

Responses to Zedner, Haque and Mendus

Jeremy Waldron

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013

Jeremy Waldron

I appreciate the comments of all three respondents and the interest they have shown in the ideas set out in *Torture, Terror, and Trade-Offs*. There is much that I agree with in the comments of Professors Zedner and Haque; however, in what follows I shall confine myself mainly to responding to the various criticisms they make. I have the misfortune to find myself in quite far-reaching disagreement with Susan Mendus. I will come to that after I have responded to Lucia Zedner and Adil Ahmad Haque. I apologize in advance to Zedner and Haque for having to devote so much more space to Professor Mendus's criticisms than to theirs, but the tone of Mendus's observations and some misrepresentations of what I wrote in the book require detailed attention.

Lucia Zedner

There is so much agreement between me and Professor Zedner, that I have had trouble concocting anything that might be phrased as a "response to critics" in her case. What I can do is acknowledge that she has stated certain concerns about security powers and their abuse much more eloquently and effectively than I did.

When I wrote the essays that make up the chapters of *Torture, Terror and Trade-offs*, in the period from 2001 until 2008, I was working in the United States and fixated on some of the worst abuses that were taking place under American authority and in the name of the American people. But Zedner's analysis illustrates the importance of attending not just to the situation in the US but also to some of the differences that emerge when anti-terrorism doctrine and practices in the UK and other countries are taken into account. She is also right to chide me for focusing on the headline issues like "the horrors of extraordinary rendition, of indefinite detention, torture, cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment,"

J. Waldron (✉)
All Souls College, Oxford, UK
e-mail: jeremy.waldron@politics.ox.ac.uk