
The Reasons Against Torture Justification

Nowadays in our world crime is happen every minute in every country. Police officer have several ways to deal with the criminal or the suspect but, there is one method that is still debate until now that it should prohibited under all circumstances or not and that method is torture. Torture is an act of intentionally inflicting severe pain, whether on physical or mental on a person for such aims as obtaining him or a third person information or in order to fulfill some desire. There is one interesting study case, it happens in Germany and the police decide to torture the suspect to gain the information.

This case is about one boy whose name is J, he had been kidnapped and the felon whose name is Magnus Gafgen, he is a law student and he know law every well. He wants one million euro for the ransom. At the result Magnus Gafgen had been a suspected and had been detained in the prison for the interrogate by the police officer. During the interrogation the police officer ask Gafgen that where is the boy, Gefgen lying to the police for several times. So, this lead police name Daschner order to use force (torture) to Gafgen if he doesn't tell where the boy is, Gafgen fear to be torture then he told the police that the boy is already dead and his corpse is under the jetty at the pond and the boy is die by suffocating. After this cased is spread out it unleashed a big debate in Germany about police interrogation technique, it divided people in to two sides. First side is who sympathized the police because they understand that the police trying to do their best in order to save the life of an innocent child. So, they oppose to charging and punishing the police officer while another side is absolute ban on torture, they believe that torture is a crime under international law, it is absolutely prohibited and cannot be justified under any situations.

In my opinion, I'm agree with the statement "torture is absolutely prohibited under all circumstances." So, I'm in the absolute ban on torture side, the first reason is because torture can destroy humanity as human everyone has right to life. Nobody should ever be tortured in any situations. The prohibition on torture is one of the most fundamental rights protected by the Human Rights Act. Also, torture is violating human dignity. More over there is a right of equality in human right, this mean that all people are born free and equal. everyone has right to be treated equally. According to the case in Germany, even though Magnus Gafgen is felon it doesn't mean that he doesn't have a right. He has the same rights and deserve the same level of respect like others.

The second reason is if it has any exception to allowing to use torture it can implicate the risk of abuse and open the door to a dangerously slope, in worst case torture can becomes arbitrary and unpunished, or widespread and systematic, or both. If torture is unpunished and widespread our world will face a big problem human will not be human anymore, they will view others like an animal, to be used as one needed or pleased and this can lead to war crime and human rights violation. More over The setting up of a legalized exception in a single State would also cause international proliferation, If States that seem to be world leaders on human rights express their tolerance of torture, even in small circumstances, other States will take this as their sign to continue their own use of torture against their own populations.

Next reason is morality, torture is absolutely prohibited as a matter of morals and ethics, and so

no torture must be applied no matter how great the costs. The consequence of torture is lifelong the victim that had been tortured will have a pain that haunted them in their memory and maybe it will damage that victim in mentally and physical way in their life forever. Sometime a person that been torture is not a real suspect but the torture is already done before knowing the truth, so who will respond on this consequence. Also, there is not a thing that can proof that torture is work, how can we know that is a true information. According to a statement by 25 former interrogators and intelligence professionals from the U.S. military and other federal agencies "The application of psychological, emotional, and/or physical pressure can force a victim of torture to say anything just to end the painful experience. The challenge of interrogation is not 'to make people talk'; instead, it is to obtain precise and credible information."

Also, torture should be permitted even in the extreme situation. Some may say that to saving the innocent life is must override a person's right not to be tortured. According to the ticking bomb scenario: a bomb has been set to explode that it will kill thousands of innocent people and a detained person is known to have information on where the bomb is and how to defuse it. Is torture justified in such a case to make the detainee to talk? The international community, however, refused the use of torture even in the 'ticking bomb' case. according to International human rights law - as well as U.S. law - do not have any exceptions to the prohibition against torture.

In conclusion, torture can never be justified and can never be considered the morality correct thing to do, torture should never happen to anyone even that person is a bad guy we should follow the law in order to protect and prevent the dangerous consequence that will come in the future. Moreover, torture does not fulfill its aim of gaining useful information and it often brings about more inhumanity. So, always say no to torture.