

The Milgram Experiment Was Also Staged



by Leaf Garrit

February 13, 2023

This is a tack-on to Miles' [Stanford paper](#), and I would suggest you read that one first, as it furnishes the key to demystifying the subject at hand. That paper got me thinking about the Milgram experiment, which I first learned about in my undergrad Intro to Sociology class (a poorly chosen elective, in hindsight), and have since never *stopped* hearing about. Milgram is name-dropped in books, magazines, newspapers, TV shows, and anywhere you're likely to get nauseating doses of spin and outright lies. Even friends (the ones who religiously tune in to NPR, mostly) have referred me to the Milgram experiment as proof of the "dark side" of human nature.

The mainstream interpretation is that Milgram demonstrated how decent people can be led into committing heinous acts against other humans simply because an authority figure tells them to. The participants, we are told, were lulled into complete obedience simply because the experiment was conducted at Yale University by a professional in a white lab coat. These conditions alone were enough to compel 65% of people to administer what they knew were fatal voltages of electric shock to other participants. Ever since, Milgram's study has been fetched out of the archives whenever the pseudo-intellectual skills at *The Atlantic* or *Time* need to explain how ordinary German citizens could have performed such atrocities against the Jews.

And there, of course, is our first clue that this was all staged. This didn't just turn out to be a convenient means of explaining away the otherwise unbelievable tale of Hitler and the Holocaust; it was conducted *for that reason*. Per Wikipedia:

Milgram devised his psychological study to explain the psychology of genocide and answer the popular contemporary question: "Could it be that Eichmann and his million accomplices in the Holocaust were just following orders?"

Wikipedia is keen to point out that the experiment began three months after the start of Eichmann's trial. But we now know several things about the whole Nazi project (thank you, Miles) that cast serious doubts on the Milgram experiment. Like the fact that [Hitler and Eichmann were both Jewish](#), and that Eichmann's trial was faked, just like all the other Nazi trials. Eichmann's trial actually took place in Jerusalem, which you will say was for its symbolic significance, but the place of a trial shouldn't be selected based on symbolic significance, should it? He should have been tried in a neutral location; that it took place in Jerusalem just proves it was all theater. We also know the official Holocaust death count is basically a complete fabrication, based on nothing more than...nothing. Remember, Jimmy Carter is on record [claiming 11 million deaths in the Holocaust](#), a whopper he got from Simon Wiesenthal, the Jewish CIA asset who was such a useful liar that England ended up knighting him. Also remember the Warsaw Concentration Camp, where – as all the most trusted historians for decades informed us – 200,000 people were killed by the Nazis. Except that, oops, [it never existed](#).

Which brings us back to the Milgram experiment, which was attempting to rationalize something that didn't need to be rationalized, since it didn't happen. Think about the implications of this. The public has always bought the Milgram experiment because it first bought the Holocaust, but if the latter is more or less fiction, then we have to question the former. They're mutually reinforcing; if one topples, so must the other. Put another way, people buy into the Hobbesian claim that humans are basically nasty and brutish because of a thousand examples throughout history to that effect. But all these examples are leaning against one another like sticks with no center pole. If you start knocking over a few of them – for example, Hitler, Stalin, 9/11, the Salem Witch Trials, serial killers, and so on – pretty soon the whole theory comes crashing down. We can no longer assume human nature is nasty and brutish; we can only assert that a small cadre of humans are nasty and brutish, and they are continually foisting their nastiness onto the rest of us.

But many of us still resist this thinking, as did many of Milgram's peers:

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... Milgram also polled forty psychiatrists from a medical school, and they believed that by the tenth shock, when the victim demands to be free, most subjects would stop the experiment.

Note that these were Yale psychology professors and practicing psychiatrists, presumably among the very top specialists in their field, and they all predicted only one or two individuals

out of 100 would actually go all the way. Tell me, is it more incredible that 65% of people were willing to severely harm another person just because they were told to, or that 100% of the country's top psychologists were wildly off the mark about their own subject matter?

I would argue that 1% or 2% is, in fact, closer to reality. The reason Milgram's results were so far above that number is because his whole experiment was cooked from the start. They practically admit it right to your face, but most people just miss it:

In 2012 Australian psychologist Gina Perry investigated Milgram's data and writings and concluded that Milgram had manipulated the results, and that there was a "troubling mismatch between (published) descriptions of the experiment and evidence of what actually transpired." She wrote that "only half of the people who undertook the experiment fully believed it was real..."

Wow. It sounds just like what we learned about the Stanford experiment, where most of the guards later admitted they were intentionally acting. If half the people knew it wasn't real, that immediately takes the results down from 65% to 32%. But more importantly, it completely undercuts the whole experiment, since these people weren't supposed to know they were the real subjects in the experiment. You should also know – though you have to go over to the [Oxford University Press blog](#) to learn this – that

...when experimenters actually issued the command, 'You have no other choice, you must go on', all participants refused to continue.

That alone completely overturns what we've been told is the central finding of the study, that most people will do whatever an authority figure tells them. We also learn that

Every participant paused the experiment at least once to question it. Most continued after being assured by the experimenter.

What were they questioning, and what was the experimenter assuring them of? They were questioning whether they were seriously hurting the "learner" by pressing the shock button, to which the experimenter **assured them they weren't**. Again, this actually proves the opposite: people do *not* blindly obey authority. It takes our number down to 0%. Stopping to question the effects of their actions isn't blind obedience, is it? And if they genuinely continued based on a lie, that's not really on them, is it? So, what "dark side" of human nature is being exposed here, except perhaps the twisted mind of the person who contrived the experiment?

Which brings us to **Stanley** Milgram, who was, of course, Jewish.



One miserable looking dude, wasn't he? That's what you get for trying to prove everyone else is nasty and brutish; you become that way yourself. He died of a heart attack at age 51, which confirms my point. Our choices have real effects, not just on our spirits, but on our bodies.

We get very little genealogical info – nothing past his parents Samuel Milgram and Adele, née Israel. [At findagrave.com](#) we do learn that Samuel was a member of the [Order of Odd Fellows](#), a major spook organization. Several U.S. presidents have been Odd Fellows, including FDR and McKinley, as well as [Wyatt Earp](#) and [Charles Lindbergh](#). We know what to think of them. Samuel Milgram was supposedly a poor baker, which we know is a favorite Intel joke. Just add an 'n' and you'll get banker. Stanley's first name may link him to the Stanleys of the peerage, though I could find no evidence in that direction.

His Bar Mitzvah speech was on the subject of the plight of the European Jews and the impact that the events of World War II would have on Jewish people around the world. He said, upon becoming a man under Jewish law: "As I ... find happiness in joining the ranks of Israel, the knowledge of the tragic suffering of my fellow Jews ... makes this ... an occasion to reflect upon the heritage of my people—which now becomes mine. ... I shall try to understand my people and do my best to share the responsibilities which history has placed upon all of us."

Sounds like someone who was groomed from an early age, doesn't it? Actually, I'm doubtful a 13-year-old would even say that; it sounds too much like something out of Langley sub-basement #8.

Milgram was not the only Jew involved in his famous experiment. As it turns out, the only two participants whose names I could find also happen to be Jewish: Herb Winer and Joe Dimow. What are the odds of that? Very high, I'd say, if it's being staged. Winer was a fellow Yale professor, and we already learned that Milgram polled his colleagues before the experiment, so chances are Winer knew about the purpose of the experiment ahead of time. I trust you can see the problem with that. Dimow was [a socialist activist](#) who was once arrested under the Smith Act – meaning he was probably a paid agent. We can assume that Milgram stacked at least half of his participants with people like Winer and Dimow who were in on the gag. They may have all been in on it.

And get this: **one of Milgram's high school classmates was Philip Zimbardo**, the architect of the Stanford prison experiment! Fancy that. Zimbardo actually consulted Milgram on his experiment – meaning, I presume, that they shared a good laugh over scotch and sodas. They were also both big fans of the TV show *Candid Camera*, though why Wikipedia deems this fact noteworthy is anyone's guess. Probably because many of the gags on *Candid Camera* were heavily staged, just like Milgram's and Zimbardo's experiments. They like to cross-reference their fakes whenever they can. By the way, the creator of *Candid Camera*, Allen Funt, was also Jewish. A scan of his Wikipedia page gives us this gem:

On February 3, 1969, Funt, his wife, and his two youngest children boarded Eastern Airlines Flight 7 in Newark, New Jersey, with a destination of Miami, Florida. While en route, two men hijacked the plane and demanded passage to Cuba. However, some of the passengers, having spotted Funt, believed the whole thing to be a *Candid Camera* stunt. Funt repeatedly attempted to persuade his fellow passengers as to the reality of the hijacking, but to no avail.

As we've yet to study a plane hijacking that turned out to be real, I'd say Funt's fellow passengers were smarter than they knew. Or else they were all in on it with Funt, which is more likely. Or even more likely, the flight never happened at all. Funt allegedly graduated high school at age 15, and his first job in radio was personally assisting Eleanor Roosevelt with her radio commentaries. As happens to you.

To close, allow me to circle back to the Hobbesian premise. After thinking it over, I don't believe the Milgram experiment was ultimately about convincing us we're all nasty and brutish at heart. It was about convincing us that Hitler and Eichmann and their ilk *aren't any worse than us*. Or, flipping that, that you weren't any better than them. It was a sort of backhanded defense of the Nazis, which should appear strange to you coming from a Jew. That is, until you learn all the top Nazis were Jewish. Milgram's great sleight-of-hand was imprinting on the public consciousness the notion that nothing is really good or evil – that these are more or less social constructs, and the only "scientific" way to explain evil is through systems theory or determinism or some other shunt. After all, if you are every bit as capable of doing what the Nazis did, and you don't consider yourself to be evil, then Eichmann must not have been evil, either. And if he's not evil, then evil itself must not exist.

And why would our overlords want us believing that? Because it completely cripples our motivation to resist anything they do. If every corrupt system – banking, media, big pharma, etc. – and every bad actor within those systems can be explained away with behavioral science or some "reality is an illusion" mumbo jumbo, then what are you left to fight against? And how do you possibly fight against it?

In this way, sociology just follows hard science since 1900, which has also promoted more and more the idea of "reality as illusion". **A mind-numbing relativity than squelches all possibility of action.**

The truth is that neither Hobbes nor Rousseau were right. Human nature is first and foremost *free*, and there is nothing that absolutely predetermines our actions. If there were, we wouldn't really be responsible for them, would we? But we *are* responsible, and this is the fact that the governors want to shield from – not us mainly, but themselves. They can't bear the thought that they might be answerable to anything, be it God or Nature or their own consciences. As usual, they are only blinding themselves.