

COURSE GRADE COVER SHEET

Complete student information portion, make copies, and submit one form with each course.
(In the event you are not able to make copies, please hand-write this page with each course.)

I have read the frequently asked questions on the back of this page: ☒ Yes ☐ No.

Student Number (Same as Inmate Number) 180161

Student Name: Eric St. George

Student Address: c/o CCF--180161; PO Box 600

City: Cañon City State: CO Zip Code: 81215

Unit Number: Fox Name of Prison: Centennial

Degree you are working toward: Masters of Ministry & Christian Counseling

My records indicate this is my 3rd course. (paper 2 of 3)

Course Number & Title: or Name of Book From the Bible: PSY472 Group Dynamics

Book Title: Obedience to Authority / Bystander "Apathy" Effect

Author: Stanley Milgram / Bibb Latané & John Darley

Begin/End Date of Enclosed Course: 1 June / 15 Aug 2023

Please note that if you are turning in a course that involves textbooks you need to turn in a complete course that normally has three books.

To Be Completed By Student:

Do you need us to send you your next course? ☐ YES ☒ NO

(This question applies only to those working on books of the Bible)

If no, what books will you use for your next course?

Please give us the name and ID number of a few people that are interested in receiving information on attending our college. Thanks and God Bless You!

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____



International Christian College and Seminary
P.O. Box 530212 • Debary, Florida 32753-0212
www.iccscampus.org



Q: Can you send me another grade coversheet?

A: You can handwrite your grade cover page.

Q: How long does it take to grade my work?

A: We normally send correspondence out once per month. However, you do not need to wait on us to grade your work to continue your courses. If you are doing books from the Bible, we can e-mail them to your loved ones and they can print and send them to you. Just ask them to e-mail us.

Q: Can I do my courses in pencil?

A: Yes, but only if you have access to nothing else.

Q: Should I staple or paperclip my work?

A: If you do it is ok. However, we prefer that you do not use staples or paperclips because we scan your work and it takes time to remove them from the papers.

Q: What course will books from the Bible substitute for?

A: We use the books from the Bible as foundation courses. You need 20 courses to graduate. We will determine which courses they will substitute for as you get closer to graduating.

Q: Is there a way I can contact you other than by mail?

A: If you are a federal inmate in good standing you can send me an invitation on Corrlinks and I will accept. If you are a state inmate you can have your loved ones forward an e-mail to me and I will respond. My e-mail is drmcorkle@icccampus.org. You, your family or friends are welcome to call me. My cell number is (407) 760-5616. The office number is (877) 391-3741 ext. 700. As long as I do not have to pay, I will accept all calls. If for any reason you do not reach me on your first attempt, please keep trying. I will pick up.

Q: How do I know if books I have available are acceptable to use as substitutions?

A: As you know, we have a list of suggested books for your degree. However, we can customize some of your future courses to assist you in obtaining your goal. Everyone knows what they need help with. Please pray about it and once you have identified an area where you would like to improve, look in your chapel library or psychology department for a combination of books that are 900 pages. Once you find the books give me the name of the book, the author and the page numbers and I will enter these as a custom course for you.

Q: Is there a time limit for each course?

A: No, you can work at your own pace.

Q: Can I send in my work if my tuition is not current?

A: Please do not send in your work if your tuition is not current. If your tuition is not current your student file is flagged on hold in our system and we are unable to grade any work until the tuition is current. If the college does not receive a payment within 90 days the student file is permanently closed.

Q: I have been writing sponsor letters but have not obtained a sponsor.

A: Some students have to write 50-100 letters before they received a positive response. It depends on your letters. You need to pray and write each one individually from your heart. Also, ask family and friends to help find sponsors.

Q: Will I receive feedback from the graders/readers?

A: Courses are graded by graduate students. They jot down notes for me to read about each of your papers. They normally put down opinions that are highlighted to advise that this is interesting. Unless they point out a problem on the paper, I will accept it as-is. If they provide a problem, I return the paper with their notes asking you to re-do and re-submit. In the past I would write down some comments and students would brag to other students in their dorm making them feel inferior. For that reason, I normally just keep to the basic comments. I know some of you put a lot in your papers and deserve complete feedback. You can call me from your chaplain's or unit manager's office and I will be glad to discuss your papers in full detail.

Q: Can you send back my original work?

A: When we receive your work, your courses and correspondence are scanned into your student records. If you want your original work sent back to you, you must send us a self-addressed, stamped brown envelope with as many stamps as you used to send your original work to us, clearly stating that you want all of your work returned. Once your tuition is paid, if you want a copy of your work, we will email it to you upon your release or you can have your sponsor send a request and we will email it to them.

Q: How long can I use the Books from the Bible?

A: You can use books/questions from the Bible up to your Bachelor's Degree.

Q: Tell me again about your accreditation

A: We are accredited by the International Theological Accountability Association (ITAA) and are recognized by the Department of Education in Florida. ICCS has been privileged to work with several regionally accredited colleges and universities that do accept some ICCS course transfer credits into their programs. This offers our students the option of benefitting from their ICCS training when pursuing a formal degree at various academic institutions.

There are different kinds of accreditation. Governmental Accreditation and non-governmental accreditation. Governmental accreditation is requested in order to receive student aid money. We, along with Rhema Bible College and many more, choose non-governmental accreditation. With governmental accreditation, we would not be able to offer higher degrees unless the student took some courses on campus. That would make our prison program ineffective to you and many others.

Q: How many credits are each course?

A: Three (3) credits or one (1) course is equivalent to 45 contact hours, 60 credits or 20 courses is equivalent to 900 contact hours.

A contact hour is a measure that represents an hour of scheduled instruction given to students. A semester credit hour is normally granted for satisfactory completion of one 50-minute session (contact hour) of classroom instruction per week for a semester of not less than fifteen weeks.

Q: Do I have to start with my Associate's degree or can I go directly to my Doctorate degree?

A: If you have college credits, we need to see the official transcripts and we will enroll you in the appropriate degree program. If you have no college credits you need to start with the Associate's degree. The undergraduate degrees (Associate's and Bachelor's) each require 60 credits or 20 courses to graduate. For graduate degrees, the Master's requires 48 credits or 16 courses plus a Master's thesis and the Doctorate requires 36 credits or 12 courses plus a dissertation paper to graduate.

Q: Will you write a letter to the Parole board for me?

A: Yes. If you are a student in good standing with us, we will gladly help with Parole and Letters to the court. You must have a hearing date. If the date is near, I suggest you have your family or friends get in contact with us so we can have the rough draft approved and we can obtain the name and address of who you want it addressed to. Otherwise, you can write to us with the information.

Q: How can I help ICCS?

A: Help us spread the word about our college by sharing the school's flyer wherever you can i.e. your prison chapel, library or common area. You can also support us through prayer and by recommending us to your friends who are interested in pursuing a theological degree. To go a step further, consider "paying it forward" by sponsoring a new student.

Q: Why is my coursework postmarked from Austin, Texas?

A: Our grading center is in Austin, Texas. All of your correspondence is to be sent to:

International Christian College and Seminary
P.O. Box 530212
DeBary, FL 32753

Q: Can I continue my degree when I am released?

A: Yes. You are welcome to continue upon your release. We will keep your tuition at the same price for the first two years. You will have an option of taking your classes online or textbooks or a combination of the two. It will be your choice.

Q: What is the cost for my next degree?

A: We offer men and women in prison an 85% discount from our normal tuition. Our current tuition is \$9,497.00 (It continues to go up each year). We offer it to inmates at \$1,425. If you pre-pay you receive an additional discount and only pay \$997. Please note that the rate you will be paying is \$22.00 per credit hour. The standard community college charges between \$150 - \$300 per credit hour. There is no additional discount.

GROUP DYNAMICS
PSY472
(paper 2 of 3)

Eric St. George
c/o CCF--180161
PO Box 600
Cañon City, CO 81215

Experiments Studied:

- (I) Stanley Milgram's Obedience to Authority experiment
Yale University (1963)
- (II) Bibb Latané & John Darley's Bystander "Apathy" Effect
Columbia and New York Universities (1968)

Journals Read:

- (I) [1] Milgram, S., Behavioral Study of Obedience. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 67:371-378 (1963)
- [2] Milgram, S., Some Conditions of Obedience and Disobedience to Authority. Human Relations. 18:57-76 (1965)
- [3] Haslam, SA and Reicher, JD., Contesting the "Nature" of Conformity: What Milgram and Zimbardo's Studies Really Show. PLoS Biology. Vol. 10, No. 11, e1001426 (2012)
- [4] Kaposi, D., The Resistance Experiments: Morality, Authority and Obedience in Stanley Milgram's Account. Journal of Theory & Social Behavior. 47:382-401 (2017)
- [5] Gibson, S., 'We Have a Choice': Identity Construction and the Rhetorical Enactment of Resistance in the 'Two Peers Rebel' Condition of Stanley Milgram's Obedience Experiment. European Journal of Social Psychology. 52:391-404 (2020)
- (II) [6] Latané, B. and Darley, J., Group Inhibition of Bystander Intervention in Emergencies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 10(3):215-221 (1968)
- [7] Latané, B. and Darley, J., Bystander "Apathy". American Scientist. 57(2):244-268 (1969)
- [8] Hortensius, R. and de Gelder, B., From Empathy to Apathy, The Bystander Effect Revisited. Current Directions in Psychological Science. 27(4):249-256 (2018)

109 Total Pages

OVERVIEW

This course on Group Dynamics "is designed to provide the opportunity to study the principles underlying the process of group action and interaction in social situations and in professional leadership and supervisory group situations." In an era before the current age of informed consent in experimentation there was the "Golden Age of Social Psychology." These experiments have been both highly regarded and infamous. They sought to answer questions about why people behave as they do when they are subject to the influence of other people in groups. The human animal is a social one, we are no different than

animals that move in herds, packs and hives. We rely on other people, and we behave very differently in our social groups than when we are alone. These experiments investigate some of the fundamental forces of group dynamics -- social behavior -- that allow humans to exist in a society. Forces like; obedience, conformity, cooperation, conflict resolution, tribalism (membership & identity). Good, Bad or indifferent, these social forces influence group behaviors, and the behaviors of the individuals in the groups. Much controversy surrounds these studies. This summary of these group dynamics experiments will cover the controversies as much as the experiments themselves. These experiments were, in my estimation, self-aware of their own controversy potential, despite the loud voices of nay-sayers that followed in the decades since. The decision to pursue this direction of study for this Group Dynamics course came from the first text used in the class, The Better Angels of Our Nature. In that book, the author made reference to the "Golden Age of Social Psychology," and listed a number of these specific experiments. The book was vast, and there was not space to properly cover this subject. These experiments deserved to be covered in their own paper.

WHY THESE EXPERIMENTS WERE CHOSEN FOR USE IN THIS COURSE

For this paper, I chose to write about Stanley Milgram's Obedience to Authority experiments and Latané & Darley's Bystander "Apathy" or Bystander Effect experiments. These experiments both have strong law enforcement implications. I've written extensively about my present incarceration, a wrongful imprisonment at the hands of the Lakewood Police. In my lawsuit against the police that attempted to murder me, St. George v. City of Lakewood, I cited the Milgram experiment in opposition to a defense motion to dismiss. [Brief in Support of Motion to Deny Dismissal, District of Colorado, Case No. 18-cv-01930-WJM-STV, DOC 54 15 March 2019]

I gave a summary of the experiment, and made the assertion that that the officers that shot me did so because it reflected their training and blind obedience to their supervision. The Milgram experiments are notorious for their context as searching for an explanation of the individual behavior of Nazi officers during the

Holocaust. The "just following orders" defense forwarded at the Nuremburg trials was too difficult for the public to accept. The conclusions of these experiments are fodder for debate still today. As research to read for writing on this subject I ordered peer-reviewed journal articles from the public library. I sought the seminal article written by Stanley Milgram and published to the Journal of Abnormal Psychology in 1963. [1] I also sought out his follow-up from 1965 published to Human Relations. [2] Milgram also published articles in 1964 and 1965 in J.Ab.Soc.Psy. and J.Pers.Soc.Psy. that I did not request. Nor did I seek his book from 1974, Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View. I did request several articles that were contemporary and cited the experiments; I hoped to see how these experiments were viewed from today's perspective. I received Haslam & Reicher's 2012 "Contesting the 'Nature' of Conformity: What Milgram and Zimbardo's Studies Really Show," [3] also Dávid Kaposi's 2017 "The Resistance Experiments: Morality, Authority and Obedience in Stanley Milgram's Account," [4] also Stephen Gibson's 2020 "'We Have a Choice': Identity Construction and the Rhetorical Enactment of Resistance in the 'Two Peers Rebel' Condition of Stanley Milgram's Obedience Experiment." [5]

Bibb Latané and John M. Darley's experiments were conducted in the late 60's, and had a very specific event that formed the context for these experiments, the Kitty Genovese murder. The murder was national news for its heinous and salacious details. Seeking an explanation for why bystanders fail to help, Latané & Darley conducted their experiments. I requested their seminal 1968 publication from the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology titled "Group Inhibition of Bystander Intervention in Emergencies." [6] In addition I requested "Bystander 'Apathy'" from American Scientist, 1969. [7] In order to get a contemporary perspective, I requested the public library send me a recent article citing to the Latané & Darley experiment. I received "From Empathy to Apathy: The Bystander Effect Revisited" published in Current Directions in Psychological Science by Ruud Hortensius & Beatrice de Gelder in 2018. [8]

--STANLEY MILGRAM'S OBEDIENCE EXPERIMENT--

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Milgram writes: "Obedience, as a determinant of behavior, is of particular relevance to our time. It has been reliably established that from 1933-45 millions of innocent persons were systematically slaughtered on command. Gas chambers were built, death camps were guarded, daily quotas of corpses were produced with the same efficiency as the manufacture of appliances. These inhumane policies may have originated in the mind of a single person, but they could only be carried out on a massive scale if a very large number of persons obeyed orders." Milgram quotes an author that wrote the Rise and Fall of the Third Reich: "The German Officer Corps were brought up in the most rigorous code of obedience... in the name of obedience they were party to and assisted in, the most wicked large scale actions in the history of the world." [1]

Following WWII, the Four-Power Allied Tribunal called the International Military Tribunal (IMT) brought German supporters of the Nazi regime to trial for war crimes in Nuremburg. These trials named as defendants high-ranking Nazis like Herman Goering and others. Also named Defendants were the German Secret State Police (Die Geheime Staatspolizei, or Gestapo) and the German National Socialist Worker's Party Bodyguard (Die Schutzstaffeln der Nationalsozialistischen Deutschen Arbeiterpartei, or SS; "Schutz" means protection and "staffeln" means graduate). Also named were German corporations and manufacturers that supported the Nazi war effort. As an example is the Degesch arm of the I.G. Farben company which made Zyklon B, the toxic poison gas used to murder Jews at Dachau, Treblinka, Auschwitz and others. The IMT charter, [59 Stat. 1546 (1945)], allowed criminal charges against war criminals for: "crimes against peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanities." At the trials, defendants overwhelmingly gave testimony that they were "just following orders." [Judgment and Sentences, 41 Am.J.Int'l.L. 172, pp. 256-57, 261-62, 266-67, (1946)] The factfinders in the trials were instructed that this was not an affirmative defense to the charges. ("...under Nuremburg Trials principles, the orders of superior officers are not necessarily an excuse

for unlawful acts..." [Rochez Bros. v. Rhoades, 390 F.Supp. 470, 473 (W.D. Pa. 1974)]

In the 1956 article's introduction [2, at p. 57] Milgram invokes the Biblical reference to Abraham, "who is commanded by God to kill his son." This reference to history's most extreme example of obedience to authority made clear his intent in setting the stage and context in his experiments. The questions that Milgram sought to answer were; Why do people act in ways that they know are morally wrong in obedience to authority? Can anyone commit acts violative of their own morals when overridden by supplication to authority? How are these phenomena possible?

Researcher Hannah Arendt coined the term "banality of evil" in her 1963 book "Eichmann in Jerusalem: a report on the banality of evil." Adolf Eichmann had implemented the Nazi "Final Solution" which was the Holocaust murder of 6MM Jews. Was he a blood-thirsty monster? At his war-crimes trial he presented as "a diligent and efficient bureaucrat -- a man more concerned with following orders than with asking deep questions about their morality or consequence" according to Arendt. Id.

This was the atmosphere in which Milgram performed his experiments, seeking explanation for how an entire nation of Germans could engage in or be complicit with such savage acts as committing genocide without a reasonable level of self-reflection. Just following orders. How could Abraham raise his knife to his son Isaac? [Gen. 22:10] Obedience to God's authority. And, as I'll apply the study to law enforcement, how can police officers use excessive force against their fellow man without conscience? Obedience to a chain-of-command and supervision, and conformity to training.

Procedure and Method

The experiments were conducted at Yale University in the "interaction laboratory." [1] The subjects were 40 males between 20 and 50 years old from the local New Haven area. They were obtained through newspaper and direct mail advertisements. They came from a range of occupations, and were paid \$4.50 (\$45.93 in 2024 adjusted dollars, Google, accessed 27 APR 2024) for their participation. They were

directly advised that the payment was for coming in to the lab and was theirs to keep; it was not contingent on any outcome of the experiment. Id.

Milgram was assisted by two "confederates;" a 31 year old high school biology teacher who played the experimenter, and a 47 year old accountant who played the role of the victim. A "shock generator" was made to have a very convincing appearance as a genuine scientific device. It had 30 switches labeled 15 to 450 volts. In groups of 4 these switches also were labeled "Slight Shock," "Moderate Shock," "Strong Shock," "Very Strong Shock," "Intense Shock," "Extreme Intense Shock," and "Danger: Severe Shock." The final 2 switches were labeled "XXX." The machine also had an industrial engraved panel that read "Shock Generator, Type ZLB, Dyson Instrument Company, Waltham, Mass. Output 15 Volts - 450 Volts." Each participant would be administered a 45 volt shock on the wrist as demonstration of the machine's function, depressing the third switch. The machine in reality contained a 45 volt battery. The demonstration was intended to convince the subjects of the authenticity of the device. Id.

The subjects were told that the experiment was to discover if using electric shocks as punishment would improve learning. (I recall the scene from the movie "Ghostbusters" where Bill Murray's character is performing a similar experiment, ostensibly to test if shocks used as negative reinforcement improve a subject's ESP skill. Hollywood was clearly spoofing Milgram.) The naive subjects were told that the role of "teacher" and "learner" would be randomly drawn from a hat; but the draw was actually rigged to assure the subject was always assigned to be teacher and the confederate victim to be learner. Id.

The learning task was paired-words that the learner was to memorize associations. The learner would be read a word with four terms, and he was to give his response via switches that lit up one of four quadrants of an answer-box on top of the shock generator. The learner is in a separate room, cannot be seen but can be heard. Id.

The subject was told to administer a shock whenever a wrong answer was given by the learner. Each shock was to be progressively stronger, beginning with 15 V, 30 V, 45 V... and so on. He is also to announce the voltage aloud with each shock -- reinforcing the

increasing intensity in the mind of the subject. Id.

The confederate "learner" answers 3 of 10 from a first list of words correctly; 7 are incorrect and earn shocks. This is entirely planned, and helps train the subject with the procedure, reading and administering shocks. Subjects are given a second list and instructed to repeat this list "until the learner has learned all pairs correctly." The learner gives a predetermined set of answers, in a ratio of approximately three wrong to each right answer. The learner makes no noises or complaints until the shocks reach the 300 volt level. At this level, the learner pounds on the wall. Id.

This point is when the subjects typically look to the experimenter for instruction. Going forward, the learner no longer responds on the answer-box. The experimenter tells subjects to allow 5-10 seconds before considering a non-response as a wrong answer. "At various points in the experiment the subject may turn to the experimenter for advice on whether he should continue to administer shocks. Or he may indicate that he does not wish to go on. It was important to standardize the experimenter's responses to these inquiries and reactions. If the subject indicated his unwillingness to go on, the experimenter responded with a sequence of 'prods,' using as many as necessary to bring the subject into line. Prod 1: Please continue or Please go on. Prod 2: The experiment requires that you continue. Prod 3: It is absolutely essential that you continue. Prod 4: You have no other choice, you must go on." These prods were made in sequence, Prod 2 was used if the first didn't compel obedience... and so on. If the subject disobeyed after Prod 4, the experiment concluded. Id.

There were two special prods that could be used in specific instances. If the subject asked if the learner could be permanently harmed, the experimenter said: "Although the shocks may be painful, there is no permanent tissue damage, so please go on. (followed by Prod 2, 3 and 4 if necessary.)" If the subject said that the learner wanted to stop, the experimenter would say: "Whether the learner likes it or not, you must go on until he has learned all the word pairs correctly. So please go on. (followed by Prods 2, 3, and 4 if necessary.)" Every time the subject complied or cooperated, the use of the prods would start again back at Prod 1 the next time that he

tried to resist again. Id.

The sessions were recorded on audio tape, and some photographs were taken. Observers (through one-way glass) took notes on the subject's behaviors. Latency and duration of shocks were recorded with timing devices. At the end of the experiment, subjects were interviewed and debriefed. They met the victim and the hoax was revealed to them. They were counseled to relieve any stress that resulted from the experiment. Id.

The Results

Prior to the experiment, fourteen Yale psychology students were asked to predict how 100 hypothetical subjects would behave. The most pessimistic of the fourteen estimated that 3 subjects would go all the way to 450 volts. The average of the fourteen students' estimates was 1.2 of the 100 would complete the series of shocks. They estimated that "few if any" subjects would comply beyond "Very Strong Shock" (195 V - 240 V). The estimates were nowhere near correct. Every single one of the 40 subjects obeyed up to 300 V. Only 5 did not proceed past 300 V. Four gave only one more shock before stopping. 26 of the 40 subjects continued to shock the victim 10 more levels after he stopped answering -- all the way to the XXX 450 volt level. Id.

Milgram writes: "After the maximum shocks had been delivered, and after the experimenter called a halt to the proceedings, many obedient subjects heaved sighs of relief, mopped their brows, rubbed their fingers over their eyes, or nervously fumbled cigarettes. Some shook their heads, apparently in regret. Some subjects had remained calm throughout the experiment, and displayed only minimal signs of tension from beginning to end." Id.

This version of the experiment, the first, would come to be known as the "baseline condition." [3] Milgram would conduct many iterations of his experiment, manipulating the independent variables in order to determine the effects on the dependent variable, the obedience of the subjects. Milgram acknowledged from the outset that the high levels of obedience could be explained by several aspects of the experimental design. The experiment was conducted at Ivy League Yale University, a highly respected educational institution.

The victim was ostensibly a willing volunteer, not a captive. The subject too is a volunteer and could feel himself to have an obligation to comply. The experimenter was a scientist and professional; from the subject's vantage he knew better and was responsible. These facets of the backdrop of the experiment and others all give the experiment the pastiche of legitimate authority which people tend to obey. [1]

Manipulations to the Experiment

One early variation includes increased protest from the victim. Milgram used pre-recorded and standardized audio tapes coordinated to fixed voltage levels. At 75 volts, the learner begins to grunt and groan; at 150 volts he cries out "Experimenter, get me out of here! I won't be in the experiment any more! I refuse to go on!" At 180 volts he cries out he can no longer stand the pain and as in the baseline at 300 volts he stops responding altogether. Milgram calls this the "voice feedback" condition [2]; in later years it will be called the "new baseline" condition. [5] Defiant subjects (those who did not go all the way to 450 V) increased from 34% in baseline to 37.5% in the "new baseline." [2]

In another condition, Milgram moved the victim into the same room with the subject, 16.5 inches apart. Defiance increased to 60% in this "Proximity" condition. (40% still cooperated!) Id. In a "Touch Proximity" condition, the subject was required to physically force the victim's hand onto a "shock plate" in order to administer the shocks. Defiance increased to 70%. (30% still cooperated!) Id. Milgram took the experiment out of the University, moving it to a down-market industrial office park in "Bridgeport." The experiment was superficially being conducted by "Research Associates of Bridgeport." Holding the other variables constant, 48% of the Bridgeport subjects were fully obedient where 65% of the Yale subjects had been fully obedient. The seedy environs reduced obedience, but not significantly so! [2]

Defiance reached 90% in a scenario Milgram calls "Groups for Disobedience" [2] and later called "Two Peers Rebel." [5] In this scenario, "two actors (confederate-teachers) broke off in the middle of the experiment... 90 percent of the subjects followed suit and

defied the experimenter." [2] Milgram conducted multiple more manipulations, altering language in the Prods to include collective "we" and "us" pronouns to create alliant behaviors [5], shifting the alliant behavior between subject/victim (Id.), subject/experimenter (Id.), subject/confederate-teacher (Id.), and so on. Milgram studied "almost a thousand adults" to test "variables that control obedience and disobedience to authority." [2]

In a highly critical article, the author writes: "Nestar Russell (another researcher published in Br.J.Soc.Psy. in 2011) has repeatedly demonstrated how strategic Milgram actually was in designing the experiments to get (it. in original) the shocking level of obedience he wanted." [4] I disagree with Kaposki's article mostly. I may be biased. I question authority in all things; I am skeptical and critical of people I find weak-minded who follow authority blindly. I see the veracity of Milgram's findings and conclusions all around me in the world. In my estimation, Milgram was going to great lengths to find, "What is it going to take to get these subjects to think for themselves and defy me?!" The highest level of defiance was when others did it first. (the Rebel condition) Most people are followers; this is what I see. Perhaps this is for the best, as in the cliché "too many chiefs and not enough indians" civilization runs on the backs of the obedient following leaders. Else is chaos, a "herding cats" scenario. A similar conclusion is made in the bystander study as to fitness to respond. [infra]

Applications to law enforcement

Organizations depend on obedience to chains of command. A corporation falls apart without a workforce that obeys its supervisors. A worksite fails when laborers don't obey authority. Armies lose battles when soldiers don't follow orders. But what happens when obedience to authority goes awry? Nobody would debate that organized crime mobsters are obedient to their capos. Street gang homies obey their shot-callers. Dealers are obedient to the cartels. I have argued that obedience to authority in law enforcement has been devastating -- it nearly left me dead. Policing requires obedience; police even use military style ranks in their chains of command.

When police are improperly trained, when toxic cultures of aggression pervade, where "shoot first and ask questions later" indifference takes root in the upper ranks, when the supervisors are zealots; danger ensues. Police are wrapped in the appearance of legitimate authority bestowed upon them by government fiat. The same obedience to authority that Milgram found occurs; officers obey their superior sergeants, lieutenants and chiefs. This upper brass regularly allow career aspirations and pressure to perform from their superiors and the public to drive policy and custom; those with whom police have contact are left to suffer. The public become fodder for the law enforcement industrial complex. Whether it be delivery of an electric shock, pulling the trigger of a gun, or murdering Jews with poison gas, to obey authority is the norm regardless of the ethical considerations.

Researching how the Milgram case has been used in law, I found several published instances of its appearance in the courtroom. In an Air Force Court of Appeals (CAAF) review of a court martial of a Dr. Jonathon Solomon, Captain O-3, who was a clinician at a base clinic at Spangdahlein Air Base in Germany. The appeal questioned, inter alia, whether the testimony of "Dr. MC" who summarized the Stanley Milgram experiment to the court members (term used for a military jury) to explain the concept of "normalizing trust." Dr. MC testified that the term was coined to explain that: "...there are certain people that we just have to kind of turn over our trust to, because they have specialized learning or expertise..." The Circuit Trial Counsel (CTC) elicited this testimony to show how Dr. Solomon obtained obedience to his authority from his victims. On appeal, the reviewing court found that the use of this testimony was not a trial error. [United States v. Solomon, 2022 CCA LEXIS 492, *70 (USAF App. 2022)]

In another case, the Milgram study is cited to explain the concept of "agentic shift," as a means to support the statement: "ordinary people would obey almost any order given to them by an authority figure." The opinion reads: "...a person comes to view themselves as the instrument for carrying out another person's wishes and they therefore no longer see themselves as responsible for their actions..." citing: Nissanl, Motl, A Cognitive Reinterpretation of

Stanley Milgram's Observations on Obedience to Authority, 1383-84, American Psychologist, Vol. 45(12), Dec. 1990. [Haraszewski v. Krupp, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 206190, *71]

~~As a student of psychology and due to my experiences in the~~ practice of law, I have seen many references to social psychology in the legal environment. I was totally unsurprised to find the Milgram experiments to be among them -- especially because I have done it myself.

-- BIBB LATANÉ & JOHN DARLEY'S BYSTANDER "APATHY" EFFECT EXPERIMENTS--

Historical Context

Latané & Darley write that the diffusion of responsibility seems to be the explanation for why people fail to intervene in emergencies. One specific emergency was in these researchers minds when they performed their study. In the introduction to their 1968 article they write of emergencies "...such as the Kitty Genovese murder in which 38 people witnessed a killing from their individual apartments without acting..." [6] More elaborately in 1969 they write: "On a March night in 1964, Kitty Genovese was set upon by a maniac as she came home from work at 3 A.M. Thirty-eight of her Kew Gardens neighbors came to windows when she cried out in terror -- none came to her assistance. Even though her assailant took over half an hour to murder her, no one even so much as called the police." They continue: "This story became the journalistic sensation of the decade. 'Apathy,' cried the newspapers. 'Indifference,' said the columnists and commentators. 'Moral callousness,' 'dehumanization,' 'loss of concern for our fellow man...' " "...can these epithets be correct?" [7]

On Friday the 13th of March 1964, Winston Moseley murdered Kitty Genovese in Queens, New York. He stabbed her 17 times over the course of more than a half-hour. He raped her, even after he mutilated her genitalia. 38 people heard her screams and saw the event from windows, yet all did nothing to help her. I took this account of the events from the Habeas Corpus decision as to Moseley's conviction. [Moseley v. Scully, 908 F.Supp. 1120, 1123 (E.D.N.Y. 1995)]

It is with this backdrop that Latané & Darley conducted their experiments, seeking to answer, "But why, then, don't we act?" Id.

Procedure and Method

The experiments were conducted at Columbia University in New York City. Male students were recruited to meet with the experimenter in order to discuss "some of the problems involved in life at an urban university." [6][7] The subjects were seated in a waiting room to fill out a preliminary questionnaire. Id. While waiting for the putative interview, the experimenters delivered puffs of smoke into the waiting room via a small vent. Id. The smoke was created using pressurized moist air passed over titanium tetrachloride (TiCl_4) resulting in titanium dioxide (TiO_2) in suspension. Id. The result was a whitish smoke. The smoke continued in puffs throughout the experimental period. The experimental period ended when the subject left the waiting room to report the smoke, or when 6 minutes elapsed from his first notice of the smoke. Id. Multiple conditions were tested; Alone condition: single naive subject, Two passive confederates condition: 1 naive subject + 2 confederates who ignored the smoke, and Three naive bystanders: 3 naive subjects. Id. Observations were made through one-way glass. Id.

The Results

In the Alone condition, 75% (18 of 24) of subjects reported the smoke before the 6 minutes ran up. The median subject was within 2 minutes. Id. No subject was panicked by the smoke. Id. When there were two passive confederates, the response to the smoke plummeted. Only 10% (1 of 10) of the subjects reported the smoke. The other 9 subjects "coughed, rubbed their eyes, and opened the window" as the waiting room filled with smoke. Id. The effect of the two confederates in the room behaving passively was highly significant in changing the behavior of the subject. When three naive subjects were placed in the waiting room in a group, 38% (3 of 8 groups) had one subject from the group report the smoke. Only one subject of the 24 total (8 groups of 3 subjects) reported the smoke before the room became unpleasantly smoky; before the 4 minute mark. If 75% of the alone subjects reported the smoke, a projected $>98\%$ [$100\% - (25\% \times 25\% \times 25\%)$] of the three naive subjects groups should have a smoke-reporter. The 38% compared to the projected 98%+ was highly significant evidence of group

influence. Id.

After the 6 minutes, the experimenter ended the test by calling subject(s) into the office for the "interview." Most subjects mentioned the smoke. There was consistency in reports that subjects were unsure if the smoke was dangerous; a fire? steam? A/C vapor? smog? (intended to simulate an "urban" environment, per the cover story) ...even "truth gas," (two subjects believed the intent was to induce honest answers to the questionnaire... but weren't "disturbed" at this prospect!) Id. These results were described by the term "group inhibition."

Seeking to corroborate this effect, "Experiment 2 was designed to see whether similar group inhibition effects could be observed in situations where there is no danger to the individual himself for not acting." They called the scenario "A Lady in Distress." [7] Male Columbia students were recruited to participate in a survey about puzzles and games putatively conducted by the Consumer Testing Bureau (CTB). They were asked to bring a friend, and only those who had a friend were used as subjects. Id. An "attractive young woman" met subjects at the door and led them to a testing room. She told subjects that she would be working next door in an adjacent office, separated by a collapsable curtain through which she exited the testing room. For ten minutes she shuffled papers and opened drawers -- then the emergency -- a standardized audio recording of a loud crash and screams and "Oh, my God, my foot... I... can't... move... it. Oh... my... ankle," and so on. [7]

Here the dependant variable was whether the subjects reacted and helped the young woman. In one condition, subjects were alone in the testing room (the friends pairs were split), in another the friends were re-paired with a "stooge" who was a confederate of the experimenter, another where the friends were re-paired with a naive subject stranger, and lastly where the friends that came together were in the testing room together. A positive result was a subject either going through the curtain separating the testing room from the office, going around through the doors, or calling out to the woman to ask if she's okay. Id.

The Results

Of the Alone condition, 28 subjects, 18 of them (70%) intervened. Projecting from this result, 91% of the Two Strangers condition subjects should intervene -- only 40% (8 of 20 pairs) does one of the subjects intervene. In the "Stooge" condition, where the confederate feigned passivity, intervention reduced to 7% (1 of 14 pairs). In the Two Friends condition, 70% (14 of 20 pairs) intervened, which is not equal to the Alone condition (despite being the same percentage) because the expected intervention rate is 91% due to having two possible intervenors in a pair. $[100\% - (30\% \times 30\%)]$ Id. The conclusions we can draw from the results: this "Lady in Distress" experiment reinforced the findings from the smoke experiment. The diffusion of responsibility is about bearing blame, the onus of responsibility is distributed over more people when more subjects are present. The social influence, seeing the reactions of others has the strongest effect; "social influence leads an individual to define the situation as non-serious and not requiring action." Id.

Additional Studies

Further studies are conducted and reviewed in the literature I read. An experiment with a staged beer theft from a liquor store, "The Case of the Stolen Beer," was conducted. Id. The beer scenario was exactly what we see in the news so often today, people walking out of retail stores with merchandise they didn't pay for, in broad daylight. In another, a study similar to the Smoke and Lady in Distress experiments, utilizing a feigned interview set-up was done. This time held at NYU, and a staged epileptic seizure in lieu of smoke or a trip-and-fall in an adjacent office. This one was called "A Fit to be Tried." Id. The experimenters again used different conditions to test different independent variables. One new variable introduced was sex of the subjects, adding females. "Coping with emergencies is often thought to be the duty of males, especially when there are females present, but there was no evidence that this is the case in this study." Id.

Over all the experiments and conditions, the experimenter found the "social influence" and "diffusion of responsibility" explanations

for observed behavior to be valid. Id.

Applications to law enforcement

~~For most of people, emergencies are rare events, "...the average~~ person probably will encounter fewer than half a dozen serious emergencies in his lifetime." [7] From an evolutionary biological perspective, "perhaps... for the best outcome, only the fittest individual should provide help and others should not..." [8] "The training of firefighters and other first responders directly follows these principles: Only well-trained individuals are allowed to help..." Id. In my opinion, this is leading to devastating results for society. For example, considering the George Floyd murder by Minneapolis Police, Officer Derek Chauvin snuffed-out a man's life while onlookers video recorded with cell phones but felt impotent to intervene. In another example, Danny Penny did intervene on a NYC subway when a mentally disturbed man threatened passengers. He subdued the man with a hold about his neck; the man subsequently died. Danny Penny acted in good faith, and he's being prosecuted for his action. All throughout our country there are smash-and-grab shoplifting events -- citizens feel helpless to intervene, as a result of the effects found in these experiments. In groups people experience the diffusion of responsibility effect, the social influence (later refined as "pluralistic ignorance" ...is this truly an emergency? And "evaluation apprehension" ...am I going to look like a fool for helping? Id.) and the threat of legal repercussions from law enforcement.

Latané & Darley say that they believe bystanders are "not indifferent or apathetic," rather "Caught, fascinated, distressed, unwilling to act but unable to turn away." [6] The government has passed statutes in an attempt to create an obligation to report crimes. In Colorado, C.R.S. Sec. 18-8-115, titled Duty to report a crime -- liability for disclosure, and federally 18 U.S.C. Sec. 4 titled Misprison of felony, are laws created by legislatures in an attempt to this end. The judiciary, the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals, however says: "It is well established that a person who sees a crime being committed has no legal duty to either stop or report it. The government is incorrect in stating that such a general duty exists under

Colorado Law 18-8-115." [United States v. Zimmerman, 943 F.2d 1204, 1214 (10th Cir. 1991)]

The conflicting interests of such a statute are clear, where the danger of legal ramifications for intervention are very great, and the threat of harm from involving police is so high. People freeze and do nothing, unsure of themselves and the right response.

CONCLUSION

These two classic experiments of social psychology from Milgram and from Latané & Darley provided a revealing look into the subject of group dynamics. These studies gave us understanding of obedience to authority, especially how obedience is influenced in the group setting. Also, the behavior of bystanders in emergency situations, and the social influence of others on the individual when in group situations is better understood owing to the experiments.

