PHILIP G. ZIMBARDO

An Oral History
conducted by Daniel Hartwig

STANFORD HISTORICAL SOCIETY ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

Stanford University

Ferne Millen Photography

Philip G. Zimbardo, 2015

Contents

Publisher's Note

Philip G. Zimbardo's oral history interview includes his recollections of the Stanford Prison Experiment conducted in 1971. The experiment is still influential today and continues to generate lively debate within the psychology community. Recent bloggers have raised questions about the validity of the experiment. Zimbardo and his colleagues address these questions in a new section of his website entitled Responses to Critics.

Introduction

This oral history was conducted by the Stanford Historical Society Oral History Program in collaboration with the Stanford University Archives. The program is under the direction of the Oral History Committee of the Stanford Historical Society.

The Stanford Historical Society Oral History Program furthers the Society's mission "to foster and support the documentation, study, publication, dissemination, and preservation of the history of the Leland Stanford Junior University." The program explores the institutional history of the University, with an emphasis on the transformative post-WWII period, through interviews with leading faculty, staff, alumni, trustees, and others. The interview recordings and transcripts provide valuable additions to the existing collection of written and photographic materials in the Stanford University Archives.

Oral history is not a final, verified, or complete narrative of events. It is a unique, reflective, spoken account, offered by the interviewee in response to questioning, and as such it may be deeply personal. Each oral history is a reflection of the past as the interviewee remembers and recounts it. But memory and meaning vary from person to person; others may recall events differently. Used as primary source material, any one oral history will be compared with and evaluated in light of other evidence, such as contemporary texts and other oral histories, in arriving at an interpretation of the past. Although the interviewees have a past or current connection with Stanford University, they are not speaking as representatives of the University.

Each transcript is edited by program staff and by the interviewee for grammar, syntax, and occasional inaccuracies and to aid in overall clarity and readability--but is not fact-checked as such. The approach is to maintain the substantive content of the interview as well as the interviewee's voice. As a result of this editing process, the transcript may not match the recording verbatim. If a substantive deletion has been made, this is generally indicated at the relevant place on the transcript. Substantive additions are noted in brackets or by footnote.

This oral history should be cited as: Zimbardo, Philip G. (2017) *Oral History*. Stanford Historical Society Oral History Program Interviews (SC0932). Department of Special Collections & University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

Abstract

In this oral history, emeritus professor of psychology Philip G. Zimbardo talks about his childhood, graduate education at Yale, joining the Stanford faculty, his research and its evolution over time, involvement in political activism, and contributions to the field of psychology and to Stanford University.

Zimbardo recalls his childhood in the Bronx interrupted by a brief relocation to North Hollywood, Calif., his hospital stay at a young age, and his experiences of discrimination. He talks about his friendship at high school with Stanley Milgram, who was later known for his controversial study on obedience to authority. He also describes his part-time job while a Brooklyn College undergraduate student at a Broadway theater and his love for musicals and jazz.

Zimbardo reflects on his graduate study at Yale, his early career, and joining the Stanford faculty. He discusses at length the Stanford Prison Experiment, the lessons learned, and his testimony on behalf of an American prison guard accused of abusing detainees in the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq. He describes the outgrowth of the prison experiment in terms of his new research in applied psychology, the Stanford Shyness Project, as well as a shift in his research focus from explicating "evil" behavior engendered by situations to fostering good through his current work with the Heroic Imagination Project. Zimbardo talks about the growth of the Psychology Department at Stanford and shares memories of the prominent psychologists he has worked with in his career. He discusses his work as the president of the American Psychological Association and his outreach to clinical psychologists to promote collaboration and research programs.

Zimbardo talks about his involvement in political activism, including his position as secretary of the Brooklyn Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People while he was at Brooklyn College, his encounter with Malcolm X, and co-authoring an article in *Psychology Today* on President Donald Trump's mental health.

Zimbardo concludes the interview with thoughts on his Stanford career, his legacy, including his role in revitalizing the Music Department by inviting Stanley Getz to be resident musician.

Philip George Zimbardo

Biography

Philip George Zimbardo, known for the Stanford Prison Experiment conducted in 1971, was born on March 23, 1933 in New York City. He attended Brooklyn College where he earned a BA in 1954, triple majoring in psychology, sociology and anthropology. He then went on to earn his MA in 1955 and his PhD in 1959 from Yale University, both in psychology.

Growing up in a nuclear Sicilian-American family during the Great Depression, Zimbardo dealt with poverty and frequent major illnesses. School provided him a "sense of future orientation" drastically different than the limitations of his day-to-day ghetto life. In high school, he acquired leadership skills and met a life-long friend and colleague, Stanley Milgram.

While attending Brooklyn College, Zimbardo worked part-time for four years at the Saint James Broadway theatre selling refreshments, programs, and checking coats--along with several other college kids. He acquired lessons in deception from the concession manager that later on got translated into skills that he perfected in deception experiments as a social psychologist. In 1953, his junior year, he published his first journal article on racial dynamics between Blacks and Puerto Ricans in the Bronx.

In graduate school, Zimbardo first worked with K. C. Montgomery on exploratory behavior in rats, was then mentored by Neal Miller, Frank Beach, and Carl Hovland before being captivated by the work of Leon Festinger, whose research on cognitive dissonance would form the basis of Zimbardo's dissertation and next decade of research.

In 1960, Zimbardo took a position at New York University, where he would stay until 1967. Despite an extraordinarily heavy teaching load of five to six courses per term and every summer, he continued to pursue five lines of research: affiliation; cognitive dissonance; conjugate reinforcement; persuasion and attitude change; and deindividuation. At New York University, Zimbardo began a life-long career of political and social activism. In 1962, he

demonstrated against the war in Vietnam in part by organizing a walkout during NYU's graduation ceremony that honored Sec. of War, Robert McNamara. In 1965, he helped organize the Harlem Summer Project to educate local youth and introduce high school students to college experiences, as well as foster a Black Pride program to promote more positive identity and situational awareness.

In 1967, Zimbardo took a one-year teaching position at Columbia, as associate professor without tenure, in the graduate social psychology program. The following year he accepted a position as full professor with tenure at Stanford, being a "minnow in a tank of sharks: Hilgard, Atkinson, Bandura, Bower, Maccoby, Mischel, Shepard, Flavell." At the end of his first year at Stanford, Zimbardo co-authored the 8th edition of the textbook, *Psychology and Life,* which he continued to write into its 19th edition. He thrived in that academically rich atmosphere, teaching many large enrollment courses while also publishing many books and professional articles at a prodigious pace.

In August 1971, Zimbardo undertook his landmark Stanford Prison Experiment which demonstrated the power of situational forces to overwhelm otherwise good people. The week-long experiment quickly gained international notoriety following two prison riots--San Quentin and Attica--landing Zimbardo as an expert witness before Congressional hearings on prisons. The experiment continues to be influential today, most notably during the 2003 Abu Ghraib prisoner abuse scandal during which Zimbardo served as an expert witness. In 2007, Zimbardo wrote about the subject at length in his book, *The Lucifer Effect*. In 2015, it was memorialized in the major Hollywood motion picture, *The Stanford Prison Experiment*.

Following the Stanford Prison Experiment, Zimbardo looked for ways he could use psychology to help people, pursing research in shyness, mind control, time perspective, heroism, and video game addiction. He authored and co-authored numerous books, including some that are widely used in university-level psychology courses. He was also the creator and host of the television series, *Discovering Psychology*, which aired on Public Broadcasting Station, and which continues to be widely used in high school and college psychology classes. In 2002, Zimbardo was elected president of the American Psychological

Association. Under his direction, the organization developed a compendium of psychological research that has applications for everyday life.

After more than fifty years of teaching, Zimbardo retired from Stanford in 2003, but gave his last "Exploring Human Nature" lecture on March 7, 2007. Today, Zimbardo heads the Heroic Imagination Project, a non-profit organization which encourages and empowers individuals to take heroic action during crucial moments in their lives. He travels around the world several months a year giving guest lectures and conducting training workshops in heroism.

Zimbardo and Christina Maslach were married in 1971 and have two daughters, Zara and Tayna. Zimbardo also has a son, Adam, from his first marriage, and two grandchildren, Philip and Victoria Leigh.

In 2011, Zimbardo donated his papers to the Stanford University Archives. Many of the materials pertaining to the Stanford Prison Experiment have been digitized and are available online.

S T A N F O R D U N I V E R S I T Y

PROJECT:	STANFORD FACULTY ORAL HISTORY PROJECT
INTERVIEWER:	DANIEL HARTWIG
INTERVIEWEE:	PHILIP G. ZIMBARDO
DATE OF INTERVIEW:	May 9, 2016
PART:	1 of 7

Please note: parts of the following transcript were modified. The modifications are indicated on the specific pages concerned.

Hartwig: This is Daniel Hartwig with the Stanford University Archives and the Stanford Historical Society. I'm here with Phil Zimbardo, professor emeritus of psychology.

Phil, welcome.

Zimbardo: [00:00:12] I am happy to be with you, Daniel.

Hartwig: Phil, let's go back to your beginnings and talk a little bit about your ancestors and where you grew up.

Zimbardo: [00:00:22] Sure. My origins start in two towns in Sicily--one, Cammarata, which is near Palermo; the other one is Agira, which is near Catania. The Agira part is my maternal grandparents, and the Cammarata part is my paternal grandparents. My paternal grandfather is Philip Zimbardo. His wife was Vera Zimbardo. They were the parents of George Zimbardo, my father. My mother, Margaret Zimbardo, her family came from the other side of the

island. Her maiden name was Margaret Basicia. Her father was a shoemaker. My other [paternal] grandfather, Philip, who I'm named after, was a barber. They came from humble origins, no education. They migrated to America in the big Sicilian migration around the turn of the century. I am second generation. My parents were born here.

Growing Up: from East Coast to West Coast, and Back

I grew up in a part of New York City called the South Bronx. It was a ghetto. It was like a third-world country. But we didn't know that. For us it was lovely. I say I grew up in poverty because my father was often out of work, didn't particularly like to work. His trade was a barber. He didn't like to wait on people. He liked people to wait on him because he was the first male after seven older female sisters. He was always treated as the little prince. I remember years later, when he was a much older man, his sisters would still treat him like a charming little boy. He had incredible talents. He had perfect pitch. He had a great ear for music. He could hear a song and then within thirty minutes be playing it. He played all string instruments--piano, mandolin, really great violin and guitar. He could sing and dance. He was the life of the party always.

Unfortunately, he got married too young and he and my mother, Margaret, had four children a year and a half apart. That's not good--to have lots of little kids. I was born March 23, 1933, so it's in the Depression. When he was out of work, we were on home relief, which meant you got a monthly check, and you got free food if you went to a food bank, and you got free clothing if you went to a [special] clothing store. You know, so things were

free. It was not survival, just humiliating, because I still remember after all these years going to a big factory where you got clothes.

In those days, boys would start off wearing short pants till you were about seven, eight, nine, and then you switched to knickers, which don't exist anymore, till you were maybe ten, twelve, and then you got your first pair of long pants. There were two kinds of knickers. One kind of knickers had fine stripes and the other kind had broad stripes. The problem with the broad stripes is that when you walked, it would make noise and everybody would laugh at you. [At the store] I'm looking through the pile not to find those ugly ones. They looked the same to me. While I'm looking this man comes over and says, "Beggars can't be choosers. Take anything and get out." I remember, in tears, you know, saying, "I'm not a beggar. And this is your job. You're getting paid not to be rude or something." That again is one of the parts of poverty that poor people don't talk about. Just the humiliation of being poor. Then the war came and my father got interested in electronics, with no background, no training, and opened a little radio store with somebody who was trained and began to make money.

[00:05:21] Then in 1947 my father built a television set from a wiring diagram, having apprenticed himself to a Puerto Rican radio store man who had a store below our apartment, which was [at] 1005 East 151st Street. I still remember. It's 1947. I mean television was invented in 1946, a year before. It was a small eight-inch screen, but we watched the World Series. It was between the Yankees and the Dodgers. I remember charging fifty cents, you know, for kids to come and watch. It was really wonderful. The only

problem, again, since I said my father doesn't like to work, I said, "Dad, you know, here's a bonanza. You know how to do it. We'll all help you. We can make another one. Everybody wants to buy one." He said, "No, no. I made one. That was the challenge. Sorry, I'm not interested."

That was the sad thing. Then I realized the only way out of poverty was through education. I realized that very, very young. I loved school. School was orderly, it was clean, neat; there was no chaos. Poverty was left behind. The teachers in those days were really admirable. They were really heroic. You know, they would come into these neighborhoods, poor neighborhoods--sometimes they were dangerous--and would teach us not only the subject matter, but really lessons in life, the importance of sanitation, personal cleanliness. I still remember how to set a table. At the time I realized this is something really special and appreciated it.

I was a really good student and went from PS 25 where I started to PS 52, which was junior high school, all boys. Then when I graduated there, I went to Stuyvesant High School for one term because I had been with all boys in junior high and I said enough. Enough with being with guys. Stuyvesant High School was amazing. I mean it was really so high level. But I switched to James Monroe High School in the Bronx because there were lots of lovely girls and I had some friends going there. Then in 1948--end of 1947/1948--my family moved to North Hollywood, California. My father had these seven sisters and two younger brothers. They were all living there, and they all put pressure on him to come so the family would be together. So we went. We actually flew out on a DC-3, one of these tiny planes.

Somebody said it was in a Clark Gable/Carole Lombard film. It was extraordinarily expensive.

[00:08:33] It took twenty-four hours to go from LaGuardia Airport to Burbank and make like three or four stops, but it was exciting for us kids. Unfortunately, in 1948 there was a big depression in Hollywood, California. The movie industry was concerned that video would take over. A lot of the defense companies were losing their government contracts. And so we got out there and there was no work [laughter] for my father. We ended up being even poorer than we were in New York, only now you were poor in a beautiful environment.

[00:09:21] It was really difficult living there. But it was so beautiful. It's really amazing--coming from the Bronx where everything is concrete and steel and asphalt. I remember one of the things. When I give lectures I always show pictures of what it was like--not only what the houses were like around the playground. The playground was just asphalt. On the weekends you had to climb a fence to get over it to play in it because they closed the playground on weekends. Imagine. There was no green, no grass, no flowers, and no trees. I had to walk seven blocks to St. Mary's Park at least once a year because when we had a project, like an Indian village, I knew the only birch tree in [the] South Bronx was in St. Mary's Park.

I'd go and I cut a little piece of birch bark to make, you know, a little birch bark canoe. I think I still have it after all these years. Then you go to North Hollywood and there were trees and flowers everywhere. Then what seemed like paradise turned out to be a nightmare for me personally. I had

always been a really popular kid. I had worked at being popular. When I say popular, I was always the president, the vice president, captain, vice-captain of everything, of sports teams, of class teams.

Hartwig: Why was that?

Zimbardo: [00:11:04] This is going to take me all the way back again. When I was five and a half years old, I developed double pneumonia and whooping cough. Whooping cough is a contagious disease. This was November 1938. What happened was that, in those days, there was a lot of contagious disease in the ghettos. People lived very close together, conditions were very toxic, and the air was toxic--everything that could be wrong. That's true in any ghetto around the world. When I developed it [pneumonia] I was five and a half. There was a hospital on--I think it was the East River Drive in Manhattan--called Willard Parker Hospital for children with contagious diseases. This is all children in New York, and I think it was maybe from age two to upper teenagers, [they] were required by the state to be put in these hospitals until they were healthy, disease free.

Now, I was there six months, from I think November 1938 till maybe Easter, April 1939. The problem was that there was no medication. Penicillin had not been invented, nor sulfa drugs.[1] That means that all of these children who had diphtheria, scarlet fever, polio, and you name it, there was no treatment. You just lay in bed all the time. They didn't even have the concept of dynamic exercise--lying in bed stretching, doing things, so you just lay there. Actually, you lay there and you got worse. Your muscles

[1] Penicillin was discovered in 1928, but it wasn't in general use to treat infections until 1942. Experiments with sulfonamides began in 1932.

atrophied. Then what happened was kids were dying. I can still remember a vision of long rooms with beds side by side as far as you could see.

Doctors would come around, pick up your chart, sometimes say, "How are you feeling?" And you'd say, "Oh, terrible." [And they would] make a checkmark. Nurses would come around and the only thing they would do is take your temperature. Then what would happen is you wake up in the morning and you say, "Nurse, where's Billy?"

"Oh. He went home," she would say.

"Why didn't he say goodbye?"

"Well, he was in a hurry."

The next day Mary's bed is empty. Suddenly you realized this was a conspiracy of denial, that kids were dying all the time as you would expect, and the nurses couldn't say they died and so they would say they went home. The terrible thing was we kids had to join in that conspiracy because we all wanted to go home, but we didn't want to go home that way. Then, of course, what made a horrible situation worse was there was no radio, no television. There was no mail from parents. There were no phone calls. Poor people didn't have a phone in their home anyway. Visiting hours were one hour a week on Sunday, which for a kid waiting a whole week here is unimaginable. Then when Sunday came, my parents came with all the kids and they were behind a big glass wall. They pushed my bed against the wall. And you had a phone and you're talking back and forth. Of course, everybody's crying.

I'm crying to be with them, they're crying probably looking at how terrible I looked. You know, I was really pale. And, again, with double pneumonia and whooping cough, it was hard to eat. It was hard to put anything in your mouth because the combination of those two diseases made it hard to swallow and made it hard to breathe. I was constantly losing weight. So they'd cry and cry. There were four sets of visitors. When the fifth one came, they moved your bed back. I think officially the visiting was supposed to be two hours, but it was never more than one hour. Then, of course, it was winter and my mother was pregnant. I had two brothers, Donald and George, each a year and a half younger. My mother was pregnant with my soon-to-be sister, Vera. George had braces on one leg. He had polio but not a contagious version.

Winters used to be really tough in New York in those days. I mean you have lots of snow. To go from our house in the Bronx to the train station was about a six-block walk. The train took probably a half an hour. Then it was probably a five or six-block walk from the train station to the East River Drive where the hospital was. When it snowed my mother couldn't come. Obviously we didn't have a car. So you waited all week and nobody showed up, and they couldn't call to say they're not coming. It was incredibly depressing.

Hartwig: How did you deal with that as a child?

Zimbardo: [00:16:33] I dealt with it the way a grownup would. That's the story. I decided I couldn't depend on the doctors, I couldn't depend on my parents, I couldn't depend on anyone, so I was going to have to depend on me and

God. I became very religious and I would pray every morning. "Bless me, Father. I'm struggling. I want to live. I want to be healthy, strong, brave, smart, and I need your help." You know, "I'll be a good boy when I get out," and so forth and so on. "Make me well as soon as possible." Then during the day I would make little prayers. Now, my family was not religious.

My parents never went to church. They encouraged me to take the younger brothers to church. Then every morning kids were dying; I realized God wouldn't kill little kids. So when the lights went out, I assumed the devil was coming to make the selection. Of course, what is the reasonable strategy? At night I prayed to the devil not to take me. I still feel guilty because I said, "Look. There are a lot of kids here." [laughter] "They're all really nice kids, but if you got to take somebody, you know, don't take me." [laughter] Then what I would do is I'd put myself under the sheets and go to sleep. Now, I realized later that I was practicing self-hypnosis, because I would then wake up and it was morning. I wouldn't have dreams or anything. That self-induced hypnosis I later perfected.

I actually was trained in Manhattan at the Morton Prince Clinic of Hypnotherapy when I was teaching at New York University. Then I went on to do lots of research using hypnosis. When I was at Stanford [University] I always had a big class on hypnotize-ability and I would do lots of demonstrations as well as teach kids, you know, how to use hypnosis for positive outcomes.

I became very self-reliant. But now when I got out of the hospital, I'm back in this old neighborhood with all these gang kids, and now I'm this

really skinny, sickly kid. I get home, I'm really happy to be home. I go down in the street and kids start yelling and cursing at me and chasing me. I didn't understand what they were saying, but what they were yelling was that I was a: "Dirty Jew Bastard!" I just kept running and running faster than my attackers.

[00:19:13] I ended up being a good runner. [laughter] Ultimately, I was the captain of the track team in high school and at Brooklyn College. Now, our relay team, of which I was the anchor, actually set a record at Brooklyn College for the time. It wasn't until my mother asked the janitor's son, an African-American boy, Charlie Glassford--I still remember after all these years. I'm seven years old I think, something like that--to take me to church on Sunday. Then Charlie Glassford said to my mother, "I can't take him to church. He's a Jew."

My mother said, "No. We're Catholic."

He said, "Oh, my god. We've been beating him up because he was a Jew."

Hartwig: Is that because they thought you looked Jewish?

Zimbardo: [00:20:11] Yes. Because I was skinny, had blue eyes and a big nose. The other kids there were from a wide variety of ethnic groups. It fit their image. That's terrible, these prejudices. I fit their image, for these little kids--I'm talking kids who are like maybe seven to ten years old, living on our street, on the east side of 51st Street.

My mother said, "No. He's Catholic."

He said, "Oh, my god. Okay. We're really sorry."

Then they said, "Okay, we'll take him into our gang." But to get into the gang there was a ritual. You had to fistfight the previous kid who got into the gang until one of you got a bloody nose or quit. Then you had to steal--they put you through a store window--you had to steal groceries or fruit from a fruit store. You had to climb up a tree. They took your sneakers and threw them up in the tree. You had to climb up the tree and take it down. Lastly, you had to go underneath the woman's lingerie shop. You had to go underneath the building, where there was a railing that you could look up from below and you had to tell them what you saw looking up at women's bottoms.

Of course, you couldn't see anything. It was black. It was all dark. Here's like a primitive kids' ritual. I mean it's nowhere near, you know, what gangs do subsequently. I got into the gang. Then, but still I was skinny and weak. The main thing they did is they played stickball in the street. Stickball was just a broomstick and a spaldeen, and you didn't need gloves or anything. Then as you got a little older, they began to play softball. But then you couldn't play that in the street. The other reason you could play in the streets in those days, nobody had cars. So the street was really where kids lived. What was exciting about it, which doesn't exist anymore, there were always kids in the street except when it was school time.

Soon as you came home from school, you would run and do your homework and then come down and play. There were seasons. I mean there was a season where everybody was playing marbles. There's another season where people are doing hopscotch, another season where kids are making

little scooter cars--very creative, you know, putting skates on under cartons, wooden fruit cartons. We would play games, and there would be Ringolevio team games and stuff. It was such an exciting place. You had dinner, and depending on what the family was doing, they'd let you out an hour or two. Again, parents would just look out their window and say come for dinner, or come home, it's time to go to sleep.

Again, parents were happy to have the kids on the street because all the apartments were too small for a large-sized family--everybody had [one] in those days, *large* meaning three to six or seven. I realized that the world was made up of leaders and followers. I looked around and I began to say it doesn't make sense to be a follower because sometimes the leaders are doing stupid shit but they can force you to do their bidding. Makes sense to be a leader and then end up doing good things.

[00:23:54] What I had to do was--this is maybe starting at eight years old--I started trying to understand what was it about the kids who were chosen to be leaders, or who became leaders. I mean who assumed that power. Sometimes the group would say, "Yes, let Johnny do it," or, "Let Norberg do it." Or somebody would say, "Hey, I think we should all do this," and it turned out to be a good suggestion. It was clear to me that leaders had a set of very simple qualities. They often were the ones who talked up first, they often had a solution to a problem, almost always had a big, strong, tough guy on their side backing them up, so they didn't have to deal with any rebellion or any physical thing. Also, typically, if they were really good, they also knew how to make a joke. I noticed this and then I

began to mimic it, mimic these traits, until they became mine. I began to do it routinely automatically.

The other thing that was critical among guys is you had to be tall. Leaders, I guess even presidents of the United States, in most cultures being tall has more respect among men than being average size or short--so I had that advantage. As I said, so then I became a leader in school. Then also, I began systematically practicing athletics. I mean, hitting balls against a wall, getting my kid brothers to catch, and then I practiced running to build up my stamina. I went from being a really sickly kid, who could do nothing, to a fairly strong kid.

When I was twelve, every weekend me and a friend, Dominic, we went hiking in the country and stayed overnight in the wilderness. The wilderness was New Jersey. If you go over the George Washington Bridge and you go to the right, there's Teaneck, Tenafly, Cresco. There are three towns. Now obviously it's all built up. But [then] it was the woods. In fact, there were running streams, there was spring water coming up. We would go every weekend, Friday night, and come back Sunday night. We'd have sleeping bags and we'd make a little tent. But it meant also you had to carry a big pack, which made me strong. My mother Margaret--bless her--she would have me practice. We lived on the fifth floor of an apartment house. By then [we lived on] 920 Avenue St. John. She would fill that backpack with cans and make me walk up and down the five floors carrying it to build up my muscles.

[00:27:21] Now, sadly those were the old days where they didn't have backpacks that had frames that they have now. It's just like a big sack. [laughter]. But I did it. Then I really got physically well and physically strong. You know, and now I had the leadership quality. I was stronger. What else? Oh. The other thing is that I never really liked guys. I really always liked girls. Girls were beautiful and soft and gentle and caring. What I would do is sneak away from the guys and go roller skating with a group of girls. The girls were from my class. Girls were always skating together and I'd join them. I became in that sense bisexual, and just trying to understand also what are the kinds of things girls value--you know, how do they relate to one another and the guys don't.

It's never about physical confrontation [with girls], it's always about working, verbally resolving conflict. I added that to my repertoire. This is a long background.

Now back to North Hollywood High School. Now I come in and I'm full of self-confidence, I'm full of vim, I'm full of vigor, I'm fourteen years old. North Hollywood High School was the most beautiful place I'd ever seen. Kids there in the senior class had their own parking lot and they all had Model T Fords. This is like *Grease,* with chrome engines with, you know, plastic covers over them. The women all seemed beautiful. I mean dressed up, not like kids, girls from the Bronx.

I'm there before school begins. There's an auditorium, and there's an auditorium with no teachers, and they say, "Okay, we're going to do the *Mikado*. It's going to be a student production. We want people to try out.

Here are the roles." I said, "Oh, my god. I've died, I'm going to heaven. What could be better?" I also liked performing, so I was in many plays. I had a good memory, so could memorize all the dialogue. I said, "Oh my god, I'm going to try out." Then I go to class, I sit down, I'm smiling, and kids around me get up and move to the other seat. I don't know. Then I go to the cafeteria and I said hi, and kids around--all-around the table--move away. This happened every single day.

[00:30:14] I was shunned and I'm not understanding. I kept saying, well, you know, can't be about me. I'm this nice guy. It was literally every single day. I didn't know how to deal with it. I couldn't tell my parents. I was embarrassed. Not clear what they could do about it. What happened is I began to develop psychosomatic asthma. This was before asthma was considered psychosomatic.[2] We didn't have money to have medical treatment, so it just meant I coughed all night, I could hardly breathe, and I would often have to miss school, which I hated to do because I loved school, but clearly [I] was psychosomatic. I said, you know, school is now this toxic place for me where before it had been a heaven. My asthma became the excuse my family could use to have to go back to the Bronx because, again, my father's not working. He had really menial jobs. So this was the excuse.

In June, all of us left. We had a 1939 Chevy. Tiny little car. We all packed in, all six of us, and we drove across the country. We went on Route 66 from Los Angeles to Chicago. I kept a record--I still have it--of how many

[2] Although stress continues to be studied as a possible trigger of asthma, it is more commonly attributed to a number of physical factors, from allergic reactions to genetic background. The idea that it is a psychosomatic disease is a subject of controversy. (Mayo Clinic, "Asthma," https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/asthma/symptoms-causes/syc-20369653).

miles we went each day, how much we spent for gas, for lodging, for treats, et cetera, et cetera. I had just gotten my driver's license because you could do it at sixteen. It was the only positive thing about North Hollywood. My father let me drive for half an hour in every state. This was my coming of age. Then when we got back to the Bronx--we didn't go to the Bronx because we had no place to live.

We all went to live with my aunt, my godmother Aunt Gemma, in Philadelphia. Her husband was a bricklayer. He was an old Italian guy. He says, "In my house, if you want to eat, you've got to work." He put us to work, I mean carrying brick. We were the brick carriers. It was really horrible. But now my father had to go into New York to try to find a job. I did something I really felt guilty about later, saying, "Dad needs companionship. It's really sad for him to be there all alone," I persuaded my mother and the kids and my aunt that I should join my father. We rented a motel room while he was looking for jobs. It was hard to find a job.

[00:33:14] It was now 1948. But I was now back with my old buddies back in the Bronx and my asthma disappeared--when you talk about psychosomatic. I went from the wonderful air in North Hollywood with all the trees back to the dirty old Bronx, and suddenly I was psychically healed. Then it was the summer, and then in September, I started back where I had left at James Monroe High School in the Bronx. It was the start of senior year, so it's September, October. I'm there two months and I'm voted most popular boy in the senior class and vice president of the senior class. There's this little kid in the class, this little Jewish kid. In the yearbook, he was the

one who wrote all the sayings next to your picture. For me he said, "Phil Zimbardo's our vice president, tall and thin. With his blue eyes, all the girls he'll win." I still remember. I said, "Stanley, that's really cute. You know, thanks so much."

This was little Stanley Milgram, who was in my class. This was the Senior Honors class. Then I said, "Stanley, you know what's really strange, is that I just was voted most popular boy. A few months ago, I was the least popular boy in the whole school." I told the story about being avoided, especially nothing I did made a difference. I have to go back. Now, why were they shunning me?

Hartwig: How did you find out?

Zimbardo: [00:35:05] Okay. I decided I'm not going to ask. I made the baseball team, I was a centerfielder, and we're on a bus going to a game. I guess it was Van Nuys High School. North Hollywood is in the San Fernando Valley. It's Burbank, North Hollywood, Van Nuys. I asked the leftfielder. Sometimes we have to work together if the ball is hit between us. Now, I don't remember his name. I said, "Could you help me out?" You know, I described the situation.

"I don't understand why people don't like me."

He said, "It's not that we don't like you, we are afraid of you."

I said, "What?"

Now, I'm six foot tall. I'm really skinny. Maybe a hundred fifty pounds at most. I was sinewy, skinny, but I could hit a long ball.

I said, "What do you mean afraid of me?"

He said, "Well, you're Sicilian from New York. We assume you come from a Mafia family and you could be dangerous."

I said, "Oh, my god."

Again, here's this prejudice. At first I'm getting beaten up because I'm Jewish. Now I'm being shunned because I'm Sicilian Mafia.

I said, "No, it's not true.

He said, "Well, it's too late. Too late to undo it." [laughter]

I said, "Okay. Screw it."

Now we go back to Monroe High School in New York and Stanley says, the question is: Did I change from being a nebbish to being so popular, or did the situation change? He and I agree that it was the situation. Again it's curious because this was 1948. In the early 1960s, Stanley did the first research demonstrating the power of situations over individual dispositions. Then I followed up some years later showing the same message, only now rather than an individual authority telling you to do something wrong, you're put in a situation where the role you're playing encourages you to use power in a domineering, physical, abusive way. But again, it started with sitting around trying to figure out why I was shunned at North Hollywood High School, and we both agreed it was situation over personality.

Hartwig: That's very, very amazing insights. You called yourselves both situationists.

Zimbardo: [00:37:57] Yes. Absolutely. Stanley's line is: How do you know what you would do until you're in the particular situation? Even as a high school kid, in 1948, it's not that far from the end of the war, he was concerned about: could he or his family end up in a concentration camp. Everybody said,

"Stanley, don't be stupid. That was the Nazis. We're Americans. We're not that kind of people." I can still hear him say, "How do you know what you would do until you're in the situation?" I would bet they said the same thing before the Nazis, you know, started the Hitler Youth. That we all like to think we're good people and we underestimate how situations make us do bad things as well as the good thing. I supported that.

It was kind of a primitive breeding ground of these two situationists. Now, the other thing I should say about it is that when Stanley did his study[3], it was not at all appreciated initially. He got a lot of flak about the ethics of it. The reason he did it, and I understand now fully, was that he always wanted to be a filmmaker. He made a number of films, some very good ones. He himself made the film called *Obedience*, a documentary in which he showed people resisting the pressure of the authority, and then people giving in. You could see in the film the anxiety of the people--the uncertainty, the worry. It's the first time in psychology that you actually saw the negative effects of being put in an experimental situation. There had been earlier videos, [Kurt] Lewin's research, but it was not this negative--the experiment brought out the negative side of human nature.

There's a lot of controversy back and forth so it really distracted from the message that nobody should do this kind of research. Then, in 1971, I did the Stanford prison experiment--August 14 to August 21. Then

[3] Milgram's well-known study on obedience to authority, presented instead as a study on memory and learning to research participants, required participants to play the role of a "teacher" and administer electric shocks to a "learner" who could not match words correctly. With every additional wrong answer the learner--an actor--provided, the level of electric shocks to be administered would increase. The learner and teacher would be separated during the experiment and could not see each other; and pre-recorded sounds of pain would be played accordingly. Despite symptoms of great stress, Milgram's study suggested that people would obey authority to do things against their own values.

on Labor Day weekend, there was the American Psychological Association--they always met on Labor Day weekend in that era. I was scheduled to give a lecture on something else I did. Then at the end of it--I saved like five or ten minutes, and I said to the audience, "I would like to take a few minutes away from this topic to present something totally new. I just finished this experiment." I described it. "And I'd just like to show you some of the slides of this study." I mentioned in one way it's a follow-up of Milgram's study. Instead of looking at individual situational power, we're looking at institutional and role power, role play.

[00:41:14] At the end, Milgram came up. He was not a very affectionate person. He gave me a big hug and said, "Oh, thanks. Now you're going to take all the ethical attacks off of my shoulders onto yours because yours is the most unethical study ever done." [laughter] We kept in touch after that. In those days, I guess it was mostly [phone] call[s]. I was on some review committees of some of his work. It was sad. He died very young. He died at age fifty after having three heart attacks. It's a shame because he was doing some very creative work. Now, the other curiosity is in 2015, just last year, there was a movie about Stanley Milgram's life and research called *Experimenter*. At the same exact time in Sundance Film Festival, there is a premier of *The Stanford Prison Experiment*, Zimbardo's prison study.

Well, in his case, after fifty years, in my case, after forty-four years, there are these two studies from these two high school kids appearing [in films]. In his film, there's a lot about his life, his wife--Wynona Ryder plays his wife. There are his kids. It's a little deeper personal background. There's

an excellent section on obedience to authority. But then I think they spend too much time on it. He did a number of little studies, like the lost-letter technique, six degrees of connection between people, which the average audience doesn't find interesting after you present the drama of the obedience stuff. He had great character actors in that part. The film loses its impact.

Then lastly, as a little sidebar, when I saw it at Sundance, I actually met with the director. He might have been everything--the writer, the director. There was a very strange thing which I asked him. I said I didn't understand, twice in the movie, when Milgram comes out of the lab and he's walking down a corridor, and he's talking to the camera, and he says something about the obedience research and he hopes he'll have a big impact because it illuminates the dark side of human nature. Behind him is walking a huge elephant. A huge African elephant. Huge. I mean like it's twelve-foot high.

Then later in the film Milgram walks out of another lab and he's walking down--it's even stranger--and he says, "The year is 1984. Two things happened in 1984. Obviously George Orville set his classic novel, which for me was very informative, and I died. And I died." He keeps talking. Behind him is the same elephant. For me it ruined the whole film. I asked the director, "Why did you do that?" His answer was people like elephants. [laughter] I repressed saying, "That is the stupidest answer I have ever heard from a director."

Now, one other Stanley Milgram story. We can talk a bit about *The Stanford Prison Experiment* movie in a minute. Maybe ten years ago in New York City, I organized a symposium probably at the Eastern Psychological Association meeting. The symposium was on famous social psychologists and their prominent students.

[00:45:40] I had Kurt Lewin, Carl Hovland--oh, god--Stanley Milgram, Hal Kelley [Harold Kelley]. They're all famous social psychologists who had died. Then I had their students, their prominent students, talk about them, and their lives, what their contribution was. It was a big audience, maybe several hundred. What was curious is John Sabini--Milgram never had very many students compared to Elliot Aronson and Leon Festinger.

Hartwig: Why was that?

Zimbardo: [00:46:24] Well, it's not exactly clear. It may have been that, like with the obedience studies, he often did not give students credit. In the obedience study, he tested a thousand people in sixteen or nineteen different experimental variations and none of them get credit. Milgram didn't run any participants. He didn't run tests. He had a high school biology teacher run them, and he got a footnote. Essentially, to be a graduate student, you've got to get publication. That's your only path to making it in academia. It might have been word got out that he does not share the limelight.

Now, the other thing that happened is that after Sabini finished, Sabini was saying how wonderful it was to work with him [Milgram], you know. Then there's the question period and then hands went up. One after another, students said, "I don't know what you're talking about. He was the

meanest son of a bitch ever." [laughter] "I hated to be in his class. I hated having to work with him." Let me tell you a worse story. There were three or four of them. Then other hands went up and said, "How could you say that? He was the kindest, most caring person. It broke my heart when he died." Suddenly I said, "Wait a minute. Wait a minute. This can't be." I said, "When did you work with him? When did you work with him?" It was pre and post his first heart attack.

Clearly what happened is he changed. Before his heart attack, he was an asshole. After his heart attack, he was a lovable guy. I mean I can't prove it, but it was literally that. I worked with him. I don't know when he had his first heart attack. It was like late 1970s, early 1980s. He was a very type A person--very evaluative, very domineering, dominant. Essentially, he had a vision. He's going to make it, no matter what. Now, what happened was he was given little support. Here he did this incredible study at Yale and he doesn't get tenure. He's a new assistant professor and he's getting all these accolades, and he doesn't get tenure.

[00:49:14] He goes to Harvard, and the Harvard faculty is split down the middle. I mean all these famous psychologists in the world at that time, half of them were supporting him--I think Gordon Allport--and half of them are against him. He doesn't get tenure at Harvard. Here he's at two dream places--the cream of the crop of academia for psychologists in those days was Yale and Harvard. He ends up at the City University of New York, which was just beginning--it was a huge step down from Yale and Harvard. He's a New Yorker and he's back home. He made the most of it. You know,

he began one of the first studies of urban stress. It was not a topic before he did it.

Hartwig: The academic confrontation or unwillingness to approve him for tenure--was that because people were uneasy about [the] ethical implications of his studies? What was the resistance?

Zimbardo: [00:50:34] It was only the ethics. It was that the colleges should not be in this kind of business of doing things to harm people. Yes. On the negative side was Herbert C. Kelman, a professor at Harvard then. He's writing *Crimes of Obedience*. Essentially he's focusing on the negative part of obedience, and Milgram really, to his credit, is saying, how do we understand why people follow an authority who is encouraging you to behave in ways that violate your moral conscience? This is a fundamental issue, again, which comes out of his interest in the Nazi state. That was really ignored. They're saying it's unethical, you harmed people.

Now, unfortunately in those days, in the 1960s, nobody did post-experimental debriefing. Now, again, in his case, the problem was that his experiment probably took forty-five to fifty-five minutes depending on if they went all the way, so there was very little time for debriefing. If you remember in his study, the person who was allegedly the student who's being shocked by the teacher was a confederate who worked with Milgram. At the end, whether or not the teacher went all the way to 450 volts or not, the experimenter and the confederate came out and said, hey, you really didn't shock him, he was a confederate, we're really studying obedience to authority.

You know, so in one way some of your guilt was relieved that you actually did not physically harm this person. On the other hand, the psychological guilt is still there, that what you did could have harmed somebody very seriously. Again, my concern had been that nobody should do this kind of research. Subsequently, I wrote the introduction to Milgram's updated book on obedience to authority, and I wrote a whole piece in the *Yale Review* just saying why this is so important in understanding the nature of human nature.

Hartwig: What was the nature or the status at the time of informed consent or human subjects protocols in terms of getting studies approved or carried out? Because with your experiments, this really revolutionized thinking about that. What was it during Stanley's time and then your time?

Zimbardo: [00:53:52] No, it didn't exist in Stanley's time. I mean that there was no such thing as informed consent, there's no such thing as Human Subjects Research Committee. Now, in fact, for me the most unethical study ever done that nobody ever labels, that is the one done by a Turkish psychologist, Muzafer Sherif, in which poor kids were sent to a summer camp in the country--I think maybe it was for free, and the parents didn't realize and did not [give] consent that the kids were going to be in an experimental camp. In fact, in this camp, they purposely created antagonistic groups. In one compound these were the Eagles, the other compound was the Rattlers, and they created conflict between them.

The kids were running wild. The idea of the research was to create a conflict so you could see how you could resolve it, and that ultimately there

was a shortage of water and the kids had to now work together as a team. This study is always presented as how you can resolve conflict between groups. But in fact, the ethics are you made kids dislike and hate one another and in a setting that was not controllable. That is, kids run around at night and, say, you had a few counselors. It's not clear how bad it ever got. I mean that is, if kids beat up each other. They certainly cursed and yelled. It's also clear, if you read the original, some kids at the end still said I hate the Rattlers or I hate the Eagles.

For me, that's the most unethical study every done. It was unethical. The parents were deceived, not knowing. The kids were deceived in not knowing the kind of thing they were doing. Kids actually suffered. But curiously, it's turned around and presented as one of the most important studies because it shows how you can resolve conflict rather than create conflict.

By 1971, when I decided to do my study, there was at Stanford a Human Subjects Research Committee. Now, I don't know when it was started. We should check. But I have a sense it was fairly recent. I had to fill out a standardized form, in which I describe here's what we're going to do, and there were sections that there had to be minimally adequate diet, that there had to be acknowledgement that if you're enrolled in a prison, there will be some stress, you'll get $15 a day, this study is set to go for up to two weeks, and it included "but at any time anybody says I quit the experiment," I would be forced to release them.

[00:57:16] Now, in fact, somebody on the committee came down, looked at the basement at Stanford. The study was done in the basement of Jordan Hall, which is on the main campus at the end of Palm Drive. The only thing they said is there's only a single entrance--we blocked off one end of a corridor where we had our video camera, and there was just one door at the other end. There were no windows, no lights of course. They said you had to have fire extinguishers, in case there's a fire. It's really a fire trap. That was really the only thing they said, plus I had to have the Student health center [Cowell Student Health Center, now Vaden Health Center] aware of what we were doing and on call, which I did, and kids had to have three meals a day.

Then I said, "In addition we're going to have parents come down several times, you're going to have parole board hearings regularly, a visit from a prison chaplain." Again, it's kids playing cops and robbers in an experiment that everybody knows is [an] experiment because each kid had to sign, "I have been informed of what it was." We said the assignment to prisoners and guards will be random, and they said "I will do my best to complete the assignment, whether it's a week or two weeks." If I remember, it did not say on their informed consent that any time if they can't handle it, or any time it's too strong, if I say I quit the experiment then I will be released.

Every student filled this out. They [The Human Subjects committee] said you have to have fire extinguishers, which ironically the guards used--these were used against the prisoners. It was skin-chilling carbon monoxide,

like fire bombing. What was meant to be there as a safety thing ended up being used aggressively. During the experiment, after the second day--I didn't know. Do we want to go into detail?

Hartwig: Let's save that because I'm sure we'll have at least a full session just on that.

Zimbardo: [00:59:50] Okay.

Hartwig: Let's circle back, so picking back up from Milgram. You're finishing high school. Let's go back to your transfer then to college.

Zimbardo: [00:59:59] Oh, okay. Good. We graduated. My father had dropped out of elementary school, he never went to school so he never appreciated school, which is sadly true in Sicily. In Sicily--we'll talk later--I have a foundation there where we send high school kids--we give them scholarships every year. I've been doing it for ten years. We give them scholarships to go to local colleges. A lot of people say it's a waste of time. It's not what you know, it's only who you know. You're wasting time to get educated because of the Mafia, because [of] their corruption, people with connections will always get the good job and you won't. Again, I had to work against that.

My father said, "Okay. Now you've finished school. It's time to go to work."

I said, "No, Dad. It doesn't make sense because, you know, I can make more money if I have another degree."

He didn't understand what that meant. He said, "Okay. Okay. You could become an accountant." Because he now is working in some business, he said, "You know, these people come in nicely dressed. They fill out some forms and they leave." He said, "It's good for you. They don't have to work

hard." He actually encouraged me to go to an accounting school, the secretarial school in junior college. Then I went for an interview and I got in.

Hartwig: Did you want to do that? Why would you--

Zimbardo: [01:01:33] I hated it. No, no. [laughter] I'm doing it to please him. When I go for the interview, they don't have science, they don't have language courses, they don't have all the things that I really liked. I said I can't go there. Now it's late in the application time and we have no money. We have no money obviously to go to a paying college. Fortunately in those days in New York City, they had the most wonderful educational program. There are five boroughs in New York. Every borough had its own city college which was tuition free. You had to have like a B average from a New York City high school to get in. In Manhattan it was City College of New York, and Brooklyn it was Brooklyn College, Queens College. Hunter College was also in Manhattan. I think that was for women.

Every borough had a college. These were incredibly good. Great teachers, brilliant educators, totally dedicated, totally devoted. I persuaded him, I'm going to go to Brooklyn College because it's free. When I graduate I can make much more money. My father said, "Well, okay. I'll let you do this reluctantly." But my two brothers and sister, he said, "We'll let you do it because you're into school." But then they couldn't. It was really sad. They had to go to work afterward. It's a shame because my brother, George, was a good student. He went to a technical high school, but then he ended up like my dad in a company that did wiring, electronics.

Then my father said, "Okay. Since you're not taking any money out, but you're not bringing any money in. You have to be self-sufficient."

I said, "What does that mean?"

He said, "You got to get a job."

Now, we lived in the Bronx and it's an hour and a half commute to Brooklyn College which is [on] Flatbush Avenue. It's this endless ride. Hour and a half from Bronx to Brooklyn, hour and a half back. I got a job along with my buddy, Gene Walcoff. He was a year ahead of me. He said, "Hey, I got this great job, you know, that you could work with us." It was to be what was called a concession boy, every Broadway theater in Manhattan has a concession, meaning when you come into the theater somebody meets you and says, would you like to check your hat and/or coat? Would you like a program of the show? You could buy--if it's a musical--recordings or sheet music. Then you could buy orange juice, Coca Cola, candies, chocolates.

[01:04:38] I got that job. It was mostly college kids who had this job because in between the first act and the second act, you always had at least thirty minutes free; between the second act and the conclusion another thirty minutes. You worked really hard. You had to get there early. We had uniforms, and you had to set up the candy, set up the orangeade, and set up all the things, and then you did your thing for maybe half an hour and then you had time to work. It was a great job for all college students. We worked really hard. We actually motivated each other. Then we said, "Okay. What are you going to do with this half an hour?" Clearly they're older guys who were already college seniors, you know, who kind of took us under their wing.

The theater's closed Sunday and Monday--[we work] Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. Wednesday and Saturday are matinee and evening. [I] arranged my schedule. What I did is I took a lighter load during the year and then I took a heavy load in the summer. I went to school all the time. I could be free on Wednesday. Essentially it meant twelve hours being there on Wednesday, twelve hours being there on Saturday. The pay was $3 a performance. [laughter] It was like nothing. It means you worked a whole day, you got $6 and you had to actually buy your own lunch or your own dinner. But it was showbiz. In that sense it was wonderful.

Now, we worked at the St. James Theatre on West 44th Street and Broadway. St. James Theatre has an unbroken record of success, meaning in the past fifty or sixty years, every single show that was performed there has been a winner, blockbuster. Hundreds of performances. When I was there it was *Damn Yankees, The King and I*--oh, what else? They had the whole *Gilbert and Sullivan* repertoire.

Hartwig: Rodgers and Hammerstein?

Zimbardo: [01:06:57] Yes. It was all Rodgers and Hammerstein. What was the one with the pirate? It was Boris Karloff. Anyway, but it was endless, endless. What it meant was that we all got to see theater for free. We actually worked out arrangements with kids in the theater across the street that they would take our shift and we would do theirs so we got to see other plays. *South Pacific* was playing across the street at the same time. It's the first time a little kid from the Bronx gets to see Broadway plays. I did it for three years. I stopped

in my senior year because I knew I had to work hard to, you know, get really good grades, SAT scores, and so forth.

Hartwig: Did you enjoy that, and did those performances, you know, have an impact on you? Or were you just too busy trying to study and make ends meet?

Zimbardo: [01:08:06] We loved it. I mean the other thing was I learned how to compartmentalize. I had to learn how to use time really, really well. On the subway, I would be reading and writing homework. You had to stand from the Bronx to Wall Street, you had to be standing up holding this thing. At Wall Street it emptied out, and so I had maybe a half an hour, and I would study that half an hour, study coming back. You learned how to use time, you know, on, zipped in, off. Same thing in the theater. That is, you got to enjoy the play. We learned the script.

We each would play with one another. We'd do the dialogue between Anna and the King of Siam. Then we would always be ready to find a slip. Somebody who fell or somebody missed their cue, and that would be a great insight for us. Also, it meant--because these were successful plays--they would always have a cast party at the end of every hundred performances. They would invite everybody--the usherettes, the concession boys. We actually got to meet Rodgers and Hammerstein, Yul Brynner, Gertrude Lawrence, later I guess it was Deborah Kerr. Ray Bolger was in *Damn Yankees*. No. What was that? Oh, I forget. Oh, *Peter Pan*. I'm sorry. *Peter Pan* was there. That was a really marvelous time. It was really a unique experience.

Now, getting back to getting to Brooklyn College. When I started freshman year, I was really excited about psychology, because I had been

doing it since I was a little kid. Right? I mean I had been analyzing the nature of leaders and followers, I had been figuring out the power of situations, and, you know, what it means to have a psychosomatic disorder. Again, I had been really an intuitive child psychologist.

Hartwig: Had you read any psychology?

Zimbardo: [01:10:34] None. None.

Hartwig: No. Just kind of experience?

Zimbardo: [01:10:36] Yes, experience. The other thing I didn't mention is that growing up in any ghetto in any place in the world, there are men whose job it is to corrupt little kids to do bad things for money--to steal, to sell drugs, to take drugs, and get girls to sell their bodies. They were always there. There was sweet talking, you know, cool, very persuasive, and they would be charming. Often they would give kids some money or some favor, something special. Might even give you a baseball, baseball glove or spaldeen balls. Then they would spring the trap. It's okay, what I'd like you to do is take this package two blocks up to Kelly Street and there will be a guy dressed with this hat, and you give it to him and he'll give you an envelope and you give it back.

In some cases, it ended up there would be a nark there and the kid would get arrested. Then you're in jail. They tell you if you say anything, we will kill your family. Kids, you know, were intimidated. The point of my story is that I had really good friends who were really good kids who gave into the temptation of doing what they knew were bad things for money. Some of them went to jail, went to juvenile jail. At least one kid ended up committing suicide because if you're a kid and you go to jail, you will be systematically

gang-raped, or you'll be somebody's sissy, somebody's boy. When they came out, one of them committed suicide. We all knew what happened. Others, like me, didn't.

Again, this was one of my child psychology analytical sessions. What was the difference between kids who went that side, between the line of good and evil, and kids like me and Gene Walcoff and Whitey Kornhaber and Sonny Mason and others who stayed on the good side? Then I began to think about, even as a kid, that I had been led to believe by my parents, by Sunday school teachers. I stayed religious coming out of the hospital. I really wanted to go to St. Anselm's Catholic School, but we couldn't afford it because in those days in catholic school, there was a little tuition, you had to buy your own books and pencils and stuff, and we couldn't afford it. But we'd go to Mass every Sunday, bring my brothers and sister. They'd have afterschool on Tuesday or Wednesday. I was very devoted. I used to wear a cross actually until I was in Brooklyn College. I was surprised. I saw a picture of the track team. I'd forgotten that I was wearing a cross when I was running track in college. I remained a very religious kid. Now, where's this story going?

Hartwig: Talking about psychology.

Zimbardo: [01:13:59] Oh. Yes. Essentially I'm asking these fundamental questions about good and evil, you know, why kids give into temptation, why kids are bad. Now, here's freshman year of Psych I, or Psych 100. I get in the class, I'm ready to be educated, entertained, and it's *the* most boring course I could imagine. I hated it, I hated every single session, in part because psychology

was boring in the 1950s. It was rats running Y-mazes, and college kids learning nonsense syllables sitting in front of the memory drum, and it was how the brain codes color. There was not a single lecture that was interesting. Then there was something called multiple choice tests, which we never had in high school. I was a really good student. I mean I had a really almost photographic memory. There would be a question and I'd say in the margin, "It's A if this means what was on page 470. It's B if what you said in class." Of course, you can't fill in two, so you got it wrong.

I'd go up to complain to the teacher and she said, "I'm sorry. Learn how to take the test better." [laughter] I got a C. A C. My only C in my entire life. No, that's not true. I got a C in penmanship [laughter] in junior high school. This was my second C in my life. I graduated summa cum laude honors, and so I hated psychology. I hated this thing that they called psychology. I switched immediately to sociology anthropology. Now, the wonderful thing about Brooklyn College is they had an experimental course in social sciences. It was like a tasting course. You know, it was anthropology, sociology, psychology, economics, political science, which means we had like two weeks of lectures of people on each of those.

I fell in love with anthropology because we had a Polish psychologist, Feliks Gross, who was talking about the ghettos in World War II, and his talks with Bronislaw Malinowski in the mountains around Krakow. I became his research assistant. It was really wonderful. Then I started to take anthropology along with sociology. They were asking big questions, and they were asking questions about the ethics of the atomic bomb. I was going

along, and now I'm about to start senior year. I don't know if I had taken one other psych course. I might have taken one other psych course. Then in my senior year my best friend, Jerry Platt [Gerald M. Platt], asked me, "I need a favor from you."

I said, "What's that?"

He said, "In order to complete my psych major, I have to take a course in research methods and I hate research methods. I like everything about psych."

I said, "No. I hate psych."

He said, "Do me a favor, because in this class you have to do research in teams. And I know you're a hotshot. And, you know, I'll pay you back anything you want."

[01:17:41] Then, so we took the course, and he hated it and I loved it. That is, now we were actually doing research. The teacher was a very tough teacher. Again, I'm blocking their name. I'll remember later. She graded really, really tough. Each week we would do a replication of a classic experiment where we would collect data, I mean, and "run subjects," you know, ten or twenty. And every single week we'd have to do a report--what was the original study, what did we do, how did we modify it, what was our data, did we support the original or not. I absolutely loved it. I mean, we always ran twice as many or three times as many participants in the study. At the end I said, "Oh, my god. This is what I want to do." He said, "Oh, my god. I hate this."

He switched into sociology, I switched into psychology in our senior year. Jerry Platt went on to UCLA, and then he ended up at Harvard working with Talcott Parsons. He became an expert in the history of social science, historical biographies. Now I take as many psych courses as I can, but it's still not very many. I apply to a lot of places. This [is an] interesting story. I really wanted to go to Yale because I had heard they're a good psych department. But I was really primitive. I didn't know any of their people. In our personality course I knew there was a guy named Neal Miller, and John Dallard, because actually Miller and Dollard wrote a book we used in a personality course.

The point is, it was only two hours away from Bronx and every place else was distant. I applied to maybe a dozen places. I got into most places. Of course, I needed full assistantship scholarship or something. I got a small fellowship from Brooklyn College, all kinds of honors. I hear from every place, except I do not get a letter of acceptance or rejection from Yale. I decide I'm going to go to [the] University of Minnesota. Can't imagine it being freezing in Minnesota. The reason was, there was a researcher there named Stanley Schachter, who had been a student of Lewin [Kurt Lewin], had worked with Leon Festinger who was my idol even at that time. I don't know if he called me or wrote to me.

Maybe he wrote to me saying this is the place. He was a New Yorker. He said, "We need you here. You know, we're doing really interesting stuff. I'm starting a whole new program on psychology of affiliation." So I was going to go there of all the places. I didn't even know what Minnesota was. I

think I got accepted to Harvard but no fellowship or scholarship. I literally had the letter of acceptance with a stamp on the table. On April 14, 1954, I get a call from a guy at Yale named K. C. Montgomery.

He said, "I've been authorized by the Yale Psych Department to make this call to ask you some questions. Have you made your decision where you're going to go?"

I said, "Yes, I'm going to the University of Minnesota."

He said, "Have you sent the letter of acceptance?"

I said, "No, not yet."

He said, "Why don't you wait. There's a possibility you might be able to get into Yale. Are you interested?"

I said, "Yes, it's my first choice."

He said, "Okay. Meet me tomorrow at the New Yorker Hotel in Manhattan. There's a psych convention going on. We'll meet in the bar, you know, on the first floor," whatever. "And be there at ten o'clock sharp."

[01:22:16] I go there at ten o'clock sharp. I'm sharp, dressed in my nicest clothes. By the way, we're Bronx super hip in those days, meaning I was wearing blue suede shoes, peg pants, a Billy Eckstine rolled collar, a thin tie, and actually had a jacket that had suede. It was really super cool. Oh, and I had a keychain that went down to my knee and back up, and at the end of it I had my Phi Beta Kappa keys. It was cool for the Bronx. Again, when I get to Yale, it's going to be a joke. I meet with this K. C. Montgomery. He's already had two martinis. In those days men really drank, oh, in general, but certainly psychologist men often had parties who drink to be drunk.

He said, "I want to ask you three questions. Question one, do you know how to run rats?"

I thought. I said, "Yes, of course." We had rats in our apartment. You get a broomstick and you bang them, you know. [laughter] I didn't say it. I said, "Yes, of course."

He said, "Do you know how to build laboratory equipment?"

I said, "What kind?"

He said, "You know, a cage."

I said, "Oh, sure." Meaning I knew my father could build anything.

Then he said, "Are you able to start work this summer, or do you have plans?"

I said, "No. I'm free this summer."

He said, "Okay. I'm here to authorize you to be a first-year graduate student in the Yale Psychology Department working with me as a full assistantship that will pay--I don't know--$1,500 a year, no tuition."

I couldn't believe it. I was overjoyed. I said, "Really?"

He said, "Yes. This is a firm offer."

Then I said, "But I never got a letter that you rejected me or accepted me."

He said, "It's a long story." I know he said provisional. So this is a nice, really amazing story that we'll hold off for a minute. Then he said, "Okay. Now, quickly, go to the convention because Neal Miller at twelve o'clock is going to give his summary talk about ten years of research on reward and punishment."

I run in. Then here's this guy who was becoming my idol, Neal Miller, presenting research that was so exciting, with animals, with people about reward, about punishment. Throughout he's mentioning his graduate students, "in the research I did with this student and we found this." I said, oh, my god, you know. Here's somebody I want to work with because he's clearly promoting their careers. I ended up doing research with Neal Miller. We actually published an article in a major journal in which I was the senior author. I get to Yale and--

Hartwig: Before that though, so you actually had your first publication [in] like 1953 and so you were doing--

Zimbardo: [01:25:37] Oh, yes, yes. That's right.

Hartwig: You were experienced in social activism. Talk a little bit about kind of your social activism and then some of your early research in 1953 and 1952.

Zimbardo: [01:25:49] Yes. In my sociology phase, they were encouraging us to do field research. I think around 1948 there was a sugar crop failure in Puerto Rico. The governor of Puerto Rico gave anyone who wanted a one-way ticket to America, meaning to New York. Thousands of Puerto Ricans migrated. Many of them went to what has become known as Spanish Harlem in Manhattan, and the rest came to the South Bronx. Now, after the war, poor people were much more affluent because there were jobs. Jewish people from the South Bronx, who had always been the most affluent, now were even more affluent, and they all moved out of the South Bronx and they moved to the North Bronx. They moved to Pelham Bay, they moved to really special projects.

That meant there was a vacuum of inexpensive apartments. Many of the Puerto Ricans moved there. Then at the same time, African American soldiers did not want to go back to the South, so they moved, and the only place that was available was, again, in the South Bronx. Now there's a lot of conflict between Puerto Ricans and African Americans over the entry-level jobs. I had friends from both communities. I began to study the integration dynamics and prejudice between these two minority groups in the Bronx. It was mostly interviews. I mean interviews with blacks, with Puerto Ricans, with people from the community, and church, and stores. I did it with a small class and I wrote it up. It was actually the first study of interminority dynamics because everything else in the past had been a dominant group versus minority group. I actually got it published I guess as sophomore or junior in college.

That provided me with the whole focus of how important it is to learn how to focus your ideas, to write [them] and share. Ideas are not good unless you share them with people. I may have had some recommendations at the end. I don't actually remember. Then at the same time I realized that here were these voting blocs that, in the 1948 election, neither Republican nor Democratic Party was appealing to, you know, Puerto Rican vote or black vote. I'm saying it doesn't make sense. I mean, here are these groups and it was clear to me these groups are going to keep expanding, not only in the Bronx, but Spanish Harlem. And why aren't people encouraging them to vote, or teaching them the importance of voting? The only one that was [appealing to them] was really the socialist party.

I was not a political person then because I just didn't have time. I would actually go to the various rallies. I'd make recordings to analyze. The socialists were trying to get blacks and Hispanics to sign up to be socialists. I could see what the advantages are, what are the disadvantages of the way they're presenting their position. I still remember it. They're talking to people about how these basic parties are missing what will soon be a big voting bloc. Curiously the Republicans still have not gotten the message [laughter] in 2016. That was 1948.

Hartwig: Maybe this might be a good time to end here and next time we can pick up with your grad school at Yale, and then NYU and Stanford.

Zimbardo: [01:30:23] Yes. Maybe let's just jump to at last Yale.

I say to K. C. Montgomery that I'm curious that I didn't get any communication from Yale--I wasn't accepted, I wasn't rejected. How could that be? He said, "We'll deal with it later." He never did. Unfortunately, Montgomery committed suicide in my second year; he was seriously depressed, and the department chair covered it from me. I had to work an enormous amount of time building rat cages, running all kinds of animal research on exploratory behavior, which was a new field opening up, but it was research about which I knew very little, and I was living in my rat lab almost all the time I was not in classes, then analyzing the data, writing [them] up. Montgomery had given me a list of projects to do, but then did little oversight because he was in and out of Yale Hospital [in 1965, Yale-New Haven Hospital]. It was really sad. I mean there was no camaraderie

between us, and it was clear to me there was something wrong, but I had no clue about how bad it was.

I ran rats for two or three years and then--I'll tell you a story later--I switched to social psychology, and then ultimately graduated in social psychology working with Carl Hovland, Jack Brehm, Bob Cohen [Robert Cohen], Irv Sarnoff [Irving Sarnoff], and Hal Kelley in my first year. Hal Kelley went on to be a famous social psychologist at UCLA.

When I graduate, 1959, I submit a paper to the International Congress of Psychology, which is being held in Germany in the town of Bonn. It's the first international congress since the war. My paper is accepted. So it's the first time I'm going overseas. I go to Germany and I give my paper. It was twelve minutes but it was a big success. I'll try to remember for next time what the topic was. Then we're going to an end-of-the-day reception. I'm getting into a taxi with Hal Kelley who I hadn't seen since my first year. I can still remember--and we'll end with this brief conversation. I said, "Hal, you know, it must be difficult for the Jewish psychologist among us to be in Germany so shortly after the war. There [are] so many negative feelings. I would bet for a lot of the Germans there's still the anti-Jewish sentiment." We talked a little bit.

Then he said, "Gee, it must have been the way you felt coming to Yale where everybody thought you were black."

I said, "What? What?"

He said, "Didn't you know?"

I said, "Know what?"

He said, "The reason we delayed in accepting you is half of the faculty thought you were black, or mulatto, and therefore we should not take you because your letters of recommendation would be exaggerated, that you'd be highly likely to fail and we wouldn't want to have that guilt. Others said we should take you because we never had a black and it would be our first and you would be a trial case. We'd see how you'd perform. And they couldn't decide."

Essentially, the Yale Psychology Department [laughter] at that time couldn't decide whether they wanted to take in a student who could be black who has graduated summa cum laude from a top undergraduate college, had gotten a President's Award, had published an article as an undergrad. They said let's table it. They never got back to it.

Then I said to Kelley, "I can't believe it."

He said, "Gee. I'm so sorry that you didn't know. Somebody should have told you."

[01:34:40] Then what happened was K. C. Montgomery had accepted a student named Gordon Bower to work with him, and Gordon at the last minute decided to go actually to Minnesota. Minnesota had a special science project program. Montgomery had an assistantship and grant money and everybody else had been accepted or rejected. I was the only one dangling. He came to see me because if it wasn't me, he would have no research assistant. That's what happened. Now, curiously, Montgomery was from the South. Think back. Why couldn't he ask me those questions on the phone

when he called me? Then he could have said, "Okay. I'll see you tomorrow. You know, we'll meet, we'll have a drink, and we'll celebrate."

I am sure had I been black he would not have given it to me. You know, I have no data for it. I thought of it later. You know, why couldn't you tell me this so that I'd be euphoric? We'd meet, have a drink. You know, why would you have to wait? I think the only reasonable thing is I think if I [were] black, he'd make up something, "Well, you know, I'm not sure you're the right--Minnesota might be better." That was very strange. I'm sure that was the reason.

Hartwig: Why did they think you were black?

Zimbardo: [01:36:15] Oh, oh. Oh, I'm sorry. Very quickly.

Hartwig: Yes.

Zimbardo: [01:36:21] It was circumstantial evidence to the nth degree. First of all, in those days you had to send a picture in with your application, in fact, to see whether you're a minority. I was, again, a poor kid. [An ad on] the back of a comic book [said] for $10, you could get a hundred pictures. Because you had to send them to all of the places I applied. I applied to every place. The pictures were dark and grainy compared to the professional pictures of other applicants. You put them side by side, I just looked darker. Then I had a little mustache. You know, I had this Billy Eckstine shirt. That was the start.

Then when it asked on the form about hobbies, you know, listening to jazz music, going to jazz clubs, like Bird Land. Same thing, you know, what are your favorite readings, and it would be stories of jazz. I also was the secretary of the Brooklyn Chapter of the National Association for the

Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), only because Charles Lawrence, one of my teachers, asked me would I do it, and he was the head of NAACP. Oh, and then I was the captain of the track team. It was a set of things. I had published on conflict between blacks and Puerto Ricans. Now it's a coherent picture. I mean like who would be doing all this stuff if they weren't black. It was not unreasonable somebody put this all together and say, "Here's a black kid who's doing his best. It's one thing to do your best at Brooklyn College, another thing to do your best at Yale--so he's not going to make it."

Now, curiously, it took ten more years before the Yale Psychology Department had its first black graduate student, Jones. You know, my buddy, James Jones. It took ten years after I left before they actually got onto getting a graduate student of color. It's a curious, funny, but actually sad story.

Hartwig: That's your third time you've been discriminated or profiled.

Zimbardo: [01:38:43] Yes. Discriminated as a kid because I was Jewish, discriminated at high school because I was Sicilian Mafia, discriminated at Yale because I was black. Then the last thing is, [laughter] and we'll end with this. So now I graduate from Yale, I get a job at New York University in the Bronx. I'm still poor, I get a van to move whatever stuff I had at Yale to an apartment in the Bronx. My brother and I are unloading the van. It's a hot summer day, and we have bandanas on our forehead. Somebody passing by looks at us and said, "My god. The Puerto Ricans are moving in everywhere." You know, we're not Puerto Rican. [laughter] That was my fourth. So Jewish, black, Sicilian, Puerto Rican.

Hartwig: [laughter] You've done it all, Phil. All right. Let's pick up then at Yale next time.

Zimbardo: [01:39:46] Okay. Thanks so much.

S T A N F O R D U N I V E R S I T Y

PROJECT:	STANFORD FACULTY ORAL HISTORY PROJECT
INTERVIEWER:	DANIEL HARTWIG
INTERVIEWEE:	PHILIP G. ZIMBARDO
DATE OF INTERVIEW:	SEPTEMBER 1, 2016
PART:	2 of 7

Hartwig: Good morning. This is Daniel Hartwig. Today is September 1, 2016. I am here with Phil Zimbardo as part of our second oral history session. Good morning, Phil.

Zimbardo: [00:00:11] Good morning, Dan.

Hartwig: Last time we ended right before you told the story of how you got to Yale. Let's start with grad school. What was the Yale Psychology Department like when you arrived?

Surviving, then Thriving at Yale

Zimbardo: [00:00:31] The Yale Psychology Department at that time was probably the best in the world. There were superstars in every area headed by Neal Miller and John Dollard, who had recently written *Learning and Personality*. It was a scene of neo-behaviorism. Its earlier program was built around Clark Hull. Its graduate faculty was relatively small in number but highly selected, with one or more outstanding scholars in each domain. I tried to take courses and do projects with as many of them as possible during my five years of

graduate studies. There were also a relatively small number of grad students spread across five substantive areas. [paragraphs deleted]

I briefly want to go back to recap my summer job with K. C. Montgomery --running white rats in many experiments focused around exploratory behavior. Instead of studying group dynamics and race relations, as I would have preferred and was prepared for, here I'm running rats for the next three years--in the department's basement animal lab center.

Hartwig: Did you adjust well, or was that difficult?

Zimbardo: [00:04:21] It was difficult. It was just a job that I tried to do well by immersing myself in it. What made it difficult was that Montgomery was doing new research on exploratory behavior in rats. It was a hot topic at that time, exploratory behavior in animals, because it went against the prevailing stimulus-response theory, because we showed that [animals] explore not just to get food. They explore to understand their environment, to be sure that it's safe rather than dangerous. The research seemed interesting in that sense.

Montgomery was never around, which was a problem for me. He would give me a list of things to do, and I'd be building cages and breeding hundreds of rats and then putting them in different situations while recording what they did. As I mentioned, in my second year, he committed suicide. I decided to continue doing all the research we had planned. I actually applied for his NSF [National Science Foundation] grant with the supervision of Professor Fred Sheffield, and I got the grant. As a graduate student, I had a $40,000 grant from NSF. In the next few years, I finished all the research.

I published several articles that I wrote with Montgomery as senior author, and several that I did as senior author, most in the prestigious journal for such research, the *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology* (*JCPP*), a leading journal at that time. So my publishing career got a hot head start.

Since I had the lab all set up, I started doing other things in which I was interested. For example, I studied sexual behavior because Frank Beach was a famous professor there [at Yale] and was the leading researcher in sexual behavior in animals. I did an early study on the effects of chlorpromazine and caffeine on the sexual behavior of white rats, which was published in the journal *Science*. Chlorpromazine had just begun being used in pharmacology. The result was chlorpromazine suppressed sexual behavior, while caffeine enhanced sexual behavior.

As a graduate student, I had a publication in *Science* as lead author with another graduate student, Herbert Barry, and also those several publications in *JCPP*. Now, I say this because it looks good as a career primer. On the other hand, I felt that I didn't belong at Yale, that I wasn't smart enough, I didn't know enough psychology compared to my classmates. I simply had not taken enough undergraduate courses.

I just felt unprepared to be with these top graduate students at the time. I did however acclimate gradually and slowly. Actually, I had considered quitting in mid-year, but I toughed it out.

The other interesting thing I want to get on the record is my relationship with Gordon Bower, whom I replaced as KCM's research assistant; he came to Yale the next year. We worked together, we roomed

together, and I think he was one of the people who got me into Stanford eventually because he went directly from Yale to Stanford, where he spent his whole career. He has been one of the leading researchers in the psychology of memory. I was also proud to be chosen as his best man at his wedding to Sharon Anthony, around 1957.

Hartwig: You told a story about Montgomery and also said that you were kind of [left] in the lurch, and then you also in some sense had to take care of his wife at the time. So not just kind of the research grants, but then kind of helping step in.

Zimbardo: [00:08:54] Yes. I both completed the research and helped to support his widow and children. Montgomery's suicide was totally unexpected. He seemed to be on top of the academic world at Yale. He had revised the introductory psychology program completely on his own. He was publishing. He got the big NSF grant. And he was pretty sure they were not going to give him tenure because at that time Yale and Harvard hired bunches of assistant professors and they typically only kept one. But that year they let all of them go. They only advanced Bob Abelson [Robert P. Abelson] because he was a hot shot in statistics, where the department was weak. That was a crushing blow to him [Montgomery]. Secondly, he and his wife recently had a child who had some mental disorder, Down's syndrome, I believe. Again, he may have felt somehow responsible.

What happened was I sold his library and I did other things to get money for his wife. I sold his entire library that included many bound

journals. Also I solicited funds from his former colleagues to help her out because she was really broke at that time.

Hartwig: What other types of research then did you engage in at Yale, and how did that prepare you later on in life?

Zimbardo: [00:10:03] Here I'm a rat runner, I [have been] publishing for three years. Then fortunately I took a course at Yale with Jack Brehm and Robert Cohen. Jack Brehm had been one of Leon Festinger's first graduate students, and Bob Cohen had been at the University of Michigan Research Center for Group Dynamics. They were teasing me, both of them, about running rats--being a New York kid. I am using my cognitive dissonance in defending why rat running is really important when a few years before I couldn't imagine it. They co-taught a special course to a limited number of students in the social psychology program. In their course--this was probably 1956, our main material was reading the manuscript of Leon Festinger's *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*, almost as he was writing it--published the next year in 1957. We're so excited. Gordon Bower and I were also in that class.

This dissonance is really a simple theory that makes these non-obvious predictions, such as if we can get you to take any action which is against your beliefs, your beliefs will come to fit your actions. This was really dramatic. Then Leon Festinger came to Stanford and gave a brilliant lecture and I was hooked. I said, "Wow, he's the guy I should have been working for." Then I decided, okay, this is what I want to do my dissertation research on.

Now, I had been working with Carl Hovland, who was the head of the social program. He had many big grants from Sterling Foundation and other sources. He headed the Yale Attitude Change Program. On the one hand, you had Neal Miller and Frank Beach, the behaviorists, and then you had John Dollard who was personality, clinical. Then in the center were Carl Hovland, Irving Janis, and Harold Kelly--who left later to go to UCLA--together they wrote the then-classic, *Communication and Persuasion*.

[00:12:32] My dissertation was pitting rational predictions from attitude change theory from Hovland and Sherif's ideas against dissonance theory ideas, and dissonance won. It was the first dissertation in 1958 of dissonance in an attitude change framework. I published it in the *Journal of Abnormal and Social* P*sychology.*

I did not submit my dissertation for another year because I was eligible for draft in the Korean War, believe it or not. To get out of service, I worked one year as a pre-doctoral fellow at the West Haven Veterans Administration Hospital, and there got interested in more clinical psychology.

When I was at Yale, one of the best courses I took was Irving Janis's course in psychopathology. We actually met at a mental hospital. I think Middletown State Mental Hospital. In the morning he would lecture about a topic, a phobia or paranoia, for example. Then in the afternoon he would interview patients who exhibited the symptoms of those disorders. Then we also would go on the wards to meet with and talk with patients first hand. Each of us had to do a case study. Each of us got assigned a patient. I was

just auditing the course, but I got totally involved and *Mr. F. B.* was my patient. I actually used the material I collected there in my teaching for many, many years.

Hartwig: Then after Yale?

Zimbardo: [00:14:10] I graduated in 1959. Several other things that deserve mention before going down to the Bronx for the start of my academic career. I was really a worker bee, working with as many faculty in all areas of psychology as I could, sequentially and sometimes simultaneously. I got interested in the work of Seymour Sarason. Sarason had been doing a number of projects on test anxiety in school children. Somehow he recruited me, or he gave a lecture and I said I was interested, so I started working with him. Then he decided that he was more interested in community psychology--he actually started the whole field of community psychology--and then asked me would I take over the anxiety project in children, which I then did. I'm still a graduate student doing that. We ultimately published our longitudinal study of test anxiety in kids.

Then I also started teaching at Yale. Claude Buxton, the chair, had written a book on [the] teaching of psychology. He used his book in our class, to test it out.

Then at the end of the course I said, "When do we teach?"

He said, "You don't teach. At Harvard graduate students teach undergraduates. At Yale, undergraduate students are special. They only get professors."

I said, "Well, I still would like to teach, if possible."

Part of the class was to give a guest lecture in an undergrad course; I did and I loved it. Then fortunately one of the professors who was going to teach Psych 100 in the fall got sick and I was the only one available. I was the first graduate student in psychology to teach my own intro psych course. I was just hooked on the joys of teaching.

Hartwig: What was it about that class that you fell in love with? And then how did that class maybe anticipate future similar classes that you taught later in life?

Zimbardo: [00:16:36] Up until that time, everything I was doing was to make me smart, to give me a vision, and then everything was how do I turn this into research. Now for the class I'm saying what is it that I know that I have to mentally repackage to make it entertaining, exciting, for students. At Yale very few undergraduates would major in psych. I mean you didn't go to Yale to be a psychologist. You went there to be in business and so forth. Each lecture I would try to present material that was exciting for them, like the case study of *Mr. F. B.*

What was good about it, it was a small class. I think it was like limited to twenty. These were freshman. It met Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday at eight o'clock in the morning--Saturday eight o'clock in the fall is terrible because that's football season, you know. Some of the kids have girlfriends coming up from the Seven Sisters colleges. So I had to make my class interesting for all of them. Everybody in that frosh class had to do research, which at that time was unheard of in Psych I. Some of them were really interesting studies. One had a large sample from his dad's company. That became a theme of my career: to put ideas into teaching from my and other's

research, and get ideas from teaching for new research, and then put them back into the next class. So I always have had a research component with students who do research both as class projects and as RAs [research assistants]. I always also do demonstrations of different phenomena in many lectures. Rather than talk about it, I illustrate many phenomena with original demonstrations with the students. That focus I carried over to Stanford. Then I expanded from classes of the initial tiny size of twenty to two hundred, to three hundred, to five hundred, then up to 1,200 max (at Stanford's Memorial Auditorium).

Last three items worth mentioning before we go to my NYU [New York University] career phase: I did a creative experiment testing a Freudian distinction; I started a jazz club at a local bar on Sunday night; and I got married.

Irving Sarnoff, a clinical psychologist, and I devised a way to test [Sigmund] Freud's differentiation between fear and anxiety, using social affiliation versus choosing isolation within a laboratory setting. It also required my building that lab in the basement of the undergraduate psych teaching building, Linsley Chittenden Hall.

I continued my interest in jazz music by arranging with the manager of a local bar to have me put on Sunday night jazz sessions, featuring top musicians, some of whom were hanging out [in] New Haven while laying low from various drug charges in New York City. I also married my college sweetheart, Rose Abelnour, who was a brilliant English literature scholar,

fellow grad student, and soon to be mother of our son, Adam, in New York in 1962.

Hartwig: After Yale, then you went to New York University. Correct?

Zimbardo: [00:18:39] Yes. That was my downfall.

Hartwig: [laughter] How so?

Back to the Bronx, But Badly

Zimbardo: [00:18:42] Here I'm published as a graduate student. I have an outstanding teaching background. I have an NSF grant. I am a pre-doctoral fellow. I have all these fine credentials, letters of recommendation from Neal Miller, from Seymour Sarason, from Brehm and Cohen, and the only job available at that time in 1959 was at NYU. The good part was that my family still lived in New York, it's familiar to me, but it is a lousy job.

Hartwig: Go back home.

Zimbardo: [00:19:19] I'm at New York University in the Bronx campus not at the Greenwich Village main campus. [After I left they sold the campus to the community college.] It was only for NYU undergraduates who were premed, and in engineering. It should have made them really top students. But compared to my fellow students at Brooklyn College, and compared to the students at Yale, they were really "second rate."

Then, at Brooklyn College, the majority of students were Jewish. I mean 80 percent or so. I had classes at Brooklyn College where I was the only *goyim*; it was wonderful on Jewish holidays, I'd be the only student in class. Teachers would beg me to come because otherwise they wouldn't get the money from the state if nobody were in class. But the NYU kids were the

bottom of the barrel of Jewish kids in New York at that time. It was hard to get class discussions. Kids would say, "We don't want to hear from other students, we want to hear from you. We're paying to hear you talk, not other students." They often did not do the assignments and many did poorly on my tough exams, and of course all complained to the chairman about my unfair practices. It was really depressing.

But I focused on doing new research while finishing up earlier ideas. I had to set up a lab to do so since there were no facilities. I continued to do research on attitude change. I started to do new dissonance research. I started to do research in the psychology of affiliation. Stanley Schachter had also come to Yale in the colloquium series and presented his new ideas about how anxiety leads to affiliation, and I was following up that research. He was then at Columbia [University]. Curiously, to backtrack, I had my letter of acceptance from Stanley Schachter at University of Minnesota when K. C. Montgomery called. I would have ended up in Minnesota and know I would have hated freezing in the winter. Anyway, but then he came and we became friends when he was at Columbia. I was at NYU.

I taught at NYU four courses really heavily, and then I also taught one graduate class downtown in Greenwich Village. I was on all the time teaching nonstop: Psych I, Advanced Psych I, Attitude Change, Social Psychology, Group Dynamics, Research Methods, and despite the endless preparations and exams and office hours, I still loved the teaching.

Then I decided how to cope more effectively with my limited talented students. Classes were now about two hundred, so it was a big step

from Yale's twenty to two hundred. I would find the gems in the rough in each class, that meant at the end of the mid-terms, to all the students who scored high I would send a personal letter--a handwritten letter, sending to them my thanks for investing the time to do well. "I hope you'll continue in the course. I hope you'll take my class next year." And also encouraging these select few to meet me in person at my weekly office hours.

At the end of the year, I would do and say the same thing. I developed a small group of kids, maybe a dozen, who actually majored in Zimbardo. They took Psych I all the way through senior honors with me. Of those, many of them turned out really well. Curiously, more of those students went on to get PhDs in graduate school than students at Stanford, because few students at Stanford who majored in psych went on to graduate school. They all went to business school, law school, and medical school for professional careers.

Hartwig: Did you do the same letter for some of those students?

Zimbardo: [00:23:32] What?

Hartwig: Did you do letters for the top of the top at Stanford?

Zimbardo: [00:23:35] Yes. I did that also for a number of classes when I started at Stanford until the classes were too big. I mean the top of the cream of the crop there in a given class was a hundred kids, not five or six.

Regarding research, I'm doing a variety of different kinds of research. In one sense, I'm eclectic, eccentric--the good news is I'm a generalist, meaning I'm interested in everything. I go from being interested in an issue, a topic, a question to then actually doing research on all these things and

publishing on all these things. I'm not sure I mentioned earlier, but somebody sent me a list recently of the different topics I've worked on. It's more than forty different publications. But I should add another negative about being at NYU--[it] was that I had no colleagues in social psychology to have as buddies and to discuss research ideas with.

Hartwig: Reinforcements.

Zimbardo: [00:24:42] What?

Hartwig: Persuasion and attitude change, deindividuation.

Zimbardo: [00:24:47] Oh, that's right. I forgot deindividuation, abandoned car study.

Hartwig: When was that again? That was in the Bronx? Then off on Palo Alto?

Zimbardo: [00:24:53] That was in the Bronx. Yes. It was my transitional year, 1967 in the Bronx, and then Palo Alto next year. We will get to that interesting little demonstration after a detour into the awakening of my political consciousness.

On Becoming a Political Activist, Reluctantly

So I'm doing all this stuff and I'm a totally apolitical person. I don't have any spare time. I don't even know any current political figures beyond the president of the United States, maybe the vice president, nobody else. I had a wonderful secretary, Anne Zeidberg, who was very politically oriented. She was involved in Women Against War, women against missiles. She kept putting pressure on me to get involved, to use my status productively against the Vietnam War that was brewing.

She said, "You got a reputation. You know, you have to be involved."

I said, "I don't have time."

She said, "I'll make it easy for you."

The first thing we did was, *Time* magazine had a whole program on how to build fallout shelters, to protect yourself when the missiles come. That was obviously a bad thing because it's assuming it's going to happen. Instead of trying to prevent it, if you're rich enough, they had the design: Here's how you build a fallout shelter in your basement. So Anne organized a group of faculty from NYU to picket the *Time-Life* building. We are all dressed up well, we're picketing with signs, and it felt really awkward and stupid. People were yelling at us, "Get a job, Commie." I still remember that with embarrassment. Anyway, that was me putting my foot in the water to get a sense of doing something for a better world. Now that I did that, I then made a commitment to do more effective tactics.

Then two things happened. The Vietnam War was just beginning to escalate. It was all lies and it was a disaster. I'm torn about what to do. I don't have time to keep getting involved personally. I had heard that some university, I think in the Midwest, had an all-night teach-in, an anti-war teach-in. If you're an academic, instead of just protesting, you want to bring education to the issue. After I read about what they did, I said, "Hey, I could do that." What this meant was, you started at ten o'clock at night and you went all night to eight o'clock in the morning. You brought in veterans against the war, a Buddhist monk, political scientists, a variety of people, each of whom would come and talk to students, faculty and locals.

There'd be lectures, and then there'd be mini workshops, all in one auditorium. I had to get approval of the dean, who was really against the idea, but he said he couldn't prevent it. Then it had a really positive effect. He sent me a long letter saying thank you very much for doing this because it got a lot of positive publicity for the university. Then the next year at NYU's graduation they are giving an honorary degree to--

Hartwig: McNamara [Robert McNamara]?

Zimbardo: [00:28:25]--Robert McNamara, who was secretary of defense, who was really the architect of spreading the war. All the graduations at NYU--from medical school, law school, graduate school--were all on the Bronx campus for graduation with a thousand undergrads because we had a large abandoned football field that could hold a large audience. I prearranged for several hundred faculty and students that when they mentioned McNamara's name we'd stand up and walk out. Very respectfully, but clearly a protest. It made the *New York Times* front page.

I'm still an assistant professor without tenure, and I'm actually on an annual contract, a year-to-year contract. This was in June. September, I don't get my letter of renewal until we're finally months into the term and I ask the Dean, "Where's my letter?"

The chairman said, "A number of people think you need time to mellow." That's the phrase, to mellow. "You're too brash."

I said, "Does this have anything to do with--"

He said, "Oh, no, no, no, no, no."

Anyway, so I said, "This is clearly the wrong place for me."

Two wonderful things happened then. Actually, three wonderful things. I think it's 1966. Students from New York are going south to register voters. Some of my students are asking me to join them. I'm saying, gee, that's really nice, but, you know, we have something called Harlem where kids are really poorly educated. In fact, when I was [commuting between] my home then in Brooklyn to NYU in the Bronx, I would stop at 125th Street because it had a Speakers' Corner. It was really dramatic. I'm so sorry it was never videotaped. You know, people would get up and talk.

There was also a black Back-to-Africa movement. That is, some black leaders were saying we should go back to the homeland and so forth. Some actually did. There was this one guy who was spellbinding, talking about really big ideas, handsome guy with a vest, not about Black Power but really more Black Pride. I remember going up afterward and really being very moved. I said, "I teach at NYU. Would you ever be available to come and give a lecture in my class?" He said sure. I said, "I'll give you a fee." He said it was not necessary. This was Malcolm X! [His original name was Malcolm Little.]

Two things then happened. He came to my class. This was after he was giving speeches about "White Devils" that menace black communities. Students were prepared to dislike him. Actually he gave a brilliant speech. Not only was he dressed really sharp in a suit and vest, but also he asked [for] permission to read some passages from the Quran. Essentially he talked about (knowing the class is primarily Jewish) Jewish landlords in Harlem who keep their housing in terrible conditions. He said, "I want you students to

put pressure on your parents or your relatives to make conditions better for poor people in Harlem tenements." It was really a very action-oriented speech. I gave him $25 for a modest fee and hoped we might work together on future events. Tragically, hit men from the black Muslim organization later assassinated him.

However, I responded to his call for activism to help blacks with the idea of what I should do is have a summer program in Harlem. We would staff it with my NYU students and those of my first wife, Rose Zimbardo, who was teaching at City College of New York. We arranged to have our students collectively be teachers in a schoolyard in a church on 126th Street all summer. We called it the Harlem Summer Project. We had fundraisers in my home to get money, and everybody did it for free. But we got books and teaching machines from publishers. Then we also arranged educational programs for preschool to middle school in the courtyard. It was one-on-one. Then we had also Black Pride programs. We took kids to Carnegie Hall to hear Ella Fitzgerald rehearsing, to go to black photographer presentations. We took some to a baseball game to see Jackie Robinson, and more such exciting activities

Then for the high school kids, we had special classes for them at City College and some at NYU, where they would sit in on a class or classes just for them, to experience what college was like. We would eat in the cafeteria and watch athletic teams practicing. The idea was trying to promote them to want to go to college. That was a very rewarding experience for me, but very time consuming.

Hartwig: Was that just for one summer?

Zimbardo: [00:33:45] That was one summer. The idea was toward the end of the summer we were training these high school kids to take over the program the next summer. We said we would supervise. What happened was some of the men from the community assumed we couldn't do all this without a lot of money. They said they want a cut. I said, "No, nobody's getting paid." They couldn't believe it. They essentially said, "We're going to shut it down because we think you're lying." I said, "Look what we're doing. We're here every morning eight o'clock." They just couldn't see beyond it. It's almost like the Mafia. They wanted their share and I said there is no share to give. They said, "I can't believe you're coming here, you're doing this for free." I said, "Well, believe it." But they never invited us back the next summer!!

Then the next two things that happened, which were transformative, was that I was sad because I'm doing all this stuff and it's not recognized by the administration at NYU. But then I'm invited to go to Europe to teach in [a] newly founded European social psych summer program. It was the first time that they'd done this; they've done it every summer since then. The International European Social Psychology Summer Program was really started by Schachter and Festinger and people at the Office of Naval Research. The idea was to show European graduate students and faculty it was possible to get an idea, to test the idea, to evaluate the idea, and write it up in a short time. The European thing is, you get an idea, you think about it, you read everything that's ever been written about it, and several years later you might do research.

[00:35:53] They had four American faculty, four European faculty, and all the students were from European nations. I was the youngest one of the Americans. It was Bob Zajonc [Robert Zajonc] who was head of the Group Dynamics Center at Michigan; Hal Kelley [Harold Kelley], who had been my teacher for the first year at Yale, who was now head of social psychology at UCLA; and Harold Gerard, who had been working at Bell Labs--Bell Labs at that time in New Jersey had a big psychology program run by him and Morton Deutsch. It was the three of them and me. I'm the new kid on the block. It was absolutely transformative to be in this elite company along with top European scholars all talking and planning our research projects. We lived in a former nunnery. We each had our ten-student research team.

Now, all of the European students who were sophisticated chose the people with the international reputations. None of them knew of me--I was *sans* reputation. I got the leftovers. I mean they didn't know who I was. I told them, okay, it's a competition. We are the underdogs but if we work hard as an elite team, we're going to win. Soon we're going to have an idea. We're going to run it. We're going to test it. We're going to evaluate it and we're going to write it up. And sure enough we did. We won that informal academic competition.

Hartwig: What was your idea?

Zimbardo: [00:37:22] It was about deindividuation. The idea was what are the conditions under which making people anonymous increases the likelihood they will be aggressive when given the opportunity to do so? I had just started doing

research at NYU. Here now we were doing this with Belgium military personnel. It was really exciting because it was totally immersion in research thinking. Usually the faculty had breakfast together, and then we started our class. We had lunch with the students, sometimes dinner with the students. I was really close to each of them. My team was from six different nations. We bonded terrifically during this six-week program. That was really, really exciting.

Then famous psychologists would be coming in, European professors coming in to give guest lectures. It revived my sense of self-worth. Then I went back to one last year at NYU. Not only was I back in that awful saddle, but I had to work extra jobs to make survival money to augment my low salary (about $8,000 pre-taxes). I moonlighted teaching one course at the Yale MA Education program Monday evenings in New Haven and another course at Barnard College in Manhattan.

Then I was asked to be a visiting professor at Columbia in 1967/1968. I was replacing Bill Maguire [William James McGuire] who went to UC San Diego I believe. The good thing about that, it was in the social psych program. That's where Schachter was, but when I arrived he left to get married. He took a year off. Bibb Latané had been there. Latané and Darley [John M. Darley] had just done the first bystander research. He also was gone. I was essentially *the* solo social psychology faculty member again.

The good thing was I had incredibly bright graduate students. Two of them, Lee Ross and Judith Rodin, and I--we bonded together, and we did one of the first studies in the psychology of attribution that was published.

Judith Rodin went on to be vice president at Yale and should have been president. She was not chosen because she had been divorced. She later became the president of the Rockefeller Foundation. She was one of my first best graduate students. The other brilliant mind was that of Lee Ross; I got him a job at Stanford soon after I got to Stanford. He's had a long, distinguished career at Stanford.

That elation is mixed with depression at the thought of descending back into my NYU dungeon. Now, the other thing that was depressing is that when McGuire decides he's not coming back to Columbia and his position is available, I'm there. Hello! Notice me! Ask the grad student whom they want as his replacement. Instead, I'm put in charge of the search committee to search for his replacement. I'm not even on the list. How can that be?

Hartwig: What do you think was the reason?

Zimbardo: [00:40:44] It's not clear. I was too close to it; I should have been more direct but it was too awkward to ask to be added to the list of potential hires. You know, I'm arranging for Elliot Aronson and really top people to apply and be interviewed. None were acceptable or else did not want that job. Later after I took the job at Stanford, Stanley Schachter said, "Oh, we made a big mistake. Of course, you are our first choice. It's not clear how your name--"

I said, "I would have loved to stay at Columbia. I would have taken it had I been offered. Had it been offered first I would have taken it over Stanford because my family is here."

Hartwig: 1968 or so?

My Hospital God is Still Working Miracles for Me

Zimbardo:[00:41:42] It's now winter 1968.

Dreary New York winter dampens my spirits even further. Out of nowhere, I get a call from the chairman of the Psychology Department at Stanford University.

Hartwig: Al Hastorf [Albert Hastorf]?

Zimbardo: [00:41:59] Al Hastorf. He said, "Hello. This is Al Hastorf. The senior faculty of the Department of Psychology have instructed me to make you an offer of full professor with tenure at Stanford starting in September 1968." I thought it was a joke. I thought it was one of these wise guys. I mean I'm not even on the list at Columbia and Stanford is the top program in the country. I did not apply, did not give a job talk, how could that be? I kept saying, "Really?" He said, "Yes."

I said, "Well, you want me to come out and give a job talk?

He said, "No, not necessary. You can do whatever you want. This is an offer."

I said, "I must come to present my current work to my future colleagues."

He said, "Whatever is best for you will work for us."

So I jetted out, met with the social psych grad students and many faculty, and was shown my new office. My faith was revived in a loving God that protects some children from the Devil and some psychologists from becoming used car salesmen, when their job becomes unbearable!

Hartwig: Yes. In 1962 and 1963 you had come to Stanford and done some visiting lectures. Correct?

Zimbardo: [00:42:47] No. I taught summer school. I forgot.

Hartwig: Summer school. Okay.

Zimbardo: [00:42:51] Okay. Let's back up. In order to make money, I taught summer school every single summer of my career. I mean literally I would teach all year, and then I would teach summer school at NYU. I taught that special summer school in Belgium. I also taught summer school one year at Stanford, 1962/1963.

Hartwig: What was the connection?

Zimbardo: [00:43:13] When I taught Stanford summer school, I was just teaching two graduate courses. Then while I was there I sat in on Leon Festinger's research lab. He got to know me better. I still renewed my acquaintance with Gordon Bower. So people just knew more about me. Obviously I got really good ratings from students. That was it. That was 1962/1963, and this is now 1968. But I think that up-close exposure helped to tip the scales in my favor. Also I was doing research on cognitive dissonance (still) and Festinger had decided to leave Stanford to teach in New York, so there I went.

Dr. Z Becomes a Frosh Dorm Dad

I started as a faculty resident in Cedro Dormitory because you got free room and board for the term. Only it was all *freshmen* and I think after that year they stopped that. Arroyo dorm next door was all women. It was really terrible. It was 1968. Kids have just discovered drugs. All the kids from the Midwest had never done drugs. It was 1968. It was hippie time.

Everybody's growing their hair long and everybody's eating marijuana-baked brownies. I'm just out of it, working instead of ever partying. Also rock 'n roll is just starting in San Francisco. In Frost Theater they'd have all these great rock groups coming in like the Grateful Dead.

Hartwig: They played there a couple times.

Zimbardo: [00:45:57] Yes. I think they stopped it because people would come and camp out for a week before and the week after it. Also I remember a great concert by the Chambers Brothers. It was really an exciting time starting for me in that summer. The good thing, I didn't have a car. I had a bike. I could bike from Cedro to Jordan Hall and back, living a very simple life. Then I started teaching, I still remember, in History Corner, a class of about two hundred, trying to outdo my old teaching techniques with lots of new stuff.

It's always important for me to be seen as accessible and available, even when I'm just starting out. One of the things I did was in a class of two hundred, I had a seating plan so I could call all kids by name. Then after a while they thought I had everybody's name memorized. I was just looking down at my plan. Just before the term began I'm eating in the cafeteria between Arroyo and Cedro. Some woman came up and said, "Why should I take your class? What's so hot about Psych I?"

So I started telling her all the things I'm going to do.

I said, "Who are you? What's your name?"

"I'm Jocelyn Gunnar."

"Where are you from?"

"I'm from Chicago,"

We just chatted. Then I found out somehow when her birthday was. At the end of the first day of class my TAs [teaching assistants] brought in a birthday cake, had her come up, and everybody sang happy birthday. I said, "This is for Jocelyn Gunnar and for everybody's birthday during the year." She blushed--crimson red. We're still best friends from that day. Two things happened with her. I think in the second year there were some antiwar activities at Stanford that made the news. Her father, who was a rich doctor in Chicago, told her he didn't want her to be at Stanford. She should come home. She refused. He said, "I'm cutting you off."

[00:48:58] She came to see me. I said, "Okay. I'll tell you what. Why don't you be my secretary? I had a grant. I can pay you, maybe enough to cover a fellowship or something." We became very close buddies. She was a secretary part-time when I'm writing *Psychology and Life*, 1969/1970. She then went on to get her first job at *Sesame Street* [now Jocelyn Stevenson]. She went to New York or Washington, just talked them into giving her a job. She said, "I'm interested in children's TV," and worked there from really the start of *Sesame Street*. Then she cowrote *Fraggle Rock*.

She's been in London since then with children's news programs and other creative shows. I go to England every two years – to teach four thousand A-level psychology students and their teachers from the entire UK--and we get together. We have dinner with her and her boyfriend and my wife in the same restaurant, at the same place.

Hartwig: Were you ever on *Sesame Street*?

Zimbardo: [00:50:11] No. No. I never thought about it. I should have had her put me on. Why didn't I? Why didn't I think about that? [laughter]

Hartwig: You had the connection.

Zimbardo: [00:50:18] Anyway, so it was just an idea that let's personalize the class, and it ended up with super personalizing. Jocelyn Gunnar. The dorm was a problem because kids are getting stoned. They still had a paternalistic thing that kids had to check in at eleven o'clock at night, one o'clock on weekends. It was before cell phones. Kids would be knocking on the door. I'd have to answer. Then they started trashing the place. I mean crazy stuff.

Then I did this thing. I said, "Okay. At this point it's going to cost all of you money, because whatever down payment you put down the damage you've done is excessive. If you don't do anything bad between now and the next two weeks, I will arrange for a smash-in. I'll bring a car and let you smash it instead of smashing our dorm." That's what we did. One of the kids had a big car, a Hudson, which would be worth a fortune now. He was going to bring it to the courtyard and we're going to trash it. Okay. Essentially work off your hostility on the car. The problem was that they couldn't get it started. I don't know where it was parked. They finally got it down. By then it was getting dark. It was really like *Lord of the Flies*. I mean kids were waiting and waiting. They came out in the dark, some might have been stoned and some of them had gotten like andirons from fireplaces and they're banging on the car. At some point somebody threw a Molotov cocktail in the car. It blew up. The Fire Department came and said, "Get away from that vehicle!" They wouldn't move from the car.

Hartwig: Oh, gosh.

Zimbardo: [00:52:48] I said, "Oh, my god. This is my job. I'm out of here. Why did I decide to do this?" [laughter]

Hartwig: [laughter] You did. [laughter]

Zimbardo: [00:52:58] But it was night, it was deindividuation in action. The kids wouldn't leave. The Stanford Fire Department had to call the police department, and the cops literally took out guns: "Move away. Get back in the dormitory." "Who's in charge?" Nobody! Although everybody knew it was the guy who was supposed to be a rational adult/ faculty member/ dormitory advisor--now fool. That was a dramatic departure from my dorm days at The Farm.

The next two years I lived off campus in [an] apartment. It was East Palo Alto, but I think this side of the bridge. It was mostly airline personnel who would come there. I was writing the *Psychology and Life* textbook longhand. Five hundred or so legal pads. I agreed to revise *Psychology and Life,* which was the oldest textbook in all of psychology, started by Floyd Ruch in 1938. It was very popular, a best seller. But he was no longer really involved. Sales were going down. Scott Foresman had published my book, *The Cognitive Control of Motivation*. It was the first book I wrote--in 1968. It was summarizing all the research that I had done, and my students' and others', on how dissonance can be applied in many realms. They published it to get me to make a commitment to revising their text book. I said, sure, I'll revise it. When I started, I did not revise; instead, I totally rewrote the entire book

except for a page on psychological testing that Floyd Ruch insisted on leaving in.

I'm teaching all day and I'm writing all night, eating TV dinners, I remember, like really a terribly hard time. I'm writing longhand, not knowing how to type, giving it to Jocelyn, but then she could not keep up with me so I hire Rosanne Sussout as my fulltime secretary. Later, I took a *Mavis Beacon Teaches Typing* course, to teach you how to type, shooting down Zs and Ys.

I got a big advance, like thirty thousand dollars, which was much more than my salary. I bought a car and donated my old trusty bike to a good student cause.

Hartwig: Is this the Mercedes?

Zimbardo: [00:55:46] My Mercedes Benz 380SL. Silver Bullet. Silver with red leather seats. It was absolutely brilliant.

Hartwig: It was used?

Zimbardo: [00:55:55] It was used.

Hartwig: Yes. What year? Is it 1957, did you say, or--

Zimbardo: [00:55:57] Yes.

Hartwig: Okay.

Zimbardo: [00:55:59] During my first two years at Stanford, I'm car sitting. When faculty would go away for any time period, they'd loan me their car. I would drive it to some special destinations like Carmel, and then I would wash it and clean it and return it better than when I got it. Here I'm a Stanford full professor cleaning cars. Suddenly I appear in this dazzling Silver Bullet Mercedes Benz!

Actually I gave a big party for faculty and graduate students to celebrate the *Psychology and Life* 8th edition appearance. That royalty changed everything because then I had a steady income. I didn't have to do things for money after that--including no more summer school teaching--except in 1971 when I taught a new summer course on the psychology of imprisonment to prep me for my Stanford Prison Experiment, August 14-19, 1971.

Hartwig: Yes. Let's take a break.

S T A N F O R D U N I V E R S I T Y

PROJECT:	STANFORD FACULTY ORAL HISTORY PROJECT
INTERVIEWER:	DANIEL HARTWIG
INTERVIEWEE:	PHILIP G. ZIMBARDO
DATE OF INTERVIEW:	SEPTEMBER 1, 2016
PART:	3 of 7

Hartwig: Let's return to your early career at Stanford. Can you describe a little bit the status of the department, your fellow colleagues, and the status of the university during these turbulent times of the late 1960s?

Zimbardo: [00:00:23] From what I understood, Stanford made a decision to be not the Harvard of the West, but the best university in the world. I think they made a top-down decision. I know the Board of Trustees--and with the administration's direction a decision was made to create centers of excellence, so they put a lot of money into mathematics, biology, psychology, and other programs. I don't know where psychology fit in, but I was part of that late 1960s, early 1970s hiring spree. That is, they went out and hired top people from everywhere. I was just lucky to be one of those. From the early 1970s till today the Stanford Psych Department has been considered the best psychology department in the world. They've maintained that for forty years. I consider that an amazing feat.

I'm not sure what the department's status is now because many of the famous senior people are dead or retired or in old age homes. The young

people they've hired are really very good, but it's going to take a while for them to get a reputation. The names that resonate with me from those good old days are many. In personality [psychology], there were Walter Mischel and Al Bandura [Albert Bandura]. Mischel had just come from Harvard, and he left later to go to Columbia. They were there for a number of years working together. Then in developmental it was Eleanor Maccoby and John Flavell, plus some others. In experimental psychology, it was always Gordon Bower, but also Richard Thompson. Karl Pribram was our animal man--monkeys not rats. He went on to George Washington University back east. He died only recently. Then shortly after that, one of the most important hires was Amos Tversky, an Israeli. He and Danny Kahneman [Daniel Kahneman], who was at Berkeley, did a lot of their work together.

Many of their thought experiments were done in my class in Psych I because in a big class, they could have four different variations of procedures. Amos was not only the most brilliant person I've ever met, but also the most kind and humble. Kahneman received the Nobel Prize in behavioral economics for his work with Amos, who sadly had died at a much too early age.

In social psychology, soon after me, we hired Lee Ross. Lee Ross, and Mark Lepper, and then, of course, Claude Steele. Ewart Thomas was our mathematics/ statistics guru. Later we hired Ellen Markman and Brian Wandell. Each area was as strong as could be. There was never any political infighting. There was never any jealousy. Everybody had enormous respect for one another.

Hartwig: Was Hastorf [Albert Hastorf] the head of the department at the time?

Zimbardo: [00:03:48] Hastorf was in the social psych program, but he was the head of the department for a period of years. He later became a dean and then provost, he was a master at the fine arts of university administration. Then the chairmanship of the psych department started rotating, that is, they went through everybody. Everybody who wanted it could be chair for two or three years. I chose not to only because I was putting so much time into teaching, research and writing, I didn't have time to do administration as well. But I probably should have because you got a sabbatical at the end of your tenure. I mean each of the five main areas was really solid. The underlying basis of complementarity was it was all cognitive. It was cognitive social, cognitive development and cognitive experimental.

Later on we hired Hazel Markus and Jennifer Eberhardt, and then Carol Dweck. The department was super strong in the early 1970s. Bob Zajonc [Robert Zajonc] came from Michigan to Stanford. It was just an exciting place to be where people shared ideas openly. I organized Monday night faculty presentations at somebody else's house, except it turns out to be too intimidating for faculty presenting only to other faculty with no students. It was short-lived but good while it happened.

Hartwig: Was there a positive general dynamic between faculty?

Zimbardo: [00:05:34] Very positive. For example, when I started to write *Psych and Life*, I went to all relevant faculty and said, "Gordon Bower, I'm about to write a chapter on memory. Why is memory interesting? What turns you on?" Essentially I got each one to give me their view of what should be in the

chapter in the introduction to memory, on developmental psychology, et cetera. They did it freely and it enabled me to present each of those domains in an exciting way for teachers as well as students of Intro Psych.

Hartwig: Stanford is often known for interdisciplinary research. Was that important or influential in psychology, or are there associations with other departments, other research going on?

Zimbardo: [00:06:21] It was not going on then. The interdisciplinary thing came much later. I mean developmental [psychology] early on had contact with some program on child welfare; I think it was a program under the Boy's Town umbrella. They actually had their own offices. But it didn't work out.

Hartwig: But later?

Zimbardo: [00:06:53] There was not as much interdisciplinary work as there should have been. Lee Ross, to his credit, promoted that with getting involved in organizational behavior, then later with a lot of connections with the Business School [Stanford Graduate School of Business]. Then Benoit Monin, who we hired as a halftime appointment along with the Business School. The connections really were more business, organizational behavior, but not as strong as it would be much later. One wonderful exception was the new program in Psychology and Law started by our beloved David Rosenhan.

Hartwig: You talked a little bit about the students' perspective of the late 1960s. Talk about the faculty and administrative perspective of the 1960s, what you had to deal with in terms of student uprisings, protests, et cetera, and kind of your role in some of those areas.

Revving Back Up My Political Activism

Zimbardo: [00:07:40] Yes. After Nixon's reelection, when he and Henry Kissinger expanded the war from Vietnam to Cambodia and Laos, Ronald Reagan, who was governor of California, shut down the UC system so they wouldn't get protests, so they wouldn't get in the national news. Stanford was then put on the docket to take over the typical role held by Berkeley as student rebels. First of all, students went on strike. The university was shut down. I guess it was the spring of 1970. The whole university was shut down.

I said to my social psych class that I want to use this time for moral reeducation. I don't want you to go home. I don't want you to go to the beach. This is really a moral issue as well as a political issue. First of all, what are we going to do to highlight our protest against the war? We organized a campaign to get people to sell their war bonds. They still were selling war bonds in front of the Union Bank on University Avenue. Find out who on the Board of Trustees is involved in any businesses that make money from the war and openly protest against them. Get Stanford Research Institute to give up its name of Stanford to change it to SRI, so we picketed them. We were really active in many constructive ways. Then we set up a rumor clinic in the Psych Department because there were a lot of conflicting rumors about things happening, that we could verify or deny.

The Psych Department really became the communication center. Students ran everything. We had regular meetings, and meetings were typically outside in the courtyard, headed by a graduate or undergraduate student. Faculty had to raise their hand to be recognized. Joan Baez, to her

credit, was very much involved in all of this, essentially in singing protest songs. I still remember vividly how wonderful that was. What I decided to do was to have my class meet outside. We met in Frost Amphitheater. I'm not even sure where but essentially to say, okay, I want to develop a new course called Social Psychology in Action. I'm going to teach the best I know how for the first half of the term, and the second half of the term, you're either going to give me material to teach the things I don't know about but I'm interested in or you're going to present.

I listed a number of topics which were social psychology, applied psychology, sociology, such as, what do we know about the psychology of aging in old age homes. Why is it that there's such a high death rate in a short time after being admitted? How does somebody become a prison guard? How does somebody adjust to his or her first time in prison? I listed a number of these topics and I said sign up for one of these. You do the research, and either I will present in class or else your group presents. For each of these, we'll have a graduate student in charge, if you wish. It's up to you. I put a lot of new energy into this. It was called Social Psychology in Action. This was the spring of 1970.

On the Birth of the SPE

Then for the group who was going to do psychology of imprisonment, they chose to present themselves. Before they did, the weekend before, David Jaffe, who was a student undergraduate in charge, said he wanted to do a mock prison in their dormitory. It was one of the dorms that had [a] nonviolent theme house. I think it was Columbae House.

Hartwig: Yes.

Zimbardo: [00:12:11] They did that. I gave them some advice about setting up mock prisoner and guard roles. In their presentation to the rest of the class some wore their mock uniforms. One of the students broke down and said, "I can't be your friend anymore because I see what you could do when you have that power."

The mock guards said, "No, we're just playing the role."

The student said, "No. I think that's the *real you*." Real tears were flowing on stage in front of hundreds of their peers. I'm saying to myself: "Wait, what is happening here?"

We met afterwards in my lab with all those kids in Jaffe's group, and with Craig Haney and Curt Banks [Curtis Banks], two of my graduate students who were also class TAs. I make clear that something powerful is going on here. The problem is it was self-selective. Of all my topics, these kids chose that prison one. It could be these are kids who had latent hostility or sadism. Right then and there we said we have to study this in more depth.

The other special thing that happened was that group brought in an ex-convict, Carlo Prescott, who had just been released from prison after seventeen years in and out of prison. He was an armed robber. Violent guy. African American. He was incredibly articulate. I said, I realize that if we're going to do an experiment, I have to know more about prisons. The best way to do it is to teach a summer course called the *Psychology of Imprisonment*, which I co-taught with Prescott. Craig Haney, Curt Banks sat in, as did Lee Ross, and other people, and we brought in former prisoners, current prison guards,

people connected with prison. I began to understand better what the psychology of prison is about. That was really formative for me. Then Carlo continued to be a consultant during the experiment and then for many years after I arranged for him to have speaking engagements. We were really close buddies.

Hartwig: Let's go back to David's experiment. Describe the specifics of that, how prisoners were selected, the process, et cetera.

Zimbardo: [00:14:18]. The problem was that all the kids in my class who said they were interested in imprisonment were in that same dormitory. Half of them were going to be guards, half prisoners; however, they each chose who wants to be guards, who wants to be prisoners.

Hartwig: Self-selected. Okay.

Zimbardo: [00:14:36] It was not really an experiment, it was really just a demonstration, and it was over the weekend. It was Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and the class met on Monday. I told them we need some kind of uniform dress. It could be that the guards are all in brown. I don't remember. I'm saying that in such a short time the impact was palpable. One of the women students playing a prisoner role said she told the guard, who was a Stanford student in her dorm, "I can't take it anymore. If he would release me I'd let him do anything he wanted." That obviously could have been sexual. I'm so glad he did not do so. I surely would have lost my job then.

The other thing is many of these kids are crying on the stage in front of the whole audience saying it's the worst experience they ever had. I said, how could that happen after a few days when you know it's a limited

experience? Then they said they just got totally into it. David Jaffe's experiment--I think now he's a doctor in St. Louis--was the direct impetus for me to say, let's do this systematically. Let's have a large number of students not connected to Stanford, advertise in the *Palo Alto Times*, "Wanted: College students for a study of prison life. One to two weeks, $15 a day." Seventy-five people answered the ad, came to my office, and were interviewed by Craig and Curt. We gave them a battery of psychological tests. Actually, it was from the Comrey Personality Inventory from UCLA, which has seven different scales.

We picked two dozen who seemed most psychologically normal, physically healthy and then randomly assigned each one to be a guard, one a prisoner. The kids who were going to be guards, we said come down on Saturday, which they did. We went to an Army-Navy supply store, where they picked out their uniforms, which were military style. Then they all came down together to our basement area in Jordan Hall to help us finish the setup. We wanted them to feel as if it was their prison. They had their special room, which was the guard quarters where the guards would come to change out of civvies into the guard uniforms, and then change back out to civilian clothes. We put a coffee machine there, and other things, a water cooler. Then they hung up our signs on the walls of the corridor: "Stanford County Jail," "No Smoking," "Solitary Confinement," the whole deal. We did these things to make it feel as if it was their place that prisoners would later be invited into. For those kids who were going to be prisoners, we simply said wait in the dormitory if they were in summer school. Or kids who were in

summer school at Berkeley, we arranged for them to go to various people's houses, like my secretary's house, wait on the porch or something, or wait inside.

Real Police, Mock Arrests are Unique to SPE

[00:17:45] Then the key to the study was that I had earlier prearranged with Captain James Zurcher, the new captain of the Palo Alto Police Department, to arrange for him to have a squad car with one or two police officers go around the town making these arrests one prisoner at a time. Arrest the prisoner, read them their Miranda Rights, handcuff them, put them in a squad car with the siren wailing, take them to the Palo Alto Police Department, do a fingerprinting, a photograph, regular booking, put a blindfold on, put them in a real prison cell. Then when they go out to get the next guy, Craig Haney or Craig Banks, or both, would pick them up, bring them to the basement of Jordan Hall where our prison was recreated, strip them naked, still they're blindfolded, and then while naked, in front of a huge mirror, take the blindfold off and there they are standing naked in the small courtyard corridor of the emerging Stanford Prisoner Study.

This is the start of institutional depersonalization, institutional. Next, they get a uniform, and the uniform for the prisoners was a smock, a dress with no underpants, with a Boy Scout number sewn on. Actually, my secretary, Rosanne, sewed on the Boy Scout numbers. We thought about shaving their heads, but in 1971 hair was so valuable and precious they were likely to quit. We had them put on women's nylon stocking caps, mostly just

to minimize individuality and create uniformity, so that everybody looked more or less the same.

Hartwig: Let's stop right there. We'll get back. Explain the back story with the police chief, how you made this, how you got them to do this and participate, and the steps that you had to go through to get this approved and what you said you would do.

Zimbardo: [00:19:58] For me, one of the keys to the success of the Stanford Prison Study was having prisoners' freedom taken away by the authorities because once you do that, then only the authorities can give it back, as in the real world. In the real world it's only through going through a parole board hearing. We did the same. In our study, we had a parole board. I imagine it would have been very different if the kids who came down to be interviewed--who, at that time, filled out an informed consent--came down and said I'm here to begin this study. Because then, if they gave up their freedom voluntarily, when the shit hit the fan, they would take it back and quit. I knew I didn't want that.

What happened was earlier in the year when the students were protesting the war in Vietnam, and we were doing all these other activities, a number of students got involved in hostile activities on campus, breaking windows, vandalizing things. The president of the university, who was just appointed from Rice University--Ken Pitzer [Kenneth Pitzer], he was a chemist--had really no experience handling this turmoil, and unfortunately called the Palo Alto police on campus. There were a lot of physical confrontations between the police and Stanford students, which made the

newspapers, and it was really ugly. I realized immediately I had to personally visit President Pitzer, and I said, please ask the police to withdraw. If you do that, we will arrange that there will be no more violence on campus.

I guess that gave him the obvious thing to say, "It's important students everywhere have a right to protest an immoral illegal war, but they have to do it peacefully. That is, the law will punish any vandalism."

"Okay," I replied, "I'm telling you, I know the students. I'm in charge of many of them. It's not going to happen." So he did as requested, and things were quieted.

I then went to the Palo Alto Police Department shortly after that. I think Captain Zurcher was recently appointed. I don't know if it was the other police chief the City got rid of because he didn't handle the disruption. Well. I said, "Look. I want to work with you to defuse police and gown tensions. One way I think you could do [this] is if I could arrange for some of your policemen to have dinner in the dorms and maybe have some of our student leaders ride around in the squad cars." We did that for a week or two. It clearly had a calming effect.

Then I said, "Oh, by the way, this summer I'm thinking"--this was now April/May--"I'm thinking about doing this experiment," and described it in general terms. "It'd be really nice if some of your rookies were included as prisoners so they have an experience with this," I said.

He said, "I like that very much."

Now it's August the 13th. It's Saturday. We're about to start the experiment on Sunday. My New York *hood* suspiciousness takes over. I said

he's not going to do it. At this point, we made the deal of a squad car riding around, picking up would-be prisoners at various places around town. It's too risky, too risky for him to do it. He'll back out, I am sure, I need a backup plan.

[00:23:44] The backup plan is I called KGO Television the night before. And I said, "Hey, we're going to do this study tomorrow at Stanford. It's going to be very visual. It's going to be very dramatic. It's never been done. I'll give you an exclusive, you know, if you send down a video team. We'll go down together. I'll drive."

They said, "We'll think it over."

The morning, I wake up, eight o'clock.

They said, "We could send down one camera man."

I said, "That's fine."

We go down. I said, "You still have an exclusive on it." We get to the police station. I go to the sergeant, I said, "I'm here. You know, Captain Zurcher said that he would arrange for a squad car to help me out for a special project."

The sergeant said, "I don't have anything on my record of this."

I said, "Oh. Can I get in touch with him?"

He said, "No. It's Sunday ten o'clock. He's not available."

At that point I said, "You know, but he promised." I said, "We're about to start this experiment." I said, you know, "Here's--"

He said, "I'm sorry. I can't do anything without orders."

Just then, miraculously, in come two cops and said, "Hey, Sarge, we just finished our morning shift."

I said, "Oh. If they've finished their shift, I wonder if they could spend an hour or so, you know, helping me because we have this camera crew from KGO who's going to film these arrests of students."

At that moment, one of them takes out a comb and goes like this, to comb his hair, presumably to look good for the viewers. [laughter] I said [to myself], home free. Clearly what happened was we gave the police the list of addresses, and we just said: make formal arrest procedures, including taking each one to the city jail for booking. Then I rode around with the cameraman behind them. He videoed each arrest from beginning to end. All the arrests were made in about two hours.

Hartwig: Did the students, when they were being arrested so to speak, did they know it was part of the experiment? What was their attitude? Did any of them protest or fight in any way?

Zimbardo: [00:25:43] No. They didn't protest. Curiously, the cops all wore silver reflecting sunglasses, which was part of my theme throughout the experiment. It's an idea I got from the movie *Cool Hand Luke* with Paul Newman, where silver reflecting sunglasses is a way that prison staff make themselves anonymous. I and all the guards always had silver reflecting sunglasses. The police on the arrest--

Hartwig: Yes. Just happened--

Zimbardo: [00:26:10] --had them by chance. They were just very formal. The arresting officer knocked on the door, said, "Are you [name from my list of nine kids]?

You're wanted for suspicion of burglary or violation of Penal Code 459PC. You have the right to remain silent. You can have a lawyer" and so on. Each student went through the same procedure: "Put your hands out." [They] put on the handcuffs, walked them down to the squad car, put their hands against the side of the car, did a full search, put them in the back of the squad car. Now, there are neighbors all around. It's now starting like maybe ten thirty on a quiet Palo Alto Sunday morning. People are looking in and the siren is wailing, the red lights flashing.

One kid said, "I know I didn't do anything, but I felt guilty. I mean I felt guilty for all the things that I had done. I had done vandalism or other things." Again, the police were just so ultimately serious that when some of the prisoners tried to make a joke, they said, "This is not a joking matter, this is really serious." At that moment, they said, "Oh, my god, this could be a mistaken identity." Same thing when they got to the jail, the downtown Palo Alto jail. Separate people were doing the booking, we had prearranged that they just said, "This is not a laughing matter. Be quiet. Answer when I talk to you." That just froze everything. It set the right tone now: "You have done something wrong. You're going to go to trial eventually and the judge will determine your penalty." Our whole experiment was really pretrial detention. They're waiting to go to trial eventually. We know this could take days or weeks at pretrial detention. That was the mentality. "You've done something wrong which probably you're going to have to pay for."

Hartwig: What were they thinking while being transferred from the police station to the prison in Jordan Hall?

Zimbardo: [00:28:21] The blindfold was still on. They didn't know who was driving the car. They presumed it was the squad car again. I mean they were just taken, put in our car with no verbal interactions--

Hartwig: From being booked to--

Zimbardo: [00:28:29]--put in the back of the car. One graduate student's driving [Craig], the other one [Curt] was sitting back there, and they said, "No talking." They got each one out, walked them down to the basement in Jordan Hall, and they soon each stood there naked. They were stripped naked and then they were deloused because the idea is you may have germs. The guards would make fun of it. Then, okay, obviously making fun of their small genitals. Just humiliating. It's the start of routine humiliation processes they would endure day and night for the next week.

Hartwig: That started almost immediately.

Zimbardo: [00:29:04] Immediately. For each one, it probably lasted ten to twenty minutes. For nine prisoners, each one like a half an hour, so this is a half a day. It probably wasn't finished until four o'clock. Maybe we started at ten in the morning. It wasn't until four o'clock that all nine prisoners were imprisoned. Then they were put in their uniform. Then they were put in a cell. There are three prison cells, which were former student offices in the basement of Jordan Hall. Once there were three prisoners in each of the three cells, then David Jaffe came out and said, "Line up. I'm your warden," and then he recited the rules. "Here are the rules." Then the study begins officially.

Hartwig: What was their attitude toward him, and what did he project as warden?

Zimbardo: [00:30:05] He was incredibly stern. I was really impressed with him because he was just an undergraduate. He just rose to the occasion. He said, "I am your warden." [We have an audio recording of all interactions of staff with prisoners.] "I am your warden, and this is no laughing matter." You know, some of them were giggling. "Here are the rules. Violation of any of the rules will lead to your punishment, will lead to being put in solitary confinement and other kinds of punishments. Here are the twelve rules."

He [The warden] and the guards made those rules together. I had nothing to do with it. I hadn't even thought about it. [Jaffe said,] "You will remember your name. You will remember your number. You are your number at all times. You will eat at mealtimes and only at mealtimes. You will refer to your prison guards as Mr. Correctional Officer." Every detail they thought about. "Attempts to escape will be severely punished," et cetera, et cetera.

Day One, the Hallway Jail

Hartwig: Describe the first day, and then the physical setup. There were the three cells. There was a narrow hallway. Guards. Then where were you and the grad students, and what were you doing?

Zimbardo: [00:31:24] It was the basement of Jordan Hall. There was only one entrance and exit at one end. At the other end, we built a wall with a little hole in it with scrim, a black area that you could look in and would have a video camera mounted. We were then in an open hallway behind that. Next to that was a room that we could rest in--the staff--and it was also a room that we later used when prisoners were having a breakdown to bring them off the

yard to put them in there for a while. You could hear everything that was happening from there. From the point of view of the prisoners, they had no idea when they were being observed or not, because sometimes they were not, and sometimes they were: one or more of the staff was often sleeping or off duty initially. The black cloth scrim concealed our video camera from view on the corridor, which we called the prison yard.

In those days, the video was one-inch Ampex. It was incredibly expensive, like $70 a roll, and expensive to develop. Now we would have had around the clock monitoring. Then, we only could use it a few hours a day. We picked specific events--around meals, around visiting days, around punishments. It was limited. We ended up filming twelve hours over six days. I'm really sorry about it. I mean I'm glad we did, but I wish we had the current digital technology to record more extensively.

Hartwig: But you audio-recorded more.

Zimbardo: [00:33:02] We had audio-recording going much longer because we had it on really slow tape. We supplemented that. We also recorded what was happening in the cells--that the prisoners were unaware of--and we got some interesting information there.

The first day nobody took it seriously. It's 1971. All the guards are anti-war activists. All the guards are for pro-civil rights. Some of them are even in the pro-feminist movement that was starting. Everybody had long hair. Everybody is out of the movie *Hair*, including me. We have big mutton chops, big sideburns, beards. Then it was cool, but in retrospect it looked raggedy.

Hartwig: Mutton chops. Yes.

Zimbardo: [00:33:45] Mutton chops. Long hair, curly hair. Suddenly they were in these military uniforms, and everybody was anti-police, anti-military at that time. The guards felt awkward in their uniforms. The uniforms were not fitting well. The prisoners said this is stupid. Now, when they signed up for a study of prison life, many of the prisoners thought they were going to be in a cell, playing their guitar, playing cards, killing time. Serving time, killing time. Now the guards have them up doing counts and pushups, and humiliating stuff, and order them around constantly. The prisoners felt this is not what they signed up for.

Hartwig: Did they do that naturally? Whose idea was it for them to perform these actions?

Zimbardo: [00:34:29] That was theirs, the guards on each shift.

Hartwig: Were they trying to control? Explain the dynamic there, why this occurred.

Zimbardo: [00:34:37] I said, it's your prison, it's your prisoners. Within limits, you are in charge. If prisoners escape, it's your fault, the experiment is over, the study's over. You have to maintain law and order. That was the main thing. Prisons are all about power, you know, the power that the guards have and the power that prisoners try to take in various ways. Again, we do have my initial meeting with the guards taped. Essentially it's clearly giving them permission to be in charge but not permission to harm. In fact, I'm sure I say, physical punishment is not permitted, will not be tolerated. But I didn't stop psychological punishment, which was obviously much worse.

At the end of day one, I said to my staff, "This is not working." Kids are laughing and the guards would say, "Come on, take this seriously." I remember meeting with Curt and David and Craig, saying, "Look. This is not working. If this doesn't change, we've put in a lot of time and effort so far, but maybe tomorrow we're just going to call it quits." Then on the morning of the second day, prisoners in two of the three cells rebelled. They locked themselves in, they ripped off their numbers, they took off the nylon stocking, and they started cursing the guards. This was the end of the nightshift.

Hartwig: Why or how did that happen?

Zimbardo: [00:36:25] We don't know.

Hartwig: Oh.

Zimbardo: [00:36:26] Essentially they were rebelling against being dehumanized. They didn't want to be a number. They didn't want to be anonymous. They didn't want to have people telling them what to do. They said this is not what they signed up for. It was prison life; it was not to be humiliated, to be degraded.

The guards on that shift came to see me and said, "What are we going to do?" I said, "It's your prison. What do you want to do?" They said, "We need reinforcement. We can't handle it." There were three guards on each of three eight-hour shifts. That's nine. Then we had three backup guards, and we also had three backup prisoners to replace. That's the twenty-four. We called in all the twelve guards. They came in.

Prisoner 8612 was [name redacted] the ringleader of the rebellion. He was a wise guy. He was always yelling and cursing. His job was to humiliate

the guards. He was the one later on who had the first emotional breakdown in thirty-six hours from the inception of the study. They [protesting prisoners] barricaded themselves in behind the prison cell doors. They got a rope someplace that they tied the door shut so the guards couldn't open it. Then they started yelling and cursing at the guards from their safety place. I said, "Oh, my god. This is a disaster."

[The ringleader] was yelling at a smaller guard, "You little shit. When I get out I'm going to kick your ass." [00:38:01] The guard said, "Yes. Okay. We'll see about that." Now it was personal. It was not just playing a role. Somebody said, "Hey, I'm going to kick your ass when I get out." The guard said, "Is that right? We'll see."

When they had the twelve [backups], the guards broke down the barricade, they came in, and they stripped all those prisoners naked. Some of them they tied up. Solitary confinement was a hall closet that originally just had old boxes in it, file cabinets. We moved them out. Solitary confinement was a closet about four feet wide, maybe ten feet high, and maybe three feet deep. They put two prisoners in there, the ringleader, 8612, and another one. The others they just stripped naked and tied them up. They were lying on the floor.

The third cell did not rebel. That was the "good cell." What happened was that the guards then immediately said, "Okay. All of you have lost eating privileges. You're not going to have any dinner. Instead, we're going to give special food to Cell #1." They had them come out and they served special food. The other prisoners said, "Don't eat it. Don't eat it. Be

part of us." That broke the unanimity among the prisoners because kids in Cell 1 did eat the food. At that point there was a switch because then one of the guards said, "You know what? These are *dangerous prisoners*. We're going to have to control them."

At that moment, it [becomes] a prison run by psychologists, not an experiment by psychologists. It's a prison in which power has to dominate so this doesn't happen again. The next guard shift said, "How come you guys let this happen? What's wrong with you?" Now the guards on the nightshift are really going to be brutal to prove they can be tough and dominate all the prisoners.

Hartwig: What was it like to watch this happen? What were you thinking? What was your assessment of what was going on?

Zimbardo: [00:40:09] It was such a surprise. Suddenly we'd say, "Well, wow, suddenly things are happening. We don't have to end the study, we're going to let it go and see what happens."

Hartwig: Were you concerned about how it was proceeding?

Zimbardo: [00:40:24] No. The only thing was there was physical violence. When the guards are breaking in, pulling them out. I didn't want to go on in the yard. I couldn't prevent that from happening. But then subsequently I got all the guards together and I said, "You cannot use physical force. You can hold them if somebody needs restraint, but you cannot hit them. You can use your billy club symbolically--if you touch them. If you hit them, then you'll be removed from the experiment." I kept doing those kinds of things.

Then very quickly the guards simply resorted to commonsense intuitive psychology, so to set one cell against the others, and then throughout to say if prisoner 416 doesn't want to eat his sausages, none of the other prisoners in their cell gets food. If this one keeps doing this, prisoners in his cell don't get visiting day. They started setting them against each other. After day one, there was never any prisoner unity. That was critical because it also meant when a prisoner started having emotional breakdown--which took many hours of yelling, screaming--none of the other prisoners came to his aid. None of them said, "Hey, pull it together, buddy."

Hartwig: Why not?

Zimbardo: [00:41:48] We don't know.

Hartwig: Oh.

Zimbardo: [00:41:49] It was really at this point everybody is on their own. There's no prisoner solidarity. Now, that's different than a real prison. Our study was really prisoner of war camp style because in prisons of war everybody comes in at similar times. All war prisoners have lost the battle. In a real prison there's a history as a family, many living there as old timers for decades. When you're new you're indoctrinated. People tell you, here are our rules. Here's what you can do, here's what you can't do. Here's the benefits. "Here's the cost of what you're doing." But in the SPE [Stanford Prison Experiment] everything was happening for the first time. Everything was emergent. For me, it was exciting. Here's something I could never have imagined happening.

Then it was clear. Each shift would tell the successor shift, "This guy's giving us trouble. This pair needs to wise up." Then what happened was, on each of the shifts, there was one of the three guards, without being told, who assumed the position of leadership, that is, meaning they would give more orders. They would give the punishments. They would be the ones who decided which activities prisoners would do. Then you had two other guards, and the critical thing was, of the three, almost always the third one was more passive, was more pro-prisoner. Didn't want to punish prisoners. Often would prefer to go get the food, be not physically on the yard as much as possible.

The key was that if Guard No. 2 went with the lenient guy, then the power of their shift would be "soft". If he went with the dominant guy, the power of the shift would be negative. In every case, Guard No. 2 on each shift went with the power.

Hartwig: Why do you think?

Zimbardo: [00:44:04] Because power is fun. Power is dominance. You're in control. You're telling people what to do and they do it. In real life, you tell people what to do and they say, who cares, goodbye. It was a dominant guard and his sidekick typically. Then the third guard was "the good guard." But it was good by default, meaning the good guards never ever prevented the bad guards from doing anything negative. They could have done it with jokes. They could have said, "Hey, we're getting paid $15 a day. It's not a lot of money for eight hours. Why don't we sit in our guard quarters and play cards?" Nobody tells another, "We don't have to do any of this." And it was

true. "Why are you knocking yourself out, hour after hour? We could be playing, having fun." They never did that.

As I said, they were good guards by default. They didn't personally do anything bad, but they didn't prevent the guards from doing bad things. Now, to get the prisoners' point of view, we bugged their cells with hidden microphones connected to our tape recorder. What we found out was that almost all of the conversation was about the current conditions, about how they might plan an escape, horrible food, which guards were terrible, which guards could be softened up. The interesting thing was there was almost no conversation about their past or future. Now, these were all strangers. Okay? None of them asked, what are you going to do when you get out? What school do you go to? What are you majoring in--all the things you do when you meet somebody. What did you do this summer?

In a funny way, psychologically they made the prison experience much worse because they were living in an immediate and negative present. When they were alone and could fantasize, could just say, "Oh, when I get this money I'm going to do this, or buy that." It was only about the negatives in the present situation. That was really curious to me how they chose implicitly to live in a present time zone.

Because of that, when the study was over, I began to do research on the psychology of time perspective, namely, how people live in different time zones, and whether you focus heavily on the past, present or future has a huge influence on everything in your life. I wrote a book called *The Time Paradox*. I started doing research on the psychology of time perspective.

[00:46:49] Now there is an international time perspective movement of hundreds of researchers around the world, all of whom are using Zimbardo's Time Perspective Inventory (ZTPI), the most reliable and valid measure of individual differences in time perspective. That new research started in 1972 is still going strong today decades later.

The other thing I should mention before going back to the study is when we finished, Craig and Curt and I wrote two or three little articles because really for me it was only an interesting demonstration, a follow-up of Stanley Milgram's research. Only in SPE no authority told you to do something bad, you were just in a situation in which the role you were playing impelled you to do bad things to demonstrate your power over the prisoners.

Shyness Emerges as a Byproduct of SPE

What I thought about in talking to my Psych I class the next year about the study, I said, "Why should any of you care about this? How many of you plan to be a prisoner?" Nobody. "How many of you plan to be a prison guard?" Nobody. "However, if you think about the message of the study, it is that all of you psychologically are prisoners and/or guards, meaning some of you use whatever power you have to control--to control other people, like in a traditional relationship the father is the guard, the mother is the prisoner. In boyfriend/girlfriend relationships, boys in those days typically are guards, the girlfriend is the prisoner. It's simply the metaphor of power and dominance over submission.

I said next, "Can you think of a kind of person who at the same time is the guard who limits the freedom of the prisoner and also is a prisoner who unwillingly gives in?" I continued, "It seems to me shyness is that model. Nobody tells you to be shy. You say I'm a shy person, and therefore, I can't answer the question, and therefore, I can't ask a girl out, I can't ask the boss for a raise even though I deserve it. Shyness is really a self-imposed psychological prison where you limit your freedom of speech, you limit your freedom of association, and you do it as if you're following the rules of an inner guard. You resent it because you know you have the ability, you know you have the talent, you know you're as good as anybody, but the moment you say I won't do it, I can't do it, your self-esteem drops because you know there's a disparity between how good you are and what you're not doing to show the world your best side."

When I finished that, several students came up and said, "We're really very shy. Nobody's ever talked about shyness. Could you give us some references to learn more?"

I said, "No. I don't know anything about it. I'm not shy. I have never been shy or studied shyness. It was a metaphor." I said, "Okay, go do a literature search and I will share it with the others, I'll work it into a lecture."

They came back and said, "There is no systematic research on shyness in adolescents or adults." How could that be? All the research in psychology was on children, shyness in children. It only went up to age twelve. When kids went to middle school, there stopped being a category. "Works and plays well with others" on the report card. At that point,

teachers assume kids are not shy anymore. I said, "I know that's not the case."

What I then did next was that I organized a noncredit evening seminar on shyness. About a dozen shy kids from Psych I attended regularly. When they first came on night one, I said, "What do you want to know about shyness?" They asked questions. I said, "Unfortunately we have no expert in this chair on that topic, so you're going to have to become the experts."

[00:50:44] Each of them had to interview ten people that they knew. We made up a set of questions: are you shy, have you ever been shy, what does shyness mean to you, how does it limit you, what have you done to overcome it? They brought back all that information. Maybe it was ten students each as respondents, so it was 120 bits of data. The amazing thing was about 40 percent of all the students they interviewed said, "I think of myself as a shy person now." At Stanford, well, how could that be? Forty percent said, "I used to be shy, now I've outgrown it." Fifteen percent said, "I'm situationally shy--blind dates, when my mother makes me perform, you know, in front of relatives, when I have to do something I'm not prepared for." You add up the numbers, and I said wait a minute, only 5 percent of all the students you've talked to are not shy now, have never been shy. Shyness is the norm. Not being shy is the exception! An amazing finding, to be sure, that whet my researcher's appetite.

I said to myself, "Oh, my god, we've got to study this." Then I said to them, "Okay, how many of you are interested in being research assistants?

I'll teach a formal course on shyness, and you be TAs and RAs as well. About half a dozen signed on. I got a grant to study the nature of shyness. We started doing survey research, experimental research, international research, and we started the Stanford Shyness Project. We collected a lot of information.

At the end of four or five years, these now savvy undergrads told me, "Hey, we know a lot about shyness. Why don't we have a shyness clinic to help students who are shy?" I said sure. We advertised, "Does shyness sometimes inhibit you? If so, call this number." We got a couple dozen students signed up. We said this is a free clinic. It's an experimental clinic since I'm not a clinical psychologist, but I will work with a student from the Education Department, Susan Butler, who is training in clinical psych. I said we're going to do group treatment. We're going to have three groups. We told each group, "We're going to do one thing we think will help reduce your shyness and then we'll compare the results of each pre-post and across the different treatments."

One group we're going to just build social skills: how to start a conversation, how to make eye contact, how to read nonverbal behavior of others, et cetera. For a second group, we're going to focus on the cognitive talk going on in your minds--all the negative things you say about yourself; we will train you to undo it. The third is emotional and physiological--blushing, feeling distressed, physical tension. We developed techniques for each of those three. At the end everything worked--there was dramatic improvement in each group.

We first did it only for students. Then we did next year for staff. Then I met Dr. Lynne Henderson, who had a PhD in clinical psychology from Palo Alto University, then it was called Pacific Graduate School of Psychology. She said she's interested in this topic. I said, "Okay. Why don't you head up a clinic in the community," which we then did. She was in charge of it. We also set up a shyness institute where we trained therapists in how to apply the technique.

[00:54:12] Then I wrote a book, *Shyness: What It Is, What To Do About It*. At the same time, I was working with a woman who got involved at the level of younger kids and parents, Shirley Radl. She was interested in what parents could do with their shy children because everything we had done and reported in my shyness book was based on teenagers and up. I then wrote two books with her, a parent's guide to shyness and how to prevent shyness. Both of those books sold really, really well. I mean the shyness book sold half a million copies. I did nationwide media promo, so I was on the *Today Show* and *20/20*, et cetera. Curiously, the shyness clinic is still in operation forty years later at Palo Alto University in Palo Alto, in something called the Gronowski Center.

Hartwig: Another outgrowth of the Stanford Prison Experiment.

Zimbardo: [00:55:04] Yes it was an unusual SPE outgrowth.

Hartwig: Going back to like--day two, day three. You see this changing before you.

Zimbardo: [00:55:10] Dramatic changes are happening. The key event was Prisoner 8612, who has an emotional breakdown in thirty-six hours after being the

first one arrested by the Palo Alto police. He was screaming, out of control. We couldn't believe it.

Hartwig: What was Carlo telling you as an insider or as an advisor as to what was going on or what to do?

Zimbardo: [00:55:26] Carlo Prescott, my consultant, was vacillating between concern that the guards were mollycoddling the prisoners and the need for them to be tougher. He said, "In a real prison, we'd have the billy clubs cracking your skull and those of other prisoners. Any sign of weakness in a guard, he would be used by prisoners for special treatment. If a prisoner cries, I mean he would be somebody's sissy, people would be bugging him." He was pushing me, saying it's not real enough, it's not real enough. "Guards have to be tougher, guards have to be meaner." I'd just keep saying, "But no physical force."

Hartwig: Are you implicitly encouraging or allowing psychological abuse?

Zimbardo: [00:56:08] Yes. I'm allowing. I'm not encouraging it; I'm just saying you can't do hitting, but not challenging their verbal abuses or mind games they were playing on the prisoners.

Again, it's you dominate through humiliation. The guards' tactic was to humiliate, degrade, and isolate prisoners from one another. They would line up the prisoners and tell one, "Say to another that he's an asshole, tell him he's a prick, tell him he's a bastard." I think maybe even one time to spit in a buddy's face. They would do it. Somebody's doing a pushup, the order is to step on his back. They get the prisoners to do things against each other. Again, it broke down any prisoner cohesiveness, any prisoner solidarity.

Then the rumor got out after 8612 left that he was, in fact, faking, that he was going to break in with his buddies and liberate the prison. I said, "Oh, my god, this is the last thing I need."

At this point I called the police station. I called the sergeant, and I said, "Look, I got a problem on my hands. I'd like to move all the prisoners to your old jail." They still had an old jail downtown near University Avenue.

He said, "Good." Then he called back and said, "Sorry. The city manager said it would be too much of an insurance risk."

I'm furious. I go down, I have this big argument. He must have thought I was a lunatic. I mean I'm saying, "Where is our institutional cooperation? If the tables were turned, I'd let you do it." At that point I clearly had lost it.

I said, "Okay. We need a new plan."

He said, "I can't do anything to help because my hands are tied. I'd like to do it as a favor to you. Please go back to your prison and find another solution."

I said, "Okay. Here's what we're going to do."

As to the rumor of an escape, all it was, we overheard some prisoners in his cell saying, when 8612 comes back, he's going to liberate the prison. We took it seriously rather than try to analyze the rumor. Now, in my Psych I class a major demonstration that I do is one in which all kids have to do research on the psychology of rumor transmission. So now I'm imbedded in this thing. I'm not even thinking about collecting rumor data.

I said, "Okay. Here's what we're going to do. We're going to take all the prisoners, blindfold them, bring them to a fifth-floor storage room, keep them there. I'm going to sit in front of the yard. Before they break in, we'll take the doors off the hinges, and I'll say, hey, study's over, we didn't find anything, go away, you know. It would diffuse any immediate tension."

When they left, then we would get the psychology lab technician to double bolt the doors and so forth. I'm sitting there for several hours, nothing's happening. Then what happens in real time, which was unfortunately messed up in the SPE Hollywood movie--Gordon Bower comes down, my old roommate. The door's open, he walked in and said, "Hey, what are you doing here?" I described the study. And he said, "Hey, what's the independent variable?"

I said, "You know. It's random assignment of subjects to prisoners' and guards' condition. That's it. There's nothing more than that." I said, "It's a field study demonstration." We're kidding around. Then he said, "Where are the prisoners?"

"They're up--fifth floor."

He and his wife, Sharon, go up there and they actually bring the prisoners cookies or cupcakes. In the movie, the one bad thing is they have some old guy, a senior professor come and ask the same question, but he's dismissive of me. It was never clear why the film director included that modified scene except maybe to highlight that I was a relatively young faculty member doing nontraditional research that senior faculty would not approve of.

Hartwig: You didn't answer the question right away in the movie. Or you couldn't answer it.

Zimbardo: [01:00:10] Yes. Like I didn't know what he was asking [laughter] It's the one thing I told the director, it's really unfortunate--I didn't understand why he did that. I said it doesn't make sense. I mean the thing with Gordon Bower, we're the same age, and we're kidding around. Finally I said, "Gordon, you've got to get out of here. Something bad could happen." This scene in the movie makes me look stupid. It's the single worst thing in the movie.

The other thing in the movie that is changed is the ending. Now I am jumping ahead, this is *The* Stanford Prison Experiment Hollywood movie directed by Kyle Alvarez with Billy Crudup playing me. It was released at Sundance last year (2015), has won many awards, and is now being shown around the world. At the end of the study things are getting worse and worse. The guards are escalating their humiliation, degradation. Prisoners are going to the parole board headed by Carlo Prescott staffed with local ordinary people. I did all the things you would do in a real prison. I had visiting day by parents and girlfriends. Had a prison chaplain come down, a public defender. Police even visited one time. I think we borrowed the handcuffs from the police and we needed to get a key.

Hartwig: I know you say at day two the idea--or the word *experiment* got lost.

Zimbardo: [01:01:43] Yes. It was lost.

Hartwig: Did it ever come back?

Zimbardo: [01:01:45] Never. No.

Hartwig: Even when the parents were visiting and they asked what's going on, did that ever come into play?

Zimbardo: [01:01:52] No, no. Because when the parents were visiting there was always a guard sitting on each table. The prisoners were told to tell their visitors everything is wonderful, hunky dory. If you don't, we're going to make things worse for you when they leave. The guards are sitting there observing. Again, in the movie, they only show one parole board thing, only one visitor a day. Now, in the parole board headed by Carlo, which included all prisoners over two days, he really goes off. When I say he was in prison seventeen years, that means sixteen times he went up to the parole board. You only go once a year. It was rejected. He hates parole boards. Here in his role of head of the parole board, he becomes his worst enemy, meaning he now is humiliating the prisoners. In some cases they're crying. [sentence deleted].

He [Carlo] said, "We don't get many of you people from your race here. You're a disgrace to your race. What are you here for?" He [the student] said, "They told me a violation of penal code 453."

"What do you mean they told you? Did you or did you not do it?" The kid is now in tears. Now, he [Carlo] has a blank sheet of paper in front of him. Carlo's improv was really brilliant. He pretends to read many details from the prisoner's dossier. "It says here, that you want to be a teacher. Is that right?"

"Yes. I do want to be a teacher."

"I would never want to have any of my students be taught by somebody like you."

Literally the kid is crying.

He [Carlo] said, "Get him out of here, officer." They take him out.

Then later that prisoner said, "Could I come back to say something to the parole board?" He asked could he come back in to apologize for not being a good prisoner. I mean you talk about taking the situation seriously. At the end of that day Carlo Prescott said, "I can't come back. I'm sick." He said, "I became my worst enemy." He said, "I didn't plan it. I didn't think it. I just was the meanest SOB possible.'

Hartwig: It seems universal in every role.

Zimbardo: [01:03:52] Yes. You start playing a role and then you become the role. I mean that's almost one of the biggest messages ever from SPE. It's you become that role assigned arbitrarily. Students playing the role of guard became a guard, as did those as prisoners. Carlo Prescott playing the parole board head became that person. I made the big mistake of switching from being the principal investigator interested in objectively analyzing what's happening to being the prison superintendent. The other mistake was I had an office with the sign, Prison Superintendent. When parents came in to the prison or visited, they had to see the warden first. When they left, they had to see the superintendent. Essentially they're dealing with me as if I were a prison superintendent. I'm dealing with them as if I were.

Once I got into that role, as a superintendent, as an authority in any institution, you care about your staff and your institution. You don't care about the people who are transient, meaning students, patients, or prisoners. They're transients. They're not here to stay. Nurses, doctors, teachers, prison

guards, you know, they're your people. I made that switch into that other role.

I give that example in full in the *Lucifer Effect* book, which is the first time I wrote about SPE in detail--in 2007. After I did those first two experimental-based articles with Craig and Curt, I wrote a piece in the *New York Times Magazine*, "A Pirandellian Prison," which is still being reprinted.

The classic example of my shifting into the superintendent's role was when the first parents came to my office after visiting with their son. This is after the third day. We had two visiting days, maybe Tuesday and Wednesday, and two parole board days. Parents came to see me [name redacted]. Their son had been one of the ringleaders of the rebellion along with 8612. They said I've never seen my son looking so terrible, and on and on. The mother said, "I don't mean to make trouble, sir." As soon as she said, that's a red light. You don't say that unless you could make trouble. I mean you could go to the dean; you could go to the chairman of the department.

I said, "What seems to be *your son's problem*?"

Now she's saying, "Something's wrong that you are doing to him."

I said again, "What seems to be your son's problem?"

That's the first shift into being authority: "Nothing wrong with us. What's wrong with your kid?"

She said, "Oh, he's not sleeping."

I said, "Does he have insomnia?" Again, making it dispositional when the whole study is about the power of situations.

She said, "No, no. He usually sleeps well. He said the guards wake them up all hours of the night for something called counts." I said, "Well, of course. Guards have to be sure that prisoners have not escaped. So the counts are simply a way of determining that all prisoners are there and accounted for. Doesn't that make sense?"

She said, "Yes. But I don't mean to make trouble, sir."

At this point I [saw] the red light blinking. She's going to make trouble. What am I going to do? Without thinking, automatically I turn to the husband who's been silent--now I'm going to play the sexism card.

I said, "Don't you think your boy can handle it? What is he going to say?" "Of course. He's a real leader. He's the captain--," da-da-da-da-da.

I stand up, I shake his hand. I said, "Good to see you, SIR."

The little lady is pushed aside. Then, "Hope to see you next visiting time."

They walk out, and that night she writes me a letter, which I have the copy of the letter in the book, saying I'm really sorry. That night her son had an emotional breakdown. She was right! The husband, who had also talked to the kid, seen his weary face, he was seduced by the power role. It's now guy power over mom--mama power. In a way it's those little things which get lost in the overall story. The guards did really bad things to this prisoner. It's really those things which illustrate the power of the SPE situation. But in an instant a husband can align with a stranger against his own son and against his wife. That was upsetting to me the next day when I reflected on how

badly I acted and how easy it was to seduce dad into playing the BIG BOY's role.

Hartwig: Incredible. What happened to make your staff realize that things were escalating, getting worse, and that you needed to do something?

Zimbardo: [01:08:57] Each day after Day 2 a prisoner is having a breakdown similar to 8612 [name redacted], yelling, screaming, uncontrollably. Each one is being released, brought to Student Health. Typically I would bring them to a kind of safe room, talk to them before I took them to Student Health. On Wednesday, Craig Haney had to leave, I don't remember if it was a day or more, because he had family problems. Now it's me, Curt and David on a twenty-four hour shift. Somebody's got to get food three times a day. Somebody's got to do the video. Somebody's got to handle the parole board hearing. The prison chaplain's coming and somebody's got to deal with that. There are all these things happening. I'm sleeping on a couch in my office on the second floor, so I'm exhausted because they're waking me up in the middle of the night--prisoner's breaking down.

At this point we are all under extreme stress. Also, Curt, as I remember, he lived on campus but his son had some problem, physical or psychological problem. Often he had to suddenly go home. So sometimes there were just two people running this around-the-clock experiment. We were really frazzled. In retrospect, I think I would have ended the study on Sunday. I know I could not have gone the second week. Probably for balance, started on Sunday--I would have gone two more days rather than ending on Friday, end that Sunday.

What happens is I had planned before we started the second week to have graduate students who had no experience with the study come in and interview everybody, all the prisoners, all the guards, and the staff, to give me ideas about what we might think about for the second week, if we should reverse the roles, if we should change some element.

One of those people was to be Christina Maslach. Christina had been my graduate student. I had been her thesis advisor at Stanford. We had published some research together. She had just gotten a job at Berkeley in June. We're talking now about mid-August. We decide in July we're going to move in together. We're going to live together in San Francisco, split the commute and see if it works out--our romantic relationship. We would end up getting married, having kids. I tell her nothing about the study other than it's exploratory. Then on Thursday she calls me to say she's working in the Stanford library, could we have dinner later that night? I said sure, why don't you come down to the basement around 10 pm.

She comes down at ten o'clock on Thursday night, August, I guess it's the 18th. She comes down and essentially what she sees is at ten o'clock every night: it's the last time prisoners could go to a real toilet rather than urinate or defecate in a bucket in their cell, which they hate to do because it smells up. The guards on the nightshift, which was the worst shift, all headed by head of the night shift [name redacted] who's been named John Wayne by the prisoners because he was like a cruel Wild West cowboy. He got the other guards to put bags over the prisoners' heads, chain their legs together, yell, curse, push, knock down.

The toilet was just right around the corner from the prison yard. Instead, what happened was they would put them in the elevator, take them up to the fifth floor, walk them around the corridor, bring them down, take them to a boiler room, really just to confuse them, and so that if they escaped they wouldn't have a sense of where they were. This was routine, did it every night. Each night it got more and more degrading, more and more humiliating, cursing. I look up, and in my superintendent role it's nothing more than a checkmark on my daily schedule ledger. It's the ten o'clock toilet run, eight o'clock breakfast, twelve o'clock lunch, parole board hearing, family visiting day, prison chaplain, et cetera. It was nothing special to me. I say to her, "Look up, here--Chris, look at this."

She begins to tear up. She says, "I can't look at this."

"What's wrong with you?"

She says, "I can't see this. This is really terrible." She runs out and I run after her shortly. We're in the courtyard in front of Jordan Hall, and we have this big argument.

I'm asking her, "What's wrong? What kind of psychologist are you?" We've never seen this kind of demonstration of the power of the situation. It's so provocative," and on and on.

She says, "Stop." She says, "These are boys suffering. They're not prisoners, they're not guards, they're boys, and *you* are responsible for their suffering."

I'm still yelling. It's the first time we've ever had an argument because she's a very calm, controlled person. She says, "Don't you realize you have

been changed by your situation? Not just the guards, not just the prisoners, you are changed." She says, "I don't understand how you could see what I just saw and not want to do something about it." Suddenly there's a chasm between us. "Do you not see what I see? How could you not see what I saw?" she says. And I'm still arguing. Finally she says, "If this is the real you, not the person I know who's a loving, caring professor of students, I don't think I want to have anything more to do with you." This is really dramatic. It's also heroic. She's saying, "I'm willing to give up our romantic relationship, a whole lifetime together, unless you come to your senses." She never says, "You have to end the study." At that point I say, "Oh, my god. Yes. Yes. You are right!" It's like I'm knocking on my head to wake up from my nightmare.

Hartwig: It hit you.

Zimbardo: [01:15:47] Literally. Talk about my being trapped in a role. I'm going nonstop from the morning shift, that shift, this shift, my activity schedule is overloaded. Here's the parole board. I'm dealing with Carlo, I'm dealing with kids crying, and I should get back to the prison chaplain. Endless duties, mindless chores.

I say, "You're right. I'll end the study tomorrow." At this point, it's like 11:30. We go to dinner at Hyatt Rickey's. We talk about how I'm going to end it. I have got to bring back all the guards on all the shifts, all the prisoners who broke down. I've got to arrange for payments. I remember that there is a public defender that I had scheduled to come in Friday morning. I say, "He'll come in, and as soon as he finishes his part, we'll end it

there." Have to arrange for all the furniture we've rented, I've got to get it picked up. There were a lot of details to deal with; we need to arrange debriefing of everyone--How? When? Where? I was groggy, tired, stressed, but relieved at the thought of SPE coming to an early ending.

A Former Prisoner Chaplain Revisits His Role in SPE

Just to back up, as to why the public defender is planning a visit. Halfway through the experiment, a Catholic priest who had been a prison chaplain had come to see me before the study began asking for some references. I say, "I'll trade you. I'll give you references if you come down just to give me a sense of how realistic the prison [is]." He comes down to our basement jail. He's in his priestly attire with his white collar. He knows this is an experiment. I tell him all about it. He sits down on a chair in the yard. I'm sitting next to him. One by one he says, "All prisoners who would like to meet with a priest can come out." All but one chose to do it. 819 didn't because 819 was in the process of having a breakdown. He broke down that afternoon. They each come out, and we have this on tape. He now goes into his role as prison chaplain rather than his assigned role by me, which was to evaluate how realistic this is. In every case he says, "I am Father Coughlin. Who are you, son?" In almost every instance they give their number rather than their name. "I'm 819." "I'm 2764."

Then he says, "What are you in for?" He asks, "Why are you in jail. You're arrested. Why are you here?" Some say, I don't know, but sometimes they say whatever the policeman says: armed robbery, da-da-da. Then the killer thing is, he says, "And what are you doing to get out?" I look at him,

each prisoner looks at me, and they say, "What do you mean?" "You're in jail. The only way to get out of jail, you need a lawyer. You're a college student. So wise up." It's just absolutely stunning. He now is totally into that role. I remember one of them says, "Well, I'm studying law. I'll appeal my own case." Then he [the priest] says something like, "You know what they say. Someone who is their own lawyer has a fool for a client." Then he says, "Wise up. I'll be back on Thursday if you need help."

[When he asks], "What are you doing to get out, son?"

One of them says, "I'm not doing anything."

"Do you want out?"

"Yes, I want out. I can't stand it," the kid says. "My cousin is a public defender. He could help."

The priest says, "How do I get in touch with him?"

The kid says, "Through my mother." Nobody had a cell phone in those days.

He [the priest] says, "What's your mother's name?" He writes it down.

Then it's all over. I take the priest, and I say, "Wow, you really got into it. It's really interesting."

Without telling me, he calls the mother and says, "Your son is in the Stanford County Jail. He wants your cousin to help him get early release."

The public defender calls me and says, "What's the deal?"

I say, "It's an experiment." He comes down on Friday morning.

There are now five remaining prisoners. He goes through a standard written out procedure.

One of the kids is his cousin. He goes through all his questions, and he says, "Have there been any threats? Have there been any promises not kept? Have there been denial of basic rights?" He goes through this standard checklist. Finally, says, "Okay, thank you very much. I'll be back on Monday." The prisoners start screaming, literally screaming, "Monday?" He says, "Yes. I mean we don't work on the weekends, as public defenders."

The kids say, "You can't leave us here. It's overwhelming. We can't go another day. You got to help us."

He says, "I'm a public defender." Some of them are really in tears. They thought he was going to say, "Okay. Come on with me, I will take you out of here."

Hartwig: Glimmer of hope.

Zimbardo: [01:20:57] Glimmer of hope. At that moment, I pause and I say, "Listen carefully. The Stanford Prison Study, the Stanford Jail, is now officially terminated. You are all free to leave." There was this pause and then hugging, kissing, yelling, genuine joy abounded. I felt good for the first time in a week. That's how SPE ended.

Now, in the movie, what they do is Kyle Alvarez, the director, thought it was not dramatic enough because the moment I say to Chris, "You're right. I'll end it," the movie's over. I mean all the logistics of preparing for termination are irrelevant. They cut out the public defender part, which I think was important. Instead, what they do is they have me

argue with her and she just leaves. She never says, "If you don't come to your senses, it's over."

In the movie, I go back down to the basement, I turn on the television watching what's happening on the yard. It's a combination of ten minutes of the worst things that happened on Wednesday and Thursday nights of a guard getting a prisoner to use obscenities who refused to do it, of the guards getting prisoners to simulate sodomy. "Pretend you're camels and you're humping them." It's ten minutes of the most intense experience in any movie.

Then at some point I see that and I say, "Oh, my god." I turn it off and I go inside on the yard and say, "It's over."

It is a very dramatic ending. But essentially it doesn't give Chris the credit that she has come rightly to deserve, as the hero of SPE, the only voice of reason. Essentially she is saying to me, "I'm willing to give up my lifetime with you if you don't come to your senses."

Now, it's curious. Later she has said in various writings that in thinking back, had we not had a personal relationship, had it been any other faculty member at Stanford who asked her opinion, she's sure she would have said, "I'm sorry, I really don't have time to be further involved" and just left. She said it was only because she cared about me and cared about our relationship that she was willing to take that risk. She said if it were Gordon Bower or Al Bandura doing it, she would not have called them on it. She said, "So I'm not a hero. I'm not blowing the whistle on evil of all kind. It was only because it was evil that you, Phil Zimbardo, were orchestrating."

Hartwig: You said you were going to have other grad students visit. Was she the first grad student to see the setting?

Zimbardo: [01:23:24] Yes.

Hartwig: There were no other graduate students who ever came down--

Zimbardo: [01:23:25] No, because we ended it.

Hartwig: That they were going to come down on Friday?

Zimbardo: [01:23:30] They were going to come. She was the first and only one. Yes.

Hartwig: Okay. We're near time.

Zimbardo: [01:23:34] Okay.

Hartwig: Why don't we cut it there and then next session we'll talk about the fallout from the Prison Experiment.

Zimbardo: [01:23:39] Okay. Let's see. We've done the movie. Oh, I should end with one other story.

Hartwig: Okay.

Zimbardo: [01:24:01] I don't remember if I said earlier, but Stanley Milgram and I were high school classmates at James Monroe High School in the Bronx. I recall now I did mention it.

Hartwig: Yes.

Zimbardo: [01:24:11] I finished the study on August the 19th, 1971. The American Psychological Association used to meet over Labor Day. I don't remember what city it was in, but I was scheduled to give some talk, maybe about research on de-individuation. At the end of the talk, I cut it short by five minutes. I say, "I really have to share something with you that I'm exploding to report for the first time ever." I say, "I just finished an unusual study last

week at Stanford that I think you'll be interested in knowing about. I have a few slides to show you." I show some of the slides that I talk about very briefly. I describe students getting into the roles and people having breakdowns. I end by saying, "So stay tuned for more details once we have fully analyzed all our data."

Then as I'm leaving, I notice that Stanley Milgram is in the audience. I haven't noticed before, he is sitting in the back of the large room. He gets up, he gives me a hug. He's a very unemotional guy, so I am surprised by this affection. He says, "Oh, my god. Thank you. Now you're going to take all of the ethical heat off of me because yours is now the most unethical study ever done. Not mine." [laughter] That was really a wonderful exchange of old high school buddies, now co-champions of situational power.

Hartwig: He knew right away. Yes.

Zimbardo: [01:25:20] I say thank you.

Hartwig: I think that's a perfect segue, so--

Zimbardo: [01:25:23] Yes. Okay.

Hartwig: Awesome.

Zimbardo: [01:25:24] Okay. Great.

Hartwig: Thank you.

S T A N F O R D U N I V E R S I T Y

PROJECT:	STANFORD FACULTY ORAL HISTORY PROJECT
INTERVIEWER:	DANIEL HARTWIG
INTERVIEWEE:	PHILIP G. ZIMBARDO
DATE OF INTERVIEW:	DECEMBER 9, 2016
PART:	4 of 7

Hartwig: Good morning. This is Daniel Hartwig. Today is December 9th. This is our third oral history session with Phil Zimbardo. Phil, good morning.

Zimbardo: [00:00:07] Greetings.

Hartwig: Last session, we were talking about the ending of the prison experiment. Is there anything additional you would want to talk about [regarding] how the experiment ended or some of the reactions--immediate reactions to the prison experiment?

Zimbardo: [00:00:23] Yes, because I don't remember exactly where we ended before but the critical thing was that we had intended for the study to go for two weeks. We had thought about maybe the second week to switch guards and prisoners, but I'm sure the guards would never have agreed. Everything would have folded. I know we could not have gone the full two weeks--probably I would have gone till Sunday to make it a week long--because it was exhausting. I had no idea what it means to do an experiment that's run 24/7. [paragraphs deleted]

Zimbardo: I should have had a much bigger research team.

Hartwig: Had you had a bigger team in it, would it have gone on longer? Wouldn't there have been more violence and escalation?

Zimbardo: [00:02:02] It's not clear. Again, one of the criticisms that I make to the Human Subjects Committee at Stanford is they should have insisted that there be an ombudsperson on site--that some official should have blown the whistle earlier. Clearly when the second prisoner broke down, that should have been the impetus to end it. Had Christina Maslach not intervened on Thursday night and then I decided to end the study on Friday, probably I would have gone till Sunday. But, as I said, psychologically, physically, I know I couldn't have gone beyond that.

Post-experimental Debriefing Sessions

I don't remember if I said last time that we spent about six hours in debriefing--two hours with all the prisoners, two hours with all the guards, and we brought them all together. I was able to say, "This is a time of moral reeducation. We all did bad things, and especially me." I described the guilt I felt at not ending sooner, not intervening earlier. I kept limiting the guards from using physical punishment but I didn't limit them from using psychological punishment, which is much worse in a sense. Then I said even though there were a few "good guards" who didn't abuse the prisoners but they never did anything to minimize the suffering that the other guards imposed on the prisoners. There were prisoners who did not break down but they never gave comfort to their cellmates who were in the process of breaking down. I said, "Therefore, in a sense, we all did bad things. It says nothing about us as individuals because we chose each of you, because you

were normal, healthy, in many ways special. I like to think of myself the same way."

[00:04:08] What this all reveals very dramatically is the power of the situation; the power of social circumstances to alter individual personality and social behavior, in ways not seen before now in this research. I said, "We are the demonstration--each of us. What it means is be aware that we are all vulnerable to situational forces." I really felt good about taking the time to share that message. We brought as many participants back as we could two weeks later because, in those days, it took several weeks to process the videos. The videos in those days were one inch Ampex and we had slides and recording to be edited before presenting them. A month later, about a half-dozen participants came back because the experiment was being presented on *Chronolog*, which was the forerunner of *60 Minutes*. And a team came down to shoot in the basement at Stanford and in my lab at Stanford with me and a number of the former prisoners and guards. Then it was shown, I guess, in October 1971.

Hartwig: That's pretty fast, yes.

Zimbardo: [00:05:22] It's only because when the study ended, August 19, 1971, the next day at San Quentin, there was a prison riot. George Jackson, African-American, political activist, allegedly orchestrated an escape of his six buddies in solitary confinement. In any event, he had a gun and he got a key and he freed the prisoners from solitary confinement. They killed some of the guards. They killed some of the informers who were put in solitary confinement. Then he [Jackson] was shot allegedly trying to escape, climbing

a thirty-foot wall in daylight. Nobody believes that. They knew it was a setup. That became instant news and the associate warden at San Quentin, Warden Parks-- was interviewed that night and one of the interviewers said, "Does this have anything to do with the dehumanization of prisoners as shown in that Stanford experiment that's going on?" He said, "No, it's all nonsense. They don't know what they're talking about." Somebody heard that.

A correspondent for the TV show *Chronolog,* forerunner of *60 Minutes,* who happened to see that news show contacted me asking, "Hey, do you have footage?" I said, "Yes, of course." So that October, there was a twenty-minute segment entitled, "819 did a bad thing," that was one of the things that guards forced the prisoners to shout repeatedly in unison. The narrator was a famous guy, Garrick Utley [Clifton Garrick Utley]. We got instant fame.

The other thing was three weeks after August 20, prisoners at Attica in New York [the Attica Correctional Facility] rioted in sympathy to George Jackson's murder. Essentially they occupied that prison for more than a month and made international news.

Celebrities got involved and then finally the Governor of New York, Nelson Rockefeller, called in the state police and they killed almost everybody on the yard--guards and prisoners. Prisons became *hot*. I was then invited to give testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee in Washington as well as San Francisco. I knew nothing about prisons. What was interesting was the tactic I used. Here is the warden from San Quentin. Here's the warden from Attica. Here's the head of the Prisoner's Union.

Here's the head of the Guard Union. These are all people who know about prisons and I know nothing. I did my social-psychological thing, the power of the situation. I said, "If possible, I have some slides of my [experiment] I'd like to show to set the stage," and they said, "Sure." Once I did that, then it meant everybody shared the same visuals--mine.

Throughout people said, "As we saw in Zimbardo's prison," not Stanford prison, not experiment, of the guards dehumanizing. That was really good. I did give a printed testimony. I think we have it in our files about what I thought was needed for prison reform.

Hartwig: Did that translate into meaningful reform?

Zimbardo: [00:09:21] None. Yes, if anything, the really sad thing now is that in 2016, there are more than two million Americans in the prison system. I think in 1971, I was alarmed that it was like seven hundred thousand. We are an incarcerating nation. I was in a conference at the Law School in Davis [University of California, Davis] and one of the people there said in the Los Angeles County Jail, there are twenty thousand people, mostly minorities--Hispanics and Blacks in jail, meaning they got arrested, they're waiting to be on trial, and many of them are there for three or four months because there's a big backlog. They are in overcrowded cells that are supposed to have two people, some of them have ten or more. The system is broken. Nobody really cares except it costs billions of dollars of taxpayer money to keep our prison system going. What's even worse now is that the way many states are handling it is they're letting people privatize it.

It's prisons for profit. If you have a prison for profit, what you need is your clientele--you need a lot of prisoners. They put pressure on judges, on legislatures to have more sentences, and longer. They have minimal quality food, minimal activities because they don't want to waste any money. It's really a very sad condition. The simplest notion of guards learning about the dynamics of the situation they're in, learning how to deal with the fear they have that any time any prisoner could kill them, and instead building in some reward system for them is never considered. For example, every prisoner has a determinate sentence or indeterminate sentence like three years to five. Guards could be assigned a number of prisoners and for every day that they get off on good behavior, a guard could get a reward. Then it would be the guard wants the prisoner to have good behavior, not punish them for bad behavior.

There are a lot of simple ideas that you just can't get into any prison system. In that sense, I really feel inadequate in my ideas having any impact in the U.S. correctional system. On the other hand, I know my study is used in many prisons and certainly used in the military just to talk about the power of the situation. It's used in the military in the SERE Program, the Search, Evasion, Resistance, and Escape program. Every branch of the armed forces has this escape planning session. Soldiers play prisoners, escaped prisoners. Other soldiers play the guards. They show the video that I made, the *Quiet Rage: The Stanford Prison Experiment* video, as a warning that even though we're all playing a game, we could cross that boundary. In fact, they have in some cases actually abused their "captives."

Hartwig: When did that start?

Zimbardo: [00:12:47] It started right after the Korean War because in the Korean War, many Americans allegedly gave testimony to the enemy. The rule in the military is give only name, rank, serial number, nothing more. But allegedly, it was never quite clear whether it was fabricated by Korea or it's true--some people actually in the Air Force gave testimony that was compromising. Because of that, there was a national order that all military facilities had to have a program to train soldiers and sailors and airmen not to give any information to the enemy. What they do is they role-play. They give a really real, very realistic, interview. It's clear, in some cases, they went over the line--that there were some female military service persons who were almost sexually abused during the game playing.

Hartwig: What was the immediate academic response to the SPE experiment?

Zimbardo: [00:14:08] There was not a negative immediate response from colleagues because I only wrote a few professional articles. The first thing I wrote was in the *New York Times*, "A Pirandellian Prison." Pirandello [Luigi Pirandello] was the Sicilian author who essentially said you can create an illusion which becomes real. I never wrote a book about it. I didn't think it was book-worthy because, for me, it was a nice demonstration of the power of the situation. It was the bookend of Stanley Milgram's *Obedience to Authority,* where he showed the power of a single person to change the behavior of another single person. I wanted to show no, it was more than that. It was an institution, a setting; many people playing a role where no one says punish somebody or do a bad thing.

There was a lot of criticism early of Milgram because of his movie. Milgram always wanted to be a moviemaker, and he was later in his career. He made his movie, *Obedience*, almost immediately after the end of his study. In it you could visually see the suffering. I think that's the difference. Having seen people suffering and saying I don't want to go on, but the authority saying you must go on. I think his movie, more than the experiment, triggered a lot of ethical criticism. I just didn't get the same thing.

Hartwig: After the experiment, talk about your research--how that shaped what you're doing in some of the other areas that you began to explore as a result.

Zimbardo: [00:16:23] Yes. Immediately after the study, two things happened. A number of psychologists contacted me and said, "If I could have trained your guards in mindfulness, I'm sure they would not have behaved that way." I actually submitted a proposal to Stanford's Human Subjects Committee to say we'd like to redo our study. The basic original study would be the control, and we would have two or three conditions headed by the psychologists who would train groups of guards in techniques that would make them act in more humane fashion. The idea would be we'd show you don't get the SPE negative outcome.

The Human Subjects Committee said, "Can you guarantee this would happen?"

I said, "No, we wouldn't do the experiment if you could guarantee it would happen."

They said, "We can't permit it."

It's really sad. The whole purpose of the experiment is to see: Can you train guards so that they would not give into the power of the situation. It would have been really important. Stanford Human Subjects Committee said no, we're not going to allow it.

Hartwig: Were they revising their procedures and perhaps ethical concerns regarding informed consent?

Zimbardo: [00:17:45] Yes. Stanford, as well as all institutions, after Milgram and my study went extremely conservative, saying anything that imposes stress on participants, especially student participants, is disallowed. That ended all behavioral research. Then what's worse is, in recent years, a lot of social psychologists would give imaginary scenarios. Imagine you were a prison guard, da da da da, would you do A, B, C, or D? First of all, we know that doesn't tap into it--what you would do in the situation--because the whole question is how do you know [what] you would do until you're in the situation rather than imagining it. But even there, you cannot ask questions which would induce stress. For example, if I were doing research on forgiveness and my subjects were women and I said, "Imagine you had been sexually abused and we've caught the abuser, under what conditions would you forgive him? If he said this or this or this?" You can't do that because having a woman imagine she was sexually abused could cause stress. What it means is there are whole areas of research, whole areas of psychological inquiry, that are now eliminated, that you can't even ask people to imagine, let alone put them in a situation like that.

Now the other thing is that so much of psychology has gone to neuropsychology, and there it's all in the brain so that it now eliminates focusing on the situations. It's all about what's happening here [pointing to head]. We put you in an fMRI machine. In a funny way, it sidetracks a lot researchers from dealing with these kinds of fundamental issues of human nature into understanding how the brain interprets a situation.

Hartwig: But you explored other areas in terms of obedience in terms of mind control, cults. Talk a little bit about that.

Zimbardo: [00:20:07] The three things that came out of the prison study is first shyness, [which I discussed earlier, leading to the Stanford Shyness Project and the Gronowski Center]. Immediately after the study, the next year I'm teaching my Psych I class and I show the slides of the study, of some little videos, and kids are all excited. I say, "Why should you care? How many of you plan to be prison guards?" Nobody. "How many of you expect to be prisoners?" Nobody. "But y'all should care because think of prison guard as part of a metaphor of domination and submission of giving into rules that limit your freedom, your prison guard made the rules, your prisoner self has to follow them."

I said, "Think about shyness as a psychological state. It's unique because people who are shy, they limit their freedom of speech, their freedom of association, their freedom of action, and nobody says you're shy. You impose that label on yourself. It's as if you are your own guard saying you are a shy person and therefore you can't ask for a raise, you can't raise your hand in class to answer the question. You can't ask the girl for a date.

You impose those limits on yourself and then you are also your own prisoner. You rebel but you give in ultimately and then your self-esteem goes down. Several students came up afterwards and said, "Gee, that's really interesting. Could you tell us more?" I said, "I don't know anything about it." I'm not shy. I made up the metaphor of shyness as a self-imposed, psychological prison.

They said oh, you know, so this is maybe fall 1971. I said, okay, I'll have a non-credit seminar. We'll have it at night and we'll try to answer these questions. About a dozen students signed up for a non-credit seminar on shyness and we explored. It turns out nobody had done any research on shyness in adolescents or adults. The only research on shyness was by developmental psychologists studying children. I couldn't believe there was no literature in 1971. I said Okay, we're going to have to collect the data. First of all, I made up a Stanford Shyness Inventory--not a scale. Just to say under what conditions are you shy? Who makes you shy? When is your shyness the worst? How does it limit you?

We had the students in the class each give it to ten people and we were surprised to find out that shyness was not the exception. It was the rule that even at Stanford then, only five percent of all students interviewed said I am not shy. Forty percent said I'm shy all the time. Forty percent said I used to be shy, I've outgrown it. Fifteen percent said I'm situationally shy--blind dates, when I have to perform for relatives playing the piano or when I called on in class unexpectedly. I said, "Oh my God, this is really interesting!" We gave our survey then to hundreds of thousands of people all over the world.

We did cross-culturally experimental research. We set up the Shyness Research Lab at Stanford.

[00:23:51] In 1975, a bunch of the students said, "Hey, we know a lot about this thing. Why don't we create a Shyness Clinic to help shy students, which we did. We put an ad in the *Daily* saying does shyness sometimes inhibit you? We can help for free. We had an experimental shyness clinic where we tried different techniques in different groups because shyness is a problem--you don't have the social skills. One group would teach you how to communicate. One is cognitive. You say negative things about yourself. We did cognitive behavior therapy. A third aspect of shyness is emotional - physiological arousal. We teach you relaxation techniques. We had different groups. We did each of those different strategies in each group.

In eight weeks, everybody was cured!! It was astounding because we had focused in very precisely to make those changes. Then we moved the clinic into the community out of Stanford University. Lynne Henderson [Lynn M. Henderson] who is a PhD headed it and now forty years later, the Stanford Shyness Clinic is part of Palo Alto University's Gronowski Clinic in Palo Alto. For me, this is the most important thing I've done. That is, to get an original idea, to think about different kinds of research to substantiate it, and then to translate the research into an application, and then demonstrate the application really makes shy people less shy, more effective.

As far as I know, we're still the only clinic that's focused only on shyness. There are clinics that deal with social phobia, social anxiety, et

cetera, but, for me, shyness is the term. Shyness is the everyday, ordinary term. I feel really good about my contribution.

The second thing that came out of the prison study was a focus on time perspective because all of our time was distorted. There were no windows. There were no clocks. You couldn't tell if it was day or night. It turned out each guard shift was eight hours and that was almost like a day. That when one guard shift left, the other one started. Everybody [Zimbardo whistles]: that's over. Now what's next? Time was clearly distorted.

Also when we bugged the cells, listening to what the prisoners talked about, none of them ever talked about their past, none of them talked about what they're going to do in two weeks, they're going to go back to school wherever they are. They focused only on the present. Given the present was negative, they made the situation even worse by living in this present time zone. It got me thinking about time perspective and how we organize our life in terms of time segments. I started doing research on time perspective and then ultimately developed a scale called the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory [ZTPI], which, again, was strange because I'm a situation person, not a scale person.

[00:27:09] That scale that I developed, published in 1999 with John Boyd who was my graduate student then, is the most reliable, valid scale being used around the world. Nowadays the International Time Perspective Network is organized around ZTPI. There are modifications of this scale for children. It's now in twenty-four different languages. We now do research looking at national differences in time perspective. We have an international

conference every two years. We started it in Coimbra, Portugal. Then we had it in Warsaw, Poland. This year we had it in Copenhagen and I think next year it's going to be in Marseilles. At each of these conferences, several hundred people come--mostly young graduate students but now also therapists. It's people in business. Again, this is something I'm really, really, really proud of.

The third thing that came out of the study was an interest in mind control because clearly, looking at the guards--their psychology changed to think of themselves as guards and their role in life is dominate, abuse, control-- [they] became creatively evil. That links to what was happening in the 1970s at really the rise of cults, of Synanon, of Moonies, of just many, many others, Jonestown. I was close to a young man whose family were killed in Jonestown. One of the people, Diane Louie, escaped from Jonestown. I worked closely with them doing consulting when they came back and then gave testimony regarding Jonestown massacre.

Some of my students at Stanford were involved--mostly graduate students collecting data. Susan Andersen worked with me in collecting data on mind control. I taught--I think it's probably the first course in the nation--The Psychology of Mind Control--in which we brought into the class cult recruiters or even pro and anti-abortion people. One of the assignments was to get recruited to spend a weekend in a Moonie camp--I keep forgetting it--in upstate California and then write a report about it. We did the class for several years.

Rose McDermott, who was a graduate student, she and I also did a case book that we used. One of the people, for example, we had come to the class was a guy named Steven Hassan [Steven Alan Hassan] [who] ended up being very high in the Moonies. He was recruited by two young women on campus and he ended up being relatively high in the Moonie regime, Reverend Moon's regime, and it wasn't until he was hurt in the hospital and his parents abducted him that he realized--you know, he broke the literal mind control. He became a cult deprogrammer--Hassan--and he wrote some of the first books on combatting cult mind control. He came to the class, lectured, and he and I have been very close since then. He has a website and a focus on freedom of the mind.

[00:31:28] The course had a very positive impact on making people aware [of] the extent to which mind control is there. At that point, we would talk about media mind control. Like, in those days, all the things that cigarette companies would do to get kids to smoke--programs, games, ads.

Hartwig: Characters.

Zimbardo: [00:31:56] The characters--a camel and et cetera, et cetera. It was really uncovering different layers of mind control, not just cult recruiting. So a little Stanford prison study spawned research on shyness, research on time perspective. We did some research--actually published some research--on cult mind control.

Hartwig: The 1970s, definitely there was a lot going on in terms of the culture, and a lot of your research reflected that culture. How did the 1970s and the 1980s influence your research?

Zimbardo: [00:32:39] It's hard for me to parcel out that. Going back to my days at Yale University, I had always been interested in the psychology of persuasion. I had [been interested in the] influence in social affiliation--what are the conditions that people join groups, lead groups. I continued to do some of that. I wish I had my publication list to see what I was doing in the 1980s.

Hartwig: You also did some research in madness as well. Is that--

Zimbardo: [00:33:26] Oh yes, okay. I keep forgetting. One of the criticisms that I get [from] colleagues--I am too eclectic, which implies superficial rather than I'm interested in almost everything. I go from being interested in something to typically presenting it in class, getting students to say, "Hey, we're interested in that too." They say why don't we study it in detail, then suddenly it becomes a research agenda. I think I taught a course in psychology on madness. I said even though I'm not a clinical psychologist, a lot of madness is not traditionally clinical. It comes out of social phenomena. Again, in the Stanford prison study, a lot of the kids got crazy.

There had always been in clinical psychology the notion of people who got crazy, people who became mentally distorted, there was a predisposition. I'm saying let's eliminate that supposition and say anyone could become crazy. Anyone could be totally normal at Time 1 and at Time 2 fit whatever criteria you have for paranoia. The question is how could that be? How could that happen? I began to say, let's look at what are the conditions under which an ordinary person could first begin to exhibit classical signs of paranoia, of neuroticism? I focused on--I guess I call it discontinuity. That is, there's a violation of your expectations. That is, we live

our life where everything is familiar and suddenly something doesn't fit and that triggers a search for understanding--that's the most normal, psychological process. With that search for understanding you need to explain. First you need to explain to yourself and then you need to come up with an explanation that others will accept.

Now sometimes, for example, the trigger for the discontinuity is in you. So imagine you are slowly losing your hearing, it's called conductive deafness. Now it could happen. You're near an explosion, you have some illness, but the problem is people are talking and you can't understand what they're saying. Okay. This doesn't make sense to you. You're trying to have it make sense. Not being aware that the problem is in your hearing, you assume the problem is they are whispering and then the question is why are they whispering. People only whisper when they want to keep a secret from you. If you ask them, why are you whispering, what do they do? They lie and say we're not, because, in fact, they're not. And then you make up a reason why they should be whispering and lying and it's always some bad intention about you. Now it could be they're planning a surprise birthday party but your birthday's not for six months or your birthday was over or you're away for your birthday. It doesn't matter.

[00:37:27] So now you begin to generate scenarios about negative things they want to do to you. That's the start of paranoid thinking. That was my reasoning. Susan Andersen, who was a graduate student then, who's a professor of clinical psychology at NYU--we did an experiment at Stanford in my lab. I always did hypnosis demonstrations in Psych I or in Social Psych

and then we typically picked a group of the best students who scored highest on the scale and then we did in-depth training. We'd have virtuosos, meaning I could go like this or just raise my hand and they would go into hypnotic trance. That's probably true of just a few percentage of all the people who are hypnotizable. I got some of these students.

Hartwig: Let's take a break.

S T A N F O R D U N I V E R S I T Y

PROJECT:	STANFORD FACULTY ORAL HISTORY PROJECT
INTERVIEWER:	DANIEL HARTWIG
INTERVIEWEE:	PHILIP G. ZIMBARDO
DATE OF INTERVIEW:	DECEMBER 9, 2016
PART:	5 of 7

Zimbardo: [00:00:01] I think one of the most interesting experiments I did was to induce deafness in people who had normal hearing and demonstrate that under certain conditions, those people who we also had previously identified as psychologically normal would begin to develop the first patterns of paranoia. The idea is that for many people who are paranoid, it may be that their paranoia started by being unaware that they were slightly deaf, assuming people were whispering, assuming people were whispering about them, and then began developing delusional thinking to explain what they were experiencing, which is the basis of paranoia. What our research revealed is that instead of a therapist, all they needed was a good hearing aid!

In this study, that I did with my Stanford grad student, Susan Andersen, we recruited students from Psych I who had demonstrated to be high in hypnotizabilty. We told them we were part of a study on how groups process information versus individuals. They came to my lab in Jordan Hall. They were each hypnotized, and there were two other students who were accomplices but pretending also to be hypnotized. Then the three of them

came into the adjoining big lab and Susan outlined the day's session: "We're interested in how people work together as teams versus as individuals so sometimes we're going to ask you to work all together and sometimes we're going to ask you to do things individually. I'm going to be leaving now. All the instructions will be presented visually and I just want to check on the slides."

The first slide was a slide with the word *focus*. That was the cue for the one of the three who was hypnotizable to go into a hypnotic trance. We assumed he went into the trance. The posthypnotic suggestion was: "When other people are talking in your presence, you're going to have difficulty hearing what they're saying. It sounds as if they're whispering and you won't understand what they're saying, but you're going to try to understand what they're saying and what their meaning is."

That's it! No implication of negativity. The study begins and puzzles are presented on the screen that they first work out individually. The next instruction is, "Now we would like you to work as a team." The two accomplices begin to talk about some guy they met at a fraternity party who was really stupid and silly and they start laughing and so forth. Now the real subject can't hear what they're saying. All he can see is they're laughing at someone, maybe assuming it's him. Then they ask him, "Do you want to be in our group?" That's one of the measures--does he want to be with them or not?

Then, of course, we had the control or comparison condition in which the participants from the same class and hypnotizabilty level were told:

"When you see the word *focus* you'll go into hypnotic trance and it'll make your ear itch and when you scratch the ear, the itch will go away."

So it was the same focus on ears in both conditions, but obviously social versus only personal focus. At the end we give them all standard measures of the mental disorders including a paranoia scale. In thirty minutes, college students who were normal, healthy, with usually good hearing but now in the induced deafness condition became significantly more paranoid on a standard paranoid scale with scores equivalent to those of patients experiencing clinical paranoia.

At the end of the session, when we say, "That's all for now, you'll remember everything that was told to you and everything that you experienced during this session," the hypnotic trance breaks. Of course, we had extended debriefing with the participants both under hypnosis and again under normal conditions. We published that research in *Science*, the premier science journal. That's a really interesting demonstration of creative research that illustrates a really important fundamental human problem that nobody's talked about: what is the process by which a hearing person becomes paranoid and how can you treat it? You treat it not with therapy but with, as I said, getting them a good hearing aid. [laughter]

Hartwig: Another big project of yours in the 1980s was your *Discovering Psychology* series. Talk a little bit about that, how that came to be. Was this on PBS? This was like a twelve-part or so project on psychology?

Zimbardo: [00:04:56] Oh no, not twelve parts, actually twenty-six episodes. It was named *Discovering Psychology*. Really, in one sense, it is maybe the most important thing I did in educating the world about the excitement and value of psychology.

Hartwig: One of many important things.

Zimbardo: [00:05:07] Thanks. I did it for the station that produced NOVA.

Hartwig: WGBH?

Zimbardo: [00:05:24] WGBH contacted me and said, "We're interested in doing a whole series on psychology because we believe psychology's important and the only psychology in media is really Freud and the brain. We think there's a lot in between."

I said, "Well of course."

They said, "We want to have somebody help us develop a series and be the narrator and we're going to interview you and several other people."

I had to go to someplace to give a lecture to students. They had their team there evaluating. It was me and several other psychology educators. I won the contest. Then they said, "Okay now your job is help us get a grant from NSF [the National Science Foundation] and then help us write the script." Essentially what WGBH wanted was a twelve-part, one-hour series like NOVA, mostly for adult education. What I wanted was material for classes, which would be fifty minutes at most. What I said to them is I want to propose actually a series of thirty-minute lectures that I would give and organize around different themes in psychology and we would have twenty-

four of them--twenty-four, thirty-minute episodes. I persuaded them why that would be good.

Ultimately we had to add two final programs--make it twenty-six. We got the money. We got $2 million from NSF. I wrote the script. I wrote about all of psychology. It was Dr. Z's Introduction to Psychology, Research Methods, Developmental Psychology, Cognitive Psychology, Neuropsychology, Social Psychology, and Personality and more. I got leave from Stanford for two years to do it. It took two and a half years. It was really intense. For each program, I wrote twenty to fifty pages of text. I must still have it someplace or maybe I gave it to you. Essentially that background info was not only for me but also for educating the staff at WGBH.

Each one I'd begin with, "Here are the important historical and current contributors to this field. Here are the people I think would be interesting to visit them or their lab. Here are the themes we should explore." That was the foundation. I was the narrator throughout and, in many cases, I was in most scenes.

Hartwig: I think it started in 1989 but definitely continued for--

Zimbardo: [00:08:35] Yes, it took two or three years. Let's say it finished in 1990. It was presented on PBS [stations] all over the nation. Now it's gone global, I mean, they have translations around the world. I think they have it live streaming for free. The PBS staff knows that many millions of people have seen it but not exactly how many. I updated it about ten years ago; we took out things which were historically limited. We did new programs on applications of psychology to the space program, and to business, also a new program on

neuropsychology but the core was really there. The amazing thing was a lot of the way I designed it is still useful and relevant today twenty-five years later, because the way I did it is by imagining throughout how I would use it in my class, rather than how it would look on television.

I would introduce each program's topic, and then we would typically go to a research lab or to visit with a famous psychologist, and then there'd be a historical, two-minute piece with Freud or William James, and then it might come back to people in the street talking about some aspect of psychology. It was historical. It was research-oriented, and it was contemporary at the same time. It has endured the test of time. As I said, I think in terms of my contribution in education, that would be really the most important thing I've ever done.

On Becoming a Stanford Superstar Teacher

Hartwig: Speaking of education and pedagogy, talk about some of the innovative or other unique ways you've incorporated a variety of different techniques for engaging students.

Zimbardo: [00:10:40] Yes. I started teaching at Stanford in September 1968 in History Corner, a little class of 200 that soon got very popular. I taught there for two years, and then I think I moved from there to Cubberley which was like an 800 audience. Then from there to Dinkelspiel, which was even more students, and from there to Memorial Auditorium, which was as many as 1,200 students, which was overwhelming. The problem was that it was clear to me very early on that if you are lecturing to a large class and you are elevated on a stage from the point of view of the audience, you are a

performer and so you cannot get up and just lecture for one hour. If you're a performer, you have to perform. You have to entertain. You have to get their attention, you have to keep their attention, and you have to move it carefully in new directions. So that was my mentality throughout.

Again, you want your class to be special among all the special classes at Stanford, such as the ones taught by Robert Sapolsky, or taught by Bill Dement [William C. Dement], et cetera. One of the unique things I did--I still do--is always begin every lecture with music. The music is relevant to the topic. If it's evil, it's Santana, "Evil Ways." If it's about memory, it's Barbra Streisand singing "The Way We Were." When you walk into my class, the music would be playing so that already makes the class special. Then I would say, Santana's "Evil Ways" sets our table for discussing the nature of evil. Or, today we're going to talk about memory, introduced by Streisand's memories music. Today we're going to talk about whatever the topic is that was preloaded by its musical introduction. That's one way to make a Stanford introductory course different. Another aspect of my teaching was having many exceptional guests from a variety of backgrounds. Among them were concentration camp survivors, ex-convicts, cult leaders and cult followers, male and female porn actors, sex workers, super salesmen, and others, including Nobel Prize winner Linus Pauling.

In fact, later on in my career at Stanford, I would announce that if there are any class members who are musicians who want to perform in class, you are welcome. I arranged my class once to be in Room 40 in Jordan Hall where there was no prior class. I said if you want to perform, come fifteen

minutes early and you start playing and then you can play fifteen minutes into the hour since it was a ninety-minute class. What would happen is there would be lots of kids who are musicians--singers, guitar players, jazz trios, taekwondo drummers, et cetera, and I would announce on Tuesday's class the opportunity to perform on Thursday. Kids would come early to class and by the time the class was about to begin, the room of 300 would be filled. It got everybody there early. It was unique. I just had to apologize to the rest of the people in Jordan Hall when the taekwondo drummers were playing loud enough to rock the whole building. [laughter] This is another way to make a class special.

[00:13:43] Another critical thing is to give personal stories, and never to give the same lecture twice without including some major changes. In fact, much of the material of any intro course is standard, and since my students used my textbook my lectures had to differ from the textbook. Typically I would always have a news of the day item. I'd also say that each lecture at its beginning or end has to be novel, so it also was challenging for me not to get the same old boring thing. Like what's in the news today? As I have mentioned, I was an anti-war activist in the 1970s against the Korean War and the Vietnam War. I would say clearly "I'm a liberal politically" and since some students were more conservative, on one of the days of the week, there would be something called Open Mike.

Clearly my views are very personal, not when I talk about the research but on some current issues I will take a side. Anybody can come up and say anything they want either in support of what I'm saying or to refute

it. This was unique and really, really very good and really opened a lot of interesting dialogue. In some cases, I would say okay, we can't resolve this in ten minutes, so please come to my weekly two office hours. The other thing is that I would make office hours really meaningful since most Stanford students don't have problems academically, they typically don't go to such office hours. [I would say,] "Come to my office hours not because you have a problem, because I'm there waiting with coffee and tea and cookies and it's the only way I'm going to get to know you in a class of three hundred, because at some point you're going to come and say you want a letter of recommendation if you're a psych major. It's important for you to come so I get to know you personally." Of course, there would always be some shy kids in my classes. I relish having shy kids come to office hours so we can practice communication skills as well as [discuss] any personal problems shyness is creating for them.

Another special feature of my lectures was extensive use of audiovisual materials to highlight and expand on my verbal presentations. I would use videos; I would create videos. I might have sixteen-millimeter films, some CDs, overhead transparencies. I can still remember a special time when I'm doing all of this while I'm talking about mental illness. I notice that there is a young student sitting in the front row and laughing.

At the end of the class I said, "Could you please stay?" I went down and I said, "What's your name?"

"My name is Cindy X. Wang."

I said, "Why are you laughing?"

She said, "You're ridiculous."

I said, "What do you mean? This is a serious topic."

"Not the topic. It is you that is funny to me! You're running like a mad man putting sixteen-millimeter equipment up to project on the movie screen, then starting a video, then flipping transparencies, and more."

I said, "What else is the way to do it?"

She said, "Do you know the word digitize?"

I said, "No, what is that?"

She said, "Give me all of your stuff."

[00:16:33] The next day she gives me a little metal disk. "Here's everything," she said. "Here's your music. Here's your film. Here's your video. Here are your transparencies." It was a stunning revelation that enhanced my teaching and all my lecture presentations on my research to this very day. Cindy later became my teaching assistant, and we became really good friends. In fact, she's now in medical school. We've been communicating back and forth about both her successes and her challenges.

Essentially it's my job to get the attention of three hundred kids who come into my class, which was usually in the afternoon. Many were tired, some upset, some had gotten a bad quiz result in another class, or broke up with their girlfriend or boyfriend, or had other bad news, et cetera. My job is to wipe all that away and say here's a unique experience you're going to have which will both educate and entertain you. And it worked, more often than not.

The other thing that I think I excelled in was designing and performing in class demonstrations. I would always do some replications of things they were reading about. Hypnosis would be one demonstration I would do often, but also some on visual perception.

I repeated a classic study where you put on goggles that displace the visual field twenty degrees. When I'm looking at you, I see you here but you are actually standing on my left side. I had these special glasses made and [then] in class I would invite students to come up on the stage who were good at darts, and then ask them to throw darts at a dartboard first without the goggles. They're really accurate. Then they put on the goggles and now are throwing the darts twenty degrees off to the side. In a big class, you need something more visually dramatic.

What I would do is now throw a football across the stage without the inverted field goggles and then while wearing them. I guess the first time that I did this demonstration was in Dinkelspiel so it's a really big stage. I'd say are there any football players in class? This is 1971 and everybody smiles. Here's Jim Plunkett [James Plunkett], Stanford football team's quarterback. Next to him is Randy Vataha [Randel Edward "Randy" Vataha], who was his tight end and receiver. They were about to go to the Rose Bowl, about to win the 1971 Rose Bowl. Plunkett is about to be first Heisman Trophy winner at Stanford. Some of the students point to him, and I ask, "If you're a football player"--I knew him, of course--"could you come up?" He comes up reluctantly.

I put the goggles on his forehead. I said, "I want you to do a simple thing. Could you throw this football across the stage to the receiver?" Spencer Sherman was my graduate teaching assistant, for whom this was a peak experience of his life. So Plunkett throws the ball two times perfectly. Then I said, "Could you close your eyes and throw it?" And he is right on. Now I put the glasses down over his eyes. "Now please could you do it two more times?" He throws it--twenty degrees off exactly. He's stunned. I said, "Could you keep doing it?" Then his brain corrects the misperception and he soon is hitting his target several times in a row despite his visual field being distorted. The class cheers! I remove the glasses to put him back in what seems like his usual condition and ask him to please throw the ball one more time. He throws it twenty degrees in the opposite direction as he had done before but now right into the class audience. Tremendous class reaction! He was really upset. I'm sure had they lost the Rose Bowl, the coach, John Ralston, would have come to me [and] asked what did I do to mess up his star player? [laughter]

What I'm saying, here is an example of how a good demonstration that worked in one class setting had to be modified to a larger audience, from somebody throwing small darts at a small dartboard across a large stage to throwing bigger footballs across a larger stage. I think it is one of the areas in which I excelled in my teaching by creating such original demonstration and also in-class experiments.

Hartwig: I think the challenge for these big classes and professors is keeping their audiences or students captive because it is such a huge crowd. But these early techniques were quite effective.

Zimbardo: [00:20:13] What's harder now than ever before is, a lot of kids are sitting there with their laptop. You say something and they're checking it out on Google. They'll say I'm sorry, that reference is no longer accurate or something like that! I never had that problem. I don't know if you could limit that. I don't know if you could say no laptops allowed in this class, or nobody's allowed to be watching pornography while I'm lecturing on child development!

Hartwig: Can this type of teaching be effective in the flipped classroom model where students do a lot of their kind of the research and the reading outside of class and then class is saved for discussion, or is it too experiential?

Zimbardo: [00:20:52] No, it could be. You can't really have discussion in a class of three hundred. Again, I've done many different things. I had many different techniques to make my class special. I would say, for example, one of the things wrong with all of education is students are isolated, pitted against each other. That's never going to happen in your career where you typically work in teams collaboratively, not competitively. I think PhD dissertations should be allowed to be done with a partner. I think exams, including final exams, you should do with a partner. How many agree? What we're going to do in class--the first exam, you're going to take it the traditional way, alone. Second exam, you're going to take with a partner. You can choose one or I will give you one. The third exam, you can do with same one or a different partner or

alone, and we're going to measure the difference. We did this as an actual full class experiment, and it had an enormous effect.

When they took the exam with a partner they scored seven points higher than when they took the exam alone, or later when they choose to take exam alone. I replicated the result and then published a paper on it with graduate student Susan Butler. The idea was that, all we said was you take the exam with a partner, we didn't say anything about studying but, of course, what they did is they studied together. The kids imposed on the other, you know, you got to come and study with me. You got to go to the library. You got to go to study hall, I'll do the lectures. You do the text or I'll do chapter one and you do three. So, again, it built in social responsibility. The other thing is no one did badly on the exam, so the whole curve went up and the students who usually were at the bottom of the curve all moved up.

Again, so partly I'm always using the class also in experimental ways, trying out new things and then, in this case, where they work, I published it to say here's something new. I think here is a case where two minds are better than one.

Hartwig: Was there anything that was a little too outrageous or maybe pushed the boundaries too far?

On Being a Deviant for a Day

Zimbardo: [00:23:13] I got in trouble for having the whole class all being "deviants for a day." [laughter] When I'm giving a lecture on group conformity, I'm saying that in all these studies on conformity, it's really obvious where the influence is coming from as these people are all in a group. What we're unaware of is

the fact that each of us is in an extended web; sometimes that web is historical, or currently situational. Sometimes the web is a male web, or a female web, and the only time you're aware of these extended, ubiquitous webs is when you see them in a historical context. I then show pictures: "Think about your hairstyle. Think about how you're dressed. Think about whether or not you're wearing--I presume everybody in this class is wearing some kind of sneakers. Think about--most of you are in jeans--when the weather is warm, all of you will be in shorts here. Think about your hairstyle, or whether you even have a hairstyle. Go through the list; for women--if you have nail polish, which colors are preferred if any. Ten years ago, no one would be in this class wearing sneakers. Nobody would have their hair like this. You would be carrying books in a book bag not in knap sacks," I said.

So here now are subtle pressures put on all of us to be appropriate for our time and place. One of the ways, and even now, if I ask you what kind of music you like, I could predict the kind of music you like if I talked to your friends, asked them what music they like. Who are your favorite actors, movies, et cetera? We're all embedded in these extended conformity networks. One of the ways to demonstrate that people put pressure on you to be what they want you to be is by going to be a deviant for a day.

[I told the class,] "For one day, starting early in the morning to night, you're going to violate your self-image. You're going to do something which is totally different, unexpected, so when people see you, they're going to see a different you. Think about what that is. It could be anything." When I first did it, it was kids came to class with crazy outfits, crazy hair. Somebody came

naked. Some women came without bras. Somebody came to class like with a beach outfit with a reclining chair. The idea was you have to do this for the whole day. Go to every class in these ways. Then the written report asks: what did you do? Why did you do it? How did people respond to this new you, how did you feel, and what was the pressure on you to stop doing it? The idea was you had to do the deviant day from eight o'clock to five.

In some cases, kids went to engineering class dressed like a clown or sat in the aisle in a recliner, and the dean finally called me up to ask, "Zimbardo, what are you doing? Why am I getting so many faculty complaints about students behaving strangely" [laughter] I then simplified the exercise. In subsequent years, I said, "All you have to do is put a square with an erasable magic marker, a square on your forehead and once you put it on in the mirror, make it really nice, you're not even going to see it, but people are going to notice and they're going to ask, 'What is that?' You're going to say only, 'It's a square on my forehead.' They will likely continue with, 'Why is it there?' You reply, 'I just feel like trying something out.' You're going to experience tremendous pressure on you to take it off, especially kids who live at home, from parents; in dorms there will be tremendous pressure from peers to take it off. But you say, 'No! Forget it. It's the same me. Let's talk about something else.' The idea is if you can resist for one day not erasing it, then you are aware of the situational forces on you to be what others want you to be."

[00:27:42] I wrote a little online essay about this exercise--that has become very popular---people are doing this in other countries. It's being a

deviant for a day in this very modest, rather than dramatic way. The other thing I did in some of my classes was having students choose to be blind for a day. These are all things I would think about and then say let's put it into the class. I guess I was lecturing on vision and we take vision for granted, if we are sighted. How is it that blind students at Stanford navigate? What cues do they use? [I would tell students,] "This is voluntary. Any of you who want to be blind for a day, here's what you do. When you go to sleep, you put an eye bandage on, or a nightshade, and you arrange with a fellow student to come and get you at eight o'clock. You're going to go through your normal activities. Now, again, you should set this up the day before, going from the dorm to here, because you're going to be using auditory cues, right. You're going to go through the day and your lesson is: What did I do? Why did I do it? What was unexpected? What did I learn, et cetera?"

Partly, the main thing [students] learn is the dependency on other people. They would get lost. For example, that day the fountain in the quad was off and they had been using that sound going from one place to the Student Union and now--

Hartwig: As a marker, yes.

Zimbardo: [00:29:21] --their marker was gone and they were just totally lost. The temptation is to take off the blinder. I had said, once you take it off, it's over. Then they wrote that up. That turned out to be a very popular exercise with many students, and I did that for several years because it was a powerfully enduring exercise. But all this was it's up to you if you want to do it. But it was very essential, the importance of sight. But, more importantly, the

psychological importance of having people you can depend on; that when somebody said they're going to be there, they're there. Also being willing to be dependent. That is, to be willing to have somebody take you by the arm and bring you up the steps rather than be independent. When does independence give way to dependence? There are really a lot of these basic ideas in that one simple exercise.

Hartwig: Let's talk a little bit about kind of your professional involvement in terms of APA [American Psychological Association] and other administrative roles you've had within the profession.

My Reluctant Administrator Roles

Zimbardo: [00:30:25] I never was an administrator at Stanford. It was probably a mistake because I could have made more money and I could have gotten a sabbatical at the end of my chairmanship.

Hartwig: Was that a conscious choice? You didn't want to be chair?

Zimbardo: [00:30:34] Yes, I didn't want it. In the Psych Department, we rotated through chairs and I should have done it. When I first got to Stanford, we were flush, meaning there was a lot of money. Once the money started drying up, the main thing a chairman would do is say "no" to most requests for any kind of funding. It's not my thing. I don't know what "no" means. Colleagues come in and say, "I need a raise, I need a sabbatical," and if you have no flush fund, you got to say "sorry but no." I said I don't want to do that. If you're chair, it's usually three to five years and then you got a sabbatical. Then you often got a raise in salary for that extra administrative thing. I know, in retrospect, I should have done it because typically you have a good

administrative officer who handles all the stuff. That was one of the few mistakes I made at Stanford.

I never was involved in politics very much. I just didn't have time except, as I said earlier, I was against the Korean War and was the leader of the anti-Vietnam War movement on the Stanford campus. Then in Psychology I did get into administration, albeit reluctantly. The American Psychological Association is a huge association, with fifty thousand members and many international members, and I would go to its conventions all the time, I'd give many lectures there, but I never was involved in administration. One year Marty Seligman [Martin E. P. "Marty" Seligman] who was at University of Pennsylvania, who started the positive psychology movement, was just a buddy, not very close, just a buddy, and he had recently been president of APA. He said, "We need you, Zimbardo, because APA is heavily clinically oriented and there's a constant battle between science and clinical psych and there are very few people with a psychological science research background that have your visibility. So you have to run for president." I said, "I don't want to do that. I'm just not interested. It's a waste of my time to be required to do all that administrative stuff." He persisted, said you have to do it. Many other research psychologists also put pressure on me. I finally gave in with a brief, "Okay, I'm in."

I ran for president and I won and I was president elect in 2001, APA president in 2002, and then past president in 2003. It was true that the majority of members of the American Psychological Association are clinically focused, I think almost half of all the divisions. There are fifty divisions and

somehow many are related to clinical psychology. I had to win them over to my side, number one. And two, I had to encourage advances in the research program as well. And so what I did, for example, right away, I hooked up with the division of practicing psychology and we put out a brochure on shyness. It was saying here is my original research on shyness, but we added the clinical component.

[00:33:50] The brochure led off with: "Does shyness sometimes inhibit you? Talk to someone who can help. If it's mild, talk to your family, but talk about it. If it gets more severe, then talk to a practicing psychologist." Here I made an immediate link between research that I had done and its clinical application. That got me a big in right away. Then on the board of directors, I included a number of clinical psychologists. In my convention in Chicago, 2002, which suffered from the 9/11 aftermath, half the people didn't come; they still had a fear of flying. It's amazing.

I had many invited lectures from clinical psychologists and it was all about working and collaborating together, and then I made the theme of my presidency "giving good psychology away to the general public." Then I made it explicit. [I said,] "The first way you have to do that is make your research into a story that's appealing to the media because the media is what gives psychology away, gives anything away. Researchers don't give it away directly. You give it to your mother or father, you give it to your kids. We had a division in APA on the association on media psychology, where I am working with their leaders to create demonstrations of how you present an idea, which is media interesting, media rich." That's been an enduring theme

of mine, I've been doing it throughout my professional life, and I think it's had some lasting impact. Let me [note] another huge administrative role I played, when I was elected as president of the American Association of Presidents of All Scientific Societies (AAPSS).

Hartwig: 9/11 is also an interesting topic in terms of your research on terrorism and also on evil, but then in terms of Abu Ghraib as well. Talk a little bit about that complicated time.

My Involvement in Emerging New Forms of Evil

Zimbardo: [00:35:59] Yes. I got into the 9/11 experience very quickly. Since I'm a New York kid, I knew exactly where that happened. The first fire engine that came on the scene was from the Brooklyn Heights fire station. I went to Brooklyn College as an undergraduate. I lived in Brooklyn for a few years before I came to Stanford. I went there as soon as I could and I went to the superintendent of the local fire department and said, "I would like to get psychologists and psychiatrists who will donate their time to give therapy in your station because nine of the firemen were killed when the building collapsed on them and their fire engine."

Fire departments are different than police departments because there's all family. There are uncles and cousins living together in a household atmosphere; in contrast police are really more isolated. So there's family. It was devastating for the survivors. I created a network of psychologists, psychiatrists, and lawyers and accountants because a lot of the survivor families didn't have wills, and so we set up a one-stop all-purpose shop, and we continue the services for at least a year after that. Initially the firemen said

we're fine, we just need a raise in our salary, it's our wives and kids that could use some help. We started doing treatment with wives and the kids, and we then told them, "Your husband/father said he's fine, he doesn't need any help."

They said, "No, no, he's drinking. He's taking drugs and he's not sleeping."

We said, "Tell your husband that we're helping you," and then they insisted that we do the therapy in the fire department. I felt very good about that. That was applying psychology on the ground.

After that, then in 2004 is Abu Ghraib. Again, I was against the war in Vietnam and especially against the war in Iraq. I knew it was immoral. It was illegal. It was all a lie. Another big presidential lie to get Americans willing to go to war and have sons die in the alleged glory of battle. Then when we saw these images of American prison guards abusing prisoners in a prison called Abu Ghraib in Iraq, putting bags over their heads, stripping them naked, sexually humiliating them, it was the Stanford prison study on steroids.

In fact, a Stanford student of mine who was working at NPR [National Public Radio] in Washington, when I was in Washington for an APA board meeting, called me up and said, "Hey Dr. Z, that was like you showed us in our class." He wanted to talk about it. So I went to the NPR station for one of the first interviews about this horrific event. I had seen some of the photos of planned abuse, maybe ten or twelve pictures.

Hartwig: Yes, there's a selection.

Zimbardo: [00:39:06] Yes, it was a brief selection from over a thousand images. We still don't know who sold them to NBC or CBS, and we still don't know the prison guards exposed in them. Immediately the Bush Administration, Rumsfeld [Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld], Cheney [Vice President Richard Cheney], and others said this is the work of a few "rogue soldiers." The head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Myers [Richard B. Myers] said, "This is the work a few *bad apples*. Ninety-nine point nine percent of our military are great soldiers." I went on NPR and said, "I want to begin with the assumption that our American soldiers who were prison guards, who were army reservists, who had no training at all were 'good apples' and somebody put them in a 'bad barrel.' Somebody put good apples in a bad barrel and that corrupted them, so I want to know what that bad barrel is like."

Secondly, I want to know who the "bad barrel makers" in the military are. I made that three-part determination as I've been doing earlier in analyzing evil: individual and situation and system. A lawyer for one of the guards, Chip Frederick, [Ivan Frederick II] contacted me--I think [the lawyer] is Gary Meyers, and said, "We'd like you to be on a team of his defense."

I said, "No, what he did was reprehensible. It was horrible."

He said, "Wait a minute. If you're on the defense team, you get access to all the images. You get access to him personally. You get to read all the investigative reports. There have been a number already. There are going to be many more [thirteen investigative reports finally]. You will have all the

materials available to you so that you can talk from strength; maybe more so than any other individual." [I said,] "I'm sold."

I spent a year totally engrossed in understanding what happened, why and how. I read all thirteen reports--some of them were several hundred pages long. I think I'm the only one to do so, including all the footnotes. In my book, *Lucifer Effect*, I wrote two chapters on Abu Ghraib. I spent a day in San Francisco with Chip Frederick and his wife, and I checked out his whole history. It was clear to me this is a good guy. He's a great husband, father, good buddy to other soldiers, did wonderful things with kids in Kuwait before going to Iraq. Had twelve medals and awards for honorable service. He gets to this place and people are doing this crazy stuff and instead of being in charge as the staff sergeant, he gives in to two conformity pressures.

When I asked him, "Why did you do it?" He said, "I have no idea." Again, it's the power of the situation. It's not a decision "I am going to humiliate the prisoners. Other people are doing it." The new problem was the cameras. Everybody had digital cameras for the first time in history, so that they recorded everything they did in pictorial format.

Abuses that take place in every prison throughout the world all the time go unnoticed. Now these prison guards never imagined that anybody from the outside would see them. In fact, they had them collected on a CD. They were circulating them to other soldiers. You know, it was fun--they called it just "fun and games." We were having fun and games and we were bored out of our mind and the prisoners were our fun and games objects.

I had to go to a naval base in Naples, Italy, and give my testimony at Chip's dishonorable discharge trial. They wanted me to go to Baghdad, and I'm so glad I didn't. This was 2005 I guess. They were still under bombardment. In fact, my wife said, no way you should go to that war zone. So I went instead to a safe place and I gave televised testimony.

[00:42:57] In my testimony, which is on record, I simply said, "Your Honor, Chip Frederick is guilty as charged and he admits it. What he did was wrong and he knows it. It was morally wrong. It was wrong from the point of military. It's an embarrassment to America. And he apologizes for it. However, from everything I know"--and I said I have read all of the thirteen investigative reports--"I am a hundred percent certain that he never would have done any of these things had the military not put him in an untenable situation." And I described it: Working a twelve-hour shift from four o'clock at night to early morning. When he finishes a shift, he goes to sleep in a prison cell in a different part of the prison. In three months, he never leaves the prison. The prison is under bombardment so there is always rampant fear. He's in charge of sixty Iraqi policemen in the dungeon who are mostly smuggling drugs and weapons in and helping prisoners escape. So I'm saying to the military court judge that although Sgt. Frederick is put in charge of that unit, he has no experience in leadership. He's an army reservist. He has no experience in combat. This is an impossible situation to give anybody. And so I think he did the best he could do most of the time, but ultimately, he gave in to the situational pressures.

It's one of the first times I think that there's been a situational defense in a legal trial. The prosecutor wanted to give him fifteen years hard time. My testimony got it reduced to eight and then ultimately to four. But he did serve four years hard time. They took away his twelve medals and awards publicly to humiliate him. They took away all of his retirement pay, twenty years' worth. He paid dearly for what he did and what he did not stop among his peers. I'm saying that I was able to mitigate the severity of the sentence. I think that's the way psychological or situational defense could be legally: guilty but with extenuating circumstances.

Hartwig: Around that time, 2004, it was also the year you retired. Talk a little bit about kind of winding down your career and approaching your time?

Winding Down My Stanford Career

Zimbardo: [00:45:17] Oh wow that was difficult. I think I retired to get access to my retirement money [laughter] that I'd been putting in all those years. I thought I wanted to take time to begin to travel a little bit more. I knew that I would miss teaching; it was in my blood, if not in my DNA.

I had taught more classes to more students than anybody in the history of Stanford. I would teach as a full professor five days a week. Introductory Psychology every year. Social Psychology, Attitude Change, Mind Control, Research Methods, Shyness, Madness, I mean, not all at once but constantly. I typically would go to give a lecture at the International Congress of Psychology, but never really travel to explore the world, and so I said I really should be doing more of that to broaden my personal horizons.

So I decided I would retire in 2004. But I did it gradually. I taught for three more years; I made up a new course, Exploring Human Nature. This was the best of all the stuff I had done and I had great TAs. One of them was Sean Bruich, who I'm still in contact with, we did really creative stuff in that class. I did that innovative class for three more years. To slowly kick my classroom teaching addiction, I also taught a new course, Social Psychology for Clinicians, for seven semesters at Palo Alto University, a superb clinical training program.

But then the Psych Department needed me to really retire, so they gave me a wonderful retirement party, which was really glorious, if a bit sad. The prison study was now spreading its evil wings around the world, so I'm invited to give talks about it at West Point, at the Naval Academy, many other places around the world.

I began to say "in part" because of the way I look like the devil with my black goatee, "I really don't want this to be my legacy." Here was this guy who created evil. I argued well, I mean, I created evil, I study evil by creating it from the inside out, and I said what's unique about the Stanford prison study, it's a simple demonstration but it's the only research in all the social sciences which went 24/7 day after day so you could see the changes in each of the participants, including me, the graduate students, the prisoners, the guards. Milgram's study went forty-five minutes. Most psychological research is one class hour, so you don't see any personal change. They check a scale--a point here and they check a point here, and we assume that they've changed

their attitude. But now in this more total engagement of all the participants, we see what's unique about this study.

Again, earlier on, the study had been widely presented on *20/20*, on *60 Minutes*, on *That's Incredible* [laughter]. Dr. Phil did a whole program on it. Then I began to think, this is going to be my legacy, or maybe somebody even said, is that going to be on your gravestone? He was the superintendent of the Stanford Prison. I began to think about my future, and then in 2007, I wrote *The Lucifer Effect*. It took two years. It was the hardest thing I ever did because I'm still an old-fashioned writer. I mean, I have crates of Stanford Prison Experiment material--the guards', prisoners' testimony, parole board hearing, and then here are the boxes filled with everything about Abu Ghraib. Here's a box filled with information about the Holocaust. Here's Rwanda. Here's Bosnia. I am immersed in evil. I'm trying to get rid of this legacy of Dr. Evil, and I ended up writing fifteen chapters of evil, and evil, and worse evil. There are two chapters on Abu Ghraib. There are ten chapters on the prison study, the Holocaust, Bosnia, Rwanda, and then I summarized all of the existing research on the power of the situation, studying Milgram and Bandura [Albert *Bandura*] and others. Then I got to Chapter 16--the last one, I said I'm swimming in evil. I said to myself, I can't imagine anybody reading this thing so I need to recover my impact on any readers still hanging in. So the last chapter has to be positive.

[00:50:03] And so the last chapter begins with how do you resist these powerful situational pressures and maybe people who can resist them are special, so special that we would think of them as "heroes." That was my

vision in the last chapter. I really began by focusing on Hannah Arendt's idea of the banality of evil; to say evil people look like your Uncle Charlie. They don't look like the monster in comic books. They look like Hitler without a mustache. And so I said maybe the same is true of heroes. Maybe there's a "banality of goodness," a banality of heroism so that heroes are not Agamemnon, they're not Achilles, they're not super warriors, but they're ordinary people who, in a particular situation, are able to resist powerful situational influences and take wise and effective actions. Now we know in all the relevant research it's the minority---ten, twenty, never more than thirty percent who resist.

In the Milgram research, in our study--looking at the good guards, and in the conformity studies by Asch [Solomon Asch], it's a minority who resist, but it's always some. But nobody has really followed them up to say what is typical about them because all the researchers were more focused on the evil part. I then said, we should be studying that. We should be looking at the resistance. I began with Dr. Z's seven steps to resisting situational influence. Here are the guidelines. Here's the thing that all of us can do. Then the last part of this final Lucifer chapter, let's rethink the nature of heroism.

I developed a twelve-part taxonomy of different kinds of heroes. Some heroes are explorers. Some heroes did the first thing--Lindbergh flying solo to Europe. Some heroes are heroes because they developed some invention that saves lives like Madame Curie [Marie Skodowska Curie, born Maria Salomea Skodowska] or Jonas Salk. I had this taxonomy of a time dimension. Then others are heroes because they supported a moral cause.

They come to the aid of people in need like Mother Teresa. Then I said, "Well of all of these different types of heroes, what I can promote, what I can encourage, what I can educate young people to do is provide detailed lessons that encourage them to be 'everyday heroes' who every day make the world better in some small way by very good deeds."

This is the way the Lucifer book ended. It was a huge success. It won the William James Award, Best Book in Psychology, and a number of other awards--*New York Times* bestseller. It now is in more than twenty-four languages. Interesting--every place in the world except France. France is anti-American, French psychology is anti-American. It's the only major country that has no interest in my book.

Hartwig: Seriously?

Zimbardo: [00:53:14] Yes, there's nothing anti-France in the book. Now, again, given the recent terrorist attacks in France, they should be interested in my work, but they don't publish any of my textbooks and other books. In 2008, I gave an invited lecture at the TED conference in Monterey, California. I was invited by June Cohen, who had been my student at Stanford. She had been the editor of *The Daily* and heard about what I was doing and invited me. I didn't know what TED was. I thought--United Airlines had a whole promo thing about Ted---so I thought it was like a frequent flyer thing. [laughter] I don't know if TED had a website then.

Hartwig: Early, yes.

Zimbardo: [00:54:14]

I went down and they said, "You have eighteen minutes."

I said, "Eighteen minutes? What can you do in eighteen minutes?"

They said, "No, it's very strict and you have to rehearse in front of us. We have to give you feedback."

I said, "Really?" I said, "I've been doing this for years."

"Doesn't matter. Everybody does it the first time."

I presented. I had a talk and it was probably like thirty minutes. They said cut this, cut this, cut this, and cut that. When I was presenting in rehearsal, the alarm clock wasn't working so we didn't have an exact time. They said we think it's a little too long. I cut out all the stuff I was supposed to do, all the stuff I could with maintaining the flow, and different ideas I wanted to include. It was first in Monterey, and then it moved two years to Long Beach, and now it's in Vancouver. I think it's permanently in Vancouver. TED has really expanded. It's now the premier information exchange center of the world, doing brilliant stuff. But ten years ago, it was really in infancy.

I get up in the red circle on center stage, I start lecturing. As soon as I begin, "I'm glad to be here," the clock goes from eighteen minutes to 17:58. I was like, oh my God, I wasted two seconds. [laughter] I'm going through my lines, and they have a little teleprompter there. You can see the slides. They say, do not look there, look at the audience because there are three cameras. There's one on you. There's one on the audience from behind your head and there's one roaming the audience. The best thing about TED is really the video production because before TED, all lectures were single face shot.

Here now is you up close, it's the audience looking at you. It's you looking at the audience. They build in a real drama, a really dynamic thing. I'm going through [it] and it's clear the audience is involved. I'm talking about my prison study, Abu Ghraib, all really dramatic stuff. It was the first time we showed any of the pictures from Abu Ghraib publicly, which were secret and TED provided a warning of graphic images, so made it even special. Then I look up at the digital clock, and it's like five minutes to go, and I know I got fifteen slides more. I start talking faster and faster and I'm almost hyperventilating. [I tell myself,] "Oh my god, you're going to faint. Slow down. But you've got fifteen slides to go. [laughter] Talk faster. I said I can't talk faster, I'm going to faint." While I'm talking, I'm doing this interior monologue thing. I said, "I can't imagine what this sounds like to the audience. Sounds crazy to me."

Then finally, I [told the audience], "Now we're going to switch from looking at why good people turn evil to why ordinary people become heroes. Ding, ding. Zero, zero. End. FINITO! There was a feeling of suppressed inhalation. The audience could feel it, literally, I could, everybody's in anticipation of that novel climax. At that moment, Chris Anderson, who's the head of TED, came up on the stage. He said, "I know what's coming"--he was in the rehearsal--"It's too important to stop now. We're going to do something we don't usually do. We're going to give you a few more minutes." Literally a vast exhalation; letting out our collective breaths.

Hartwig: Cliffhanger.

Zimbardo: [00:57:33] I said, "Thank you very much." Of course, they cut that part out of the talk. I actually went on for five more minutes. I did the hero thing and I got a standing ovation, which in those days was relatively rare. The other thing that happened was, at the end, I went down into the audience for the next talk, and a number of people came up to me and said the idea of studying heroism is really innovative, the idea of ordinary people becoming heroes is really special, extraordinary. One of the people who came to see me was Pierre Omidyar [Pierre Morad Omidyar], the guy who started eBay. He's a millionaire. He said, "I really want to encourage you to start a foundation to do this formally and not just a research lab. I'll give you twenty thousand dollars to get consultants to get your legal information."

That was the start of what I called the Heroic Imagination Project [HIP] because the idea is heroism starts in the imagination--imagining I could be the one who stands up, speaks out, takes wise actions. We started in 2008. We're a California nonprofit. Then I made a big mistake. I was too ambitious, trying to do too many projects at the same time, with a big staff and large office in the Presidio. I started fundraising. I got money from some foundations. I gave a lot of my own funds. We began with a very productive two-day conference at Stanford's Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences. I brought in lots of different people telling them that I want to start this new organization and I need help. What ideas can you give me? We had professors from different areas--from education, from communication, other people from the military, from the Spencer Foundation, and it was just all exciting and encouraging, very encouraging. I

said, "Okay, I'm going to give some of my retirement money to get it started."

We got a big office in the Presidio. I had a staff of a CEO, Director of Research, Director of Training, Director of Volunteers, Director of Business and one for education. We had a large paid staff, plus some volunteers. That's a huge amount of money being spent monthly. I don't know, hundreds of thousand dollars a year. We did a lot of good stuff. At the end of two years, I had to retire everybody because we couldn't afford it. I mean, I put in $250,000 of my own money and raised much more money. But suddenly, it's gone. Everybody's working like half salary but still it was not enough.

The most important thing I did was to work with a retired high school principal, Clint Wilkins, and an advanced [UC] Berkeley student, Brian Dickerson, and some others to develop six lessons in basic social/cognitive psychology in a unique format that could be delivered to colleges and high schools. Each lesson would be about three hours in presentations that could be chunked in thirty-minute segments. They were about basic themes such as: How do you transform passive bystanders into active heroes? How do you transform people that have a fixed, narrow mindset into a dynamic growth mindset? We expanded on the work of Carol Dweck, my Stanford colleague. How do you transform prejudice and discrimination into understanding and accepting an appreciation of differentness? Other ones were organized around themes of: How can we get groups that exert a negative influence on us to exert positive influence, and more.

[01:01:35] Each of these is organized in great detail of twenty to thirty pages. We give the teacher a script. We have a presenter's guide. We have response booklets for the students. We have lists of videos and lists of all the research. What's unusual about it is teachers don't lecture. We give the teacher a script. The script says open with this story. Show this video three minutes. Ask the following question, two minutes. The class is divided now in pairs--a hero squad--a boy and a girl ideally because boys no longer respond in class. The teacher asks the questions and says, okay, share your thoughts. The kids talk to each other and sometimes [the teacher] says, "Okay, write down your answer in our response booklet." At the end of the lesson the teacher collects them so she can correct the writing style and any misinformation.

What's exciting and novel is it's all organized around provocative videos because kids live in a visual world. The whole thing [is] four to seven videos in each lesson. Again, our program now is thriving in a dozen different countries globally, and we tell the organizers to arrange translations and get culturally appropriate videos. Now I'm also trying to make a program for younger kids. We want to have cartoons instead of the videos. It's been working incredibly well. Usually what we do is we license the program. But we license it for a moderate fee. In addition, I or one of our Heroic Imagination Project team members has to do a formal training of the people who will deliver the material. They pay a modest fee for the training. Then they get certified. That is when they can take these materials, make it suitable for their school, for their audience, and then deliver it.

We started in Arizona, California, and Oregon. It's mostly with Psi Beta student trainers, which is the Honor Society of Community Colleges, whose national director was at our meeting. They bought the program immediately and it's been transformative for the kids. These are second-year, community college students who are delivering the program in local high schools. And now in high schools, they're big deals. For them, they couldn't make it into a four-year college so their whole self-image is changing positively. I was at a symposium where one after another kid would come in and say, "Hey, I used to be shy, [now] I can't wait to talk to people about what I'm doing. I was an introvert and now the best thing in the world is I tell everybody--my friends, not only the students I teach--about these amazing lessons." So it's been transformative in many ways I did not anticipate.

Of course, we measure impact on the students, on the teachers, and we're always getting feedback--how to make the program work better. Then we moved our program to Flint, Michigan, because one of the people that worked with me, Cora Keene, had come from there. This was before the water pollution tragedy made this town an even worse disaster center. But our program was successfully adopted there. We now have an annual hero roundtable conference in Flint, Michigan, attended by hundreds of teachers, students, and townspeople.

Now because I'm free to travel extensively, wherever I go, I say, "I'm coming with some special material. I'd be happy to do a training either for a fee or some initial trainings for free." I did a training in Hungary--in

Budapest four years ago. I gave a lecture at the end of which I said, "Here's the kind of thing we're doing. If you're interested, I can come back tomorrow and do it." I trained a dozen people. Since that time, they have created a Hero Square nonprofit foundation that does my trainings once a week all over Hungary.

[01:05:46] Our program is in more than a thousand high schools everywhere in the nation. So let's say for the bystander lesson, there's a movie about passive bystanders--which I helped create. Another program I did was called the *Human Zoo* for a British production company, where we staged different kinds of public demonstrations. One of them was a woman lying on the steps of Liverpool Station. A clock starts. People pass by. The question is how soon before somebody stops? In four minutes, thirty-five people pass by and nobody stops. Our HIP Teacher pauses the video and asks the kids, what were they thinking? Why didn't they stop? What would you do? What's the difference between being in a situation and looking in? And then what would happen if somebody stops? Restart the video. Soon as somebody stops, immediately in six seconds, a second person comes to help. What's the message? "Be the one."

Second message, "Be the second one and make a difference." How do you do that? And then it explores what are all the reasons not to help? Could be dangerous. What do you do? You call the police. It could be there are obstacles. You don't know how to swim and somebody's drowning. What do you do? All of our programs have built in critical thinking exercises, meaning between every good intention, every appropriate action, there are

obstacles, there are problems. How do you transform them into challenges for which there is a solution? Every program, despite the content, has that same structure. We're teaching critical thinking skills in this very dynamic way to students around the world.

Typically in Budapest, what they do during their training, they actually re-create the bystander situation. They have somebody in the training group lie down in a busy place and videotape what happens--who stops, who doesn't stop. People who stop, they give a reward. People who don't stop, they interview them. Why didn't you stop? Didn't you see that? When I was there last year in 2016, in addition to school kids, the Hero Square program is also moving into corporations. I'm going there soon giving lectures to Nestle, Mercedes Benz, and Telecom.

When I was there last year, the president of Telecom got up before a large audience made up of eight hundred employees. He is Christian Matheson, handsome man, big guy, and [he] said, "I didn't believe any of this stuff. I thought it was, you know, kind of psychology fluff, but they convinced me to try it and I was the victim. I laid down at noon at Student Square in the middle of Budapest pretending I had a heart attack and in five minutes, no one stopped to help me. While I was lying there, I was saying I could die and here are my compatriots, here are my people and no one is going to stop and I could hear steps all around." He said, "This is so important. I want all my employees to understand this." So that was a really, really dramatic testimonial! Unfortunately, we didn't have that video piece. I am part of the Hero Square Foundation, headed by György Orosz, with

Professor Gabor Orosz doing quantitative assessments. I go to Budapest several times every year; every second year we host a major conference on hero themes, or recently on opposing racism and prejudice.

[01:09:04] I also trained a small group of teachers in Poland, and they have very active centers in Krakow, in Warsaw, in Wroclaw. My main contact there that arranged for translations of all six HIP lessons is Professor Agneiszka Wilczynska, with whom I work closely. In Poland, we also have a HIP-Poland foundation. I'll mention something else about Poland.

My family comes from Sicily. We started a program in the town of my grandfather, Cammarata, and another one in Corleone. Corleone is the *Godfather* town. Steve Luczo [*Stephen* J "*Steve*" Luczo], Stanford graduate, is the biggest funder of HIP now because he's the [executive chairman and former] CEO of Seagate Technology and is very generous and socially conscious. His grandmother came from Corleone. I helped arrange with the mayor of that town to do the same program as we have in Cammarata. In these two programs, we give scholarships of a thousand euros to each of ten local high school students who have performed outstandingly to go to local Sicilian colleges. We do it annually in Cammarata and Corleone at their respective city halls. Next June will be my eighteenth year of directing this educational foundation.

We also have cultural festivals, art contests, poetry, and music in both towns arranged around the scholarship programs, headed by my Sicilian cousin, Dr. Pasquale Marino. We also give generous prizes to winners in three age categories: little kids, teens and adults. Now we're doing our

programs in the ghetto of Palermo, where many of the kids are African teen migrants. That's where we're going to have a big ceremony in June prior to traveling to our nearby mountain towns. One of the remarkable things that is happening in Palermo is that the government, although relatively poor, invites West African teens to emigrate to Palermo, providing housing, clothing, language lessons, and a warm welcome by our HIP leader, Clelia Libero. We have just put into practice her idea of training some of these young men and women in how to deliver our HIP lessons to Italian students in local high schools, with wonderful results of these students, now acting as teachers, developing new self-respect and admiration from their Italian peers.

Finally, let me briefly mention our truly global HIP outreach. We are in Bali. I went to Bali for a lecture at their international school and then I trained all the teachers to deliver our message. We are also in Geelong, Australia; Prague, Bratislava, Portugal, and Tehran in Iran, Doha in Qatar, and soon many other nations.

Hartwig: What are the next steps for the project?

Zimbardo: [01:10:49] The two most immediate steps are reworking our program so it's appropriate for all age levels. We're working with people in Poland who are starting to do that--reworking our lessons so that they appear as fairy tales, which primary students love. Also reworking them so as to be more appropriate for heroic leadership in corporations because ultimately, you want corporations to pay a larger fee and give it away free to schools they sponsor. There's no question that it works. It's unique. It's dynamic. Has impact.

We are in San Ramon High School now and they're doing a term-long test and if they can show success compared with classes that didn't have it, then we will be in the whole school district. Also, I'm about to do training in the YMCA in San Francisco. Again, they're going to do a test trial and if it works, they'll put it in all of their programs in San Francisco. So it's really several new directions: having the program be relevant for corporations as well as kids and then there are many other lessons we want to add. There should be one in conservation and sustainability. There should be one on persuasion, and another on time perspective. There should be one on conflict resolution. So essentially building out let's say a dozen complete lessons that are interactive and dynamic, so that it can qualify as a stand-alone academic course in high schools and colleges. Ultimately this will be another of my major contributions, I think.

Finally, we're in all these countries around the world, and who is running the show? Only me--and I'm working pro bono--and we have a halftime assistant, Melissa Shafer, and Taylor Langley who's my halftime personal assistant--she helps out a bit, and soon, we will add a super trainer and HIP lesson coordinator, Ellie Jacques, and that's it. We have a fine board of directors, also pro bono, but we went from having a staff of twenty in our formative stages to a combined total of one now! This is the new center for HIP.

The last good news is next week, December 15th [December 15th, 2017], we have a big fundraiser at the California Club in Los Angeles. We've

been writing to everybody I know trying to get my Stanford undergraduates to come and to donate.

I'm going to present. We're going to have a student who's trying to put our program in all the sororities at USC who will present. Another presenter is Apollo Robbins, a master illusionist who you have to see him online. I met him at a science conference and I said you've got to come and perform for HIP in LA. For example, while he's taking your wallet, while he's taking the ring off your finger, while he's taking your watch, he's describing what you're thinking--knowing that you're thinking the wrong thought makes it possible for him to deceive you. It's educational. It's really, really entertaining. And then honoring a student who helped somebody, who got physically hurt while helping somebody on the college campus. It's mostly to raise enough money to add some more HIP staff. I mean, we definitely need an education director, international relations director, and program enhancements. I mean I can't keep doing this global travel while suffering from worsening spinal stenosis.

[01:14:38] I'm about to be 84 so I have a limit and I'm now almost immobile. I'm going around on canes and crutches and it's an embarrassment. Some places I go, they have to wheel me out. I went to China and they're wheeling me around in a chair. I went to Iran, I should mention. How did I forget? I went to Iran for two weeks. It took three years to get a visa and I went to Iran and I gave lectures in Tehran, Shiraz, all over the nation, and I'm told I'm the Mick Jagger of Iran. Hundreds of kids were taking pictures, selfies with me. When I was in Iran, I think I may be the first

American person there since President John Kennedy. I was popular enough so they made postage stamps of me--three different sets. This one is I think my favorite. This one is my Z shirt. A Polish cartoonist made this special Z shirt. While I was in Tehran, I did a training for three women who were in a small center that worked with handicapped vets. I gave them money to start a program and all the materials in three HIP lessons, and I did a free training.

They've now translated everything into Farsi, put captions on all of the videos, made some new videos, and they are about to start HIP training throughout Iran. The curious thing is here's our program in these extreme totalitarian counties, like Hungary now becoming so nationalistic in extreme. Poland is moving in that direction. Iran is there religiously, and the next goal is HIP [in] China. I visited China and China's much more difficult because it's so fractionated in what people want and psychology is really not very well established. I think it was all those years in communism away from the individual psyche. It's the commune. It's not the person. So I'm saying wait, but that means social psychology is okay, because we care about the group. We care about the impact of the group.

I'm working with a young woman, Jenny Maher, who's a Stanford graduate from our Business School and we're trying to develop new psychology programs in China. She wants to call it *The Zimbardo College* in Beijing. I think that might be a little too ambitious. For me, this is one of the interesting things that is on my horizon. Lastly, we are planning a Hero Roundtable conference in San Francisco for the first time in mid-April 2018.

Hopefully, it will be an intellectual and financial success to enable HIP to move up and on to a better future.

S T A N F O R D U N I V E R S I T Y

PROJECT:	STANFORD FACULTY ORAL HISTORY PROJECT
INTERVIEWER:	DANIEL HARTWIG
INTERVIEWEE:	PHILIP G. ZIMBARDO
DATE OF INTERVIEW:	MARCH 14, 2017
PART:	6 of 7

Hartwig: Good afternoon. Today is March 14, 2017. This is the fourth session with Professor Phil Zimbardo. Phil, welcome back again.

Zimbardo: [00:00:09] Thanks for coming and happy to be back. Hopefully this will be our finale.

Hartwig: Hope so. So much that we've covered, but there's still so much more to do. Let's pick up a little bit where we were from last time. Think one project that we did not talk about was the 2008 book on--was it *Boy Interrupted*?

Zimbardo: [00:00:30] There are several different versions. Essentially the same book is called by different titles in different countries, such as, *Man Disconnected* (USA), and also *Man, Interrupted* (UK), and *Where have all the Good Men Gone* (Poland). It all started about five years ago, when the director of TED, Chris Anderson, contacted me and said, "You've given a number of talks at TED, all very interesting. This year we're going to try to do something different. We want to have brief three to four minute talks, and we want you to do one of them. He said, "It has to be provocative."

I said, "Let me think about it." I couldn't come up with anything. Then I began to think about a lot of recent evidence I was getting about boys failing in school academically, dropping out of school, doing poorly across many areas of life. I started investigating those issues: why is that happening, and how extreme it is. It turns out to be a major problem not only in the United States, but also in many places around the world. Many boys are failing academically. The question is why. In pursuing it, what I came up with is their total engagement in playing video games. It turns out that for many of these kids it's an addiction, meaning it's *the* most important thing they want to do. When they're not doing it, they're thinking about it. Unlike anything else in their lives, it's the kind of thing that the more you play, the better you get. Actually, you can see how well you're doing instantly, how well you're performing on scores on your screen. Almost nothing else in their life has that same immediate positive impact for them.

I did some personal interviews with kids, put information online, and encouraged youngsters to respond to our survey. I discovered that there is a double input of combining gaming with freely available online pornography. Many of these young boys are spending hours watching video games and then more hours watching pornography. Another contributing factor is the extent to which many of these young boys have no fathers because of the high divorce rate in America. More than 40 percent of all young boys are growing up without a father. What that means is when they come home with a bad report card, mothers say, "Try harder, I love you nevertheless." Fathers say, "It's not good enough; we're going to cut your allowance, take away your

gaming device." Fathers give love conditionally. Mothers give love unconditionally. So boys need that extrinsic motivation to perform better academically. They need that male role modeling; girls get it from their mothers.

A lot of these boys have lost that extrinsic motivation [from] a father who says, "Step up to the plate, you're not making us proud to be your parents." Now what's happening is these multiple factors are coalescing to encourage boys to just do what they are doing well at and enjoying most. Many of these boys, when they do go to school, then they come home, they just want to be in their room to play video games. Once it becomes an addiction--it's the ultimate consumer addiction--so let's say they're playing ten hours a day every day, or ten hours a night. What do you give up? You give up your job typically, you give up exercising, you give up playing with your friends, you give up team sports, and you give up anything creative--reading, writing, and learning new skills and more. I saw this pattern as a huge threat nationally, and ultimately internationally. I presented this all in a jam-packed four-minute presentation, which got a huge ovation at TED. [As of October 2017, it has been viewed by 2.2 million people around the world]. Then they asked me to write an eBook about it, which I did. Then I decided to expand it. Not many people read eBooks, certainly not in my generation.

[00:04:57] With the help of my former personal assistant, Nikita Duncan-Coulombe, we expanded it to a full-length book, and called it *Man, Interrupted*, and it was published in England and later in America, as *Man Disconnected.* As I mentioned, there is also a bestselling Polish version. It has

hit a very responsive chord now around the world because video games are here to stay.

Now what's happening, gaming is an intercollegiate sport. I go to Poland every year because my Heroic Imagination Project training is really big all over Polish high schools and colleges. When I was there recently in a huge soccer stadium where there are sixty thousand people watching an international gaming competition, where ten guys were sitting down below playing video games, and essentially the winner got a million bucks. Now that's another extrinsic reason to play video games--for fame and fortune! Unfortunately, from my non-gamer perspective, they're here to stay and become more entrancing and addictive.

Then the other thing to mention is that once games get either into 3D or virtual reality, which development is literally around the corner, then the game is all around your head. Also when pornography is viewed through inexpensive VR goggles, naked beautiful women will be seducing these guys from every direction. The problem is that these kids then may never come out of their personal bedroom/game room. [laughter]

That's really sad. What it means is that in general, boys are giving up on academics. In many colleges now, there's a disproportionate number of women to men. Even in college applications, it's at least 55 percent to 45 percent women to men, and in some colleges even more extreme. In many majors, like psychology, it's now like 70 percent to 30 percent women over men. Something unusual is happening for our times. I am glad to be able to tap into it, and to sound an alarm of its current and future dangers, and also

to lay out solutions at many levels. I am also pleased to note that my alarm--sounded in my many talks around the world, as well as in my writings--has had one important impact. Recently, the World Health Organization, in its international classification of diseases, ICD-11, has identified both compulsive sexual behavior and gaming disorders as clinical addictions, requiring professional treatment.

Hartwig: Give a little bit of update of the Heroic Imagination Project in the last few months.

Creating a New Generation of Everyday Heroes

Zimbardo:[00:07:09] Yes. Gladly.

The Heroic Imagination Project is now the main thing I do in my current life, when I should have been retired. We're underfunded in part because fundraising is not one of my top skills. We have a very small staff. We don't have enough money to have an office, so where we are now, in my home, is the HIP office. We do have a board of directors that's putting us on a straight and narrow path of financial prudence. But our programs are wonderful educational programs, many of which were based on lectures I gave back at Stanford on the bystander effect, on prejudice, on group dynamics, on situational forces, and more, that are being well received throughout the world, as I personally disseminate these fundamental lessons, or interventions, in over a dozen nations.

What's special about our lessons [each one is two to three hours in length] is that they're organized around provocative videos. We give teachers a script. Teachers are in a more dynamic relationship with students. They

don't lecture. They show a video, they ask a series of questions, stimulate discussions among students arranged in pairs--in hero squads, and we outline all the questions.

Then all of our metrics show we're having a big impact. Our program is in many places in the Western United States: California, Arizona, and Oregon. But the big impact we're having is globally. In Hungary, we are in like fifteen hundred high schools all over Hungary. In Poland, we're in hundreds of high schools in many different cities. We are in Bali, Indonesia, in Geelong, Australia, in Sicily, the Czech Republic, Tehran, Iran, Slovakia, Portugal, Doha, Qatar, and in London, soon in Germany and more on the horizon. In each of these places that show an interest, we license each of our six programs fairly inexpensively either to the whole country or to the main city or some team. Then I go there and I do a training for a group of teachers or a group of trainers who then bring our lessons to classes of students, or now also to businesses.

What's exciting now is I just did a big training in San Francisco at the YMCA to twenty trainers. They are about to disseminate our program because they have many programs, including Youth-At-Risk, [at] high schools. If it's successful, then I think we'll get bankrolled, because they have lots and lots of money from the city especially for youth development. They encouraged me to submit a grant for five years of funding [from the] San Francisco youth agency, which I recently did and I'm hoping for a good outcome. At the same time, I can't be going around the world doing training. I will be eighty-five years old in March 2018 and still recovering from knee

surgery, hip surgery, et cetera, et cetera, so I can't be hobbling around the world. I try my best. But I decided also to train a bunch of advanced graduate students at Palo Alto University to complement me as HIP trainers. Recall that I taught there after I completed my forty years of teaching at Stanford.

[00:10:21] I taught at Palo Alto University for about seven years. It's a professional training school. They train clinical psychologists, masters, PhDs, and PsyDs. I persuaded the new president to let me make that a training center, meaning that anybody now who wants training. We have available a dozen advanced graduate students whom I've trained in several of our lessons who are available to go anywhere in California or anywhere in the United States. That's going to relieve the burden on me, and that means that we can supply skilled trainers immediately. Those are the two new directions that are exciting. I'm hoping to add more on conservation and sustainability, on time perspective, on heroic leadership, and more. Also, we want to move our program really out of just high school and college, to move it down to middle school and primary school, and then to move it out into industry. That new vista is exciting for me.

Hartwig: This is the perfect segue. Talk about your most recent article and how the events of the last few months have changed and provided challenges to the Heroic Imagination Project.

Zimbardo: [00:11:46] Yes. The newest challenge, not to the Heroic Imagination Project, to the world, is the surprising election of Donald J. Trump as president of the United States.

He's unique in history, and he's fascinating. When there were the debates with Hillary Clinton, he got all the press because he said outrageous things. He believes in "alternative truths", so that he can say anything he wants. Then he's a guy who's addicted to Twitter. Who ever heard of an adult, but who ever heard of the President of the United States being a Twitter dude? And given his background, he's not used to collaborating, he's not used to compromising. He is The Man. He has been able to assert in all his business dealing: you do it or you get fired, you do what I want or you get out of my face. But now he has almost unlimited power.

I wrote an article with Rosemary Sword [Rosemary K. M. Sword]. Rosemary is a psychologist in Hawaii, and we've collaborated on *The Time Cure* where we developed with her husband, Rick Sword [Richard M. Sword] who died recently, a time-based treatment for PTSD that we demonstrated as being very effective with veterans. She and I write a monthly column for *Psychology Today*. Each theme is related to time in some way. The previous issue there was an article by some psychiatrist about Donald Trump's dangerous mental disorder. They got nearly thirty thousand clinical psychologists to say, yes, he has a narcissistic personality disorder and it's a serious mental disorder. There's been a lot of challenge about labeling somebody by observing public behavior rather than personal clinical observations. We followed that up in an article, "The Elephant in the Room: It's time we talked openly about Donald Trump's mental health" [*Psychology Today:* February 2017].

We said that for us the most serious problem is that he is an over-the-top present hedonist. He's an uncontained, unbridled present hedonist. If you remember in the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory (ZTPI) that I developed in 1999 with John Boyd, one of my graduate students, that our scale identifies five time zones. You can be future oriented, meaning you work hard, you make every decision thinking of the consequences, you think of the costs versus the gains. Or you could be past oriented, everything you do now is influenced by what you experienced in the past. Or you can be living in the present. Now, within those three time frames, you can be past oriented focusing on the good old times, successes, or the bad old times, regrets and failures. You could be present fatalist meaning that you believe your life is fated, especially if you're a Muslim, by forces beyond your control or you've given up planning because nothing ever works out for you.

[00:15:29] To be present hedonistic is the most dynamic because it means that you seek sensation and you seek novelty. You get easily bored. Your whole life is trying to stir up things, to stimulate yourself, to stimulate other people. You're a joiner. You're active. You join many groups. You're always trying to do new things. You get bored easily so you're constantly switching to new things. But the most important thing is when you make a decision now, you never think about the consequences, you make decisions on the spur of the moment. My argument is this is what characterizes Donald Trump, the President of the United States! Making decisions on the spur of the moment means without thinking through the consequences, certainly without Trump's talking with his staff about the consequences. We see this in

young kids, who are uncontainable. The problem now is you have somebody who has unlimited power, and some of those decisions can be destructive.

When we wrote this article we described what makes him so present hedonistic, what are the consequences, for example, all addictions are triggered by present hedonism, because once you do something that's pleasurable, then you keep doing it. The other interesting thing is even though you know, for example, cognitively that heroin is not good for you; even though you know cognitively that gambling is not good for you; you know if you're diabetic, eating sugar's not good for you; that cognitive knowledge never feeds back to change your behavior. ACT first; think later! I'm saying, so that's what makes being present hedonistic [a] life style dangerous to yourself and then to others depending [on] one's power domains.

Now when your actions are political, can influence others, it makes you dangerous to the world. We wrote this article and it got an unprecedented number of readers--over nine hundred thousand in several weeks. It's the most *Psychology Today* hits they've ever gotten. Most of them are likes.

We've just been invited today to expand this blog into a chapter for a new book with chapters by twenty-seven psychiatrists and mental health experts who assess this president's fitness to serve, as "their duty to warn" their nation. The title is, *The Dangerous Case of Donald Trump,* edited by Dr. Bandy Lee for St. Martin's Press, 2017. It has become a bestseller. There's nothing in Trump's present or past character that leads me to have any

optimism that what he's going to do is better, and likely ever more dangerous, and it's not clear how you contain that. When I was lecturing around the world, when he was running for election, no one could believe it. In Poland, in Hungary, in Jakarta, they'd say what's wrong with you Americans? [laughter] We forgave you George Bush. [laughter] You resolved it with Obama. And now you have gone back to doing worse than ever for the world. [laughter]

Hartwig: Speaking of stepping back, so let's take a step back and reflect a little bit on your career as a psychologist, as a teacher, as a researcher. Let's talk a little bit first about Stanford. When you arrived, you know, describe the evolution of the Psych Department and your time there.

Zimbardo: [00:19:21] 1968 was the year I arrived. Nothing in my life had as big an impact as coming to Stanford, as coming to Palo Alto from the Bronx. As I said earlier, I grew up in poverty in the Bronx, born in 1933. For me it was a transformation at every level coming from the Bronx. I was born in the ghetto in the Bronx where I grew up. I went away to Yale to graduate school for six years, but then came back and taught at NYU in the Bronx, believe it or not, for another six years. I was very unhappy at NYU. Now it's a good school. It was not a very good school when I was there. I didn't have exciting students. I didn't have exciting colleagues. Actually I was teaching at NYU in the Bronx, which is now a community college, so I didn't have regular contact with other faculty in social psychology. I was the only social psychologist there.

I realized that in order to get out to a better university with a fine faculty, I had to do a lot of original research; I had to do a lot of writing, and substantial publishing, which I did. I worked all the time. Fortunately, it worked. In 1963, I was invited to teach summer school at Stanford, which I did. Faculty there got to know that I was a good teacher. I taught two graduate courses. Gordon Bower was there. Recall that he and I were Yalies together and I was the best man at his wedding. He just had his sixtieth wedding anniversary, Chris [Christina Maslach] and I and he and Sharon went to dinner recently to enjoy that. There were a few other professors at Stanford in 1963 that knew me from before.

Then the other serendipitous thing that happened was that I was doing original research on cognitive dissonance. That was Leon Festinger's theory, who was a professor at Stanford then. In 1968, Festinger decides to leave Stanford to go to New York, to the New School of Social Research. So his position is vacant. Also, here I'm doing research on cognitive dissonance, so it's a natural fit. People knew I was a good teacher from my earlier summer school stint. The really interesting twist is that in 1967/1968, I was a visiting professor at Columbia University in the graduate program. I did it because I needed to get stimulation from graduate students and faculty in social psychology. The amazing thing was that one of the professors there, Bill McGuire [William McGuire], who had been a professor of mine at Yale, decided to leave. He was on sabbatical, so I was replacing him. He decides to leave to go to San Diego, so his position's available. And I'm there. So hello!

They have a search for his replacement and I'm not on the list. I mean it doesn't make sense. Wait a minute. I'm there. Invite me and I sign on for life!

[00:22:48] My best graduate students there are Judy Rodin and Lee Ross. Judy Rodin [Judith Rodin] became the vice president at Yale, and now the president of Rockefeller. I think she just retired. They're giving me rave reviews to the search committee. It was really disconcerting and I was really feeling down on myself. First week in December 1967, I get a call from Albert Hastorf. I say, "Oh, I just finished teaching your wonderful experiment on *They Saw a Game* about how your personal point of view influences your perception." He let me talk on and on. He then said, "Thank you very much." He continued with, "I've been authorized by the tenured professors in the Psychology Department at Stanford University to offer you a tenured position as full professor starting in September."

I thought it was a joke at first. I really did. I'm saying, wait a minute. You know, I didn't have tenure at NYU. I was just an associate [professor] without tenure. Then I say, "Is this real?"

He said, "Yes." He could hear that I was uncertain. He said, "What will it take to get you to come here?"

I said, "A one-way ticket and sunglasses and I'm there." [laughter] Then I said, "But I have to come out and give a talk."

He said, "No, you don't have to give a talk. You've got the job."

I said, "But I have to."

[00:24:31] Essentially I flew out the next week and gave a talk about all the research I was doing. I needed to prove to them that I deserved to be

hired and join their distinguished ranks. I then finished the term at Columbia and I came out in the summer to restart my career at Stanford in 1968. I was really poor. After all those years of teaching at NYU, I had a really low salary and many family financial obligations. I chose to be a faculty resident at Cedro dorm because you got free room and board. I didn't have a car so I biked around. When faculty went away, I "car sat," and then washed their car to return the favor, despite being a full professor. But I loved it.

I think the most productive four years of my life were from 1968 to 1971. I just started writing the *Psychology and Life* textbook, which I took over from somebody else [who] had made it famous [Floyd Ruch], but I rewrote the entire book. It came out in 1971. It was a huge hit, selling over a hundred thousand copies. Actually it made me instantly academically wealthy. I wrote a book on cognitive dissonance, *The Cognitive Control of Motivation*. I wrote a third book on *Influencing Attitudes and Changing Behavior*. I also wrote many articles. I wrote a major chapter in the *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*. In those four years, I probably wrote five books and many articles. Oh, I was still heavily involved in anti-Vietnam War activities, so I wrote *Canvassing for Peace* (1970), with Robert Abelson, my former Yale stats professor. I'm also teaching fulltime. I'm teaching Introductory Psych and Social Psych, starting out in History Corner.

I remember a class of about two hundred and fifty students, which was reasonably big. And then it started overflowing. Word got out that I was doing special things in my classes. Next thing I know I'm in Dinkelspiel and it holds seven hundred. Then I'm in Cubberley. Then I'm teaching at

Memorial Auditorium to a class of twelve hundred students, with late-coming students filling up the balcony. Then I decided, as gratifying as that was, it was really wrong because if you teach in any of the big auditoriums--if you're on a stage--it doesn't matter how big the audience is, it matters your distance from the first student. When you're on a stage, there's a gap between you and them. You're up there alone as an entertainer to the audience of student viewers.

I said I have to teach in a place where I'm not on a stage, where I'm level, where I can walk down into the audience easily. Sometimes at Memorial Auditorium, there'd be a play, *Pirates of Penzance.* You'd have to walk around props to lecture. I think I taught in virtually every auditorium at Stanford. Finally the Psych Department built these two wonderful auditoriums in Jordan Hall. The larger one at that time had about three hundred students. That's where I settled in. Essentially I helped design it. I said, the stage is just two steps down, and so what you do is you have the seating gradually slope up so that students can see you from every angle. I taught Psych I almost every term. I taught social psych, group dynamics, and then shyness, later on time perspective, and a course on madness.

Then I also was the first one to teach a course on how to teach. Part of being a graduate assistant was you had to take my new course in teaching psychology. Essentially it was giving lessons on preparing a lecture and also how to deliver effective presentations. We would videotape the graduate students in their sections. I would go over the videotapes with them, give them hints. We'd get feedback every month from their students, and we'd

give them the feedback to say here's what you're doing good, here's what you're not doing well. I really felt good about doing that. Many of those students went on to have distinguished teaching careers at other places.

Hartwig: What allowed you to be so productive, so influential?

Zimbardo: [00:29:20] I don't know. Initially when I got here, I felt I had to prove myself, because here were the superstars in psychology. I'm pretty sure that there was a decision made at the highest level at Stanford to go from being The Farm to number one university in the world, and that they decided to invest in different departments creating centers of excellence. My recollection is that maybe they started with mathematics or biology, and then psychology was high up. They started raiding other schools for the best available young but proven stars. Then instantly they had this incredible department where every major faculty member was the best in his or her area. They brought in Amos Tversky and they had Eleanor Maccoby [who] was there from before. John Flavell and Al Bandura, of course, and Walter Mischel, and Gordon Bower, as well as Karl Pribram [who] was in biological psych. [They] were all active young professors. And there were more who I can mention later.

Hartwig: Did you collaborate a lot with the other faculty?

Zimbardo: [00:30:41] No, each faculty member really was much more contained; they each had labs with their own students. One of the things I did was when I was writing *Psychology and Life* when I first got there, I went around to each of the faculty members and said, I'm writing a chapter on your specialization. I asked why should anybody be interested in that topic? I mean, why it isn't just not another boring academic topic. [What] got you interested in it? Why

do you spend your life doing work in that realm? I did this with everybody. I went to the memory guru, Gordon Bower for starters. That process helps to make most chapters in my new *Psychology and Life* both current and interesting to faculty who were adopting the book as well as to students who were reading it

I was one of the few people who then had such personal contacts with the entire faculty. My book had sixteen different chapters, each a different topic. I got to know what everybody was doing and they got to know me in a more personal way. The other thing I did, I was always a socializer. I had arranged for us to have a monthly faculty get-together. Somebody would give a career retrospective in somebody else's house. I think it was just drinks, drinks and snacks and stuff. This was an interesting thing that nobody had thought to do. It was just intellectually intoxicating to be in that setting.

The other thing I chose to do is co-teach a course that all first-year graduate students had to take. It's like 207: Introduction to Psychology. Usually the chairman of the department taught it. I asked him could I teach it with him. What that meant was each week a faculty member would come in and tell the students what he or she was doing. That means I got to know at the end of the year what everybody was doing without having to read all of his or her publications. So essentially I actively worked to be a good colleague, actively worked to know what everybody was doing, and also have them know what I was doing. What they were doing was remarkable. A few

years later, I was invited to compete to be the host of the first psychology television series called *Discovering Psychology*.

Hartwig: Probably WGBH?

I Created Discovering Psychology

Zimbardo: [00:33:37] Station WGBH in Boston decided they're going to do an introductory psychology course video. It was going to be thirteen, one-hour programs. I competed with Marty Seligman [Martin Seligman] and several other nationally recognized teachers of big psychology courses.

Hartwig: What was the competition? What did they consist of?

Zimbardo: [00:33:54] They sent you to a different college back East. They sent me to Swarthmore and I had to give several lectures there that they sat in on to see, how I lectured and how I interacted with the audience. Eventually I won the job. After I won the contest, they said; now you have to write the grant for two million dollars, which seemed enormous then, but which turns out to be small change now. We updated several programs and we did two new ones in 2001. It was about a million dollars for each new program.

The first thing I did was to say almost every program must be no longer than forty-five minutes. They had these classical WGBH one-hour programs, in their NOVA series. I said it doesn't make sense. It'd be better to cut them in half to thirty minutes so professors could also teach one topic, and then have twenty-five minutes to talk about it. They agreed. Then I said that when I'm lecturing I don't want to give up a half an hour for students to watch a video, so let's conceive of each program as being a series of chunks, like four or five, each in five- or six-minute periods. Then I wrote the

background and the text for all of those twenty-six programs, some thirty, forty, even fifty pages. I think I deposited all of them in the Stanford archives.

Essentially, I'd say, for example, here are the most interesting people in social psychology. Here are the people who are doing the most interesting work. Here are the concepts we have to be sure to get across. And then here's how I would structure it. Then I worked with a scriptwriter. We had a script. I was the host that did the narration. I also did all the voiceovers for various scenes. It was absolutely a wonderful experience. It took three years from the start to the last program. We did programs in the street. We did them all over the Stanford campus, and in the streets of Cambridge, Massachusetts, as well. It was a huge success; millions of students and teachers learned their intro to psych from my *Discovering Psychology* series, first appearing in 1990. It's still being shown for free, live-streamed in high definition, on *Learner.org*, It's now on the WGBH Annenberg Corporation website.

Hartwig: Annenberg?

Zimbardo: [00:36:23] Annenberg PBS. They were ultimately the funders. They were the ones who put up the original two million bucks. Originally it was for adult education. That's what the money was for, but I got them to refocus on secondary students, teachers, and parents. Now, it is still being shown around the world. It's shown now in literally every advanced placement psychology course. It's rare that I go anywhere that somebody does not say, "Oh, my God; I got interested in psychology because I took your course on *Discovering*

Psychology." That's one of the things I'm really, really glad I did it, despite the enormous amount of intense time it took, and the reduction in my research and publications during those three years in front of the camera.

Hartwig: Is there anything you regret that you didn't do or--

Zimbardo: [00:37:09] I don't think so. But I have to tell you one special and unusual thing about one of the programs in *Discovering Psychology*. Amos Tversky and Danny Kahneman [Daniel Kahneman] were doing groundbreaking research that I knew would become classics--Nobel Prize-winning research. Nobody ever thought about decision-making in their original way. I persuaded the organizers of *Discovering Psychology*: let's have a whole program on judgment and decision-making, and half of it will be with the two of them. That is, I'll give them problems and they'll tell us how they solve them, and also we will have people in the streets be given those decisions and see how the general public responds. I said, "These two Israelis are so dynamic, so argumentative that we need two cameras not the usual solo one." This was toward the end of the series. The WGBH staff said, "We don't have a lot of money." I said, "Please." They agreed. One camera on Amos, the other on Danny, and me in the middle.

We set it up at Stanford. We're ready to begin. Then they were told, (a) they had to wear ties. They didn't have ties. They gave them ties. Israelis don't wear ties. And (b), then they had to wear makeup because we had bright lights. It just freaked them out! They were really upset at the artificiality of the whole setting. They silently rebelled, meaning they didn't interact at all. It was an embarrassment for me. The producers were looking

at me saying, do you really know these guys? We shot for maybe an hour, and then we took a break. As soon as we took a break, the camera turned off, then they're arguing vigorously about some research they're doing. The red light went on, they froze up. Finally, I talked to the director, "Look, here's what we're going to do. We're going to reedit the whole thing. Don't even try to get them to interact. Talk to Danny first, then talk to Amos, and then put in some links, like, 'Amos, do you agree with Danny,' 'Danny, is Amos right when he says such and such?"' That's what we did--by reediting the entire several hours into a provocative twelve-minute unique episode.

Hartwig: That worked then?

Zimbardo: [00:38:51] As far as I know, it's the only interview existing between the two of them. The sad thing is Amos died shortly after that. Danny, in fact, won the Nobel Prize for that research. He acknowledged in his acceptance speech that this would not have been possible without Amos. Amos was the most brilliant person I ever knew, more so than anybody at Stanford with the brilliance of many different kinds. My colleagues all agreed; Bandura, Mischel, Bower, Lee Ross, everybody said, Amos was on a plane by himself. Roger Shepard was also a rare breed, super creative, idiosyncratic theorist.

Hartwig: How so?

Zimbardo: [00:39:35] There'd be some faculty debate, some intense arguing, and he could cut to the center and say, "It seems to me that there are three ways to look at, da-da-da-da, and of the three, this will be the least profitable, and therefore, I think we should focus on these two, and I would put my money on this one." People are going, "Yes, of course, that's right." Even in our

usually congenial faculty meetings there'd be some argument. It was always very modest. It was never in a dominating way. Amos would just say effectively, "Let me do a memory dump and cognitively tell you the way I see it." And we all agree to see it that way.

You know, wow, as soon as he was finished, others and I would say, "Why didn't I think about that?" It was that kind of brilliance. Lee Ross was very close to him. Lee has that almost semi-genius mentality where it's going beyond the obvious to what is the really important underlying issue when everybody gets caught up in the more superficial things.

Hartwig: How did the department evolve over the years, and how heavy or how much a hand did the chair have in kind of shaping the department?

Administrator, No; Talent Identifier, Yes

Zimbardo: [00:41:00] No, it was never a chair-centric department. Faculty were encouraged to rotate through the chair, to do it three years. Al Hastorf did it a long time, and then he went on to be dean and provost. He was a great administrator. Then Bower, Bandura, Mischel, many of the other faculty members did it. I probably should have done it. Partly also you got a sabbatical and also a raise in salary, but I didn't take it because I couldn't imagine saying "no" to my colleagues when they asked for a raise or something like that. That was the thing about the department. It was always a group decision. It was never a strong chairman saying, "Here's how we're going to move this department." It was always, "Where are we weak? Where do we need some strength? What direction is the field moving in and who are the leading researchers that we should be bringing here?"

Then the other thing is we would bring in for colloquia people we thought might be possible good additions to our department, so we'd get to see what they were like. One of the sad things is one of our best undergraduates was a kid named Peter Salovey. Just brilliant, dynamic, exciting. Then he went to Yale, worked with Judy Rodin very closely, and was graduating, and we had a position available in social psych. I said, "He's the guy we want. We know him. He's hardworking. He's creative." One of the saddest things in my life is that after all my promotion, he came and gave a terrible talk, one of the worst ever. He had taught at Stanford. He was a teaching assistant and taught classes. Kids loved him.

I'm sitting there listening to this talk. This is like a low-level Psych I talk. He knows here's Bandura, here's Bower, here's Mark Lepper, here are all these smart people--Eleanor Maccoby, Amos Tversky, and others. People said no way will we hire him! I mean I was the one who invited him. It was like the single worst experience of my academic decision-making to that point, my colleagues are saying, "Zimbardo, have you lost it?" I said, "Well, he should give another talk, maybe just to the graduate students." He gave a second talk, also terrible. I couldn't believe it. It turned out that when he was at Yale, Judy Rodin had been busy during that time period and really never went over his talk with him, so his talk was not well prepared. It really was a Psych I talk rather than a talk suitable for our graduate students.

He then got a job at Yale, won awards for best teacher at Yale. His courses had hundreds and thousands of students, he did much original research, and now he's the president of Yale University. He will be for a long

time because he's brilliant and charming and a good alumni fundraiser. It's one of the few times I think my colleagues said, "Zimbardo, we're taking away a lot of your idiosyncrasy credit for that poor show by your inept presenter."

[00:44:49] Ultimately, I was proved right, that he was going to be a star--not in Stanford's cosmos, but Yale's.

Hartwig: Yes, absolutely. Yes.

Zimbardo: [00:44:53] Salovey is a special kind of a star.

My Role in Encouraging African American Psychologists

Hartwig: Were there other contentious issues within the department over the years?

Zimbardo: [00:44:57] Yes. There was the African American issue for a while. Oh, in the mid-1970s, Al Hastorf and I said, we really should be encouraging more African American students to apply, we should be taking more African American students in as graduate students, we should be looking around for potential African American faculty members. Al essentially put me in charge of that mission. We gave special consideration to black graduate students. At one point, in a few years we had five or six African American psychology graduate students, more than in any other Stanford program, or area within our department. Then I said we now needed African American faculty. There were very few available. Unfortunately, the two we got turned out to be terribly bad research psychologists. One of them was actually more interested in drama; Phil McGee spent half his time in the Drama School, and then the other one got quickly involved in the Black Panther Movement. Dr. Cedric Clark became "Cedric X. Black Muslim." Not Black Panther, but Black

Muslim. He suddenly had bodyguards. I mean he would come to the department, people would drive him up in a big sedan, he'd get out, and there'd be bodyguards by his office!

In our department, when we moved into Jordan Hall in 1970, each academic area was located in a contained unit. All the social psychologists were on the third floor at the back; personality psychologists at the first floor right side; developmental was on second floor left side, and so on. I didn't fit upstairs in social. The chair, Richard Atkinson, said to me, "It would be good if you stayed down on the second floor because you get along so well with these new students and faculty." If I agreed, he would see to it that I got two adjoining rooms, as an office and a sitting or entertaining room. Done deal! [I slept on that couch during the SPE in August 1971.] I said we could make this the Zimbardo African American wing, okay, it's me and I initially have a couple of graduate students working with me--Christina Maslach, Craig Haney, and Curtis Banks. Curt Banks was one of the first African American graduate students we took in. Then there was Cedric Clark--had his office here. I think Phil McGee [DuBois Phillip McGee] was next to him. They had their own African American secretary. Then there was an office with three African American graduate students. The students were doing reasonably well--Mary Banks, Wade Nobles, and Ken Montiero. Ken and I published together on hypnotizabilty. He worked in Jack Hilgard's [Ernest Hilgard] hypnosis center. Ken went on to be Director of Minority Studies at San Francisco State University for many years.

Perhaps Wade Nobles went on to have the biggest impact of any of those students in his professional domain of black studies. Wade recently retired after years of founding and directing the Institute for the Advanced Study of Black Family Life and Culture, Inc. in Oakland, California. He was also a prolific writer, engaging speaker, and longtime promoter of African psychology.

One African American student from the Deep South was really rebellious--I am blocking on recalling his name. He hated the African American faculty members because he said they're "Uncle Toms"--they're not doing anything for ordinary black people. He later insisted on not having any faculty advisor listed on his PhD thesis. I then was nominally his thesis advisor in absentia. Later on, a fine black grad student was Michael Hubbard who worked with Lee Ross; Irving Brown was in the personality program; and Willie Smith did research in the developmental area. So all in all, I think that is a reasonably fine record of recruiting many minority students into our department.

Curt Banks, who worked with me very closely, first on the SPE, then in later research, finished his degree in only three years, rare even at that time. He was the first African American professor at Princeton, got tenure there, and then decided he should leave and make a bigger impact at Howard University. He started the *Black Psychology Journal* and was a role model for many black psychologists. I was always really very close to him personally and professionally. Sadly, he died very young. Then finally we hired Claude Steele. Claude was magnificent. He was doing original, creative work. I had

known him earlier in the beginning of his career when he was doing research on alcohol addiction. He came, was doing interesting research. He then started doing work on stereotype threat and started engaging a number of the graduate students, and was clearly the leading thinker among African American psychologists in the nation. You now don't think of Claude as an African American psychologist, just one of the leading thinkers amongst all psychologists. He added new star power to our department. I always felt very good about having some hand in inviting him. Later on, his career moved into top-level administration at Columbia and Berkeley.

Hartwig: What about in the case of women as well? Eleanor was there for a long time by herself.

On Being the Best Psychology Department

Zimbardo: [00:49:37] Yes. We made many fine women hires in the next decade. Laura Carstensen expanded the child development program into life span development, and has created the unique Stanford Center on Longevity. She married Ian Gotlib, now a fine chair. That marriage was among the many within our department; Markus and Zajonc, Mark Lepper and Jeanne Lepper, who was the director of the Bing Nursery School for many decades [and where I did some initial shyness observational research on shyness in preschoolers]. Herb Clark, our language expert is married to Eve Clark in the Linguistics Department.

We brought in Felicia Pratto in social psychology who later did pioneering research on social dominance theory. Unfortunately, she did not get tenure because she had not completed enough significant published

research by that decision time. George Quattrone was a maverick social psychologist who replaced her; conceptually original, fine teacher, but his many lifestyle eccentricities got him into troubles that led him to quit his job in our department.

Again, obviously given my connection with Christina Maslach, who in 1971 was one of the first female faculty members in Berkeley's psych department in decades, I encouraged us to have more female faculty. We had a fair number of female graduate students who were very, very good. Anne Fernald was one of the first women tenured faculty members. Another outstanding colleague was Ellen Markman, who has gone on and up in the Stanford University administration. Then we brought in Hazel Markus. Hazel Markus and Bob Zajonc [Robert Zajonc] were a married pair hire. Bob Zajonc was a great addition. He had done so much original research at Michigan. Had gone there as an undergraduate, graduate, was a dean, and headed their group dynamics program, and had just a great reputation as a teacher, as a leader.

Hazel had been his student there, graduate student I guess. We really wanted him, and essentially it was a package. So we took them both, and Hazel turned out to be a superstar in cultural psychology. We were always weak in cultural psychology. She added that power. Jeanne Tsai expanded our focus on cultural psychology and is another married pair with Brian Knutson, in neuro psych. Then we got Jennifer Eberhardt [an African American faculty member] who was another great addition, who recently

won the MacArthur Genius Award. She and I taught social psych jointly one year and we were a fine pairing.

Hartwig: Barbara was there.

Zimbardo: [00:51:44] Oh, right, Barbara Tversky.

Hartwig: Yes.

Zimbardo: [00:51:46] Yes. Amos's wife, Barbara. Barbara Tversky also taught several fine courses for a while. Among our most significant hires was Carol Dweck, whose original ideas on psychology of mindsets has revolutionized education and even sports performances. [I have adapted some of her ideas in my HIP educational interventions on the value of growth mindsets that I have delivered in dozens of nations around the world.]

In recent times, our department has continued to hire outstanding young female researchers, such as Alia Crum in social psychology and education. Another future star is Kalanit Grill-Spector in what I call the "hard psych" area of computational methods and neuro imaging. Jay McClelland, Brian Wandell and Jeff Wine have always powerfully represented the strength of that domain. Finally, I should mention a young female instructor, Brigitte Hard, who has been the Intro Psych coordinator for a number of years, working closely with superstar lecturer, James Gross, to continue our long tradition of having one of the finest introductory psychology programs in the nation.

Hartwig: Now, was this ahead of the curve, or in terms of overall kind of efforts to recruit and retain either people of color or women within the university?

Zimbardo:[00:52:13] I think it was a little ahead of the curve, but I think it was that we were also able to make it explicit. We don't want to be an all-white department, we don't want to be all guys, you know. Not to be politically correct, but essentially we're limiting ourselves. We're limiting models for our graduate students. We want the best academic, research-oriented psychologists in the world here, regardless of race, creed or gender.

Now, the other thing I did, which was ahead of its time now that I think about it, is promoting graduate students into careers in local tech companies. In the olden days the best graduate students we chose to get the best available academic jobs. There would be an announcement or people would call us to alert us to the availability of a job at Princeton or Yale or Harvard or Duke, or NYU. Then the faculty would say, who of all of our students would be the best for this fit because they'd have to go and give a job talk and so forth. Then we actually would prepare them for the job talk because any major student wouldn't just go and give a talk on their own. They would give a talk usually within their area, social or cognitive or development, and then we'd give them feedback on how to be most impressive.

Our students almost always got the job that they went for. Then in those days--I'm talking about 1990s--the students who couldn't get a good academic job began to drift into Silicon Valley jobs. That tech center of the world was just starting up. You know, nonacademic professional jobs. They felt terrible; it was clearly second-class. I realized that we were giving them no

preparation. I mean they're still top Stanford students. They still are carrying psych degrees from the Stanford Psychology Department. I said, "We really have to prepare them better. They're never going to teach again. All the effort we put in to teaching them how to be good teachers is not materializing; instead, we really need to teach them how to be good professional psychologists." I started a new course, On Being a Professional Psychologist. This was for any graduate student, but certainly I advertised it for anybody who's considering a nonacademic job. Silicon Valley had lots of profitable jobs for our grads and ultimately has become the tech center of the world. Some of those jobs were in research, but applied, team-based research, which we did not fully value in our department, but which I encouraged in my course.

Actually clinical psychology is heavily centered on applied research. Before I got to Stanford, there was an active clinical program, an active clinic, but once the Stanford administration decided to make psychology a center of excellence. Excellence meant people who were publishing, people who were winning awards, getting grants, if you were in the clinical program, you were spending huge amounts of time with patients and doing supervision, and so they didn't get enough publications. Many of them were not getting promoted, and so morale was really low.

[00:55:28] Then I think Bandura and Mischel and other personality psychologists said that to have the top-flight clinical program in the nation, we'd have to invest a lot of money. I mean they need a clinic, they need a full staff, secretaries, research coordinators, et cetera, and we don't think it's

worth it. So they disbanded the clinic. Many people think it's always been a weakness of our department. That is, our students don't have any clinical training at all. Now, there was always some clinical training in the School of Education. Some of our students who had a clinical bent, I would always send over to various professors in clinical education, most notably one of my most outstanding students, Susan Andersen, who went on to head a clinical research program at NYU.

I was always interested in clinical psych personally. Maybe the best course I ever had at Yale was one taught by Irving Janis on abnormal psychology, where we spent a day each week at a Connecticut state mental hospital interviewing and testing mental patients.

Zimbardo: [00:56:49] The course was not at West Haven VA [Veterans' Administration]--I had a postdoc there after graduating from Yale, [that I mentioned earlier as a way of keeping out of the Korean War draft.] The course was at a large state mental hospital. Again, I always thought about the importance of psychologists being rounded, having that clinical background along with social and cognitive and cultural.

Let's see. Okay. Where are we now?

Hartwig: We're talking about nonacademic career training.

Zimbardo: [00:57:16] Oh, oh. Essentially I was the first to begin to say if you're going to go on this path, here's what you have to know. I would bring in people who were working in the VA pool, working in Genentech--I don't know if Apple was getting started. They'd come in and say here's what we do and here's the kinds of aptitudes we want, and so forth. Then the other thing is I realized

that if you are in a business setting, the research you do is always in a team. In fact, it's almost never individual. You're never going to get promoted based on your academic visibility, because if you do something there's always a string of people beside you as a team.

Again, it's getting them to think in that other way. None of what we do at Stanford prepared them for that. I mean everything is to be *the* number one. Again, it's changing your orientation to say here's how you have to think of yourself as a team. I taught my class with third-year students so they'd have another year to think about how they should be collaborating, think about research that [they] can do in a collaborative network with one of our students, and even with people outside of our department. I felt good about that.

Hartwig: How much collaboration did you have with other departments?

Zimbardo: [00:59:02] Not much. Again, a weakness at Stanford is the departments are relatively isolated. One of our early collaborations was with the [Stanford] Law School, organized by my dear colleague, David Rosenhan, in his innovative Psychology and Law course. But most students who took it ended up in law not in psych because of the greater prestige and money in the legal profession. Curiously, I think the most long-term connections have been with the Business School because the Stanford Graduate School of Business is heavily based in social psychology. I mean they've always had some social psychologists, even from the very beginning. Over time, I think they realized that the most important skills in business are understanding social groups, interactive and dynamic, and so they always have several psychologists, they

always have a good social psych course. Then over time there would be shared professorships. Benoit Monin is a really good social psychologist in our department. Maybe he taught a course there or maybe students from the Graduate School of Business sat in and they liked him, so then he got a halftime appointment in Business and also in Psych.

The problem is, in Business, a beginning assistant professor gets about the same as a full professor in Psych. Once you go there, you're never coming back, just like you go to Medical School. We never had enough contact with education, almost nothing with sociology or psychiatry. I think it was one of the negatives of Stanford. There was not any active encouragement. Maybe it should have come from the dean down to have more interdepartmental colloquium or collaborations--which is curious because later on, Stanford's claim to fame is being interdisciplinary, biology and technology, I mean bringing whole areas together. But there was none of that during my time. I always felt bad about it, not having more of that cross-fertilization.

Hartwig: Talk a little bit about the changes in administration and how those teams had some influence on the course of the university for good or bad.

Zimbardo: [01:01:39] Yes, I have never been focused on administration. I'm a non-administrative guy, although I was president of the American Psychological Association with fifty thousand members. But there was a whole set of people who ran it. I mean I stepped up, did some innovative programs--I did my dog and pony show, and then left.

I was never very much involved with university administration at any level. I should have been more. It somehow just ran itself beautifully. I guess people feel that Hennessy [John Hennessy] was a really good president, moved the university financially forward in part by promoting our links to technology more. His predecessor, who I'm blocking on--

Hartwig: Gerhard [Gerhard Casper]?

Zimbardo: [01:02:34] No, before him. My dear friend.

Hartwig: Kennedy [Donald Kennedy]?

Zimbardo: [01:02:37] Kennedy, yes. I was fairly close to Don Kennedy because he sometimes asked my advice about some issues. He was just a very energetic, dynamic guy. Was he the one who started Human Bio?

Hartwig: I believe so. He was part of, yes.

Zimbardo: [01:02:58] Yes. Essentially there was a point at which I think in part with the success of my large enrollment Psych 100 class and others, Hum Bio could siphon off lots of students to this new adventurous program. Again, the other thing I should say is Psychology always had a reputation in our department for being good teachers. I mean we do course evaluations that we take seriously; they go in your profile. For all new professors, we have several faculty members sit in and give new lecturers feedback, which is rare. Doesn't happen anywhere else that I know of. We always had really positive evaluations among the students, both undergraduate and graduate.

There was a time during which psychology was the biggest major of all, like more than five hundred students. We couldn't handle it with our relatively small number of faculty, rarely more than twenty-five. It was

overwhelming. Then I think there was an economic crash, and curiously many students went into economics. Then the other thing that happened is Kennedy started Human Biology. All the premeds who wanted biology without blood [laughter] went to that new program [from] us, it dropped majors from five hundred to two hundred fifty and it stayed about that, which is absolutely wonderful. It's manageable. Right? It really wasn't before.

Human Bio was an interdisciplinary program that's been a national model. It was never a department. Again, his brilliant idea was to pick several of the best teachers from psychology, from biology, from chemistry, from whatever, and they would come in and do their thing. I think Herant Katchadourian was their superstar. The only two classes that rivaled mine in attendance were Herant Katchadourian's Human Sexuality and Sleep and Dreams by Bill Dement [William Dement]. Now, what's interesting about Bill Dement is he was working in the hospital doing his groundbreaking work on sleep. I had heard about it and I guess I sat in on some sessions. I invited him to give a lecture in Psych I.

He said, "I don't do that." He's never given a lecture in a lecture hall. It was that he only did small seminars.

I said, "No. It's really fascinating. You'll love it."

He got turned on. He came in, he told stories, he really liked it, and from then on, he was hooked. Then he gave these huge Sleep and Dreams courses, which became Stanford classics. The other person I have to mention who had a huge influence on me is Robert Sapolsky in Bio. I mean he's at the level of Amos Tversky in terms of sheer brilliance. Whenever I had heard

from students that there was this great guy teaching something special, and I would go sit in to learn what was so fine. I said, "Wow, this guy is really something." I invited him to give a lecture on stress. He had just written, *Why Zebras Don't Get Ulcers*. I was always flashy, you know, gimmicky, sort of. My presentations were heavily dependent on visual supporting material. I'd always have 16 mm movies. I'd have slides, overhead projectors, music, stage demonstrations, and all kinds of special things.

Hartwig: Dynamics. Yes.

Zimbardo: [01:06:55] Dynamics indeed! I mean things are blazing all around my stage. I give Sapolsky a grand intro, he gets up on the small stage in Room 40 Jordan Hall, and he says, "Does anybody have a piece of chalk?"--later on, I actually gave him a chalk holder as a gift. There is a little laughter. He starts writing on the blackboard, "When you're stressed, what do you feel?" One, two. Just write down your reactions. Then he would go through each of ten aspects of stress, at various levels of analysis. He brings in his original field research on chimps in Africa. He gives a truly brilliant lecture. One of the problems is, he has a great sense of humor but it's too quick and kids are missing it. You know, I'm laughing and I'm looking around and the kids miss it because it's something esoteric about Gilbert and Sullivan. I mean that you have to know that this is from *Pirates of Penzance* or something like that to realize the crux of the joke.

He would be one of my regular guest lecturers that I would book into Psych I. Every year he would come and always be totally mesmerizing; we got to be really close friends. Yes. Sapolsky really is at another level,

intellectually at the same level as Amos Tversky in terms of the two most brilliant people that I knew. Sapolsky has just written a remarkable new book, *Behave: The Biology of Humans at Our Best and Worst* (2017)*;* it includes a lot of my work on the situational basis of evil.

Hartwig: Did you have other mentors that helped you professionally?

Zimbardo: [01:08:21] I take a little bit from everybody that I can!

S T A N F O R D U N I V E R S I T Y

PROJECT:	STANFORD FACULTY ORAL HISTORY PROJECT
INTERVIEWER:	DANIEL HARTWIG
INTERVIEWEE:	PHILIP G. ZIMBARDO
DATE OF INTERVIEW:	MARCH 14, 2017
PART:	7 of 7

Hartwig: All right. Let's talk a little bit about some fun things from your days in the past. You were just talking a little bit about some of the interesting people you brought to campus. Talk about Stan Getz [Stanley "*Stan*" *Getz*].

Zimbardo: [00:00:14] Yes. For me, one of the most important things I had ever done was that I was part of a small faculty group that wanted to revitalize the teaching of music. Stanford had just completed its new building, the Braun Music Center within the Department of Music. Many of the students in music were not very happy. We decided we needed a musician in residence, somebody who would be there all the time, would teach, ideally jazz improvisation, and would give performances.

Stan Getz Does Stanford Music School

We got together and we found out that Stan Getz was available. He was living back east. We invited him. Now, the backup story is that Stan Getz went to James Monroe High School--where I went to high school, only a few years before him.

When he was sixteen years old, a sophomore, he was recruited out of school by Jack Teagarden [Weldon Leo "Jack" Teagarden] to be in his band to go around the country. He never finished high school and that was always a bad feeling that Stan Getz had. When he came to Stanford, I think one of the reasons was to have the Stanford name associated with his. Immediately I had a personal business card made for him. I still have a copy: Stan Getz, Stanford University Musician in Residence. He really loved being here. He not only taught a course in jazz improvisation, but each quarter he would create a performance. He'd bring in top musicians. They were always in the summer at Frost Amphitheater. The students loved it and he loved it. He did it I think for six or seven years. I had him at my home for dinner once, and he said he had just come from doing a recording with Huey Lewis and the News. He said it's the first time he ever played that he was not high [laughter] on alcohol or drugs. He said he now realized that he didn't need it. He said to me how many hundreds of songs that he recorded that could have been even better if he was not on "medication." I always felt really, really good about that.

We're now celebrating the Summer of Love, 1967, just before I came. There was still a little carryover the next year. When I came here, some of the graduate students took me to the Fillmore Auditorium; they took me to hear a number of rock shows. The music was wonderfully creative and so were the artistic posters everywhere announcing the rock groups coming there to perform. When I was at NYU, I used to work all the time, I mean I didn't

even have time to listen to music or get to know the names of most groups. I knew the Beatles and that was about it.

Many students were experimenting with drugs. In my Cedro dorm, when we would have a cooking contest with the women in Arroyo dorm, they would always end with desserts of marijuana-laced brownies. [laughter] And the kids would dress down, actually often rather raggedy.

The Vietnam War Cast a Dark Spell

[00:03:14] Everything was really loose, but encouraging and friendly, except for the dark shadow of the Vietnam War. It was terrible. I mean everybody knew this was immoral, illegal, in the same ways that the Iraq War was later. The last year I was at NYU, 1967-68, I got involved in some anti-war activities. I was not a political person because I didn't have time. I was writing, teaching, doing research, all career stuff. But when NYU gave an honorary degree to Robert McNamara at the university graduation, I challenged that decision. I organized a respectful protest at the mention of his name.

Hartwig: Oh, yes.

Zimbardo: [00:03:51] I think I mentioned he was the architect of the war. I led a walkout at graduation. Several hundred people got up and walked out. That public action moved me toward becoming more political. When the Vietnam War started to escalate in late 1960s and early 1970s, there were student strikes. I think the university was closed down. Everybody went on strike. Faculty and some students picketed the Stanford Research Institute because they had ties with the military, and we got them to change the name to SRI. Then I

organized several thousand students in many positive antiwar activities, like getting people to sell off their war bonds, and many other more positive actions.

I also wrote a book *Canvassing for Peace*, informing readers how they should help elect peace candidates against pro-war candidates. I co-wrote it with my former Yale professor, Bob Abelson. Then I created and taught a new course called *Social Psychology in Action.* This is where the prison study came out of, where I would teach half the course and then each week students would pick one of ten topics to teach the other half of the course. The topics were such as: what happens when people go into a mental hospital, what happens when people go to elderly care facilities, or into prisons. It was part of a new way of experimenting within a teaching framework. For me, that was a most exciting time.

Then over the years, I had a sense that students got more conservative, that the point early on was if I graduate from Stanford, I'm going to get a good job. If not the best job, it's certainly a good job. Then as students got conservative, they really no longer believed that a Stanford degree was enough, that somehow they were competing with the whole world. Then after the economic downturn in the nineties, the earlier economic crash prior to the 2008 more recent crash, students began to be worried about their careers. Many got to be much more economically conservative, politically conservative. They were less willing to experiment with life. I think that's what it was, experimenting with life. For me when I got here at Stanford, I was doing it, they were doing it. You know, it was in

the music, music of the times; it was being willing to be an antiwar activist and still be a fulltime faculty member, or student member. We had the sense we could do it all and still succeed.

Pleasant Recollections of Unusual Contributions

[00:06:46] The other thing I feel good about is that I was instrumental in starting Psi Chi, the Psychology Honor Society. Then I realized that to qualify you need a lot of credits, so kids only got into it in their senior year. Then I decided to start the Psych Club so that any psych major that had a certain number of units could get in and would be semi-honorific. Then we decided with one of my best graduate students, George Slavich, to have an annual research conference that would be national, for undergraduates. Undergraduates would organize it all, a two-day weekend conference at the end of May, which is still continuing, now bigger than ever. It's like maybe the twelfth year we've been doing it. I would give an opening lecture. I probably do so every two years. Those are some of the little things that I did at Stanford that were original and proved valuable, that I still think back on and glad I made the time to do them all.

Hartwig: There has been a resurgence of activism among students recently. What parallels do you see, or what lessons may be learned from your experience and the students around you from the 1960s and 1970s you think could make them more active and more--

Zimbardo: [00:08:17] I don't know if it's with our recent presidential election of Donald [Disaster] Trump, or it's with more of the world-changing events, and the rise of right-wing political leaders and parties--that is scary. For me, what was

always important was to have students working closely with faculty because what faculty can provide is some balance, some sense of history, some sense of what we did, it didn't work, or why don't you try doing it some other way. Again, one of the great things about our Psych Department when I was there is the whole faculty was young. I mean there was a point at which nobody was over forty. The whole Psych Department had vitality. The problem is it's started to gray, and then you lose that youthful vigor we had in those "good old days."

Now there are a lot of new young faculty who are rebuilding the department in new ways. I'm happy that students are now more active. I would be happier if there was more collaboration of faculty and students around political issues as well as academic issues. Now, the other thing that the Psych Department always had is that almost every faculty member had their own research lab. That is, the students, graduate and undergraduate, who would be working on related projects, would meet once a week. Other faculty or students could sit in, you would say I'm with the Lee Ross Lab or I'm with Fernald's [Anne Fernald] lab or another one of many. That was also special. It was like you didn't get credit for it, but it's where the real action took place. It was a point at which undergraduates could get heavily involved in research, which is relatively rare.

Oh, the other thing I should say now that I am doing some strange recollections is my role as marriage broker for some of my favorite students. The provost at Lewis and Clark College is Jerusha Detweiler [Jerusha Detweiler-Bedell], and the chairman is Brian Detweiler [Brian Detweiler-

Bedell]. Jerusha was the top student in Psych I. I used to give really tough exams and she would get 98 or 100, and Brian was my head research assistant. At some point, I had an office hour and they both happened to be there. I said, "Do you have a boyfriend?" No. "You have a girlfriend?" No. I said, "You two are ideally suited. Think about getting to know each other better."

Hartwig: [laughter] Matchmaker.

Zimbardo: [00:10:56] They ultimately got married; they have three kids. They both went to Yale, and then they decided they wanted to be in the same place. Then they went to Lewis and Clark and actually built up the Psych Department, and are happily married. They wrote a book on how to do research with undergraduates for undergraduates.

Hartwig: What are some other happy recollections or things you're most proud of?

Zimbardo: [00:11:34] I think I have always been a good family man. I mean it's part of the Sicilian tradition of family comes first. Not that it comes first before everything else, but just instilling in my kids the importance of family, allegiance to your family, going out of your way not only for your immediate family but your extended family. Christina and I have two daughters, Zara and Tanya, who we see on a regular basis. Tanya lives in San Francisco. Zara just moved to Oakland. We try to meet together for dinners here or in a restaurant. My son, Adam, by my first marriage with Rose, has given me two grandchildren, Panda, little Philip, age five, and Bunny, Victoria Leigh, age four. We go up to their home in Davis once a month or they come here, or

we Skype now. The wonderful thing about the technology is we Skype. Yes. That's really rewarding.

The two things we did that transformed all of our lives is the house that we're in now at 25 Montclair Terrace, halfway down Lombard's crooked street, we bought in 1972 for $175,000. It's a four-story townhouse with garage and a garden and stunning views. We thought that was outrageously expensive at the time. We had to take many loans from friends, family, et cetera. Now it's probably worth more than $5 million. Then also, along with Christina's family, we bought a little plot of land up in Sea Ranch, which is about two hours up on the coast. Chris's grandmother, who then was ninety, said she really wanted to have her last years near the sea, so she gave us money for an architect.

We built a beautiful house on a place called Walk on Beach. Literally you can walk onto the beach. It was designed by a famous architect, Joe Esherick [Joseph Esherick]. Esherick, Homesy [George Homesy] and somebody else had a great architectural firm. They built the aquarium in Monterey Bay and many other splendid sites. My father-in-law, George Maslach, was the dean of engineering [at UC Berkeley College of Engineering] and Esherick worked under him, so George got him to be our architect. He designed a unique house there. It's a place that all the family goes to regularly. All of us assemble there for big family holiday gatherings. And we each group [go] there separately for a weekend or a week or even longer times. It's a wonderful escape into nature.

[00:14:40] Earlier on, I wrote a number of my books there. I would just hole up for a week or two or longer, and just wrote endlessly without any of the usual local distractions. When I first wrote *Psychology and Life*, I didn't type. I wrote longhand. I wrote a hundred yellow pads double-sided. I'd write a batch of stuff, my secretary would come, to gather my scribbles, she would type it up, I'd edit by hand, bring it back to her for final typed version. When my secretary had to retire, she said you have to take Mavis Beacon's typing course where little things drop out of the sky and you shoot them down with a Y, or some other letter. I learned how to type from doing it. I can't even believe it worked so well and so fast.

Hartwig: What did you do during grad school?

Zimbardo: [00:15:36] I wrote longhand.

Hartwig: But for your dissertation, how'd you get through your dissertation?

Zimbardo: [00:15:44] I wrote longhand and gave it to a typist. I paid a lot of money to have it typed. They usually charged by the page in those days. And there could be no typos or errors, or it could not be submitted to the thesis committee. Anyway, so now I'm a good typist. But I overdid it and have had three carpal tunnel surgeries because of my heavy-duty typing. Now there's Dragon dictation--technology comes to my rescue!

Hartwig: Yes. Yes.

Zimbardo: [00:16:07] Technology is helping me out. By my last count is I probably have written more than sixty books. *Psychology and Life,* which I started in the eighth edition, was revised every three years until I quit after the nineteenth edition. *Core Concepts* is a midlevel introductory psych that I've done eight editions

with coauthors. Now I have also written and typed more than five hundred articles, both academic articles, and popular articles. I also write a monthly *Psych Today* blog. Now I also write a monthly essay in an Italian magazine and a monthly article in a Polish magazine.

Hartwig: Is there one that you're most proud of, research project or article publication?

Zimbardo: [00:17:31] Yes. I mean in a funny way, the little article I wrote in *Psychology Today* magazine, when it was just starting out, titled, "A Social Disease Called Shyness," had a huge impact. The cover is a guy standing naked in a cocktail party and nobody's looking. He is shy and is distressed no one is even noticing him despite his nakedness. Many readers wrote letters to the editor, essentially saying: I NEED HELP! And that encouraged me to give them that help.

I think I mentioned this earlier--I'll do it very quickly--is that when I finished the Stanford prison study, in September of that year--study ended in August--I'm teaching Psych I and I'm describing the study. Then at the end I said, "Why should you care? How many of you plan to be prisoners? How many plan to be guards?" None. "You know, what's the relevance of this study for you?" Then I looked at it as a metaphor, anybody who has a certain kind of personal problem sometimes imprisons himself or herself in this neurotic fantasy. Or I said, "What does it mean to be shy? Isn't shyness a self-imposed, psychological prison?"

Nobody ever says, "You're shy. Put your hand down. You're shy. Don't ask a girl for a date. You're shy. Don't ask the boss for a raise." I said,

"In a funny way, shyness is a self-imposed psychological prison in which the shy person is his own prisoner, but is also his or her own guard, because they're the one who says don't do this, don't do this, you know." A kid came up. I still remember. Bob Norwood--this is from 1972--said, "Gee. I'm really shy. Nobody's ever talked about that. Could you talk more?"

I said, "No. You know, I'm not shy. I never--"

He said, "Oh."

I said, "Look. Do a literature search and come back, you know, and we'll talk about it."

He came back and he said, "There's no research on shyness in adults. There's shyness in children." I mentioned to the class. I said, "Bob has convinced me this is an important topic to study. Nobody's studied it. If you want, I'll have a non-credit shyness seminar for shy kids." We met in the evening, twelve kids. I started by saying, "Here are the questions about shyness that there is no answer for. Your job, get the answer. Go start doing a survey of your friends."

[00:19:47] We found out 40 percent of all Stanford students were shy. Said they were shy. Forty percent said, "I used to be shy, I grew out of it." Fifteen percent said, "I'm shy in situations, on blind dates, when I have to, you know, perform in public and I'm not ready." It turns out not to be shy is the exception. I said, oh, my god, this is something worth studying. On the basis of that classroom extension of the prison study, I said, "Okay, let's study shyness." We started studying it. I got a research grant. We had

multiple studies, cross-cultural studies, experimental studies, and correlational studies.

Then the kids said, "Hey, we know enough about shyness, why don't we have a shyness clinic." So we started the shyness clinic. You know, and we had ads in the *Daily*, "Does shyness sometimes inhibit you? If so, we can help." We started with Stanford students doing the treatment for other Stanford students. Then we moved it to Stanford staff. Then Lynne Henderson came, who had just gotten a clinical degree and heard about this and said, "Hey, I'd like to supervise this." Then we moved it into the community. Thirty-five years later, the Stanford Shyness Clinic is operating at Palo Alto University's clinic setting.

In thinking back on my career the most interesting things I've done revolve around shyness. From my research on the Stanford Prison Experiment, I pulled out a central issue of how do we each create our own prisons of the mind. Then I presented it in my class as a metaphor within a new lecture, and then responded to students' interest in this topic by creating a new seminar on shyness. Out of that new course came original shyness research. Out of that new research came an original shyness treatment program and the start of a shyness treatment center. And out of all that I wrote several popular books, as well as professional articles and many conference presentations. That's probably, if I think back, the single best assortment that I've ever done which combines my interest in social problems, interest in research, interest in teaching, and then putting all of this

into a practical application and also useful information for the general public. If I had to pick one thing, it would be that.

Hartwig: That's pretty good. One final question. If you can, how would you like the future to understand you, or what do you want your legacy to be?

Zimbardo: [00:22:11] Wow. That's hard to say. What is it going to be on the tombstone? [laughter]

Hartwig: Is it okay with just being Stanford Prison Experimenter or--

Zimbardo: [00:22:22] No. [laughter] I want a different legacy; let me say why not just SPE creator, and then I will share what is my legacy preference.

The problem is that my current popular legacy is SPE bound and gagged. I'm in a taxicab in Budapest and the cab driver asks, "What do you do?"

I said, "I'm a psychologist."

He asked, "Did you ever hear about that research they did in America? They put kids in a prison?"

"Yes, I know about it very well!"

So that is the curse of the SPE. It is like an urban myth that really happened. Or students will come up to me and say, "Oh, I'm in psychology because of your experiment."

"Which one?"

"Oh, you know, the prison thing."

It will always be there only because it's *the* single most dramatic experiment ever done in social sciences. It's the equivalent of the old Sherif [Muzafer Sherif] Robbers Cave Study. Because SPE went on for hour after

hour, day after day, you could see the transformation of human character in action. All other research lasts only one hour. In Milgram's study [Stanley Milgram], the action is that men press a button or they don't press a button, or they keep pressing buttons for higher shock levels. It lasts less than one hour.

I should add, another thing I did with the Stanford prison study is to make it into a teaching tool. I created a slideshow first for my class, then I had that slideshow automated with a soundtrack that I started distributing.

I distributed it with funds from Stanford. They gave me a small grant to put the slideshow into a film that I did with an undergraduate, Ken Musen. Again, I was always interested in how do you get the ideas out into the world. So we did it with a slideshow initially. Then we made an academic little movie that was widely used. Now it's a big Hollywood movie going around the world. However, for too many people the SPE is only negative. It just simply shows how good people can turn evil.

It's not till Chapter 16 of *The Lucifer Effect* that I propose the opposite: how ordinary people can become heroes.

I don't want my tombstone to read: "He was the superintendent of that prison at Stanford." Instead, I prefer it read: "He liberated people from the prisons of the mind"

Hartwig: You're okay with that?

Zimbardo: [00:25:10] Yes. I think that on a big tombstone it could read, *"He liberated people from the prison of shyness, from the prison of ignorance, from the prison of self-*

aggrandizement, and he did it with fun, while also inspiring youth to become Everyday Heroes."

Hartwig: Phil, this has been enormously fun and influential. Thank you so much.

Zimbardo: [00:25:32] Thank you for creating these special opportunities for my historical reflection.

[End of interview with Philip G. Zimbardo]

Philip G. Zimbardo

Curriculum Vitae

EDUCATION

Brooklyn College, A.B. (Summa) Honors in Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology, 1950-1954; Phi Beta Kappa, 1953.

Yale University, M.S. 1955; Ph.D., 1959

Psychology License: # PL 4306 (since 1975; currently lapsed)

CURRENT WORK AND PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

President & Founder (2009-Present)

Heroic Imagination Project (HIP) Corporation dedicated to encouraging and exploring everyday heroism.

Executive Board Member (2009-Present)

Center for Compassion and Altruism Research and Education (c CARE), Stanford Medical School

Board Member (2009-Present)

International Positive Psychology Association (IPPA)

Professor Emeritus (2008 – Present)

Stanford University

President (2005-PRESENT)

Philip G. Zimbardo Educational Foundation (Sicily, Italy-USA Cultural Exchanges)

HONORARY DEGREES

Honorary Degree, Doctor of Humane Letters in Clinical Psychology, Pacific Graduate School of Psychology, 1996

Honorary Degree, Doctor Honoris Causa, National University of San Martin, Peru, 1996

Honorary Degree, Doctor Honoris Causa, Aristotle University, Thessaloniki, Greece, 1998

Honorary Degree, Doctor of Humane Letters, Webster University, Vienna, 2007

Honorary Degree, Doctor of Humane Letters, Brooklyn College, New York, 2008

Honorary Degree, Doctor of Humane Letters, Rutgers University, New Jersey, 2009

Honorary Degree, Doctor Honoris Causa, Lund University, Lund, Sweden, 2009

Honorary Degree, Doctor of Humane Letters, Loyola University, Chicago, 2010

Honorary Degree, Doctor of Humane Letters, University of Puget Sound, 2013

Honorary Degree, Doctor of Science, Chapman University, 2014

Honorary Degree, Doctor of Science, Krakow Academy University, 2015

Honorary Degree, Doctor of Science, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic, 2016

HONORS AND AWARDS

General

President, Western Psychological Association, 1983 & 2001

Who's Who in America, 1982 – present year

Ugliest Man on Campus (Most Popular Stanford Faculty/ Administrator), Alpha Phi Omega, 1983

Chosen by Editors of *The Sciences* to represent psychology in its 35th year celebration reflecting on the contributions in each field of science, November, 1996

Phi Beta Kappa, Distinguished Visiting Lecturer, 1989-1990

President of the American Psychological Association, 2002

Western Psychological Association, Service Award, 2003

Chair of the Council of Scientific Society Presidents (CSSP) representing more than 60 science and math societies, with 1.5 million members, 2005

President of the Western Psychological Foundation, 2005

Board Member, American Psychological Foundation, 2005 to 2008

APA, Distinguished Contributions in the Public Interest (Senior Career), 2008

Richard Lyman Award, Distinguished Lifetime Service to Stanford University, 2008

Innovations in Humanity Award, Ciudad des Ideas, Puebla, Mexico, 2009

Lifetime Achievement Award, Brooklyn College, 2010

Lifetime Achievement Award, Western Psychological Association, 2010

Lifetime Service Award, Society of Personality and Social Psychology, 2010

Fellow, American Association of Arts and Sciences (AAAS), 2010

APA Distinguished Lecturer, 2017-2018

Aurora Foundation, Keynote speaker, National Dialogues, Sept.11 Memorial, 2018

Teaching

Distinguished Teaching Award, New York University, 1965

Distinguished Teaching Award for Outstanding Contributions to Education in Psychology, American Psychological Foundation, 1975

Phoenix Award for Outstanding Teaching, Stanford Psychology Department Faculty, 1984

California Magazine, Best Psychology Teacher in California, 1986

The Walter Gores Distinguished Teaching Award, Senior Faculty, Stanford University, 1990

Bing Fellow Outstanding Senior Faculty Teaching Award, Stanford University, 1994-1997

WPA Recipient of the annual Outstanding Teaching Award, 1995

Distinguished Teaching Award, Phi Beta Kappa (Northern California Chapter), 1998

Robert Daniel Teaching Excellence Award, APA Div. 2, Society for the Teaching of Psychology, 1999

Dean's Award for Distinguished Teaching, Stanford University 1999-2000

Research

Peace Medal from Tokyo Police Dept., 1972 (special recognition of a foreign national whose research and ideas significantly contributed to improving criminal justice administration)

Fellow, Center for the Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, 1972

Gordon Allport Intergroup Relations Prize (honorable mention), 1974, Society for

Psychological Study of Social Issues (for the Stanford Prison Experiment)

Distinguished Research Contributor Award, California State Psychological Association, 1977

Psi Chi Award for contributions to the Science of Psychology, 1986

Guze Award (Society for Clinical & Experimental Hypnosis), Best Research in Hypnosis, 1989

Selected as one of ten major contributors to *Social Psychology*, Yosemite Conference on 100 Years of Experimental Social Psychology, 1997

Ernest R. & Josephine R. Hilgard Award for the Best Theoretical hypnosis paper for Society for Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis, published 1999

Distinguished Lifetime Contributions to General Psychology (APA, Division 2, 2000)

APA Division 1 award, Ernest Hilgard Award for Lifetime Contributions to General Psychology, 2000

Distinguished Contributions to Scientific Hypnosis (APA, Division 30, 2001)

Psychology Today Magazine, Mental Health Award for Research and Treatment of Shyness, 2001

Distinguished Contribution to Psychology as a Profession, California Psychological Association, 1998

Los Angeles County Psychological Association: Psyche Award for Lifetime Contributions to Psychology as a Science and Art (2000)

Distinguished Lifetime Contributions to Psychology, California Psychology Association, 2003

Ig Nobel Prize In Psychology, 2003, AIR, Harvard University

Nobel Prize in Psychology (Virtual) 2004, Klagenfurt University, Austria

Havel Foundation Vision 97 Award, 2005, for lifetime of research contributions to knowledge

Carl Hovland Distinguished Lecturer, Yale, 2005

Group Psychologist of the Year, APA Division 49, 2007

Writing

National Media Award (honorable mention), American Psychological Foundation, 1973 (for popular writing on vandalism)

William Holmes McGuffey Award for *Psychology and Life*, for Excellence and Longevity, (Textbook Authors Association) 1995

New England Council of Latin American Studies (NECLAS) prize for the best book published on Latin American Studies in 2002 (***Violence Workers in Brazil***)

William James Award for best book published in psychology in 2007 (***The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil***). Also New York Times bestseller.

Charactery Award. Super-Hero writer as best foreign writer whose books have influenced generations of Polish readers, 2017.

Media

Senior Academic Advisor, Host, Writer and Narrator of *Discovering Psychology*, (A 26-part PBS TV series on psychology, Annenberg/CPB project, 1986-1989)

London Weekend Television (Granada Media), "The Human Zoo" Three Programs, Chief Scientific Advisor and On-Screen Expert, 1999.

STC (Society for Technical Communication) International Audiovisual Competition Award of Excellence for "The Power of the Situation" (*Discovering Psychology* video series), 1991

Columbus International Film & Video Festival Bronze Plaque Award for "The Developing Child" (*Discovering Psychology* video series), 1992

International Film & TV Festival of New York Finalist Certificate for "Past, Present and Promise" (*Discovering Psychology* video series), 1992

WPA Film Festival Award of Excellence for "The Responsive Brain" and "Social Psychology"
(*Discovering Psychology* video series), 1992

WPA Spring Festival first place award for *Quiet Rage: The Stanford Prison Study* video, 1993

WPA Spring Festival first place award for *Candid Camera Classics in Social Psychology* Video, 1993

APA Presidential Citation for outstanding contributions to psychology for the *Discovering Psychology* video series, 1994

Champions of Mental Health, *Psychology Today Awards*, 2001. (One of eight national figures honored)

Psychological Consultant, New Programming for NBC TV, 2002.

Emmy Award, New England Instructional Television, Host, Cognitive-Neuroscience (*Discovering Psychology* Video Series), 2002

WPA Spring Festival, First Place Award for Cultural Psychology (*Discovering Psychology* Video Series), 2002

Carl Sagan Award for Promoting Public Understanding of Science, Awarded by Council of Scientific Society Presidents, 2002

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Post Doctoral Trainee - West Haven Veteran's Hospital, Clinical Psychology Dept., 1959-1960

Co-Director (with Dr. S. Sarason), Children's Test Anxiety Research Project, Yale University, 1959-1962

Created, Directed The Harlem Summer Program, "A Head Start-Black Pride" Daily Program

Staffed by NYU and CCNY Students in Harlem (1965)

Training and research consultant in hypnosis, Morton Prince Clinic, New York, 1963-1967

Co-Director (with Dr. Ernest Hilgard), Stanford Hypnosis Research Lab, 1969-1980

Director, Stanford University Social Psychology Graduate Research Training Program

Founder, Co-Director (with Dr. L. Henderson), Shyness Clinic/ Shyness Institute, 1975-2007

Senior Scientific Advisor, writer, narrator, *Discovering Psychology,* PBS-TV/ Annenberg Corp Video series (1989, updated 2001)

Executive Director (2005-2012) Center for Interdisciplinary Policy, Education, and Research on Terrorism (CIPERT)

Distinguished Senior Fellow (2002-2012) Center for Homeland Defense and Security, Naval Postgraduate School (NPS)

President (2005) Western Psychological Foundation

TEACHING

Instructor/Assistant Professor, Yale University, 1957-1960

Assistant Professor, New York University, 1960-1967

Columbia University (1967-68; Klingenstein Professor of Race Relations)

Professor, Stanford University, 1968 to 2003, Emeritus currently

Senior Fellow, Monterey Naval Postgraduate School, 2002-2011

Professor, Palo Alto University, 2007-2014

Visiting Professor: Yale (1962), Stanford (Summer 1963), Barnard College (1966), University of Louvain (Belgium) Part-time (Summer 1966), University of Texas (1967), University of Hawaii (Summer 1973), International Graduate School of Behavioral Sciences, Florida Institute of Technology at Lugano, Switzerland (Summer, 1978), Guanajuato University (Summer, 1985), University of Warsaw (Summer 2000), Master Program, Visiting Professor of Social Psychology, Webster University, Vienna, (2007).

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

American Psychological Association (APA), Fellow; Div. 1(F), 2(F), 3(F), 8(F), 9(F), 13(LM), 15(F), 26(LM), 45, 46(LM), 48(F), 52(F)

Association for Advancement of Psychology (AAP)

American Psychological Society (APS), Fellow

Charter Fellow Canadian Psychological Association (CPA)

Western Psychological Association (WPA), Fellow

Eastern Psychological Association (EPA), Fellow

California State Psychological Association (CSPA)

International Association of Applied Psychology (IAAP)

International Congress of Psychology (ICP)

International Positive Psychology Association (IPPA)

Society for Inter-American Psychology

Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI)

American Association for Advancement of Science (AAAS), Fellow

Society for Experimental Social Psychology (SESP)
Society for Advancement of Social Psychology (SASP)
Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP)
Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, Psi Chi
American Association of University Professors (AAUP)
Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PSR)
Council of Scientific Society Presidents (CSSP)
Italian American Psychology Assembly (IAPA)

CONSULTATIONS AND BOARDS

Research Consultant, Morton Prince Clinic for Hypnotherapy (New York City)
Asthma Research Unit, Cornell Medical School (New York City)
Tokyo Police Department
Wake Up! Louisiana (New Orleans Citizens' Group)
Public Advocates Law Offices (San Francisco)
Charles Garry Law Offices–expert witness, prison litigation, Senate subcommittee on prisons and juvenile delinquency
Japanese internment reparations hearings (San Francisco)
San Francisco Newspaper Agency (Senior Project Research Consultant)
Cristaldi Films, Rome, Italy (Consultant on "Control" film)
SRI International Consultant to PSI Phenomena Project (Oversight Committee)
San Francisco Exploratorium, Consultant to APA Traveling Museum Exhibit, and Memory Project
Executive Board for the Holocaust Study Center, Sonoma State University
Advisory Panel for the Center on Postsecondary Learning, Teaching and Assessment
Board of Advisors, *Psychology Today* Magazine
Consulting Editor, McGraw Hill Publishers, Social Psychology Series
Historian, Western Psychological Association (1984-2000)
Editorial Board, *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*
Editorial Board, *Journal of Social Issues*
Institute for Research on Social Problems

Contributing Editor, *Healthline*

Advisory Board, The Foundation for Grand parenting

Advisory Board, End Violence Against the Next Generation (California)

Advisory Board, North American Journal of Psychology

Honorary Member, Italian Inter-university Center for the Study and Research on the Origins and

Development of Prosocial and Antisocial Motivations

Consultant, Live Entertainment, Hollywood, "Stanford Prison Experiment" film

Advisor, London Weekend Television, "Human Zoo" 3 programs on group behavior, shown on Discovery Channel

Advisor, BBC, Human Rights, Human Wrongs Program: "Five Steps to Tyranny,"

Founder, Scientific Advisor, RealPsychology.com

Consultant, NBC TV, ABC TV

Consultant, Coup d'Etat Films, Hollywood, "Stanford Prison Experiment" film

Honorary Committee, Jan Karski Institute

INTERNATIONAL INVITED ADDRESSES, WORKSHOPS, PRESENTATIONS

Conventions and Associations

International Congress of Psychology (in Bonn, London, Tokyo, Mexico City, Brussels, Stockholm. Berlin); International Congress of Applied Psychology, International Social Psychology Conference (in Majorca, Spain, and Budapest); Canadian Psychological Association, Japanese Psychological Association, Japanese Social Psychological Association, German Psychological Society, Greek Psychological Association, Spanish Social Psychological Association, European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, European Association of Personality Psychology, World Congress on Eclectic Hypnotherapy in Psychology (Ixtapa), International Conference on Time (San Marino, Italy); International Convention on Shyness and Self Consciousness (Cardiff, Wales), Mexican Psychological Society, Cammarata, Sicily Conference on Italian-American Culture Confrontations, Australian Psychological Society, Hawaiian Psychological Association, Palermo, Sicily, First Conference of Sicilian Psychologists and Italian-American Psychologists, Royal

Society of Arts, London, A Level UK High School student conference, Edinburgh and London, British Psychological Society, School of Life

Universities

University of Salamanca, University of Barcelona; The Sorbonne; University of Paris (Ecole des Hautes Etudes), University of Rome, University of Bologna, Catholic University of Milan, University of Naples, University of Parma; Oxford University, East London University, Central London University, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Silesian University, Business School of Warsaw,
University of Cardiff, Open University-Birmingham, England; University of Thessaloniki, University of Athens; University of Louvain; Hamburg University; Tokyo University, Kyoto University, Okinawa University, Osaka University; University of Sao Paolo, University of Rio de Janeiro; Guanajuato University; University of British Columbia, Calgary University, University of Alberta, Toronto University, McGill University, University of New Foundland; Chinese University of Hong Kong, Deree College, (Athens), Webster University (Vienna), Advanced School of Social Psychology (Warsaw, & Wroclaw), Warsaw University, School of Management, State University of Moscow, St. Petersburg University (Russia), Cambridge University, Doha College, Qatar, Oman College, Oman

DOMESTIC LECTURES, WORKSHOPS, PRESENTATIONS

Conventions and Associations

American Psychological Association, American Psychological Society, Eastern Psychological Association, Western Psychological Association, Midwestern Psychological Association, South Eastern Psychological Association, Rocky Mountain Psychological Association, New England Psychological Association, American Psychiatric Association, American Ortho-psychiatric Association, American Association for the Advancement of Science, New York Academy of Sciences, Society for Experimental Social Psychology, Federation of Behavioral, Cognitive and Social Sciences, Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, Society for Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis, National Conference on Law Enforcement, Smithsonian Institute,

Annenberg Foundation, American Association of Behavior Therapy, Anxiety Disorders Association of America, California School of Professional Psychology (Fresno and Berkeley), Pacific Graduate School of Psychology, Eriksonian Conference on New Developments in Therapy, National Conference on Teaching, Texas Junior College Convention. Veteran's Administration Hospital Psychology Programs in Palo Alto, Menlo Park, CA., Bronx, NY, Society for Research in Child Development, California Psychological Association, Midwest Institute for Teachers of Psychology, CATO Institute, Aspen Institute Festival of Ideas, TED, Technology, Entertainment and Design (2008, 09,10), United Nations Psychology Day, Evolution in Psychotherapy Conference, Positive Psychology Conference, Hero Roundtable Conference, Compassion and Science Conference

Georgetown University, Cal Tech University, Harvard Law School, MIT Business School, Scripps College/Claremont-McKenna, University of Akron, Bucknell University, Columbus State C.C., Cal State University at Monterey Bay, Brooklyn College, University of Puerto Rico, San Francisco State University, Nova South East University (Ft. Lauderdale), New York University Business School, U. North Carolina, Asheville, United States Military Academy (West Point), United States Naval Academy (Annapolis), D'Anza C.C., Florida State University, University of Puget Sound, Chapman University, USC, UCLA, Folsom Lake College,

MEDIA PRESENTATIONS, APPEARANCES, INTERVIEWS ON TV & RADIO

"*Discovering Psychology*" Series, 26 episodes shown nationally on PBS and internationally in 10 Countries (from 1989 to present)

The Phil Donahue Show, 20/20, Night Line, The Today Show, and Good Morning America (several appearances on each show); Charlie Rose Show, Tom Snyder Show, The Daily Show with John Stewart and The Colbert Report on Comedy Central,

That's Incredible, Not For Women Only, To Tell The Truth, NBC *Chronolog*, People Are Talking,

BBC, CNN, National Public Radio, KGO Radio, Live 105 San Francisco Radio, Milt Rosenberg Radio Interview Program (Chicago), Italian TV-RAI (Shyness Program

on Quark), Stanford Television Network, The Discovery Channel Program on Torture. 60 Minutes, and, London Weekend TV/ Discovery Channel program on the "Human Zoo," Only Human, NBC/Discovery Channel, Terri Gross, Fresh Air, Amy Goodman, Democracy Now, Wolf Blitzer, CNN Reports, New York Times video blog interview, Claudia Dreifus, Pete Wilson, KGO Radio, CBS Early Morning AM and Late Night TV Shows in NYC, LA, Chicago, Seattle, Washington, DC, Atlanta, Detroit, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Boston, Vancouver; Canadian Broadcasting Company,

INTERVIEWER/ON-STAGE CONVERSATION SERIES

Public interviews/conversations for California Academy of Sciences and S. F. City Arts & Lecture Series) with:
Anna Deveare Smith, Oliver Sachs, Jonathan Miller, Robert Coles, Andrew Weil, Frank Sulloway, Sarah Lawrence Lightfoot, Elizabeth Marshall Thomas, Mary Catherine Bateson, Peter Funt (son of Allen Funt), Frank Sulloway, and Michael Gazzaniga.

Conversations on Compassion with Dr. James Doty, Center for Compassion and Altruism Research and Education lecture series

Public conversation Holocaust Memorial Museum 20th anniversary Lecture Series: San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Washington D.C.

PUBLICATIONS

As of winter 2018, Zimbardo has written more than 600 publications, including over sixty books in many areas of psychology.

NOTE: Information on Philip G. Zimbardo's recent research and publications is available on his personal web site at http://www.zimbardo.com/zimbardo.html.

Topics

Interviewer

Daniel Hartwig has been the Stanford University Archivist since 2010. From 2006-2010, he was the Records Services Archivist at Yale University. Previously, Hartwig was Assistant Archivist and Digital Projects Developer at Ball State University from 2004-2006 and Archives Reference Assistant at the Wisconsin Historical Society from 2002-2004. A graduate of the University of Iowa, he holds an MA from Indiana University and a MLIS from the University of Wisconsin.