GENEVA ACADEMY
of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights
a joint centre of
GENEVA GRADUATE INSTITUTE
UNIVERSITÉ DE GENÈVE

IN BRIEF ...

NEUROTECHNOLOGIES AND THE PREVENTION OF TORTURE AND OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN, OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT: DEVELOPMENTS AND IMPLICATIONS

DECEMBER 2025 | JONATHAN ANDREW

INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of neurotechnology presents unprecedented opportunities and challenges for human rights protection, particularly regarding the prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment. As brain-computer interfaces (BCIs),[1] neural monitoring systems,[2] and cognitive enhancement technologies[3] mature, their potential applications in detention facilities, contexts of examination and interrogation, and correctional systems demand careful examination.[4] This analysis explores how emerging neurotechnologies' use might both strengthen protections against torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment yet also possibly create new vulnerabilities that require robust ethical and legal frameworks for prevention.

BENEFICIAL APPLICATIONS IN PREVENTION OF MISTREATMENT

Neurotechnologies offer several promising avenues for the prevention and detection of torture. Advanced neuroimaging techniques, including functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) and other non-invasive medical tests such as electroencephalography (EEG), can potentially serve as objective tools for documenting psychological trauma resulting from abuse.[5] These technologies may provide forensic evidence of the neurological impact of a person's mistreatment, thus offering victims scientific documentation that surpasses subjective testimony.[6]

Brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) designed for therapeutic purposes could potentially assist torture survivors in rehabilitation.[7] Neurofeedback systems[8] could assist individuals recovering from trauma-induced conditions such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) by enabling real-time monitoring and modulation of brain states associated with anxiety, depression, and hypervigilance.[9] Such applications could significantly improve treatment outcomes for torture survivors.[10]

In addition, neurotechnologies could be used to enhance monitoring systems within detention facilities. Wearable devices capable of measuring indicators of stress, sleep patterns, and neurological biomarkers of distress could alert supervisory authorities to conditions suggestive of substandard detention conditions, abuse or mistreatment.[11] If implemented transparently with appropriate oversight, these systems could serve as early warning mechanisms to prevent mistreatment before it occurs.[12]

RISKS AND POTENTIAL FOR ABUSE

However, the same neurotechnologies capabilities that might promise greater protection for individuals also present grave risks for abuse. Neurotechnologies could enable sophisticated forms of psychological torture that leave no physical evidence. Advanced brain stimulation techniques, including transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS)[13] and deep brain stimulation (DBS), could in theory be adapted for harmful purposes to inflict psychological suffering, manipulate cognitive function, or to coerce confessions.[14]

The capacity for such monitoring raises profound concerns regarding mental privacy and psychological autonomy. Access to neural data could facilitate breaches of the right to privacy, with mistreatment reflecting a violation of cognitive liberty; the fundamental right to mental autonomy and self-determination over one's neurological processes.[15] Those within public authorities such as law enforcement conducting questioning might avail themselves of devices enabling neural behavioural monitoring; this could potentially exploit psychological vulnerabilities.[16]

Moreover, the potential for neurotechnological enhancement of interrogation techniques presents serious ethical challenges.[17] Neurotechnology-based techniques to detect deception or extract information founded directly on neural activity might create challenges for legal systems, potentially undermining the principle that individuals cannot be compelled to testify against themselves.[18]

TECHNICAL IMPLEMENTATION: CHALLENGES

Technical limitations currently place curbs on both the beneficial and harmful applications of neurotechnology in the context of mistreatment. Neural signals remain difficult to interpret reliably, and individual variations in brain structure and function complicate their development.[19] The nature of invasive BCI-based neurotechnologies also presents practical barriers to widespread implementation due to the need for surgical intervention.[20]

A further critical consideration is that resource and expertise constraints may pose additional challenges to the prevention of mistreatment, especially in jurisdictions where mechanisms to prevent torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment are weaker or non-existent.[21] As such, it might be argued that the sophisticated clinical demands required for advanced neurotechnologies use may limit their accessibility precisely where they could provide the greatest benefit. Training requirements for proper implementation further complicate deployment in resource-constrained environments.[22]

Questions of data security and system integrity for neurotechnologies applications also present ongoing technical challenges.[23] Neural monitoring-based systems vulnerable to unauthorised access or manipulation could be exploited to hide evidence of abuse or to falsify evidence of mistreatment. Ensuring reliability and security of these systems may therefore require substantial investment in cybersecurity measures and technical safeguards.[24]

HUMAN RIGHTS AND ETHICAL FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

The integration of neurotechnologies into torture prevention efforts necessitates careful consideration of fundamental ethical principles. The principle of human dignity demands that any technological intervention preserve the inherent worth and autonomy of individuals, particularly those in vulnerable positions such as detainees. Neurotechnologies must enhance rather than diminish human agency and self-determination.

The role of informed consent in providing a basis for collecting and processing neural data from an individual also presents particular challenges in the context of detention, where power imbalances may compromise voluntary decision-making. The development of robust consent protocols that take account

of potentially coercive environments is essential for ensuring ethical implementation.[25]

The development of neurotechnologies has to date highlighted concerns regarding the right to privacy and the protection of people's individual autonomy.[26] The need to protect cognitive liberty, encompassing mental privacy and protection from cognitive harm, necessarily places constraints on the use of neurotechnologies with regard to contexts such as civil and criminal justice systems. Indeed, widening of the scope of the safeguards afforded under the right to privacy may require greater elucidation and recognition as a fundamental human right deserving explicit legal protection.[27]

POTENTIAL ADAPTATIONS TO LEGAL FRAMEWORKS

Existing international legal frameworks prohibiting torture may require adaptation or elucidation to address specific developments in neurotechnologies. For example, the UN Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment articulates that the term "means any act by which severe pain or *suffering*, whether physical or mental, is *intentionally* inflicted on a person…".[28] In essence, clarification regarding induced psychological harm on the basis of the use of neurotechnologies may be necessary.[29]

Domestic legal systems may need to amend existing legal frameworks governing the use of neurotechnology in civil and criminal justice. Legislation may need to be adopted or adapted to establish clear boundaries regarding permissible applications, mandate oversight mechanisms, and provide remedies for victims where neurotechnologies are abused.[30] The development of professional standards for officers working in detention facilities will also likely prove necessary to ensure effective supervision of neurotechnologies' use.[31]

CONCLUSIONS

Neurotechnologies present both significant opportunities and serious risks for the prevention of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment and, more broadly, human rights protection. While these technologies may offer the promise of highly capable tools for detecting, documenting, and healing the effects of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment on individuals, they also create new possibilities for sophisticated methods of abuse. The realisation of neurotechnologies' beneficial potential while mitigating its risks requires proactive review and development of both legal frameworks and technical safeguards.

The international community should engage further in dialogue to refine the appropriate framework for governance of neurotechnologies. Success in harnessing the benefits of neurotechnology for the prevention of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment will require not only technical innovation but also necessitate institutional innovation in the form of new mechanisms of governance, oversight bodies, and accountability frameworks.

POSSIBLE QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH:

1. How can international legal frameworks be adapted to address forms of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment resulting from the misuse of neurotechnologies while also preserving applications that provide for legitimate therapies and treatment?
2. What technical standards and safeguards are necessary to prevent the misuse of neurotechnologies in detention facilities?
3. How should the right to privacy be defined and protected in an era of neurotechnologies and the increasingly advanced monitoring capabilities of the human nervous system?
4. What oversight mechanisms and accountability frameworks will prove most effective for governing

the use of neurotechnologies in justice systems?

5. How can the benefits of neurotechnologies for the prevention of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment be made more accessible in resource-constrained environments where the need for safeguards may prove greatest?

END NOTES

1 Hramov, A. E., Maksimenko, V. A., & Pisarchik, A. N. (2021). Physical principles of brain–computer interfaces and their applications for rehabilitation, robotics and control of human brain states. *Physics Reports*, *918*, 1-133.

2 Al-Ayyad, M., Owida, H. A., De Fazio, R., Al-Naami, B., & Visconti, P. (2023). Electromyography monitoring systems in rehabilitation: A review of clinical applications, wearable devices and signal acquisition methodologies. *Electronics*, *12*(7), 1520.

3 Georgiev, D. D., Georgieva, I., Gong, Z., Nanjappan, V., & Georgiev, G. V. (2021). Virtual reality for neurorehabilitation and cognitive enhancement. *Brain sciences*, *11*(2), 221.

4 See further: Pustilnik, A. C. (2013). Neurotechnologies at the intersection of criminal procedure and constitutional law; Ienca, M., & Andorno, R. (2017). Towards new human rights in the age of neuroscience and neurotechnology. *Life sciences, society and policy*, *13*, 1-27.

5 See, for example: Gjini, K., Boutros, N. N., Haddad, L., Aikins, D., Javanbakht, A., Amirsadri, A., & Tancer, M. E. (2013). Evoked potential correlates of post-traumatic stress disorder in refugees with history of exposure to torture. *Journal of psychiatric research*, *47*(10), 1492-1498; Elbert, T., Schauer, M., Ruf, M., Weierstall, R., Neuner, F., Rockstroh, B., & Junghöfer, M. (2015). The tortured brain. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*;

6 Moreno, A., & Grodin, M. A. (2002). Torture and its neurological sequelae. *Spinal Cord*, *40*(5), 213-223.

7 King, B. J., Read, G. J., & Salmon, P. M. (2024). The risks associated with the use of brain-computer interfaces: a systematic review. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, *40*(2), 131-148. See also: Botes, M. W. M. (2022, June). Brain Computer Interfaces and Human Rights: Brave new rights for a brave new world. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 1154-1161).

8 Marzbani H, Marateb HR, Mansourian M. Neurofeedback: A Comprehensive Review on System Design, Methodology and Clinical Applications. Basic Clin Neurosci. 2016 Apr;7(2):143-58. doi: 10.15412/J.BCN.03070208. PMID: 27303609; PMCID: PMC4892319.

9 Askovic, M., Watters, A. J., Aroche, J., & Harris, A. W. (2017). Neurofeedback as an adjunct therapy for treatment of chronic posttraumatic stress disorder related to refugee trauma and torture experiences: two case studies. *Australasian Psychiatry*, *25*(4), 358-363.

10 Choi, Y. J., Choi, E. J., & Ko, E. (2023). Neurofeedback effect on symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Applied psychophysiology and biofeedback*, *48*(3), 259-274. See also: Askovic, M., Soh, N., Elhindi, J., & Harris, A. W. (2023). Neurofeedback for post-traumatic stress disorder: systematic review and meta-analysis of clinical and neurophysiological outcomes. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, *14*(2), 2257435; Burback, L., Brult-Phillips, S., Nijdam, M. J., McFarlane, A., & Vermetten, E. (2024). Treatment of posttraumatic stress disorder: A state-of-the-art review. *Current neuropharmacology*, *22*(4), 557-635.

11 Tesink, V., Douglas, T., Forsberg, L., Ligthart, S., & Meynen, G. (2023). Neurointerventions in criminal justice: on the scope of the moral right to bodily integrity. *Neuroethics*, *16*(3), 26.

12 Van de Pol, N. (2023). Neuro-Interventions in Criminal Justice: An Analysis of Article 3 ECHR. European human rights law review, (5), 459-476.

13 See: https://www.mayoclinic.org/tests-procedures/transcranial-magnetic-stimulation/about/pac-20384625

14 Navarro, M. S., & Dura-Bernal, S. (2023). Human Rights Systems of Protection from Neurotechnologies that Alter Brain Activity. *Drexel L. Rev.*, *15*, 893.

15 Sententia, W. (2004). Neuroethical considerations: cognitive liberty and converging technologies for improving human cognition. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1013*(1), 221-228.

16 Giakoumis, D., Drosou, A., Cipresso, P., Tzovaras, D., Hassapis, G., Gaggioli, A., & Riva, G. (2012). Real-time monitoring of behavioural parameters related to psychological stress. *Annual Review of Cybertherapy and Telemedicine 2012*, 287-291.

17 See, for example: Rickli, J. M., & Ienca, M. (2021). The security and military implications of neurotechnology and artificial intelligence. *Clinical Neurotechnology Meets Artificial Intelligence: Philosophical, Ethical, Legal and Social Implications*, 197-214; S O'Mara, The captive brain: torture and the neuroscience of humane interrogation, QJM: An International Journal of Medicine, Volume 111, Issue 2, February 2018, Pages 73–78, Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/qjmed/hcx252. See also: GCSP, Neurotechnologies and Future Warfare, 9 December 2020, Available at: https://www.gcsp.ch/news/neurotechnologies-and-future-warfare

18 Stoller, S. E., & Wolpe, P. R. (2007). Emerging neurotechnologies for lie detection and the fifth amendment. *American Journal of Law & Medicine*, *33*(2-3), 359-375.

19 Stieglitz, T. (2021). Why Neurotechnologies? about the purposes, opportunities and limitations of neurotechnologies in clinical applications. *Neuroethics*, *14*(1), 5-16.

20 Leuthardt, E. C., Moran, D. W., & Mullen, T. R. (2021). Defining surgical terminology and risk for brain computer interface technologies. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *15*, 599549.

21 See, for example: González Pinto, L. (2022). The United Nations Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture: The Effects of Preventive Action. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, *14*(1), 134-159; Jefferson, A. M. (2024). Prison reform and torture prevention under 'compromised circumstances'. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, *24*(2), 413-429.

22 Giacobbe, P., Burhan, A. M., Waxman, R., & Ng, E. (2023). Interventional psychiatry and neurotechnologies: education and ethics training. *Canadian Journal of Neurological Sciences*, *50*(s1), s10-s16. See also: Cometa, A., Falasconi, A., Biasizzo, M., Carpaneto, J., Horn, A., Mazzoni, A., & Micera, S. (2022). Clinical neuroscience and neurotechnology: An amazing symbiosis. *Iscience*, *25*(10).

23 Yuste, R. (2023). Advocating for neurodata privacy and neurotechnology regulation. *Nature protocols*, *18*(10), 2869-2875.

24 Kempes, M. (2023). Added value of neurotechnology for forensic psychiatric and psychological assessment. *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*, *197*, 217-232.

25 Holmen, S. J. (2021). Neurointerventions and informed consent. *Journal of medical ethics*, *47*(12), e86-e86.

26 See further: Yuste, R. (2023). Advocating for neurodata privacy and neurotechnology regulation. *Nature protocols*, *18*(10), 2869-2875; Bublitz, C. (2024). Neurotechnologies and human rights: restating and reaffirming the multi-layered protection of the person. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, *28*(5), 782-807.

27 See further: A/HRC/58/58: Foundations and principles for the regulation of neurotechnologies and the processing of neurodata from the perspective of the right to privacy - Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy, Ana Brian Nougrères. Available at: https://www.ohchr.org/en/documents/thematic-reports/ahrc5858-foundations-and-principles-regulation-neurotechnologies-and

28 Article 1, UN Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, Available at: https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-against-torture-and-other-cruel-inhuman-or-degrading

29 Collins, B., & Klein, E. (2023). Invasive Neurotechnology: A study of the concept of Invasiveness in Neuroethics. *Neuroethics*, *16*(1), 11.

30 See further: Ruiz, S., Valera, L., Ramos, P., & Sitaram, R. (2024). Neurorights in the Constitution: from neurotechnology to ethics and politics. *Philosophical Transactions B*, *379*(1915), 20230098; See also: Farahany, N. A. (2023). *The battle for your brain: defending the right to think freely in the age of neurotechnology*. St. Martin's Press.

31 Meynen, G., Van de Pol, N., Tesink, V., & Ligthart, S. (2023). Neurotechnology to reduce recidivism: Ethical and legal challenges. *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*, *197*, 265-276.

THE GENEVA ACADEMY

The Geneva Academy provides post-graduate education, conducts academic legal research and policy studies, and organizes training courses and expert meetings. We concentrate on branches of international law that relate to situations of armed conflict, protracted violence, and protection of human rights.

DISCLAIMER

The Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights is an independent academic centre. Our publications seek to provide insights, analysis and recommendations, based on open and primary sources, to policymakers, researchers, media, the private sector and the interested public. The designations and presentation of materials used, including their respective citations, do not imply the expression of any opinion on the part of the Geneva Academy concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its boundaries. The views expressed in this publication represent those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Geneva Academy, its donors, parent institutions, the board or those who have provided input or participated in peer review. The Geneva Academy welcomes the consideration of a wide range of perspectives in pursuing a well-informed debate on critical policies, issues and developments in international human rights and humanitarian law.

GENEVA ACADEMY
of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights
a joint centre of
GENEVA GRADUATE INSTITUTE
UNIVERSITÉ DE GENÈVE

Villa Moynier
Rue de Lausanne 120B
CP 1063 - 1211 Geneva 1 - Switzerland

Phone: +41 (22) 908 44 83
Email: info@geneva-academy.ch
www.geneva-academy.ch