



Spy the Lie: Former CIA Officers Teach You How to Detect Deception

Philip Houston , Michael Floyd , Susan Carnicero , Don Tennant

[Download now](#)

[Read Online](#) ➔

Spy the Lie: Former CIA Officers Teach You How to Detect Deception

Philip Houston , Michael Floyd , Susan Carnicero , Don Tennant

Spy the Lie: Former CIA Officers Teach You How to Detect Deception Philip Houston , Michael Floyd , Susan Carnicero , Don Tennant

Three former CIA officers - among the world's foremost authorities on recognizing deceptive behavior - share their proven techniques for uncovering a lie.

Imagine how different your life would be if you could tell whether someone was lying or telling you the truth. Be it hiring a new employee, investing in a financial interest, speaking with your child about drugs, confronting your significant other about suspected infidelity, or even dating someone new, having the ability to unmask a lie can have far-reaching and even life-altering consequences.

As former CIA officers, Philip Houston, Michael Floyd, and Susan Carnicero are among the world's best at recognizing deceptive behavior. *Spy the Lie* chronicles the captivating story of how they used a methodology Houston developed to detect deception in the counterterrorism and criminal investigation realms, and shows how these techniques can be applied in our daily lives.

Through fascinating anecdotes from their intelligence careers, the authors teach listeners how to recognize deceptive behaviors, both verbal and nonverbal, that we all tend to display when we respond to questions untruthfully. For the first time, they share with the general public their methodology and their secrets to the art of asking questions that elicit the truth.

Spy the Lie is a game-changer. You may never experience another book that has a more dramatic impact on your career, your relationships, or your future.

©2012 Philip Houston, Susan Carnicero, Don Tennant, Michael Floyd (P)2012 Macmillan

Spy the Lie: Former CIA Officers Teach You How to Detect Deception Details

Date : Published July 17th 2012 by St. Martin's Press (first published 2012)

ISBN :

Author : Philip Houston , Michael Floyd , Susan Carnicero , Don Tennant

Format : Kindle Edition 272 pages

Genre : Psychology, Nonfiction, Self Help, Science, Business

 [Download Spy the Lie: Former CIA Officers Teach You How to Detec ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online Spy the Lie: Former CIA Officers Teach You How to Det ...pdf](#)

Download and Read Free Online Spy the Lie: Former CIA Officers Teach You How to Detect Deception Philip Houston , Michael Floyd , Susan Carnicero , Don Tennant

From Reader Review Spy the Lie: Former CIA Officers Teach You How to Detect Deception for online ebook

Donna says

This is nonfiction and it is exactly what the title says it is....a book about determining if someone is lying to you. This book was just okay for me. It didn't rock my world. I had to laugh a few times though because I've raised 5 children....and some of my 'mom techniques' were also used by the CIA....who knew. Lie detection is something we all try to do, so I guess I was expecting some secret insight here but there wasn't anything new regarding lie detection. I also think this was entirely too long.....maybe a pamphlet would have been nice. So 2 stars.

Kent Winward says

A nice primer on how to tell if someone is lying. Honest.

Laura Leaney says

A layman's manual for detecting a liar, this book was interesting from a psychological perspective. Still, I think you'd have to be using the authors' system on a continual basis in order to keep all the things you're supposed to look for (in the person you're interviewing) in mind. I haven't been interrogated since I was pressed by my parents to "give up the truth," and I'm left wondering if I'd so easily exhibit the tells of the liar if I were trying to hide something. It's thought provoking.

I've a sinking feeling that I get lied to frequently by students who drum up the most creative excuses - but I rarely follow up because I simply feel awful for insinuating a kid might be cheating. However, this book does explain the kinds of questions one might use to determine the truth while still remaining non-confrontational. These might be useful.

Kathryn Bain says

I was given this book by a friend for research purposes for a manuscript I'm working on. Some of the information was very informative. However, the examples were a bit cumbersome and lengthy. I also hate any book that says this is an example of ... (but we'll discuss that later in chapter 10). This was done quite a few times in the first couple of chapters. It makes me feel like you stuck a commercial in your book to try to keep me interested.

Nuel Sitanggang says

Teknik deception-detection yang diperkenalkan di buku ini adalah mengenali indikator-indikator kebohongan yang muncul seperti dokter bedah menandai bagian tubuh yang akan dioperasi sehingga bisa lebih fokus di daerah tersebut. Tapi deception-detection tidak serta merta berhenti pada observasi indikator yang mencurigakan, karena konteks sangat berpengaruh. Menggunakan pemilihan pertanyaan yang tepat dan mengamati kekonsistenan dan keterkaitan satu pernyataan dengan pernyataan lainnya membutuhkan pemikiran yang kritis dan tidak jarang menuntut kita untuk berpikir selangkah lebih maju didepan orang yang sedang berusaha menutupi kebohongannya.

Bukunya ringan, informatif, dan menyertakan studi kasus dari beberapa transkrip wawancara. Dari buku ini aku mengerti mengapa interogasi polisi, dan wawancara sering mengajukan pertanyaan-pertanyaan yang menyebalkan. Pertanyaan-pertanyaan tersebut membuat yang diwawancara merasa tidak nyaman. Ketika ada kebohongan, indikatornya akan terlihat lebih jelas.

Tapi perlu diperhatikan buku ini tidak akan membuatmu menjadi ahli. Buku ini mendorong untuk lebih observan dan kritis dengan menunjukkan detail apa yang perlu diperhatikan dan dikritisi, tapi bukan langkah eksak untuk setiap keadaan. Penggunaan yang keliru bisa membuat hubunganmu dengan orang lain menjadi renggang karena dicap judgemental. Lebih baik baca versi aslinya, karena buku ini banyak memeriksa transkrip percakapan yang kalo diterjemahkan malah jadi aneh.

BetseaK says

This audiobook was a light, informative and entertaining listen, with some good tips and illustrative life examples. After a bit slow start, a very good narration kept me interested and entertained. I was a little surprised to learn that the good-natured, nice guy type is better at detecting deception than the cold, dispassionate one. I particularly liked the descriptions of the three categories of lies (the lies of commission, the lies of omission and the lies of influence) and the part on popular misconceptions regarding micro-expressions, such as poor eye-contact.

Being a general reader, I found a sample narrative analysis in Appendixes a little too long and detailed for my taste and had to force myself to listen it to the end.

Overall, this book does a good job of outlining what detecting and evaluating deception looks like to those who are trained but it won't quickly teach you how to do it yourself. If you are a normal adult person, it will give names to your common sense approaches to identifying deception. Bearing in mind that you should not jump to conclusions based on a single sign of deceptive behaviour and that this book must be employed with understanding that what it yields is information that requires further examination and training, some tips and questions it provides could be used as an effective tool in resolving everyday situations.

Warning: Don't ask a question until you are sure you really want to know the answer! :)

Jeff Price says

Despite the title, the authors are not revealing any CIA secrets. All the information on the techniques is freely available in the public domain. So I guess I managed to spy the lie.

Secondly, the authors are keen to try and sex up the book with lines like "we can't reveal the location of this

interview as it could compromise our field officers".

Thirdly the scenarios that are used to illustrate the effectiveness simply aren't are credible. For example, one of the CIA's finest prepares for the next interview by reading "Omar's" (the next subject) file. During the interview Omar asks to use the bathroom. On his return to the room he carries a towel. He spreads the towel on the floor at which stage our CIA man is bewildered by Omar's behaviour. When Omar prostrates himself on the floor our star interviewer realises that Omar is a Muslim and he's praying. Very astute.

I guess this explains why the CIA use water boarding as an interview technique.

On the plus side I managed to read the book in a couple of hours although I can't reveal the location.

Sajid khan says

1. To hide their lies people try to show their good side and feeds and their truthfulness. We need to ignore their truthful behaviour do that it is not processed. Ignoring it will help us manage bias, make decisions about persons veracity and filter extra information making deception spotting easy.

2. FAILURE TO ANSWER. If you ask someone a question and he doesn't give you what you ask for, there's a reason for that. One possible reason is that the facts aren't on his side, and he's trying to figure out how to deal with that. Now, should you immediately conclude that the person is lying because he didn't give you what you asked for? Absolutely not. Always remember the cluster rule—we need more than just that single behavior. After all, there could be other explanations. Have you ever spoken with someone who just can't seem to get to the point? Or the person might not have understood the question, or thought he heard a different question.

3. DENIAL PROBLEMS. Closely related to the failure to answer is the absence of an explicit denial of something in your question that involves an act of wrongdoing, or has consequences associated with it.

4. Nonspecific denial. If the "no" statement is delivered in a way that's more of a general focus than a specific expression of denial of the matter at hand ("I didn't do anything," "I would never do something like that"), that's also significant. It's subtle, but if a person says he didn't do anything, psychologically he's letting himself off the hook so he doesn't have to tell the bald-faced lie, "I didn't do it." It's a nuance that's easily missed by an untrained ear.

- Isolated delivery of denial. If in response to a question about wrongdoing, a person gives you a "no" response, but buries it in a long-winded answer, that's important. If the percentage of the answer that relates to the denial is relatively small, that's a bad thing. Consider it a deceptive indicator.

5. REPEATING THE QUESTION. Why might a deceptive person repeat a question? We think of it as buying time, and ultimately that's the goal. But what's happening, according to behavioral psychologists, is he's probably trying to fill in what would otherwise appear to be a very awkward moment of silence. Silence in response to a question is almost universally perceived as deceptive. So rather than just sit there in stone silence with a blank look on his face, he'll repeat the question to give himself time to think. What's interesting about this is that while it might take only two to three seconds to repeat the question, let's do the math. If a person thinks ten times faster than he speaks, he's just bought himself twenty to thirty seconds' worth of what he hopes will be good response material. As always, it's important to remember the cluster rule here. There are perfectly legitimate reasons to repeat a question—perhaps the person didn't hear it, or wants to ensure he understands it. And sometimes, it's just a habit.

6.

NONANSWER STATEMENTS. The psychology behind nonanswer statements is much the same as that associated with repeating the question—avoiding that awkward silence and buying time to figure out how to respond. These are things that people say that don't provide what you ask for: "That's a good question," or "I'm glad you asked that." Sometimes, these can provide you with useful information. We often hear the nonanswer statement, "I knew you were going to ask me that." Why is that statement made in response to this particular question? Without realizing it, the person may be cluing us in on what he's thinking or worried about.

NONANSWER STATEMENTS

"That's a good question."

"I'm glad you asked that."

"I knew you were going to ask me that."

7. INCONSISTENT STATEMENTS. "It is not without good reason said, that he who has not good memory should never take upon him the trade of lying." So said Michel Eyquem de Montaigne, who well knew that keeping your story straight when the truth isn't your ally is a formidable task. When a person makes a statement about an issue of interest to you, and subsequently makes a statement that's not consistent with what she said previously, and she doesn't explain why the story has changed, that is significant.

8. GOING INTO ATTACK MODE. Being backed into a corner by the facts of a situation can put a lot of strain on a deceptive person, and can compel him to go on the attack. This might take the form of an attempt to impeach your credibility or competence, with questions like, "How long have you been doing this job?" or "Do you know anything about our organization?" or "Why are you wasting my time with this stuff?" What he's trying to do is to get you to back off, to start questioning yourself on whether you're going down the right path. Kids will often give this a shot when confronted by their parents. Questions like, "Why do you always pick on me?" and "Why don't you trust me?" fall into this category.

9. INAPPROPRIATE QUESTIONS. Some schools of thought suggest that answering a question with a question is deceptive, but we would say that's not necessarily the case. What concerns us is when we ask a question, and the response is a question that doesn't directly relate to the question we asked.

10. OVERLY SPECIFIC ANSWERS. Deceptive people might be overly specific in two ways, and they're almost polar opposites. One way is they will answer a question too technically, or too narrowly. When Phil ran the internal affairs operation within the CIA, he required all of his investigators to ask employees being interviewed, "What do you do here at the Agency? What's your job?" Obviously, the investigators wouldn't have gone into the interview without knowing that. The purpose was something of a test. We found that truthful people tended to respond succinctly with a job title: "I'm a case officer," or "I'm an analyst." Deceptive people tended to provide a job description, offering specific information intended to manage the investigator's perception of them. What's interesting is that everything they said was the truth. But the purpose was to create that halo effect.

11. INAPPROPRIATE LEVEL OF POLITENESS. We're certainly not at all suspicious of someone who's just a nice person. But if, in response to a question, a person suddenly increases the level of nicety, that's significant. Perhaps the person says, "Yes, ma'am" in that particular response, but at no other time in the interview. Or a compliment might be injected during the response: "That's a great tie, by the way." The idea here is that the more we like someone, the more we're inclined to believe him and to shy away from

confrontation. The person is using politeness as a means of promoting his likability.

12. **INAPPROPRIATE LEVEL OF CONCERN.** If the facts are not a person's ally, he's put into a hole from which he needs to try to extricate himself. A person in this position doesn't have much going for him, so he might resort to a strategy of attempting to diminish the importance of the issue. Typically, he'll focus on either the issue or the process, and try to equalize the exchange by doing the questioning: "Why is this such a big deal?" or "Why is everybody worried about that?" The person might even attempt to joke about the issue, which can be especially inappropriate.

13. **PROCESS OR PROCEDURAL COMPLAINTS.** Sometimes, a person won't necessarily go on the attack, but will still attempt to play offense rather than defense by taking issue with the proceedings. Questions like "Why are you asking me?" or "How long is this going to take?" fall into this category. They may be a delaying tactic, similar to repeating the question or making nonanswer statements, or they may be an attempt at deflection in the hope of steering the proceedings down a different path.

14. **INVOKING RELIGION.** When a person brings God into the equation, he's engaging in an extreme form of what psychologists call "dressing up the lie," and it can be very effective. After all, what do you have in your briefcase that tops God? So, you need to recognize responses that include such phrases as "I swear to God" or "As God is my witness" for what they may well be: an attempt to dress up a lie in its Sunday best before presenting it to you.

15. **QUALIFIERS.** There are two types of qualifiers that are potential deceptive indicators: exclusion qualifiers and perception qualifiers. Exclusion qualifiers enable people who want to withhold certain information to answer your question truthfully without releasing that information. Examples of qualifiers of this type include "basically," "for the most part," "fundamentally," "probably," and "most often." Perception qualifiers are used to enhance credibility: "frankly," "to be perfectly honest," and "candidly" are examples. Keep in mind that we all have speech habits and patterns that can account for the presence of these qualifiers, so again, remember the cluster rule. Also, we don't count each qualifier as a separate indicator. Consider the use of multiple qualifiers in response to a question as one indicator. There can be a lot of them in a single response.

16. **BEHAVIORAL PAUSE OR DELAY.** You ask a person a question and you initially get nothing. After a delay, he begins to respond. How long does a delay have to be before it's meaningful, before you would consider it a deceptive indicator? Well, it depends.

Try this exercise on a friend: Ask her the question, "On this date seven years ago, what were you doing that day?" The person will invariably pause before responding, because it's not a question that naturally evokes an immediately response—the person has to think about it, and likely still won't be able to offer a meaningful response. Now ask her, "On this date seven years ago, did you rob a gas station?" If your friend pauses before responding, you probably need to choose your friends more carefully. Much more likely, there will be no pause—your friend will immediately respond, "No!" or "Of course not!" It's a simple exercise, but it drives home the point that the delay needs to be considered in the context of whether it's appropriate for the question. A second variable is whether the delay is appropriate for the person. In the course of an interview, for example, a pattern will naturally develop that gives you a sense of how much time elapses before the person responds to your questions. If we see something that falls outside of that established pattern, then we have a concern.

17. **VERBAL/NONVERBAL DISCONNECT.** Our brains are wired in a way that causes our verbal and nonverbal behaviors to naturally match up. So when there's a disconnect, we consider that a potential

deceptive indicator.

A common verbal/nonverbal disconnect to watch out for occurs when a person nods affirmatively while saying, “No,” or turns his head from side to side while saying, “Yes.” As an exercise, if you were to perform that mismatch in response to a question, you’d find that you really have to force yourself through the motion. Yet, a deceptive person will potentially do it without even thinking about it.

There are a couple of caveats associated with this particular indicator. First, this indicator is only applicable in a narrative response, not in a one-word or short-phrase response. Consider, for example, that a person’s head might make a sharp nodding motion when he says “No!” That’s not a disconnect; it’s simple emphasis. Second, it’s important to keep in mind that in some cultures, a nodding motion doesn’t mean “yes,” and a side-to-side head motion doesn’t mean “no.” So, you need to ensure you’re familiar with the cultural patterns of the person who’s being questioned.

18. HIDING THE MOUTH OR EYES. A deceptive person will often hide her mouth or eyes when she’s being untruthful. There is a natural tendency to want to cover over a lie, so if a person’s hand goes in front of her mouth while she’s responding to a question, that’s significant. Similarly, there’s a natural inclination to shield oneself from the reaction of those who are being lied to. If a person shields her eyes while she’s responding to a question, what she might well be indicating, on a subconscious level, is that she can’t bear to see the reaction to the whopper she’s telling. This shielding may be accomplished with a hand, or the person might even close her eyes. We’re not referring to blinking here, but if a person closes her eyes while responding to a question that does not require reflection to answer, we consider that a means of hiding the eyes, and a likely deceptive indicator.

19. THROAT-CLEARING OR SWALLOWING. If a person clears his throat or performs a significant swallow prior to answering the question, that’s a potential problem. If he does it after he answers, that doesn’t bother us. But if he does it before he answers, a couple of things might be happening. He might be doing the nonverbal equivalent of the verbal “I swear to God . . .”—dressing up the lie in its Sunday best before presenting it to us. Or physiologically, the question might have created a spike in anxiety, which can cause discomfort or dryness in the mouth and throat.

20. HAND-TO-FACE ACTIVITY. While you’re in L-squared mode, be on the lookout for anything a person does with his face or in the head region in response to your question. This often takes the form of biting or licking the lips, or pulling on the lips or ears. The reason goes back to simple high school science. You’ve asked a question, and the question creates a spike in anxiety because a truthful response would be incriminating. That, in turn, triggers the autonomic nervous system to go to work to dissipate the anxiety. One of the ways it does that is by kicking in the fight-or-flight response. The person’s body is rerouting circulation to his vital organs and major muscle groups so he can run faster, jump higher, fight harder in response to the threat. Where does that blood come from? It comes from blood-rich regions of the body that can temporarily do with a diminished supply of blood—typically, the surfaces of the face, the ears, and the extremities. When the blood rushes away from those regions, it irritates the capillaries, which can create a sensation of cold or itchiness. Without the person even realizing it, his hands are drawn to those areas, or there’s a wringing or rubbing of the hands. Boom!—you’ve spotted a deceptive indicator.

21. ANCHOR-POINT MOVEMENT. Beyond these physiological reactions, the body also dissipates this anxiety through other forms of physical activity, most notably “anchor-point” movements.

A person’s anchor points are those parts of his body that anchor him in a particular spot or position. If a person is standing, his primary anchor points are his feet. His secondary anchor points might be his arms if

they're folded in front of him, or they might be his hands if he's standing with his hands on his hips or in his pockets. We're not worried about his posture; we're only looking at those anchor points.

If a person is sitting in a chair, his primary anchor points would be his buttocks, his back, and his feet. We always consider both feet as anchor points, even if he has his legs crossed and one foot is in the air. In fact, if everything else is locked down, that foot in the air might be the most likely anchor point to move as the body works to dissipate anxiety, because it's the point of least resistance. Secondary anchor points might be an elbow on the arm of the chair, or hands resting in the lap. Bear in mind that we do not consider each anchor-point movement as a separate deceptive indicator. So, if there is anchor point movement in response to your question, regardless of how many anchor points move, count that as just one deceptive behavior.

It's worth mentioning here that when we interview someone, the last place we would want the interviewee to sit is in a straight-back chair with four legs. We want the person in a chair that has wheels, that rocks and swivels, that might even have moveable arm rests. That type of chair becomes a behavioral amplifier, magnifying those anchor-point movements and making them particularly easy to spot.

22. GROOMING GESTURES. Another way that some people may dissipate anxiety is through physical activity in the form of grooming oneself or the immediate surroundings. Let's get a sense of what this looks like.

In a more typical setting, when responding to a question, a deceptive man might adjust his tie or shirt cuffs, or maybe his glasses. An untruthful woman might move a few strands of hair behind her ear, or straighten her skirt. We're also concerned with sweat management. That a person might be sweating doesn't bother us, but if he takes out his handkerchief (or, perhaps more likely, a hand sans kerchief) and wipes the sweat off his brow when responding to a question, that's significant.

Tidying up the surroundings is another form of grooming gesture. You ask a question, and suddenly the phone isn't turned the right way, the glass of water is too close, or the pencil isn't in the right place. Like anchor-point movements, count all of these grooming gestures that come within the response to a single question as a single deceptive indicator.

23. A particular question that often causes revealing unintended messages to surface is one we call the "Punishment Question." You ask the suspect, "What do you think should happen to the person who did this?"

This question has been routinely asked in interviews of suspects since at least the 1970s, and it's probably the least understood and most misused question employed by law enforcement officers today. If you are interviewing the guilty party, you are, in effect, asking the person to sentence himself. The theory is that the guilty party will, naturally, suggest a relatively light punishment. On the other hand, the theory goes, the response of a person who is innocent will likely reflect a stiffer punishment, and an especially harsh one for heinous crimes.

The problem with this theory is that it's easy for some to see through the thrust of the question, so deceptive people respond with what they presume we expect to hear from a truthful, innocent person. Not uncommonly, they respond with a harsh punishment—something like "He should be locked up for life." Analyzing a response to the Punishment Question requires caution. We are completely unfazed by a response that advocates strong punishment, because it's a response that's equally likely to come from truthful and deceptive people. On the other hand, our experience has demonstrated that if a suspect's response reflects an abnormally lenient punishment, that raises a red flag that suggests we're dealing with a deceptive person. Let's examine what this looks like in actual cases.

24. PRESENT A CLEAR STIMULUS:

Remember, the model is only as good as the questions you ask in the course of employing it. Since the behavior you're analyzing is the direct result of a stimulus—your question—it follows that your presentation of the stimulus is critical to the accuracy and usefulness of your analysis. Here are four tips to keep in mind when you formulate your question to ensure that it's as clear as you can make it:

Keep it short. When possible, keep your question shorter rather than longer. As we noted in chapter 3, the individual you're questioning is likely thinking ten times faster than you're speaking. So if you ask a long, drawn-out, rambling question, that can be problematic if his agenda is to try to avoid answering your question or to provide a response that's misleading.

Keep it simple. Some people try to convey their level of intellect by means of complex sentence structure and highbrow vocabulary. Make sure you don't fall into that trap—if the person doesn't fully understand your question, his response is less likely to be behaviorally significant.

Alex says

(3.5)

Glenda says

The authors have developed a deception detection system which has worked for them in law enforcement, intelligence operations, and domestic settings. The system is presented in a concise and organized manner, with helpful appendices. The book also works surprisingly well as an audiobook both due to the organization of the material and the well-chosen reader. However some of the examples are belabored, especially the extensively annotated transcripts of interviews of Anthony Weiner and Jerry Sandusky. We did not need a system in order to perceive that those two lied.

Gareth Otton says

I have read a number of books on being better at lie detection and for the most part I have been severely underwhelmed. Normally these books are full of subjective lessons that are about as useful as flipping a coin to decide whether or not someone is lying... that might even be a generous analogy.

However, this book was surprisingly interesting in that I feel that a lot of what I just read could actually be very useful in a real world application. I think that a lot of this is because at no point during the book does the author make the claim that this is an exact science. He instead lays out a series of guidelines and specifically tells the reader over and over again that in order for this to be used appropriately a cluster of these behaviours need to be displayed quite close together.

This information which seemed to be well researched and well tested in real life environments by the CIA and other law enforcement officers has been neatly broken up in this book into easy to understand chapters and lessons. I am sure that in order to learn these techniques properly it will take reading this book a number of times and practicing them a great deal but I am impressed that not only does this seem like a worthwhile effort, it is also something I am quite interested in doing.

Overall this was a good book and something I genuinely feel will be useful if learned properly. Of all the books I have read on this subject, this is the one that I would recommend reading.

James Rye says

It may be nerdy to admit it, but I thoroughly enjoyed this book. The writer, Don Tennant, manages to take the experience of three authoritative CIA operators and turn it into a very readable account of how to get better at detecting deceit.

This doesn't re-hash popular, generalized, untrue myths that already exist about certain types of body language. It exposes their weakness. But what it does do is provide a detailed and extensive template of both verbal and non-verbal behaviour linked to possible deceit. It encourages the reader to examine the context, and then point out that if clusters of these behaviours exist out of context, there is further work to do in digging for the truth.

Although the theory is very readable, it is frequently illustrated with transcripts from interviews, and at the end of the book, also contains two quite extensive interviews showing theory in practice. The material is drawn from personnel interviews, family disputes, major crime, and international terrorism.

I have always know that, when interviewed, many politicians try to avoid difficult questions. This book has left me confident that I will be more sensitive to political wriggles, and more able to label what is happening. I also feel that I will now be more aware of when clients are hiding something.

Jane says

Fascinating. The authors are not polished, and the book is a bit rambling and wanders off into anecdotes and explanations in the middle of a list, but the information I sifted out were very useful. It busts a few myths about how to detect lies, and reminds people not to take one behavior by itself as significant. It also points out that the questions used in an interview (or interrogation) can make or break the quest for the truth.

Owen says

This is a useful and interesting book. I listened to it on tape, then immediately bought two copies. The premise is that lying is something that makes people uncomfortable; while this is a known fact, this book explores some of the behaviors that this discomfort causes. Then, it proceeds to demonstrate these behaviors with excerpts from famous interviews. If this sounds a lot like the show Lie To Me from a few years ago (at least the first season), this is some similiarity. However, the show focused on microexpressions happening in fractions of a second; the book focuses on noticing what people say and how they answer questions rather than requiring you to have incredible detection powers. It even shows how analyzing transcripts can lead to signs of deception.

One of the ways that people deal with their discomfort about lying is by telling a truth- just not the truth. They answer a different question than the one that was asked- "Did you steal the laptop?" "I don't steal." In their head, this might be the truth, but it's not answering the question. Or they'll answer with a question-

“Why would I steal a laptop? I’ve got plenty of money.” They might also use ‘convincing statements,’ treatises on how they are pillars of the community and would never do such things, and all of this in service to keep from lying. And this is before you get to the movement portion, the things that happen to a person once the autonomic nervous system has kicked in and the blood drains away from the non-essential parts of the body under stress (like, say, the face).

Also, the interrogation techniques were fascinating; the fact that an interviewer should never be combative flies in the face of every preconceived notion (and formulaic police procedural) I know. The most effective interviewers seemed to be shocked themselves by how effective a calm presence was in eliciting stunningly truthful information (as an aside, I understand the need for the tales of its effectiveness, and, while I’m a staunch proponent of the plural of anecdote not being ‘data’, I can see the necessity for entering them both as evidence and pure entertainment).

In short, read this book, and you’ll catch people lying to you.

Owen Gardner Finnegan

Denny says

Doesn't work very well as an audiobook, which sounds more like an extended infomercial for the authors' classes on detecting deception, for which they no doubt charge exorbitant fees. I may try to read the actual book someday to see if it's easier to absorb the lessons therein.
