danger. Torture violates the most integral component of Locke's justification for righteous violence against another person, which torture claims to be, only to "retribute to him, so far as calm reason and conscience dictate, what is proportionate to his transgression; which is so much as may serve for reparation and restraint" (79). These two reasons, Locke deems the "only reasons why one man may lawfully do harm to another." Locke deliberately delivers these as the only reasons, leaving out intelligence gathering or confession extraction. Torture is not a modern concept, and

Locke would have been familiarized with it during his time period. Based on his nonviolent philosophies, Locke would have rejected the use of preemptive violence.

While many would like to entertain torture as a viable means of intelligence collection and view it as a preventative measure, intellectuals such as many of our founding fathers and John Locke who understood the complexities of torture. Experts have crafted new vomit-inducing ways to torture, but the core concept has not changed since its inception. In a hypothetical “enhanced interrogation” of a terrorist officials believe have pertinent information to a time-sensitive attack on innocent lives, one must consider the motivations for the actions of terrorist organizations. Most terrorist groups aim to do enough harm to a large enough group of people to incite fear and cripple a nation internally. Oftentimes, the goal is to undermine the foundation of a country to see it eventually crumble as a result of enough inner turmoil. Torture goes against the beliefs of this nation’s founding fathers and the philosophers who studied human irrationality and of whom we derive many core “American” beliefs. If the government is willing to engage in a practice as anti-American as torture, those wishing to see the destruction of virtue, democracy, and American life are halfway to the finish line.