THE END OF RECIPROCITY

Why should America restrain itself in detaining, interrogating, and targeting terrorists when they show it no similar forbearance? Is it fair to expect one side to fight by more stringent rules than the other, placing itself at disadvantage? Is the disadvantaged side then permitted to use the tactics and strategies of its opponent? If so, then America’s most controversial counterterrorism practices are justified as commensurate responses to indiscriminate terror. Yet different ethical standards prove entirely fitting, the author contends, in a conflict between a network of suicidal terrorists seeking mass atrocity at any cost and a constitutional democracy committed to respecting human dignity and the rule of law. The most important reciprocity involves neither uniform application of fair rules nor their enforcement by a simple-minded approach. Real reciprocity instead entails contributing to an emergent global contract that encompasses the law of war and from which all peoples may mutually benefit.
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We acquire attachments to persons and institutions according to how we perceive our good to be affected by them. The basic idea is one of reciprocity, a tendency to answer in kind. Now this tendency is a deep psychological fact. Without it our nature would be very different.


International humanitarian law texts rarely admit it, yet without reciprocity in practice those texts may be of little avail, for not all belligerents will be so saintly as to observe restraint and to honour humanitarian obligations in the face of an enemy’s persistent refusal to do so. The most effective actual working engine of international humanitarian law observance, far from being established or even mentioned in the Geneva Conventions... works in fact in apparent defiance of them. Reciprocity is its name. Reciprocity may roughly back humanitarian principle, whether humanitarian or principle ask it to or not.


Since we have reacted in kind, your description of us as terrorists... necessarily means that you and your actions must be defined likewise... If killing those that kill our sons is terrorism, then let history witness that we are terrorists... We treat others like they treat us... The Americans started it, and retaliation... should be carried out following the principle of reciprocity, especially when women and children are involved... If we don’t have security, neither will the Americans... We swore that America could never dream of safety, until safety becomes a reality for us living in Palestine... Terror for Terror... Blood for blood, destruction for destruction... Stop spilling our blood in order to save your own.

Osama bin Laden, *Messages to the World: The Statements of Osama bin Laden* (2005), and 2007 fatwa

Whoever fights monsters should see to it that in the process he does not become a monster. And when you look long into an abyss, the abyss also looks into you.

Friedrich Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*, 1886
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