*Supplementary Materials*

Supplementary Table 1. Experimental conditions and number of participants in each condition (Experiment 1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Prospective duration | Retrospective duration |
| New policy | 6 months | 1 year | 2 years | 5 years |
| 6 months | *n* = 60 | *n* = 62 | *n* = 59 | *n* = 61 | *n* = 61 |
| 1 year | *n* = 60 | *n* = 62 | *n* = 61 | *n* = 60 | *n* = 59 |
| 2 years | *n* = 60 | *n* = 59 | *n* = 60 | *n* = 62 | *n* = 60 |
| Permanent | *n* = 60 | *n* = 63 | *n* = 64 | *n* = 61 | *n* = 56 |

Supplementary Table 2. Willingness to approve the policy: Nonlinear effects (Experiment 1)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |   |   |   |   |
| Variable | Model 1 | Model 2 |
|   | *B* | *SE B* | *Exp(B)* | *B* | *SE B* | *Exp(B)* |
| Age  | 0.004 | 0.005 | 1.004 | 0.004 | 0.005 | 1.004 |
| Female | 0.410\*\* | 0.132 | 1.508 | 0.412 | 0.132 | 1.51 |
| Right-wing political views | 0.116\*\*\* | 0.027 | 1.123 | 0.116\*\*\* | 0.027 | 1.123 |
| In effect for 6 months | 0.601\*\* | 0.197 | 1.824 | 0.562\* | 0.217 | 1.754 |
| In effect for 1 year | 0.650\*\* | 0.199 | 1.915 | 0.611\*\* | 0.219 | 1.842 |
| In effect for 2 years | 0.877\*\*\* | 0.206 | 2.404 | 0.838\*\*\* | 0.226 | 2.311 |
| In effect for 5 years | 0.753\*\*\* | 0.204 | 2.123 | 0.714\*\* | 0.223 | 2.042 |
| Proposed for 6 months | 0.248 | 0.185 | 1.282 | 0.363 | 0.326 | 1.438 |
| Proposed for 1 year | 0.256 | 0.186 | 1.292 | 0.371 | 0.326 | 1.449 |
| Proposed for 2 years | 0.066 | 0.181 | 1.068 | 0.181 | 0.325 | 1.199 |
| Interaction (retrospective \* prospective) |  |  |  | 0.151 | 0.351 | 1.163 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Nagelkerke R2* | 0.067 |   |   | 0.067 |   |   |
| \*\*\**p* < .001. \*\**p* < .01. \**p* < .05. |

Supplementary materials, English translation of experimental instructions (Experiments 1-3):

In this part of the survey you will be presented with a dilemma that is currently on the agenda of Israeli politicians and public, and asked to provide your opinion about a possible solution.

Over the last few years, the security situation in Israel has deteriorated, with much severe violence committed by Palestinians, as well as by Jewish and Arab citizens. Israel has been fighting against terrorism in various ways; one of them is through the Israel Security Agency, the chief organization in charge of counterterrorism and the interrogation of suspects in terrorist activity.

For the last several years, the Security Agency has been having a free hand to employ enhanced interrogation techniques (torture) at its own deliberation, with no need to get approval from or report to any external entity, to extract information which can save people’s lives. So far, this policy has been applied only during interrogations of Arab terrorists.

**Lately, due to an increase in the amount and severity of Jewish terrorism, it has been suggested that the Security Agency should be allowed to employ** **enhanced interrogation techniques when interrogating Jewish terrorism suspects. If this new policy is introduced, the conditions of interrogation will be equal for all terrorists suspects, Jewish and Arab alike.**

Supporters of this suggestion argue that the detainees are determined not to provide any information for ideological reasons, and therefore, the Security Agency should be allowed to use harsh physical and mental measures to break their resistance and help security forces find Jewish terrorist cells, get information on planned terrorist activities and prevent military escalation.

Opponents of this suggestion argue that it is a blunt violation of human rights that freedom from torture is one of the most basic human rights essential to maintain human dignity, and therefore, use of torture in a democratic state which must defend its citizens’ rights is unthinkable of. Furthermore, use of enhanced techniques may lead to false confessions and provision of inaccurate information, and thus disrupt the investigation.

*Study 1*

*(It is suggested to approve this policy as a temporary policy that will require reconsideration after)/(The suggested policy has been in place for the past) (six months/one year/two years/five years)*. In your opinion, should this policy, that will allow the Security Agency to employ at its own deliberation enhanced interrogation techniques when needed, *(be approved for a limited period of)/(be prolonged for an additional) (six months/one year/ two years)*?

*Study 2*

*1st condition:*

Q1: In your opinion, should this policy, that will allow the Security Agency to employ at its own deliberation enhanced interrogation techniques when interrogating Jewish terrorism suspects, be approved for a limited period of six months?

*2nd condition:*

Q1: In your opinion, should this policy, that will allow the Security Agency to employ at its own deliberation enhanced interrogation techniques when interrogating Jewish terrorism suspects, be approved?

Q2: In your opinion, should this policy, that will allow the Security Agency to employ at its own deliberation enhanced interrogation techniques when interrogating Jewish terrorism suspects, be approved for a limited period of six months?

*Study 3:*

Below are several possible decisions regarding the suggestion to give the Security Agency a free hand to use enhanced interrogation techniques when interrogating Jewish suspects in terrorist activity. Please choose the one you would prefer:

1.Not to allow it at all.

2.To allow it for a period of *(six months/one year)*, after which it will be decided whether to continue with this policy or not.

3. To allow it for a period of *(one year/two years)*, after which it will be decided whether to continue with this policy or not.

4. To allow it for a period of *(two years/three years)*, after which it will be decided whether to continue with this policy or not.

5. To approve it permanently.