00:59:49:04  {START}

01:00:11  NARRATOR: Why would a woman obey phone
commands from a stranger to strip-search an innocent
employee?

    M: [She] pretty much got this victim trapped
in the office, totally naked.

    DONNA SUMMERS: But unless you’re put in that
situation, how do you know what you would do? You
don’t.

    NARRATOR: Why would four young men watch
their friend die, when they could have intervened to
save him?

1:00:34  FRAT BOY: Matt stopped breathing.

    M: This guy is in real trouble. You call
911.

    FRAT BOY: I had it typed into my phone. All
I had to do was press the green button. And I hit the
red button, and canceled it out.
M: When good people do nothing, evil prevails.

NARRATOR: How could good soldiers, with clean service records, suddenly descend into barbaric behavior?

M: Sometimes you cross a line. And it’s a thin line; at any time, that can be crossed by anybody, if placed in certain conditions.

F: [UI].

NARRATOR: The answer to these questions can be found in the human behavior experiments.

M: Hands off the door.

M: Hey! I don’t want anybody [UI].

M: {YELLING}

1:01:44 NARRATOR: In a unique period from the early ’60s to the early ’70s, a group of social scientists conducted a series of experiments examining the nature of human behavior in its relationship to social conventions and situations.

M: In this setting, I allow things to be done to me that I wouldn’t allow in any other context. The
dentist is about to put an electric drill into my mouth.

DENTIST: Open, please.

M: In this setting, I willingly expose my throat to a man with a razor blade.

1:02:17 NARRATOR: Stanley Milgram, one of the most influential social psychologists of the time, was particularly fascinated with the dangers of group behavior and blind obedience to authority.

M: What is there in human nature that allows an individual to act without any restraints whatsoever, so that he can act inhumanely, harshly, severely, and in no way limited by feelings of compassion or conscience? These are questions that concern me.

SUBJECT: But he might be dead in there!

RESEARCHER: The experiment requires you to continue.

SUBJECT: Three hundred and thirty volts.

{ZAP}

"VICTIM": Ahhhh!!

1:02:50 NARRATOR: The experiments that Milgram and others conducted were controversial.

{HIGH PITCHED NOISE}
M: Everybody out...

NARRATOR: ...and, for ethical reasons, may never be conducted again. Yet the results of those experiments remain groundbreaking, profoundly revealing about the tensions between the individual and society, and increasingly relevant to contemporary life.

In 1962, Stanley Milgram shocked the world with his study on obedience. To test his theories, he invented an electronic box that would become a window into human cruelty.

In ascending order, a row of buttons marked the amount of voltage one person would inflict upon another.

Milgram’s original motive for the experiment was to understand the unthinkable: how could the German people permit the extermination of the Jews?

“MILGRAM”: When I learn of incidents such as the massacre of millions of men, women and children perpetrated by the Nazis in World War II, how is it possible, I ask myself, that ordinary people, both courteous and decent in everyday life, can act callously, inhumanely, without any limitations of conscience?
Now there are some studies in my discipline, social psychology, that seem to provide a clue to this question.

M YELLING: [UI].

CROWD: [UI].

“MILGRAM”: The problem I wanted to study was a little different; it went a little bit further. It was the issue of authority. Under what conditions would a person obey authority who commanded actions that went against conscience? These are exactly the questions that I wanted to investigate at Yale University.

1:04:39 ANOTHER NARRATOR: It is May 1962. An experiment is being conducted in the elegant interaction laboratory at Yale University. The subjects are 40 males between the ages of 20 and 50, residing in the greater New Haven area.

M: Psychologists have developed several theories to explain how people learn. One theory is that people learn things correctly whenever they get punished for making a mistake.
NARRATOR: Forty years later, Milgram’s infamous experiment, Obedience, is still taught in classrooms around the world.

1:05:07 RESEARCHER: Would you open those, and tell me which of you is which, please?

M: Teacher.

M: Learner.

RESEARCHER: All right now, the next thing we’ll have to do is set the learner up, so that he can get some sort of punishment.

1:05:19 M: What inspired [uh] Milgram, I would say there were a number of factors. One of them is he was very ambitious. He wanted to make a mark in social psychology. And he wanted, ah, as he wrote to one friend, he wanted to come up with the most, with the boldest experiment that he could think of.

1:05:33 RESEARCHER: Would you roll up your right sleeve, please?

This electrode is connected to the shock generator in the next room. And this electrode paste is to provide a good contact, to avoid any blister or burn.
Do you have any questions now, before we go into the next room?

1:05:50  “VICTIM”: About two years ago, I was in the Veterans Hospital in West Haven.

RESEARCHER: Um hm.

“VICTIM”: And while there, they detected a heart condition. Nothing serious. But as long as I’m having these shocks, um, how strong are they? How dangerous are they?

1:06:02  RESEARCHER: Well, no. Although they may be painful, they’re not dangerous. Anything else?

“VICTIM”: No, that’s all.

RESEARCHER: All right. Teacher, would you take the test, and be seated in front of the shock generator, please, in the next room?

NARRATOR: But the experiment was rigged.

1:06:17  ANOTHER NARRATOR: The victim was an accomplice of the experimenter. The victim, according to plan, provided many wrong answers. His verbal responses were standardized on tape, and each protest was coordinated to a particular voltage level on the shock generator.
M: Now as teacher, you were seated in front of this impressive-looking instrument, the shock generator. Its essential feature is a line of switches that goes from 15 volts to 450 volts, and a set of verbal designations that goes from slight shock to moderate shock; strong shock, very strong shock; intense shock; extreme intensity shock; and finally, XXX — danger, severe shock.

Your job, the experimenter explains to you, is to teach the learner a simple word-pair test. If he gets each answer correctly, fine, you move on to the next pair. But if he makes a mistake, you are instructed to give an electric shock, starting with 15 volts {BUZZ}. And you increase the shock one step on each error. {BUZZ}

1:07:17 SUBJECT: Incorrect. You’ll now get a shock of 105 volts. {BUZZ}

“VICTIM”: Unh!

M: Hard head. Just how far can you go on this thing?

RESEARCHER: As far as is necessary.

SUBJECT: What do you mean, as far as is necessary?
RESEARCHER: To complete the test.

1:07:34 DR. THOMAS BLASS: Milgram was very much aware that obedience is a necessary ingredient for society to function. But he focused on the darker side of obedience.

{BUZZ}

SUBJECT: Incorrect. Hundred and fifty volts.

{SHOCK}

“VICTIM”: Unh!

SUBJECT: Sad face.

“VICTIM”: [UI]. That’s all! Get me out of here! I told you I had heart trouble! My heart’s starting to bother me now!

RESEARCHER: It’s absolutely essential that you continue. You have no other choice, Teacher.

SUBJECT: Oh, I have a lot of choices. My number-one choice is that I wouldn’t go on if I thought he was being harmed.

1:08:04 M: Now this man makes disobedience seem a very rational and simple deed. Our other subjects respond quite differently to the experimenter’s authority.

{BUZZ}
1:08:13 SUBJECT: Wrong. It’s hair. Seventy five volts, [Jim].

{BUZZ}

“VICTIM”: Unh!

SUBJECT: [UI].

RESEARCHER: Please continue.

M: Some psychologists were troubled by the ethics of it. Many, if not most subjects found it a highly stressful, conflicted experience. The people are stammering, stuttering, laughing hysterically, inappropriately.

SUBJECT: A hundred and fifty volts. {BUZZ}

“VICTIM”: Uhhh! Experimenter! That’s all! Get me out of here! I told you I had heart trouble. My heart’s starting to bother me now! Get me out of here, please! Let me out of here! You have no right to keep me here! Let me out! Let me out of here! Let me out!

1:08:51 RESEARCHER: Continue, please.

“VICTIM”: Let me out of here! My heart’s bothering me! Let me out!

RESEARCHER: Go on.

SUBJECT: [If you’re] responsible for it.
DR. THOMAS BLASS: Clearly, you know, when we see people went to the top of the shock board, it wasn’t like they were goin’ blithely, sadistically. People went stop and go, stop and go. They were in a state of conflict, which was, created a tremendous amount of stress. So that was the main critique.

SUBJECT: This will be at 330. {BUZZ}

“VICTIM”: Owww!

1:09:15

SUBJECT INTERVIEW: As his voice began to show increasing frustration, uh, so did I. And I was really in a state of, uh, real conflict and agitation. One of Stanley Milgram’s basic contributions was that you don’t ask people what they would do, given this hypothetical situation; you put them in the situation.

{BUZZ}

SUBJECT: Wrong!

HERBERT [WEINER]: Wrong! I’m up to a hundred and eighty volts.

1:09:46

RESEARCHER: Please continue, teacher.

SUBJECT: A hundred and eighty volts? {Zap}

“VICTIM”: Ow!! I can’t stand the pain! Let me out of here!
SUBJECT: He, he can’t stand it. Uh, I’m not gonna kill that man there.

DR. THOMAS BLASS: Ac-, according to Milgram, one of the things that’s a prerequisite for carrying out acts that are evil is to shed responsibility from your shoulders, and, and hand it over to a person in charge.

SUBJECT: I mean, who’s gonna take the responsibility if anything happens to that gentleman?

RESEARCHER: I’m responsible for anything that happens here. Continue, please.

SUBJECT: All right, [UI] slow.

DR. THOMAS BLASS: He didn’t hold any gun to anybody’s head. Just the fact that he conveyed a sense of r-, authority. Roughly 60, 65 percent of the people went all the way to the top of the shock board.

SUBJECT: Four hundred fifty volts. {BUZZ}

That’s it.

RESEARCHER: Now continue, using the last switch on the board, please, the 450 switch, for each wrong answer. Continue, please.

SUBJECT: Ah, I’m not gettin’ no answer. Don’t the man’s health mean anything?
RESEARCHER: Whether the learner likes it or not, we must...

1:10:40 SUBJECT: Well he might be dead in there.

M: Milgram made the point, I think very effectively, that the Nazis weren’t all a bunch of psychopaths at Belsen, and Dachau; that you could staff a death camp from the middle class in New Haven.

M: Well, who was actually pushing the switch?

1:10:57 SUBJECT: I was. But he kept insistin’. I told him no, but he said, it’s gotta keep goin’.

M: What kind of obedience would Milgram get today, if he were to do the experiment today?

F: Probably about the same.

M: Probably about the same. Why?

F: I don’t know. I think people are just inherently obedient. It just really shows, like how far human beings will go to appease what they perceive to be a authority figure.

1:11:18 M: Milgram has identified one of the constants, one of the universals, of social behavior: the readiness to obey authority cuts across time. It’s a constant.
The other outstanding and distinctive thing about the obedience experiment is how much it has and keeps on permeating contemporary culture, uh, and thought. It’s still with us, in very, very important ways.

1:11:43 NARRATOR: A series of strange events recently confirmed Milgram’s theories about obedience.

Targeting fast-food restaurants across the country, a con man telephoned restaurant managers, and convinced them to strip-search and sometimes sexually abuse their employees. The mystery is not in the con man, but in the victims. Why would they obey?

M: This person was so convincing. People saw him as a legitimate authority. I think we have a, uh, probably the closest thing that we have to [a] Milgram experiment today, in the uh, in these strip searches.

NARRATOR: The most famous of these incidents took place at a McDonald’s in Mount Washington, Kentucky.

M: There was a videotape security camera; it had film. We didn’t hear what the instructions were, but [do], to do the actions that were t-, uh, had taken
place; what the victim was doing in, in the video and stuff. And it was...uh, pretty evident what each instruction was.

1:12:44 NARRATOR: An anonymous caller, pretending to be a police officer, told the assistant manager that an employee had stolen some money.

DONNA SUMMERS: He said, I’m Officer Scott. And he said, I’m with the police department. I’m investigating...a complaint.

It went directly from a theft into a drug thing. So I was asked to search her clothing.

1:13:11 You know, he would tell me: take her shoes, click ‘em; take her shirt; check it out.

I know how it seems to people. But you weren’t on the phone with him. The man has convinced seventy to a hundred other places [of] the very same thing. He’s very good at what he does. Very good.

He sounded like a police officer. And um, I’m thinkin’, okay. You know, I’m doin’ what I’m supposed to do.

1:13:48 M: He was gettin’ some kind o’ satisfaction by bein’ an [authoritive] figure, and tellin’ people what to do. And then realizing, by the phone
conversation, that they were actually doin’ what he said.

DONNA SUMMERS: He’s tellin’ me that I needed to get someone to sit with her while he goes and gets somebody to come in to pick her up.

M: The caller then asked the manager if she was married or had a boyfriend. She said that she had a fiancé. Then the caller asked if she could have her fiancé, uh, come to the restaurant, and assist, uh, her with the, the strip search of the victim.

DONNA SUMMERS: He says, well, why don’t you have him come up and sit there. I mean, you can trust him. So, um, I called Wes, my fiancé; we were gonna get married — to ask him if he would come up.

1:14:31 M: The manager goes about doin’ her duties, uh, of runnin’ the, uh, restaurant. And uh, leaves the fiancé there in the office. And then the caller starts givin’ instructions over the phone of, of things that he wants, uh, the victim to do. And uh, what he wants the, uh, fiancé to tell her to do.

Have her remove her apron, and, and uh, instruct her to do jumpin’ jacks, and jog in place, a-, and uh...several more things.
She was still in high school. Uh, the kind of person she was, she was actually graduated in the top ten in her class. And uh, she was scared of being in trouble with the police, so she sorta just went along, and uh, did whatever, uh, the fiancé t-, told her to do, because, uh, she didn’t want to be in trouble for anything.

1:15:25 DONNA SUMMERS: Durin’ all this time, I’m workin’. I’m runnin’ the floor; I’m gettin’ change; and then, when I would walk into the office to get the change or whatever I had to get, Wes would be sittin’ where he was when I left. And she was settin’ where she was. And no one said anything.

1:15:45 NARRATOR: After over two and a half hours, Summers’s fiancé, Walter Nicks, did something that was unthinkable. Complying with the instructions of the caller, he ordered Louise to perform a sexual act.

DONNA SUMMERS: And there’s no way that I could, uh, take away from what happened to [her]. A lot of people, you know, look atcha, and go, and you’re, you know, you’re [UI]; you should be strung up. I’ve had it even said to me. And it’s really hard, because you weren’t there.
F: The Milgram study showed us that most people would do that. If you structure the environment such that, you know, you provide all the authority, and, and, you know, the commands, just anybody might do this.

M: [UI].

F: But I do think this sounds worse.

M: You think this is worse than [with] Milgram [did]?

F: With the Milgram, there was somebody, like, right, sitting right there, and instructing them. If they hesitated, they could turn, and then somebody could encourage them, and, and they could sort of maybe psychologically leave that responsibility on that other person. But in this case, the police officer’s on the phone. He’s not standing there.

M: [That actually] is a very good point.

DONNA SUMMERS: You know, you look back on it, and you say, I wouldn’t-a done it. But unless you’re put in that situation, at that time, how do you know what you would do? You don’t. You don’t.

NARRATOR: Over 70 other people did exactly as Donna Summers did. Why is it so easy for us to obey
orders, even when we know they are wrong? Why are we so willing to inflict pain on others if someone else takes responsibility?

1:17:22 M: There’s nothing more difficult [than for] people to violate a social structure which all participants have initially accepted.

It reminds me of a situation that once occurred in South America. I was in an airplane. The pilot came into the plane. He was drunk. He was reeling toward the cockpit. Passengers looked at each other, but no one got up. No one said to the pilot, you’re drunk; we can’t fly in this plane.

There are a set of pressures that keep you in the role that you have initially accepted.

1:17:49 NARRATOR: What pressures would keep a friend from calling for help, even when it was a matter of life and death?

In 2005, four fraternity brothers watched, and did nothing to help, as their close friend, 21-year-old Matthew Carrington, died in front of them.

DEFENDANT: I’ll live with the consequences [UI] for the rest of my life. My actions killed a good person.
DEFENDANT 2: Nothing I can say here today will bring back Matthew Carrington, or lessen the grief that his family feels.

DEFENDANT 3: His death was preventable. And I will live with the guilt for the rest of my life.

1:18:26 NARRATOR: Why did these four boys do nothing?

DEFENDANT: Every time I think about it, the feelings rush back, and the idea of “what if?” just...stands [out of a] corner. It’s not, not leavin’. It’s always there.

I have no doubt that if I would have known what I know now that I could have stopped it.

NARRATOR: The story is not unique, but it raises a question: Is there something in human nature that often keeps us from helping?

1:18:57 In 1964, 38 New Yorkers watched through their windows as one of their neighbors was brutally murdered. Her name was Kitty Genovese, a 28-year-old woman.

M: The Genovese incident, where a young woman, coming home, late at night, from her work, was assaulted by somebody – he was one of those random, crazy people...
M: Kitty was running up the block. And Winston Moseley ran after her...until she reached the midpoint of the block, almost directly under this streetlight.

Moseley caught up with her. And stabbed her four times in the back.

Her screams were loud, unmistakable, and reverberated throughout the entire area.

1:19:55 M: Lights went on, in, in the windows around the courtyard. So we know that people were seeing this.

Nobody called the police.

Somebody who lived on the seventh floor opened his window, and yelled out: what’s going on down there?

1:20:15 When Moseley heard somebody yelling out, he ran back to his car – and Kitty was still alive. She managed to get up. She staggers around the corner here, still screaming. People in that building heard her as well. And she collapses inside this hallway.

There’s one apartment above here. It was occupied by Carl Ross. Carl opened his door at the
time that Moseley, who turns, and he saw the second attack taking place.

1:20:49 And he did nothing.

NARRATOR: After stabbing Kitty another eight times, in this very hallway, the killer ran away, leaving Kitty to bleed to death. Eventually a neighbor called the police. But it was too late. Kitty died before the ambulance could get her to the hospital.

1:21:08 JOHN DARLEY: That shocked the city. Now, it’s not that a person got murdered that shocked the city. That happens, sadly. It’s that a person got murdered, and her neighbors watched. And nobody did anything.

Bib Latane and I, we read about the murder, as did everybody else. Yeah, we were two young social psychologists, starting our research careers. We knew about Stanley Milgram’s set of experiments on obedience to authority. And we started to think about, in an offhand way, what could have produced the Genovese effect?

1:21:48 M: Perhaps Kitty Genovese might have been alive today if, uh, fewer people had seen her.
M: There were perhaps 38 people who could have responded. But each were looking to see what these other people were doing.

{WHISPERING}

1:22:08 JOHN DARLEY: Uh, we decided to try to create a relatively ambiguous situation, in which we could see how people responded. We thought that one kind of thing that comes up that’s often hard to tell whether it’s a real emergency or not has to do with fire.

1:22:34 JOHN DARLEY: You see smoke coming through the vent. And it is ambiguous. What do you do?

SUBJECT: Um, there’s, there’s smoke coming out from under the door in that room where he was filling out the questionnaire?

JOHN DARLEY: Almost everybody does that, if they face the smoke alone. Now let’s have you face the smoke with two strangers.

1:23:02 One person can be seen glancing at the other. The other is continuing to fill out the questionnaire.

It’s getting a little more smoky in the room. But nonetheless, you stay in the room.

By and large, people surrounded by people who react as if there’s nothing wrong don’t respond.
Everybody sees the other people not reacting, so they create a definition of the situation: no emergency.

1:23:34 NARRATOR: To test their theories about how groups and individuals respond differently to a crisis, Darley and Latane conducted a second experiment. This time, the emergency was clearly defined.

RESEARCHER: First of all, I would like to thank the two of you for being here today to help out in this study.

NARRATOR: In this experiment, one student was asked to communicate via intercom with another student in a room down the hall.

“VICTIM”: Would somebody give me a little help here, because I’m having a problem, and [UI] one of these [UI]. [UI] coming on, and...

NARRATOR: What sounded like a real seizure in the subject’s headphones was just a tape recording of an actor playing a role for the experiment.

“VICTIM”: If somebody would, would give me a little, little help.

SUBJECT: Huh?

“VICTIM”: Could somebody...help, or...
JOHN DARLEY: If you knew there was nobody else but you to help, you got up; you opened the door of your room; and you headed off to find the person.

SUBJECT: Hello? Anybody there? Help! We need some help! We’ve got somebody hurt! Hello!

1:24:34

JOHN DARLEY: On the other hand, if there were three or four other people present who you heard...

RESEARCHER: Oh, I would like to thank the three of you for being here today to help us with th[e] study. We are interested in learning...

JOHN DARLEY: ...you are much less likely to respond yourself.

“VICTIM”: Somebody, ha-, get, g-, give me a little, little help here. ‘Cause I’m havin’ a real probl-, problem right now, and...help me out...

JOHN DARLEY: The responsibility any individual feels for helping is diffused when there are other people who could also help.

F: [UI]...

1:25:11

JOHN DARLEY: So what can we say back to the bystanders in the Genovese situation?
The first thing we can say, I think, is they got a bum rap. They were reacting the way that you or me might react in those situations. There have been many incidents like the Genovese incident since then. And there have been many incidents in which people who could help don’t help.

F: The children are not professional actors. They agreed to participate in an unusual study. Wired with microphones and filmed from an observation point high across New York’s Fifth Avenue, they will be sent out to ask a simple question: Will you help me?

GIRL: Excuse me. I’m lost. Can you help me, please?

    Excuse me, I’m lost. Can you help me, please?

    Excuse me, I want to call my mother, please?

    F: What?

    GIRL: I want to call my mother. Can you help me, please?

JOHN DARLEY: We are all creatures of socialization. And socialization is what teaches us to pay attention to what other people do when they’re responding to a situation.
M: [UI] I can remember when I first heard about the study. Psych 1. Thought, oh, that is ridiculous. How can someone see something happening that they know is wrong; that they know the person standing next to them [know is] wrong; but not take an action?

It’s [sickening] to know that I took part in it; that I, that I could have just been the one that stood up.

1:26:58  

{BELL RING}

NEWSPERSON: A makeshift memorial of flowers and candles is placed outside the Kai Tau fraternity house for Matthew Carrington. Police say the 21-year-old Chico State student was in the basement of this house, taking part in a fraternity event at 5 a.m. Wednesday morning when his body gave out.

1:27:22  

F: Matt didn’t have to die that night. It could have all been so different. It could have all been, from the very beginning, when they were all down there; when there was a roomful of guys. It went wrong before they all left.
NARRATOR: Matthew Carrington joined a fraternity, and was undergoing hazing during the spring semester of his sophomore year.

FRAT BOY: Pledge class, two thousand oh four.

FRAT BOY 1: Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo.

FRAT BOY 2: ...see what’s goin’ on.

FRAT BOY 1: And these are little, uh, pledge brothers you see right here.

M: He wanted to, to join because he, he would get to meet people. He was kinda shy. You know, networking and such. When you’re older, I mean, you’ve got brothers in houses in every college, all over the country, so.

FRAT BOY: Whoooooo! Whoooo!

M: They did some pretty, uh, silly things; more embarrassing than causin’ anybody any harm. Like wearin’ a miniskirt out in the intersection, or switchin’ your T-shirt with a homeless guy, and puttin’ his shirt on.

It was nothin’ that was gonna get anybody hurt.

FRAT BOY: Oh, isn’t that sweet?
NARRATOR: How did these seemingly harmless pranks escalate to the point where Matthew died?

1:28:35 M: Basically, it was the third night of what the fraternity called Inspiration Week; what the pledges call Hell Week.

The pledges - Mike, Matt - [were, arrived] into the basement. And the first thing that they did was undergo just some grueling physical calisthetics. The young men were then given a five-gallon water jug, which in itself weighed about 42 pounds, and were told to stand up on a narrow bench, standing on one foot. And to drink as much as they possibly could.

1:29:12 M: Matthew at some point became nauseated; vomited; became increasingly confused. The kidneys can only handle so much water, and indeed, you can poison yourself.

F: When you’re drinking water, and you’re acting drunk, okay, somethin’s not right. You know? When you’re slurrin’ your words; when you’re, you know, you can’t manipulate things like you normally, something’s wrong.

1:29:37 M: [UI]. And J.P. Fickes came in at some point, and they were both intoxicated, and Maestretti
was excessively intoxicated. And they basically took over.

    FRAT BOY: Actually, to tell you the truth, I don’t remember most of it. Uh, unfortunately, I was pretty intoxicated when it happened. I remember making him do pushups. I don’t remember why.

    FRAT BOY: Matt was at a point where he couldn’t do any more pushups. He just all of a sudden dropped. And his, it just seemed like his whole body just tensed up.

    F: You’ve got, well, at this point, four boys down there. It just makes me sick that they didn’t think; that they didn’t think, something’s wrong. So why can’t someone say, stop?

1:30:27  M: What could happen is if one person says, this guy is in real trouble; you call 911; you do this; you do that: Everybody will buy that definition; will start to react; uh, will be helpful. The thing is balanced on a knife edge. But sometimes it falls. And nothing happens.

1:30:50  FRAT BOY: His hips moved a little bit, and he just seized up. And Mike said, uh, oh my god; uh, I
think he bit his tongue. And then he said, somebody needs to call an ambulance.

I was turning on my cell phone [when I was ga-] walking down the stairs, and was typin’ in 911 when I saw Mike at the bottom of the stairs. I had it typed into my phone. All I had to do was press the green button.

And he said, it’s okay, you don’t need to call 911. Matt’s just sleeping. You know, I hit, I hit the red button, and canceled it out.

And then he was snoring. It just sounded like he was snoring.

1:31:23 FRAT BOY: I remember that, thoroughly. I remember the sound of him snoring. I remember thinking, no, he’s sleeping.

M: The snoring was certainly not sleeping. It would have been a result of water intoxication, uh, and of pulmonary edema, which is basically the lungs filling with fluid. Approximately an hour after he had been left to sleep it off, he was not breathing.

F: Did nothing for an hour, [UI] lay there. Then they realize he’s not breathing. Then all of a
sudden, it’s like, call 911! Well, god, I, at this point they do. But at this point, now, it’s too late.

M: Matthew was pronounced dead, uh, approximately 27 minutes after arrival in the, uh, emergency department.

1:32:13 MATT CARRINGTON’S FATHER: When we got there, they took me and Debbie in the back, and we were still hopin’ that when they pulled that sheet over his head, it was gonna be another kid; not yours. Just [the], bad as that sounds, there was just a chance it wasn’t our son. And as soon as they pulled the sheet up, and we seen his hairdo, you know, it was...

MATT CARRINGTON’S MOTHER: {Crying} I was just screaming, no, not Matt! Not Matt!

1:32:49 NEWSMAN: The four ringleaders in the fraternity hazing and torture death of 21-year-old Chico State student Matthew Carrington accepted responsibility; all four, some through tears, pleading guilty.

FRAT BOY: Guilty.
FRAT BOY: Guilty, sir.
FRAT BOY: Guilty.
FRAT BOY: Guilty.
NEWSMAN: All four were given jail time. Most culpable: 22-year-old Gabriel Maestretti, sentenced to a year in jail for involuntary manslaughter. Twenty-five-year-old Jerry Lim and 19-year-old John Fickes sentenced to six months as accessories to manslaughter.

1:33:19

M: Matt trusted ‘em to, to help him out, if he is gonna get into trouble, ‘cause he wasn’t worried about gettin’ into trouble with just drinkin’ water. When it was time for help, they didn’t step up, and he didn’t get any help.

1:33:37

NARRATOR: Nearly a year after Matthew’s death, Debbie visits three of the four fraternity brothers who remain in jail, serving time for involuntary manslaughter.

DEBBIE: I don’t think they’re bad kids. I think they just made bad choices, [and a, and a] terrible, terrible mistake. You know, that we’re all gonna live with for the rest of our lives.

1:34:03

It’s just hard. {sigh} I start all of my days crying for Matt, ‘cause I just miss him so much. And I think of all you guys. And I think of the pain that you must be feeling, having to live with that.
CONVICT: For like the whole year, it was just...one day bein’ played over and over; that night, bein’ played over and over again in my head.

CONVICT: I find it hard to forgive myself. I don’t know. It’s like the only thing that makes me feel better is to like hate myself.

M: It’s sad [in, uh] of itself that you want, you want retribution, just so it can be over with.

M: What it’s hard for us to realize is the power that situations have over us, to cause us to act in certain ways. It was not the case that they had been horrible moral failures. It’s the case that they’re like the rest of us, caught up in situations, influenced by the situations, reacting.

CONVICT: I believe that there’s all different kinds of people. And that a certain kind of people take charge in situations. Unfortunately for Matt, none of us were the type of person who took charge and told people what to do. We just found ourselves looking at each other, waiting for someone to step up. And nobody did.
1:36:00 ANOTHER NARRATOR: One of the illusions about human behavior is that it stems entirely from personality or character. But social psychology shows us that often, behavior is dominated by the social roles we’re asked to play. This point is driven home with particular force by a study carried out by Professor Philip Zimbardo at Stanford University. Professor Zimbardo created a prison situation, in which ordinary people were asked to play the role either of prisoner or of warden. Then he observed what happened.

1:36:28 NARRATOR: In 1971, in the basement of the Psychology Department of Stanford University, a mock prison was created. It was an experiment that rivaled all social psychology experiments in controversy.

PHILIP ZIMBARDO: Shortly after I finished the Stanford prison study, Milgram embraced me, and said, I’m so happy that you did this, he said. He said, ‘cause now you can take off some of the heat that, that he’s had to bear alone, heh, of having done the most unethical study.

NARRATOR: Although this experiment is over 30 years old, its enduring power has been underscored by the events at Abu Ghraib.
1:37:05  

SOLDIER: When we got to Abu Ghraib, it was eerie. People were being told to rough up Iraqis that wouldn’t cooperate. I mean, they’re torturing, they’re abusing detainees. You’re looking at the s-, the situation thinking, they’ve condoned this, but why? And if it wouldn’t have been for those photos, no one would have ever believed what was going on over there.

M: When I first saw the pictures, and immediately a sense of familiarity s-, struck me. Because I knew that I had been there before; I had been in this type of situation; I knew what was going on. [I might.]

1:37:48  

M: The photographs were strikingly familiar to the photographs that we had taken, many of the photographs I had taken, in the prison study.

M: We didn’t do any of the stuff that you see in Abu Ghraib where they, you know, get [them] in big piles. [UI] but [I] certainly subjected them to all kinds of humiliations. I don’t know where [I would have stopped myself, given enough time [UI].

1:38:12  

PHILIP ZIMBARDO: When the images of the abuse and torture at Abu Ghraib were revealed, immediately
the military went on the defensive, saying, it’s a few bad apples.

When we see somebody doing bad things, we assume they were bad people to begin with. But what we know in our study is there are a set of social-psychological variables that can make ordinary people do things they never could imagine doing.

1:38:38 NARRATOR: At Abu Ghraib, ordinary people perpetrated extraordinary abuses. To understand why, it helps to reach back to the lessons of Zimbardo’s experiment: how people respond to a cruel environment without clear rules.

{HIGH-PITCHED NOISE}

X: Everybody up! [UI] come on. Up, up!

1:38:57 F: I think he, and everybody else who came down into that situation got caught up into that situation. And the sense that this was an experiment; that began to fade away. It became just life.

X: {YELLING} [UI] Zimbardo!

RESEARCHER: We frankly didn’t anticipate what was gonna happen. And we tried to really test the power of the environment to change and transform otherwise normal people. Much as Milgram had changed
or transformed otherwise normal people in an obedience situation, we wanted to do it in a prison-like situation.

1:39:33 NARRATOR: Over 70 men volunteered for Zimbardo’s experiment.

PHILIP ZIMBARDO: And they completed a battery of psychological tests. We picked two dozen; 24 who were the most normal, [and] most healthy.

Half are gonna be guards; half are gonna be prisoners. And it’s like flipping a coin, and heads, this one’s a guard, this one a prisoner.

So at the beginning, there’s no difference in the kinds of people who are in your two groups.

“GUARD”: When we were given our jobs as, uh, guards, we were issued a uniform, which was a plain sort of khaki, uh, or lighter-colored uniform.

1:40:07 PHILIP ZIMBARDO: And then we gave them the symbols of power: uh, handcuffs, a whistle, a big billy club. And then the other thing we gave them were silver reflecting sunglasses.

M: When you have mirror sunglasses on, then nobody can see your eyeballs.
I think that anytime you put on what essentially is a mask, and you mask your identity, then it allows you to behave in ways that you would not behave if you didn’t have the mask on.

PHILIP ZIMBARDO: To make it more realistic, I had arranged with the S-, Palo Alto Police Department to make mock arrests.

“PRISONER”: When I was arrested, it was a surprise to me. I didn’t think I was gonna [be] brought to an actual police station; I didn’t think I was gonna go through a booking process.

PHILIP ZIMBARDO: The guards then put a blindfold on them; stripped them naked; and then they put them in dresses — smocks, with no underpants. Each had a number that replaced their name. They had to know their number; they, they could only be referred to by that number. And they had a chain on one foot, which was put there to remind them, at all times, of their loss of freedom. So all of these things produces a sense of being dehumanized.

On the first day, I said, this is not gonna work. I mean, the guards felt awkward, giving orders.
And they’d say, okay, line up, and repeat your numbers. And the prisoners would [start] giggling.

“GUARD”: Hey! I don’t want anybody [laughin’].

PHILIP ZIMBARDO: And then a very interesting thing happened. Dave Eshleman, who the prisoners named “John Wayne,” like he’s a Wild West cowboy; he begins to be more extreme.

1:41:43 DAVE ESHLEMAN: I decided that I would become the worst, most, uh, intimidating, uh, cruel prison guard that I could possibly be.

{PRISON EXPERIMENT TAPE UNINTELLIGIBLE}

“JOHN WAYNE”: Say it again.

X: [Thank you, Mr. Correction...].

“JOHN WAYNE”: Say [bless you,] Correction Officer.

X: [Bless you], Mr. Correction Officer.

DAVE ESHLEMAN: I was sort of fascinated myself that people were believing the act. And I was trying to see how far I could take it before somebody would say, okay, that’s enough. Stop.

{PRISON EXPERIMENT TAPE}

Y: Yeah!
“PRISONER”: We did have to do things like pushups. Uh, we would have to sing things. But at the beginning, we protested some of the actions. We did things to irritate the guards.

{PRISON EXPERIMENT TAPE}

“PRISONER”: But if I gotta be in here, I’m not gonna put up with any of your shit.

RESEARCHER: So the guards’ authority was challenged right off the bat.

Then the guards had to decide how they were gonna handle that, and they had to decide it without our input. I mean, again, this was not a Milgram study, in which we were standing over them, telling them what to do. And they began to see the prisoners’ behavior as a kind of an affront to their authority. And they began to push back.

DAVE ESHLEMAN: We would ramp up the general harassment. Just sorta crank it up a bit. Nobody was telling me I shouldn’t be doing this. The professor is the authority here; you know, he’s the prison warden. He’s not stopping me.

“PRISONER”: This is unbelievable. He took our clothes...
“GUARD”: Hands off the door.

M: It was the first evening, a kind of rebellion that took place.

PHILIP ZIMBARDO: The prisoners rebelled. They barricaded themselves in their cells; they said, we refuse to come out. They took off their numbers; they didn’t want to be de-individuated. They started cursing the guards to their face.

1:43:20 And the key, the key turning point was, the guards began to think of them as dangerous prisoners. And so the guards formulated a plan; they used a fire extinguisher.

{NOISE}

Took the doors down; they dragged the prisoners out; stripped them naked. And essentially broke the rebellion in a purely physical way.

“GUARD”: [UI] your bedding, your clothes, and strip it.

RESEARCHER: From that point on, the study was as remarkable a, a series of events as I’ve ever seen.

1:43:50 RESEARCHER: It was, it was a real laboratory for Zimbardo and, and I to, to watch human nature
transformed in a very rapid way, uh, in the face of a very powerful situation.

PHILIP ZIMBARDO: People really suffered. I mean, guards did terrible things to the prisoners. They punished them by putting them in solitary confinement, which was a small closet. You could squat or stand, but you know, you, you couldn’t sit. And it was dark, and, and uh, dank, actually.

{PRISON EXPERIMENT TAPE}

X: [UI].

1:44:18 F: Every hour, every day, there’s a teeny, little bit more of an increment. And they’re stepping up taunting the prisoners; they’re stepping up the counts, not letting them sleep; they’re stepping...I don’t think from one minute to the next, the people who are in it see the change and see the difference.

“GUARD”: [UI]. [UI] gonna see to it that you don’t get [UI].

PHILIP ZIMBARDO: And the k-, next key thing happened, beside the rebellion, Prisoner 8612, he was the first one to have an emotional breakdown.

“PRISONER”: I feel really fucked up inside. You don’t know. I gotta go. I, uh, uh, uh, to a
doctor; anything. I mean, Jesus Christ, I’m burnin’ up inside! Don’t you know? I’m fucked up! I don’t know how to explain it! I’m fucked up inside! [UI] out! Let me out now!

1:45:04 DAVE ESHLEMAN: At the time, if you had questioned me about the effect I was having, I would say, well, they must be, they must be a wimp. They’re weak, or they’re faking. Because I wouldn’t have believed that what I was doing could actually cause somebody [to have a] nervous breakdown. It was just us sorta getting our jollies with it. You know. Let’s, let’s be like puppeteers here. Let’s make these people do things.

“GUARD”: What if I told you to get down on that floor, and fuck the floor? What would you do then?

PHILIP ZIMBARDO: The guards now began to escalate their use of power. Some of them had prisoners clean out toilet bowls with their bare hands. They now taunt, humiliate, degrade the prisoners in front of each other. And they exert arbitrary control over the prisoners. They keep thinking of more and
more unusual things to do. And very soon, after the fourth day, things begin to turn sexual.

“GUARD”: You be the bride of Frankenstein. And you be Frankenstein. I want you to walk over here like Frankenstein, and say that you [love] [UI].

1:46:03 DAVE ESHLEMAN: If you want to f-, fully sort of humiliate somebody, then you want to get them in the, in those things that they’re, the, where their biggest fears are. And a lot of us have a lot of sexual hangups. And so that was part of that effort to humiliate them even further.

“GUARD”: Get up [close]. Get [up close].
X: I love you [UI]. I love you [UI].
“GUARD”: [UI]. You get down here and do 10 pushups!

1:46:26 RESEARCHER: The guards knew that had the coin come up heads rather than tails, they would have had the dress on, rather than the uniform on; they knew that.

So they certainly knew that the prisoners who were being mistreated had done nothing wrong to deserve the[ir] mistreatment. And yet, the roles themselves were so powerful, and the environment itself was so
powerful, that they ended up punishing those prisoners as though they had done something wrong.

“PRISONERS”: Prisoner 819 did a bad thing!

Prisoner 819 did a bad thing!

1:46:53 “PRISONER”: We were told to chant something about how he was a bad prisoner. And at the time, I went along with it, I’m thinking, what does this matter? We don’t believe this, but we can c-, go along and chant it.


1:47:12 PHILIP ZIMBARDO: That night, he had a breakdown. Every day after that, another prisoner broke down, in a similar way, but broke down. I mean, extreme stress reaction. And we released another one on, one on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday.

1:47:23 RESEARCHER: Nobody who was in that study could deny that the prisoner breakdowns were genuine. They were, they were scary to see; they were upsetting to us; we, they were unexpected; but they were, they were very clearly the real thing. At some level, we understood that something was happening that we were no
longer in control of; and it was damaging people; we
didn’t quite have a grasp on what to do about it.

One of the mistakes we made was that we
didn’t, we hadn’t built in time to step back and to
look at what was happening, and call it what it was;
which was mistreat[ment]. We were caught up in the
events that were, that were taking place.

1:48:02 “GUARD”: Or you can keep your blanket, and
416 will stay in another day. We got three against
one. Keep your blankets; 416, you’re gonna be in there
for awhile. So just get used to it.

NARRATOR: On the fifth day of the study,
Zimbardo invited his girlfriend, recently psychology
graduate Christina Maslach, to visit the mock prison.

CHRISTINA MASLACH: I had heard bits and
pieces, uh, from Phil, uh, about what was going on
[it]. And then when I w-, was down there that evening,
it really was kind of a [UI]. The thing that really
got to me was when some of the guards took the
prisoners down the hall to the men’s room.

1:48:44 PHILIP ZIMBARDO: She looks out, and sees a
line of prisoners, with paper bags over their heads;
each one holding the other one’s shoulder.
CHRISTINA MASLACH: And they’re leading them down the hall. And Phil comes over, and [like], look, look, you know, my god, look at that! And I looked up, and something about it just, you know, again, it was the dehumanizing, demeaning kind of treatment. I just, I couldn’t watch it.

PHILIP ZIMBARDO: And she said, it’s terrible what you’re doing to those boys. [And] she got tears in her eyes. And I said, what?

And she runs out, you know. And I’m furious. I’m saying, you know, I’m saying, look, this is, you know, I run outside, we have this big argument. I’m saying, look, this is, this is dynamics of human behavior. Look, it’s fascinating; power of the situation; all [the]. So I’m giving all of the psychological basis, and what kind of psychologist are you? You don’t appreciate this.

Um, and she said...

CHRISTINA MASLACH: I don’t understand [it]. You’re a stranger to me. I don’t understand this. How could you not see what I see? I mean, you know, you’re a caring, compassionate person. I know you from all of [these] other things. Somethin’s gone wrong here.
PHILIP ZIMBARDO: And then, the next thing she said, which I, had an equally big impact, is, uh, you know, I’m not sure I want to, you know, have anything to do with you if this is the real you.

And that was like a slap in the face. Because what she was saying is, you’ve changed. You know, the power of the situation has transformed you from, from the person I thought I knew to this person that I don’t know.

And at that moment, I said, wow, you’re right. We gotta end it.

1:50:04 NARRATOR: After only six days, Dr. Zimbardo shut down his experiment.

PHILIP ZIMBARDO: What makes this study interesting, and what makes the Milgram study interesting; it’s really about the transformation of human character. People can be seduced into doing things they never thought they could.

There are interesting parallels that are coming up now, with Abu Ghraib.

1:50:24 NARRATOR: At Abu Ghraib, standard operating procedures were changed. Normally, military guards are
supposed to protect prisoners. Suddenly, they were asked to soften them up for interrogators.

SOLDIER: We were never trained to be prison guards. The higher-ups said, use your imagination. Break them. We want them broke by the time we get back.

As soon as we’d have prisoners come in, sandbags instantly over their head. They would flexicuff ‘em; throw ‘em down to the ground; some would be stripped. It was told to all of us, they’re nothing but dogs. So you start breeding that picture to people, then all of a sudden, you start looking at these people as less than human, and you start doing things to ‘em you would never dream of. And that’s where it got scary.

1:51:18 Tier 1A was where, uh, a lot of the stuff started happening. And that’s what tier Specialist Graner was in charge of.

One evening, after he got off of his shift, he was hoarse.

And I said, Graner, are you gettin’ sick?
And he goes, no.
And I said, well, what’s going on?
And uh, he said, well, I’m havin’ to yell, and, and do things to detainees that I feel are morally and ethically wrong. What do you think I should do?

I said, then, then don’t do ‘em.

And he goes, I don’t have a choice.

And I said, what do you mean?

He says, well every time a bomb goes off outside the wire, or outside the fence, they come in, and they tell me, that’s another, another American losin’ their life. And unless you help us, their blood’s on your hands as well.

{EXPLOSION}

1:52:05 So early on in October, what I saw whenever I walked up to the tier was two soldiers that I had no idea who they were. Uh, they had two naked detainees handcuffed to, to prison cells.

They were tellin’ ‘em to confess, confess, confess. Um, he would swat him on the behind with a water bottle. So then, after they did that, they handcuffed ‘em together, in what appeared to be a sexual position. I’ve, I’ve never been trained in [an] interrogation. But I definitely didn’t think that this is the way interrogation should be.
And so I reported it to my lieutenant. Basically, I, you know, tellin’ him, Military Intelligence is doin’ some pretty weird things with naked detainees.

And he seemed not to care.

1:52:49 PHILIP ZIMBARDO: Whenever there’s a system, there are perpetrators of evil; there’s people who do bad things, like at Abu Ghraib, the guards. But [the] top administration gives permission, either implicitly or explicitly. They didn’t say “put ‘em in a pyramid.” But they gave them general permission to do whatever they had to do to get confessions.

M: They may well, uh, be given missions in connection with this overall task, strategy. We also have to work the, sort of the, the dark side, if you will. [We want to] spend time in the shadows.

1:53:24 RESEARCHER: I can’t think of a worse thing for somebody who is in charge of an environment like that, or in charge of people who work in an environment like that to say: it’s time to take the gloves off, and go to the dark side. Those kinds of institutional environments create pressures on people to head to the dark side anyway. And we learned this in the prison
study; [those] environments elicit the worst from good people.

M: My guess is that 99.999 percent of our armed forces behave admirably at all times. But it’s like the rest of society: there will be a few bad apples that will conduct themselves in ways that we’re not proud of.

1:54:08 PHILIP ZIMBARDO: Were there a few bad apples? No. The, what was bad was the barrel.

Who made the barrel? This whole chain of command.

M: I feel terrible about what happened to these Iraqi detainees. They were in U.S. custody. Our country had an obligation to treat them right; to treat them as human beings. We didn’t do that. [Uh] that was wrong.

1:54:31 NARRATOR: Prior to the Abu Ghraib scandal, Donald Rumsfeld had personally approved interrogation techniques, including dogs, stress positions, and nudity, that violated long-standing military rules.

M: When you follow an order, you gotta be held accountable as well. But the ones that hold the key to that door; the ones that ask you to walk through
that door; hold a higher accountability, ‘cause they know better.

1:54:56 PHILIP ZIMBARDO: I know the situation very closely now, because I was an expert witness for one of those guards, Chip Frederick. Exemplary soldier. Nine medals. Model father. Husband. Uh, patriot, and you know, normal, healthy, no sadistic tendencies; nothing that would indicate he was anything other than [an] ordinary k-, good guy. And he gets into this place. And he is totally corrupted.

1:55:24 M: Sometimes you cross a line. And it’s a thin line; that anytime, that can be crossed by anybody, if placed in certain conditions.

F: I think it’s a hard conclusion, from all of the research evidence, to sort of say, there’s nothing inherent in who you are that would necessarily say, I’m safe, I will never cross the line. That research was done thirtysomething years ago. This is not news, you know. The, the lessons that we learned: it’s been in textbooks; it’s been taught in psychology courses. Other research — Milgram; all of these other studies — are pointing to those same conclusions.
PHILIP ZIMBARDO: It is the rare person who’s able to be in that situation and resist. It’s the majority who conform, who comply, who, who obey authority, who, who do these things. And that’s what nobody wants to hear. We want to all think we’re heroes; if we were in that situation, we’d be different. Maybe that’s true. But heroes are rare, in any society. They, they are the exception. The rule is the majority. The rule is, the base rate is what the average person would do.

And so, so the big message from the Stanford Prison Experiment; big message from the Milgram Obedience Study; from many of these other studies; is that if you imagine yourself in those stu-, being a participant [in the] studies, you have to say, it’s likely I would do what the majority did. And I’m not that special. I’m an ordinary person, and they were ordinary people.

END OF RECORDING