ISLAM AND THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT
By Peter M. Friedman

The Milgram Experiment was originally devised to explore the “ethics” that were in play during the Holocaust. How did the Nazi guards at places such as Bergen-Belsen, Dachau, and Auschwitz “rationalize” and/or live with themselves during the period they were shoving Jews into gas chambers and burning the bodies, and after the war? Were they haunted by their actions and memories? For the most part, apparently not as they performed their actions under specific Color-of-Authority as the Milgram Experiment proved. We are now faced in America with, and the rest of the civilized world, a similar, but more sinister threat than the Holocaust—radical Islam, which may be the future’s next great Holocaust.

The Milgram Experiment proved that a human’s moral compass could be diverted when exposed to specific authority, which was “human”. However, what would happen to that moral compass if the Color-of-Authority was the Islamic god, Allah?

Muslims believe that every word in the Koran comes literally from their god, Allah. For those who are not Muslims, you better acquaint yourself with the religious obligations detailed in the Koran or you will end up as cannon-fodder! The Koran specifically demands Muslims to conduct Holy War [read Jihad] against non-believers until they convert, pay an extortion tax to be allowed to survive as an inferior under Muslim control, or be killed! (Ref. Koran 9:29 et al) What are the ethics and rationalizations of Muslims who engage in atrocities against non-believers? The Milgram Experiment in 1961 provides the best insight.

According to Wikipedia:

The Milgram experiment on obedience to authority figures was a series of notable experiments in social psychology experiments conducted by Yale University psychologist Stanley Milgram, which measured the willingness of study participants to obey an authority figure who instructed them to perform acts that conflicted with their personal conscience. Milgram first described his research in 1963 in an article published in the Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, and later discussed his findings in greater depth in his 1974 book Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View.

The experiments began in July 1961. Milgram devised his psychological study to answer the question: “Was it that Eichmann and his accomplices in the Holocaust had mutual intent, in at least with regard to the goals of the Holocaust?” In other words, “Was there a mutual sense of morality among those involved?” Milgram's testing suggested that it could have been that the millions of accomplices were merely following orders, despite violating their deepest moral beliefs. The experiments have been repeated many times, with consistent results within societies, but different percentages across the globe. The experiments were also controversial, and considered by some scientists to be unethical or psychologically abusive, motivating more thorough review boards for the use of human subjects.
The volunteer subject was given the role of teacher, and the confederate, the role of learner. The participants drew slips of paper to "determine" their roles. Unknown to the subject, both slips said "teacher", and the actor claimed to have the slip that read "learner", thus guaranteeing that the participant would always be the "teacher". At this point, the "teacher" and "learner" were separated into different rooms where they could communicate but not see each other. In one version of the experiment, the confederate was sure to mention to the participant that he had a heart condition.

The "teacher" was given an electric shock from the electro-shock generator as a sample of the shock that the "learner" would supposedly receive during the experiment. The "teacher" was then given a list of word pairs which he was to teach the learner. The teacher began by reading the list of word pairs to the learner. The teacher would then read the first word of each pair and read four possible answers. The learner would press a button to indicate his response. If the answer was incorrect, the teacher would administer a shock to the learner, with the voltage increasing in 15-volt increments for each wrong answer. If correct, the teacher would read the next word pair.

The subjects believed that for each wrong answer, the learner was receiving actual shocks. In reality, there were no shocks. After the confederate was separated from the subject, the confederate set up a tape recorder integrated with the electro-shock generator, which played pre-recorded sounds for each shock level. After a number of voltage level increases, the actor started to bang on the wall that separated him from the subject. After several times banging on the wall and complaining about his heart condition, all responses by the learner would cease.

At this point, many people indicated their desire to stop the experiment and check on the learner. Some test subjects paused at 135 volts and began to question the purpose of the experiment. Most continued after being assured that they would not be held responsible. A few subjects began to laugh nervously or exhibit other signs of extreme stress once they heard the screams of pain coming from the learner.

If at any time the subject indicated his desire to halt the experiment, he was given a succession of verbal prods by the experimenter, in this order:

1. Please continue.
2. The experiment requires that you continue.
3. It is absolutely essential that you continue.
4. You have no other choice, you must go on.

If the subject still wished to stop after all four successive verbal prods, the experiment was halted. Otherwise, it was halted after the subject had given the maximum 450-volt shock three times in succession.

The experimenter also gave special prods, if the teacher made specific comments. If the teacher asked whether the learner might suffer permanent physical harm, the experimenter replied "Although the shocks may be painful, there is no permanent tissue damage, so please go on". If the teacher said that the learner clearly wants to stop, the experimenter replied, "Whether the learner likes it or not, you must go on until he has learned all the word pairs correctly, so please go on".

The results obtained through this “experiment” were unbelievable to the researchers! They really thought that inherent human morality would prevent the “teachers” from administering electrical shocks to innocent human beings – they were grossly incorrect, especially when they were being paid to do it, and under specific Color-of-Authority.
Before conducting the experiment, Milgram polled fourteen Yale University senior-year psychology majors to predict the behavior of 100 hypothetical teachers. All of the poll respondents believed that only a very small fraction of teachers (the range was from zero to 3 out of 100, with an average of 1.2) would be prepared to inflict the maximum voltage. Milgram also informally polled his colleagues and found that they, too, believed very few subjects would progress beyond a very strong shock.

- **In Milgram’s first set of experiments, 65 percent (26 of 40) of experiment participants administered the experiment's final massive 450-volt shock**, though many were very uncomfortable doing so; at some point, every participant paused and questioned the experiment, some said they would refund the money they were paid for participating in the experiment.

Milgram summarized the experiment in his 1974 article, "The Perils of Obedience", writing:

- The legal and philosophic aspects of **obedience** are of enormous importance, but they say very little about how most people behave in concrete situations. I set up a simple experiment at Yale University to test how much pain an ordinary citizen would inflict on another person simply because he was ordered to by an experimental scientist. Stark authority was pitted against the subjects' [participants'] strongest moral imperatives against hurting others, and, with the subjects' [participants'] ears ringing with the screams of the victims, authority won more often than not. The extreme willingness of adults to go to almost any lengths on the command of an authority constitutes the chief finding of the study and the fact most urgently demanding explanation.
- Ordinary people, simply doing their jobs, and without any particular hostility on their part, can become agents in a terrible destructive process. Moreover, even when the destructive effects of their work become patently clear, and they are asked to carry out actions incompatible with fundamental standards of morality, relatively few people have the resources needed to resist authority.
- Dr. Thomas Blass of the **University of Maryland, Baltimore County** performed a meta-analysis on the results of repeated performances of the experiment. He found that the percentage of participants who are prepared to inflict fatal voltages remains remarkably constant, 61–66 percent, regardless of time or place.

There is a little-known **coda** to the Milgram Experiment, reported by **Philip Zimbardo**: none of the participants who refused to administer the final shocks insisted that the experiment itself be terminated, nor left the room to check the health of the victim without requesting permission to leave, as per Milgram's notes and recollections, when Zimbardo asked him about that point.

Milgram created a documentary film titled **Obedience** showing the experiment and its results. He also produced a series of five social psychology films, some of which dealt with his experiments.

The experiments provoked emotional criticism more about the experiment's implications than with experimental ethics. In the journal **Jewish Currents**, Joseph Dimow, a participant in the 1961 experiment at Yale University, wrote about his early withdrawal as a "teacher,” suspicious "that the whole experiment was designed to see if ordinary Americans would obey immoral orders, as many Germans had done during the Nazi period." Indeed, that was one of the explicitly stated goals of the experiments. In the Preface (p. xii) to his book, **Obedience to Authority**, Milgram wrote: "The question arises as to whether there is any connection between what we have studied in the laboratory and the forms of obedience we so deplored in the Nazi epoch."

**Professor Milgram elaborated two theories explaining his results:**
• The first is the theory of conformism, based on Solomon Asch conformity experiments, describing the fundamental relationship between the group of reference and the individual person. A subject who has neither ability nor expertise to make decisions, especially in a crisis, will leave decision making to the group and its hierarchy. The group is the person's behavioral model.

• The second is the agentic state theory, wherein, per Milgram, "the essence of obedience consists in the fact that 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. Once this critical shift of viewpoint has occurred in the person, all of the essential features of obedience follow".

As Shakespeare said, “There’s the rub!” Therein lies OUR problem with Islam!

The Milgram Experiment proved that a human’s moral compass could be diverted when exposed to specific authority, which was “human”. However, what would happen to that moral compass if the Color-of-Authority was the Islamic god, Allah? Fourteen hundred years of Islamic history of Holy War (Jihad) and tortuous slavery as religious obligations of the Koran have proven that Muslims have been guilty of crimes against civilized humanity dwarving anything accomplished by the Nazis! In the name of Allah and Islam Muslims have tortured, raped, and ritually slaughtered innocent human beings who were not Muslims, and who refused conversion. Dr. Andrew Bostom, in his great work, The Legacy of Jihad, chronicles that millennium-plus of worldwide Islamic atrocities, again in the name of the Islamic Color-of-Authority, Allah. Like the Nazi concentration camp guards, how do Muslims torturing, raping, and slaughtering reconcile their actions with civilized human ethics and morality? There is a psychology involved.

How does a person develop the internal psychology which leads them to a rationalization that committing atrocities are within their spectrum of mental understanding? What went through the brains of the Muslims when Muhammad demanded they behead every male Jew after the battle with the Jewish tribe, the Quraiza? Over 800 men were paraded in front of Muhammad, and their heads were systematically cut off by his followers in his presence. The heads were all thrown into a pit and burned along with the bodies. The Jewish tribe was entirely exterminated, and Jews were expelled from Arabia forever.

Today the Nazis are gone, but the Muslims are on the rise. They are using the commission of abhorrent atrocities against non-believers, Jews, Christians, and anyone else not a Muslim, throughout the world. The commission of atrocity simply terrifies people. The mere fact that there are humans willing to commit atrocities is a very powerful force. Raw horror and savagery usually results in people running away, hiding, or attempting appeasement to avoid conflict, like what is happening today in America. This is the psychology of Islam as practiced by millions of Muslims who really believe they are following the dictates of their supreme being, Allah. These dictates of atrocity are very specifically detailed in numerous chapters of the Koran. While the Old and New Testaments are historical and chronological, the Koran is neither historical nor chronological, but written for all time. While the Old Testament chronicles many wars by the Jews in biblical times, there is nothing in either Testament that requires any continuing conflict
like there is in the Koran. The ancient tribes that were the subject of the biblical wars have long
gone in history, but the requirements in the Koran to slaughter non-believers, and subjugate,
capture, and rape them lives on. What goes through the brains of Muslims who commit
atrocities? How do they peacefully sleep at night believing they have accomplished the will of
Allah?

A noted criminologist, Jeff Cooper, hypothesized, “Any study of atrocity…shows immediately
that the victims, by their appalling ineptitude and timidity, virtually assisted in their own
murders.” The German Jews wanted to believe that Hitler really didn’t mean what he wrote in
Mein Kampf. Then they really wanted to believe that they were being taken by trains to work
camps, not to their deaths. They were unable to suspend their dis-belief as Americans are doing
today.

He wrote further, “Any man who is a man may not, in honor, submit to threats of violence. But
many men who are not cowards are simply not prepared for the fact of human savagery. They
have not thought about it…and they just don’t know what to do. When they look right into the
face of depravity or violence they are astonished and confounded.” Here is the problem in the
proverbial nutshell! They are unable to suspend their dis-belief!

The use of atrocity is especially forceful when used as an institutionalized policy by armies,
revolutionary organizations, and especially governments such as currently found under Islamic
rule. As the noted author Colonel David Grossman wrote, “There is a simple, horrifying, and
obvious value resident in atrocity.” Whole nations have achieved power through the use of
terrorism and atrocity. You only have to look at the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to see how much
power and influence the Palestinians have achieved through the use of atrocity and terror. In the
two generations since Israel declared itself a state in 1948, as the righteous victim of millennia of
persecution and attempted extermination, the victim view has turned about to now target Israel as
racist and the aggressor. When Israel defends itself they are very careful not to target civilians.
The Muslims, on the other hand, specifically target Jewish civilians. They use the Judaic-
Christian ethic of human decency against Israel by hiding behind women and children.

Mass empowerment can be effected through atrocity and terror. The Romans and Nazis
developed this concept to an art. The Muslims are following in their footsteps. Remember, the
highest example of Islam for a Muslim is to emulate the behavior of Muhammad, who
slaughtered people every chance he got. He was able to imbue his followers with the ideology
that they were doing the work of Allah. When a Muslim kills he screams, “Allahu Akbar”, God
is great! What else do you need to know?

After 9-11 Americans went into denial, especially with the assistance of President Bush. When
Bush himself immediately entered dis-belief stating, “Islam is one of the world’s great religions.
It has been hijacked by radicals.” Bush was dead wrong, but why? Was he in denial or was he
just ignorant? Then Obama stated in 2010 from the Pentagon on Veterans Day, “We are not, nor
will we ever be at war with Islam.” Perhaps he’s not aware that Islam has been at war with everyone who is not a Muslim for more than 1400 years! What a stupid, ignorant statement for the leader of the free world to utter when he knows better. (Always remember, Obama studied the Koran in Indonesia for six years when he was growing up there.)

So what sociopathic psychotic mentality drives the atrocities committed by Muslims? Why do Muslims scream “Allahu Akbar”, God is Great, as they slaughter innocent women and children, and cut off the heads of Infidels who get in their way of world domination?

Col. David Grossman writes, “The enemy who fights to a ‘noble’ death validates and affirms the killer’s belief in his own [sic] nobility and the glory of his cause.” That’s it in a nutshell.

In conclusion, America is headed for another Milgram Experiment, but for REAL!