

The following content is provided by MIT OpenCourseWare, under a Creative Commons license. Additional information about our license, and MIT OpenCourseWare in general, is available at ocw.mit.edu.

TAFT BROOME: Goethe, Thomas Mann, and Christopher Marlowe-- so they thought this was a great story. There is some-- there's something truthful about Faust. Apparently there was a Faust. We're passing these around.

And his story is a little bit-- for me, I haven't delved into it, but it's-- to me, it's very similar to the true story-- the true part of the story of Nostradamus. That they lived around the same time, they were both physicians, and they both got some notoriety for what they were doing in helping people with the plague-- the Black Plague.

Apparently they had some thoughts that cleanliness had something to do with the plague. And it turns out they were right. We didn't find that out until many years later, that it was this flea on the rats. But they had something to do with burning clothes, and burning blankets, and washing-- or cutting your hair and washing up. And so people thought that they were mystical. And people would write about them.

Now, it'd be good for you to sort the truth-- the whole truth of that story, and bring it back to class, if you get the inclination. But the point that I want to bring is the Faustian contract. And we've talked about that.

Now, let's do a little review. But I'm going to review in a manner that gets us ready for this discussion today. I want to put it in a little bit more sophisticated context than before.

First principles-- we ask ourselves, does ethics have first principles, and a logic from which we deduce or argue good and bad behavior, right and wrong action, from those principles. Let's take stock of the other learned disciplines. Let's write down some learned disciplines. And let's ask ourselves, do they have first principles?

A starting point is with philosophy itself. And we can talk about first principles in a theory called teleology, which is the study of ends and means. And if we look at the contents of the other learned disciplines, we'll find teleology there, with different names.

Let's go to the-- let's go to the sciences. In the sciences, the application of teleology to the methods of the sciences will have us arrive at what they call ultimate causes. Now, there was a time when Newton came up with his law, F equals ma , and said that F equals ma was a law of nature, that was the cause of a body to accelerate, or to explain how a body accelerates. If you ask what was the cause of F equals ma , that was the end.

Now, Einstein came up with another one, E equals mc^2 . But if you add-- and says that's the cause of F equals ma . F equals ma is a special case. Then, if you ask what is the cause of E equals mc^2 , what do you get? That's the way the world is. Right, that's an end.

Can you think of any more ends in the sciences? And it's interesting how the word end is used. It's not the last, it's actually the first in your logic.

AUDIENCE: I think in cosmology, if you can explain the cause of the big bang.

TAFT BROOME: The Big Bang Theory.

AUDIENCE: Yes.

TAFT BROOME: OK, someone says there's a Big Bang Theory. That the world was caused by the-- I mean that the universe was caused by this Big Bang. Do you ask them what caused the Big Bang?

AUDIENCE: If you knew the intro to that, that would be an end.

TAFT BROOME: That would be an end. But right now, the Big Bang is the end. All right? Any others? How about mathematics? Well, one is the action. And by definition, what is an axiom? Well, I've got a definition, unless you want to give one.

It's not merely a proposition that is assumed to be true without proof. One has to prove, well, that an axiom does not have a higher cause. That's the starting point.

Now one thing that I think that a college education is supposed to do, even in mathematics, is to give you at least one experience-- maybe two-- where you solve a problem from a first principle. You go all the way back to the beginning, solve that problem-- and go right on up through to the solution, 7.29 feet per second squared.

The Theorem of Pythagoras-- is that a first principle or does it have a proof? Can you prove it? A squared is equal to B squared plus C squared. You can prove it. Yeah, you can prove it.

The trick is that the theorem is stated in algebra, but the proof is in geometry. Remind you how to get started-- start with a triangle like this, And then a squared is the area of that square, c squared is the area of that square, b squared is the area of that square.

And then if you're clever about how you organize these, you can prove that this plus that is equal to that. No algebra, just looking at it. And you don't have to draw to scale, cut it out, and put one on top of the other. You can just prove that this whole thing is a square. Try it sometime.

How about in the military? Well, when I was in the army, there was a theory called strategy and tactics. And you look at what your mission is. You look at where you're standing. You figure out a way to go from where you are to where you're going.

That was the outline of the strategy. There's was a-- there are some good ways to understand strategy and tactics through the game of chess, and the other games that we call sports. So one way-- anybody here an athlete?

AUDIENCE: I used to be [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: You used to be? What?

AUDIENCE: I played volleyball.

TAFT BROOME: You played volleyball?

AUDIENCE: Mm-hmm.

TAFT BROOME: Oh. One time at Howard, the School of Engineering organized two volleyball teams. And both sides were made up of students, the staff, and faculty. But they were divided between the men and women. So we decided to have this big game, right before a final exam.

And the men felt we were going to win, because we could spike them. You know, we got in there and we lost. And I'll tell you why. It was because the women could return some of those spikes. They could get down and the men couldn't. And so whenever we spiked on them, we could get 20% of them returned. Whenever they spiked on us, it was a clear point. It was a clear point.

In sports-- let's say in basketball, you might have five little guys playing five big guys. And the question is, how are we little guys going to beat the big guys? All right? Well, we're going to set up a game strategy. And that's an overall rule that we try to implement all of the time.

We won't be able to implement it all of the time. But it's an overall rule. And the overall rule is to run the ball. Outrun them. Make them tired. Now, a tactic, for us, is an opportunity that sometimes we can force. Very few times can we force, but as a matter-- it's an opportunity that arises, and you've got to recognize that it's arising, and you take full advantage of it.

And one of them is called the open shot, the open man. That is, somebody is standing out on the court and nobody's guarding them. If you run around enough, you might get all of the big guys clumped together, somewhere. And there's one little guy standing out there. So if that arises, throw the ball to the little guy. And a little guy can take his time, and shoot the ball-- got a high percentage shot.

Strategy and tactics-- it's the application of teleology to sports. Any others? Business-- it is the study of ends and means-- formal study of ends and means. we. Could go on and on and on. Anybody got some others, from other disciplines?

All right, let's-- yeah?

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: Say it again? Maxwell's equation. I would put that under physics but let's talk about it. Maxwell's equations--

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: Well, let's put it this way. Here's a good way to start with it. If there's anything that you can derive Maxwell's equations from, I don't know about it. I've never looked higher into that. But if you can find-- I don't know, on the web or just by asking somebody-- if there is a higher principle, then bring it back to class.

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: Business.

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: They adept strategic theory. It's not it's not the only theory that they use. But definitely, if you're in business, you're going to talk about the bottom line. And when you talk about the profit, the end is profit and you have various means to those ends.

AUDIENCE: Government.

TAFT BROOME: Who?

AUDIENCE: Government.

TAFT BROOME: Political science?

AUDIENCE: Yeah.

TAFT BROOME: All right. Now, we could argue whether or not political science is actually a science. But it is definitely a learned discipline. Maybe we could maybe we can divide political science up into two parts-- something that we could legitimately call a science, and call it political science, and something else we call politics.

And it is possible that-- and it's more than likely that the very successful politician never, ever took a course in political science. But the smart ones get some advice from the political scientists. And there's a theory-- not the only one, but there's a theory about political science-- that political-- a philosophical theory a philosophy of political science, that political science is the study of the uses of power.

AUDIENCE: Power?

TAFT BROOME: Power-- that the end-- yeah, what is the end, then? Is power the means or is power the end?

AUDIENCE: I think is that the end of political science is a well governed society or a just society, some [INAUDIBLE] society [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: OK.

AUDIENCE: Maybe [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: No, let's penetrate that a little bit. Let's play a game. There is a philosophy of law-- and incidentally, anybody know the discipline that is called-- that also goes by the name philosophy of law? Jurisprudence. There's a theory of jurisprudence.

And probably, is it's handed down to us from a man named-- he's an Englishman, so he has three initials and then a last name, HLA and the last name is Hart, H-A-R-T. And Hart says that the end of law is social order. Then we'll talk about whether it's good or bad. But we got to have an ordered society, before we can talk about-- make it good or bad. So the end for him-- notice how I jumped to law, because they I know what I'm talking about. I have not studied political science like this. But the end, for Hart, in law is first, an ordered society.

AUDIENCE: What do you mean by ordered?

TAFT BROOME: A society that's intact. That people are not going out doing whatever they want to do. That there may be some minimum principles in that, that he talks about. But basically he's talking about a society that is held together as a unit. If you can make a distinction between a collection of people and a society of people, and we're talking about the society.

AUDIENCE: What he meant was there's often [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: Yes. Yes. That they're held together as a whole, instead of an anarchistic, individualistic collection of people.

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE] political science is to [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: Yeah, power politics is what they call it. Is power-- now, let's go back to the question-- is power the means or the end? I tell you what I think. In political science, I think power is the end. You get the power, then let's worry about how are we going to use it. I think the ideal falls into another category.

Now, let me point you to something else that is germane to what this lecture is going to be about today. And this is a formal term. This will put us in the mood for today. And I'll get to it in about five minutes. Still got something else to do. Now, social contract theory. Now, project yourself to a time-- the last half of the 18th century, the first half of the 19th century. The last half-- no, the last quarter of the 18th century, the first third of the 19th century.

OK, what was going on? 1776-- American Revolution. 1789-- French Revolution. I think it was around 1803-- somewhere around in there-- that the Holy Roman Empire fell. So we could go on. There's some more. But the point is, you're sitting down and you're talking about governmental regimes that had been in place for many years-- hundreds of years-- all of a sudden collapse.

And you've got scholars sitting around, saying, how can we replace it with something better? That produced a lot of great thinkers. In France, the greatest thinker was who Rousseau. In England, probably one of the greatest was-- and Rousseau's, think his was the *Second Treatise on Government*. The

One in England was Thomas-- was Hobbes, H-O-B-B-E-S. you've heard of his great book, called *Leviathan*. Before them were some others. And I'll just name one, because I'm breaking them up into types, was Machiavelli.

But you had all of these thinkers. And they're called social contractarians. Because these great works-- I have to emphasize this, because when I tell you what the method used in these great works, you're going to triv-- it's only natural to trivialize it. The method is very trivial, when you look at it at first. But these people wrote the greatest works on government in the Western world. Not in the whole world, but in the Western world. Europe, mainly Western Europe, the United States, Canada, England, all of that.

Their method was to tell a story. And here's what they did. They said, let's imagine a state where a-- state, I don't mean a political state, I mean a state of being. Let's imagine a state of when there is no government. There's total chaos out here. People are running amok. And we decide that we're going to make a whole new government out of this.

So what we're going to do is pick a set-- a collection of people, 20 people. Have them come into a room and say to them, don't come out until you've got the articles of government. What would they come up with? The operative word here is the word would. So you tell a story. And then you come back, and say the ideal government is what they would come up with.

That's how this was done. That's how the United States was grounded, on Rousseau and many of the others that you can find. They told a story. That's incredible, isn't it? You look at it and tell a story.

Hobbes' story is the most famous only because-- when I say most famous, I'm talking about outside of the scholars-- because he had some-- he was clever with words. And he talked about the state of nature being nasty, brutish, and short. Life being nasty, brutish, and short-- people remember that. But these were great pieces of work.

So what I want to do is ask-- so the first principle, then, is a story. You don't ask, why did they come up with that story? You say, well, they would come up with this story. Reasonable people would come up with this story. How would they argue it out?

That all goes back to Plato. Plato told us about-- Plato, so probably his greatest works are called *Dialogues*. It was a fictitious story about him having a talk with Socrates. Socrates was dead at the time. The story is very powerful.

Let's go to ethics, and then we'll-- what are the first principles there? Well, ethics is going to do the same thing that these other disciplines are going to do. The first thing they're going to do is to study or to look at the problem the same way that a person would who is studying metaphysics.

Now, what does metaphysics mean? Well, the first thing is, don't get confused by the word. It looks something-- the word metaphysics would, at first, tell you I've got a prefix here over the word physics. And Meta means higher, or above, or beyond in some kind of way. And physics is the study of physical nature. All right, so something beyond all of that.

That's not where this word comes from. When Aristotle's works were rediscovered-- rediscovered in the Western world, where did they rediscover them from? I'll tell you. Islam. Because during the Islamic period of domination of the West, they recovered the Greek works, translated them, and held them in libraries. And when they were receded back to Arabia, that then their books were rediscovered.

And some of the-- and there was this one book that was discovered of Aristotle's that didn't have a name on it. It wasn't entitled. It wasn't titled. And apparently it wasn't finished. But it came after his book of physics.

[LAUGHS] So that's how the word metaphysics comes into being. And if you look at the world-- if you look at a problem like a person who studies metaphysics would, the first thing you do is break up the world in the parts. And traditionally there are three parts-- the mental world, and the material world-- and

Before I go any further, there is a problem that my most precious encyclopedia of philosophy says is the most persistent problem in all of philosophy. It's called the mind-body problem. Better stated for us today, what's the difference between the mind and the brain? That's a rhetorical question that makes you want to-- what is the difference between the mind and the brain? That's a good question, isn't it?

And the other one is, I will call it the mystical world. This includes the spiritual world, but includes some other worlds, too. I'll tell you how we're going to get there.

The material world we can break up into parts. We can say that there is a social world, and then there's the natural world. Can we break them up-- and we can say there is the physical world. We can call the natural world the physical world.

If we talk about physics, as opposed to sociology-- we're talking about two kinds of sciences. But the objects of this study are two different-- they belong in the two different worlds. But they all belong to the material world.

Now, the mental world-- if we talk about the mental world as being a world of the rational and the non-rational, then you'll be comfortable sitting around with a number of philosophers talking about the mental world. You'll be more comfortable, in this class, if you talk about the conscious world and the unconscious.

Now, the conscious mind is susceptible to reason. It's not always reasonable. The conscious mind, we say, unless you're out of your mind, is susceptible to reason. Reason will bend you into some of complicity, they claim. There's a word-- there's a term called the Socratic dictum. This is formal, Socratic dictum.

It says that-- let me see if I can quote it exactly. If I can't, I'll give you a reasonable translation. Knowledge of the good will compel a commitment to the good.

Now, the rational-- the conscious mind will have some apprehension of data, that it will say belongs to the material world. We do this all the time. This is what we do 99.9% of our lives. We have a conscious mind, and we look over here, and we say there's a chair. That belongs to the material world. I've got a mental world, but my mind can learn-- tell me something about it through what it's called sense data. That's the conscious mind.

The unconscious mind-- and the best way to understand the unconscious mind is not to open up a psychology book, but to think about what you dream. Do you ever remember your dreams? You remember them?

AUDIENCE: Sometimes.

TAFT BROOME: Sometimes. The good news is sometimes. If you remembered them all the time, you'd be in the world-- what we call a world of hurt. I remember all of mine, every morning. Man, I remember all of them. There are some truths in your unconscious. Your mind can't face certain kinds of truths. So there's some truths down there.

But when your unconscious sees those truths, guess what the unconscious is going to do? It's going to do the same thing that of conscience does. It's going to put those truths in a different world. I want to call that the mystical world. Yes?

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE]. between the number in the social work and the [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: Yeah.

AUDIENCE: But if social work gets [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: Oh, I know.

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: Yeah.

AUDIENCE: So [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: These divisions-- I think a good word for it-- they're artificial. And there is a substantial overlap.

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: Depending on how you talk about it, there definitely is a lot of overlap. So a social scientist is talking-- well, let's ask ourselves, what's the difference between sociology and psychology? Psychology wants to study you. But in order to study you, we have to understand how you fit in with other people.

Sociology wants to study all of us, as a unit. But how can we do that without talking about some individuals? So, yeah, it's one of those things where the more you read about the stuff and talk about it, you'll just get to see what other people mean. It doesn't mean that there's anything wrong with what you just apprehended at first. All right?

In ethics, we've already seen that first principles-- that Kant gave us a first principle, in the mental world, for ethics, called the categorical imperative. We've already seen that Mill and Bentham and others have given us a first principle for ethics in the material world, and that is the happiness principal.

There's first there's a first principle of ethics in the spiritual world. We call it religious ethics. And that has to do with God's will. But the one that I want to study today is not in the spiritual world. It's in another part of the mystical world. And it comes from Plato, even though he is said to have a powerful atheology.

And what it says is that there is something that is not entirely mental and not entirely material, and that it is a clear understanding of character, and that character is a subset of the good. And for him-- Plato-- good character was defined in terms of the possession of virtues.

And the virtues came from mythology. And the first principle, therefore, for Plato-- and the way I teach Plato underscores that, because other people will teach Plato differently. The first principle under Plato was actually mythology. Now he would say that there is an idea of the perfection of the good. And we can give it a name. We can call it God.

But I think that Plato, when he comes up with these virtues and says that a human being can aspire to be a heroic god, that we're really talking about a kind of religion that goes by a different name-- mythology. That it really preceded formal religion, and when they built pagan religion on philosophy it was just what I just said. It's a way of thinking about philosophy-- is the way of thinking about mythology in philosophical and ceremonial terms. It's still mythology.

So the first principle is-- I'm going to argue the first principle is actually mythology. Why-- what is the cause of mythology? I'm not going to say that it's not-- it's the writers. You know, mythology was one of these things that evolved. There were a lot of writers. Many of the writers did not put their names to what they wrote, because they didn't want to take ownership for it.

They finally-- over time, it settled into a story that had lasting value and nobody knew why. There are just some stories that you will take with to the grave. And other stories are more entertaining. Other stories might have more meaning to you, for the time. But if you live to be 90 years old, and can remember some stories, there will only be a few that you will still remember, and still pass on to your great-great-grandchildren.

So there's something mystical about mythology. Mythology is not only mystical in its content, but it's mystical in its context-- what it does to you. Now what I'm going to do now is tell you a mythical story that when I say it's part legend and part fantasy-- if somebody says that it's a legend, which is part truth and part fantasy, then I'm going to say no, it's mythology, because there's two different kinds of truth. One is what your conscious mind sees, and one is what your unconscious mind sees.

So if there's a fear that you have-- and I'll tell you about one of my fears that I had early in life-- and your conscious mind does not want to think about it and that fear gets projected down in your unconscious as a dragon, in that unconscious mind, that dragon is just as real as that chariot, because you've taken the truth and put it someplace else.

So I want to tell something. And when I get to the end of it, I'll give you some-- I'll give you some references for it. As a matter of fact, I'll do something better. I'll give you your papers back tomorrow. I'll give you hard copies, and I'll save some for you all of references.

OK, so if I had my way, the best way to tell this story would be out there by the river. Everybody's laying back. And you're allowing your mind to do what Freud called free associate.

So to the best of our abilities in these surrounds, let's try to free associate. So if you want to put your foot up on the table, OK. If you want to go out and get a beer, that's not OK.

But you'll have to-- the more you anticipate what's going on, the more you try to figure out what is the point of all of this, the more you try to figure out, well, how can I take a test in this, the less you're going to appreciate. And you're going to miss the real point. I promise you, there is some deep points in here. I promise you that.

But if you look for them, you will not find them. They have to come through. So you ready? All right.

OK, first of all, I have to get-- see, I came up in a storytelling family. And everybody would turn off the television. The kids would lay on the floor. The old folks would just tell stories. And my younger brother would go to sleep, and he'd fight it.

So this is natural for me. All right, the story goes as-- there are 1, 2, 3, 4 stories. And they are connected.

The first story begins right after World War one I. So we're talking 1918. And two of my grand uncles, brothers of my grandmother on my paternal-- maternal side were over there. And they came back home to a small town in Pennsylvania called Milton, Pennsylvania. And they discovered that their parents had died. And that their eight brothers and sisters, younger brothers and sisters, were in the house with their oldest sister, who had come back to take care of them when the parents died while they were away and had brought two of her kids.

Her name was Irene. The boys that came home were Roy and Thornton. So they sat down and had a big meeting and tried to decide what are we going to do.

Now, the oldest person in the room is, what, 24. And there were a whole bunch of young ones in there, two years old, four years old. Some of their young-- one of their younger brothers was six years old.

So the question, what are we going to do, was a question. Why was it a question? You know what you got to do. You got to take care of all those kids.

That was a question because something had just begun around that time. It was called, later, the Harlem Renaissance. You see, around that time-- around that time, Blacks no longer wanted to just get a job.

They want a PhD. They wanted to write musicals. They wanted to do all of these great things. The NAACP was invented around 1911.

But now you're talking about people like Satchmo. I mean, Satchmo just didn't write some good music. Satchmo went to Europe. And there's another story about Satchmo that I can tell about how it was that two Nobel Laureates in physics went to see Satchmo one night and how they wrote down after it was that they found out that they were not the only people dealing with a new dimension in time. And Satchmo had gotten some fame because he had just hit a note on a trumpet that the scholars had said a trumpet was not capable of.

So people were going to see Satchmo who didn't want to hear-- who weren't interested in jazz. They just wanted to hear if this man could hit the note. And when he got to this one place in Paris, he hit-- he hit that note and another one above it. Louis Armstrong.

So these were times when that was a real question, what are we going to do? I want to get a PhD. I don't want to sit here with 12 kids and work. What am I going to do?

All right, so they-- Irene came up with this great idea. Irene said, well, why don't you two, who just come back, go to college? But when you finish college, don't just go out and pursue your destiny. Come back and help the rest of them.

That's the deal. In the meantime, I'll keep a roof over their head and food in their stomach. So they agreed that was the plan.

So Roy and Thornton found out-- somebody told them that there was a college that let Black folks in. It was called Oberlin. Actually, in 1867, there was Howard and a whole bunch of others, but they didn't know anything about that.

So they went down to Oberlin. And they had this-- they went down to Oberlin, and Harry was another one of the brothers. He was younger. He stole away in the wagon with them. And they had to send the wagon back, because they didn't own it.

So they went over to Oberlin, and they said, we want to start college. And somebody said, OK, do you have tuition? And they didn't know what the word tuition meant.

So they had to go start working. So they're working, and they're working. And they're not making enough money for tuition.

They come up with a brilliant idea. They take their money, and they go out and they buy this horse. And they make an appointment with the academic dean. And they go over there.

And the dean said, OK, what do you boys want? And they said, look out the window, Dean. What do you see out there? He said, well, I see a horse tied to a tree.

And so they said, you know what we see? We see this school here with all these rich kids and y'all don't even teach a horseback riding course. And the dean said, well, what do y'all propose to do about it?

They said, we'll use that horse, and we'll teach horseback riding. He said, well, what would you charge? They said, tuition.

Roy came out of there-- out of that experience, went to Bucknell, got a degree in engineering, became the first African-American to be a registered professional engineer in the state of Pennsylvania, became the first African-American to be a member of the Engineers Club of Philadelphia. Harry graduated from Oberlin, went on to-- got his PhD from the University of Chicago and taught at Howard. And Thornton left there and went to Canada and became the first African-American to be a big-game hunting guy.

The story is that they all went back, and they helped the rest of them go to college. And that's the end of the first story. Now, what I shall do and what I do in this document that I'll show you and why that story became a scholarly story is that what I want to-- what I demonstrate in there is that the story illustrates two kinds of mythic heroism.

Irene had one. Roy and Thornton had another one. And Harry had another one.

And I want to say that all of the attributes of a heroic story are in that story. And that has meaning later. But you'll see that I make a comparison between them in parts of it.

The second story starts not-- around the same time as during the time that they were back. And they had this first cousin named Tubby. And they were saying Tubby was resisting all of their efforts to get everybody to go back.

He was a first cousin. He wasn't one of the kids in the house. But he was young-- youngest-- the youngest ones. And they were helping him come along.

Roy didn't marry until the last kid graduated from high school. He didn't even start his family. And Tubby said he wasn't going to college.

So-- but Tubby was a little guy. And Tubby was real scrappy. And back in those days, the boxing champs used to give what they call exhibitions.

Y'all know what an exhibition is? An exhibition is where there would be a county fair. Y'all know county fair? There would be a county fair, and in one of the tents, there would be a boxing ring.

And there would be some national or international champion in there. And if you could stay in the ring with him for one round, they'd give you a lot of money, \$300. And it was a big event. And people used to do that.

As a matter of fact, Muhammad Ali gave a couple of exhibitions once. People can say, I was in the ring with Ali. They got knocked out, but they were in there.

Well, they put Tubby in there with this champion. They said, now, you've got to have some kind of destiny. If you don't want to go to college, you've got to be-- fit in there with the rest of us, you've got to have some kind of destiny. So you be a world champion.

So they took him down there, and they stuck him in the ring. And Tubby knocked the guy out. Well, the champ was not only a champ because he had physical skills. The champ was a champ because he had character.

So the champ said he wanted Tubby to join him and be one of his seconds and that he was going to teach him the skills of boxing and make a professional boxer out of him and travel around the world with him. And the story goes on that the champ came by Tubby's house that Sunday morning. And the whole town of Milton turned out on the front yard of that house, the whole town, all 250 of them.

And Tubby came out, and the champ is standing out there on the lawn with his seconds. And Tubby came out and said, I can't go. They said, why? He said, because my mother told me that boxing was a sin, and so I can't go out and do this.

Tubby became an alcoholic. He died of alcoholism. He had a family later. But it took him about 30-- 30 years to-- 40 years to pass on. He had a what you could call a-- I don't want to say miserable life. What I want to say is a life that was devoid of taking the chance to fulfill your destiny when it came. Tubby did not want to go because Tubby was afraid to go. That's the second story.

So Tubby is important here at least on an account because it tells you what a hero is not. A metaphysicist would appreciate that. Say what it is, and then you say what it is not, then you'll know better what it is.

The third story takes place in 1948. I was in the first grade. And I was visiting with my parents and my little brother-- my grandmother in Philadelphia.

And there's not much I remember about this one event. But part of it, I can remember just like it happened yesterday. We were all sitting in the living room.

There was a large family gathering in there. And there was one conversation. But in the background was the radio.

So you have to understand how important the radio used to be back in those days. So the background music or whatever is playing. And then something came on. They said, flash-- a news flash.

And everybody stopped talking. And I don't remember-- I know what was said, but I don't remember what was said. What I remember clearly was that after it was said, everybody in the room turned around and started looking at me.

I said, what are you all looking at me for? They said that some cases of polio had been discovered in Philadelphia. And the governor came on the radio and announced that he had quarantined the state of Pennsylvania against children, first, second, and third grade, traveling across state line, that the state highway police would prevent any child, first, second, or third grade, from either coming into the state or going out of the state.

This was Christmas time. I was in the first grade. I was the only one sitting there in that room that fit into that category. My brother was too young.

So that meant that I had to stay there in Philadelphia. I remember there being a big rustle of discussion, much ado going on in there about me and that case of polio. And I remember my father taking his fist and hitting the table and saying, stop. And he turned to me and pointed to me and said, if you want to go back to North Carolina with us, I'll take you back.

But you've got to think, do you want to go back to North Carolina and give some other little kid the iron lung? Y'all know what the iron lung was? You know what it was?

The Iron lung was a cylindrical device that you put a child in when they were afflicted with polio around the chest region and couldn't breathe. And the thing would pump your chest. And you had to lay there, presumably the rest of your life.

I mean, I don't think that I ever had a fear-- as a matter of fact, I know that I have never had a fear that was greater than the iron lung. And I had to sit there and ask myself, was I going to stay in Philadelphia and go into the iron lung? This was-- I was six-- this is a child's thinking now, because the center of the universe is on me.

That governor was speaking directly to me and my parents and these people. He wasn't speaking to the state of Pennsylvania. And if I was going to stay, then I was going to get the iron lung-- not the polio, but the iron lung. I was not afraid of the disease. I was afraid of being stuck in that iron lung.

And the question was, was I going to stay there and get the iron lung, or was I going to go back to North Carolina and give it to another little kid? And I don't know how long the pause was. My conscious-- my memory tells me that the pause was 30 minutes. The pause was about 30 seconds.

But it was a long time. And I remember trying to figure out what my answer was going to be. And my answer was that I didn't really want to give it to another little kid.

So I told my dad I didn't want to give it to another little kid. I couldn't face that. So I stayed. My parents were back. And I had to stay in Philadelphia.

Well, that's the end of the third story. And the connection with the first story is that that's when I got to know these people, Irene, Roy, and Thornton, because they all lived in Philadelphia. That was that big family that still stuck together over all of those years. And in that period, I got to know all of them as individuals.

They weren't just members of the gods. I got to know them as persons. The second part of the story is that had to be my first moral decision.

What makes that a story is that I had to make a moral decision before I was ready to make it. It was like *Hamlet*. First of all, Shakespeare did not invent the story of *Hamlet*. It was Danish mythology.

Second of all, Laurence Olivier got the Oscar for his portrayal of *Hamlet*. And he starts it off by saying, this is a story about a man who cannot make up his mind. My mother was the literary type. She taught literature.

And my mother said the story is not about a man who cannot make up his mind. The story is about a boy who's got a man's job. And so I had a man's job. I was a boy, and I suffered in many ways from that because it was too big of a decision at the time to make, even though it was about me.

But that is a lesson in itself, too, isn't it? It's a lesson. The fourth story is connected to all of these.

And it has a name. It's called the concrete sumo. Please write that down. You might want to google that.

It took place in 1966, June of 1966. It took place in Washington, DC. I had just graduated from undergraduate school from Howard with a degree in engineering. And I was reporting for work on my first engineering job, a construction job at the Washington Hospital Center, building what is now called the Nursing Center.

And there was a big hole in the ground. And I reported for work at 7:30 in the morning. Actually, I reported at 7 o'clock. I wasn't supposed to be there until 7:30, but I got there early.

And let's see if I can characterize the moment. I had-- on my feet, I had my ROTC Army-- what they call paratrooper jump boots with the steel toe, ready to go out in the field. My pants were khaki pants. And my shirt was a khaki matching shirt.

Strapped on my belt was guess what? It was not a calculator. This is 1966. What did I have strapped on my belt? A slide rule in my scabbard-- leather.

And what did I have on my head? Well, nothing, but I knew that I was going to get my hard hat. And I didn't wear a hard hat to work because every hard hat had the name of the company on it.

So I was going to get-- that was the first thing I was looking for, where I was going to get my hard hat. So I reported to work, and all of the workmen are sitting there eating their breakfast. And they took one look at me and said, you go to the trailer. That's where the engineers were.

Well, I got to the trailer door, and the door opened up. And this old man came out. And no exaggeration, he was dressed just like Harrison Ford in *The Temple of Doom*.

He had that hat with a short leather jacket. He had his khakis on with his jump boots. And he came out and introduced himself as the superintendent on the job. That was the big boss.

And he said he couldn't-- he knew that I was coming, but he couldn't stay with me because the company had many jobs around the city, and there was a failure on one of the other jobs. And he was called over there to supervise repairs. But he would be back later that day if he could get back.

And then right after him, a miniature version of himself came out, a younger version of himself came out, introduced himself as the project manager, number two in charge. And he had a bunch of blueprints under his arm. And he said he couldn't stay with me today because they had just hit something hard down in the ground. They couldn't dig it up.

And they-- nothing was on the plans. And he had to go down to city hall to see if he could do some historical search to find out what was over there, what that thing was. And so he said goodbye and he'd see me later.

The carpenter foreman said hello, went down in the hole. And then I was left alone in the trailer. And so I did probably what you would do-- sat down and fantasized on what it would be like to know what I was supposed to be doing. The whistle blew, everybody else knew what they were doing.

So I sat down there and made myself a cup of coffee. I remember that. It was the worst cup of coffee I ever had in my life.

And then it happened. The door opened up, and in came this man that looked like a concrete sumo wrestler. I mean, looked like a sumo wrestler, very intimidating. His biceps were as big as my waistline.

And he had hair coming out of the back. He had a T-shirt on-- boxer T-shirt. He had a big cigar in his mouth. And he said, where do I pour the concrete? I said, what concrete?

He said, look out the window. There was a fleet of concrete trucks out there, churning concrete. Now, it wasn't a fleet, but I have to tell you, if a judge asked me what was I looking at, I would tell him I saw 12 trucks out there.

If a judge asked me what did I see-- what did I actually see? I would tell him, your honor, on my oath, I saw 40 trucks out there. I mean, it was a very intimidating thing to see all of those trucks lined up, coming in, churning like they were ready to go. And I'm the one that's supposed to tell them where to pour the concrete.

It was my first day on the job. It was my first couple of minutes on the job. So I said, well, I'm the only engineer out here.

He said, you're an engineer? I said, yeah. Is there any other engineers? I said, no. He said, I got these trip tickets, and that's the contract, and only an engineer can sign for it.

And he said, now, I'll tell you, you've got a choice. You're either going to tell me where to pour that concrete, or I'm going to pour the concrete out where those trucks stand and we're going back. He said, first of all, I can't have the concrete sitting up in my trucks.

Secondly, we got to make money on my job. We've got to make-- we've got other deliveries to make. We've got to go back, load up the trucks, and go someplace else. We can't be fooling around here with you.

So I said, look, I'll be back in five minutes. Do y'all know what a jiffy can is? It's a portable toilet.

Have you ever gone to a construction job and looked out there? Well, you've seen them. They are about so tall and little door. They got them all around the job.

So I knew that I would be able to get privacy and be able to think this matter through in there, in one of them. So I went into this little jiffy can. I went in there.

And I just could not get started to think about what to do. Then, I'm going to say something that's concrete. I shouldn't use the word concrete.

But I don't want to say-- I don't want to make it sound like I was hearing voices. But my uncle Tubby, he spoke to me-- my grandmother's brother. And uncle Tubby said, don't worry about a thing, because nobody is going to blame you for whatever you do.

Let them drop that concrete on the side, because those engineers left you alone the first day. You just got out of college literally a week ago. No judge in the land is going to side with them against you. Don't worry about it. Drop that-- tell him to unload the concrete where it stands.

So that's what Tubby said. Now, put it in the context that that's not just an alternative that I had, but Tubby was the one who said it. I gave you something about Tubby's character already. So I thought that the advice was good advice.

But I didn't want to do it because Tubby was the one that said it. I ain't want to be like Tubby. So I asked myself, what would Uncle Roy say? Then Uncle Roy began to talk. And Uncle Roy said, well, you're a professional. Professionals have responsibilities.

If you are a laborer out here on this job, then you do what your boss says. You are a professional, so you're in charge. You're supposed to make money for this company, that you're supposed to think your way through this problem.

And as a result, this may not only be your first day as an engineer, but it very well may be your last. But that is not your concern. Your concern is for getting this job done, a higher principle than self.

So I decided to try out what Uncle Roy said, not by reason of the quality of his advice, but because it was Uncle Roy who said it. So I went back in the trailer, relaxed a little bit, because I said if this is my last day, what have I got to worry about? It was going to be my last day.

So I looked around. There was a whole lot of stuff in there. There were blueprints. And the blueprints were on these sticks that if you go in the library sometimes, you got newspapers on them.

And the sticks were in a closet. And there were a couple of hundred of them in a big closet. And on one side of the trailer, there was this long sheet of paper. And I recognized it because I had studied the critical path schedule in college. I knew that that's what it was.

And I didn't remember all that. I don't remember making an A on that test. But it had these circles, and it had jobs. And it had arrows connecting the circles.

The good news, it had the dates across the top. So I went to today's date. And I know that engineers think in terms of matrices.

What is directly under the date is what we're doing that day. Engineers don't think like well, maybe some of it is over here. No, it's straight down.

And one of the circles said pour elevator pit. Ah, now I know what to do, pour the elevator. The question is, where's the elevator pit?

So I said, well, pouring concrete is something the engineers do all the time. Probably some of these plans that are sitting on this table has the elevator pit on it. So I started going through, and I said, well, these are the electrical plans. They won't be on there.

These are the mechanical plans. They won't be on there. These are the architectural plans. Oh, circled in red, elevator.

Orange is north. I looked out the trailer, saw where it was. My courage came back. And I used a set of four-letter words to order that great big old guy to go down there and pour the elevator.

3 o'clock that day, the engineers came back. And instead of coming straight to the trailer, guess what they did? They ran straight down to the elevator pit.

And they looked in it. And then they rubbed their chins. They came back up to the trailer. And they asked me, quite casually, how did it go today?

And this is an ethics class, which means that I have to tell the truth, and I told a lie. I said, no problem. It was the biggest problem I ever had in my life. Just put no problem.

At the end of the summer, I decided to go to graduate school. And so they took me out to lunch. And we're sitting at lunch.

And I said, by the way, there's something I've been meaning to ask you guys. You all left me alone that day, my first day. I had to-- you all knew the concrete was coming. Why did you all do that?

So the old superintendent said that on his first day as an engineer, they left him alone, too. And his job was to lay out a church, put down stakes on the ground where they dig the hole. And he not only laid out a church in the wrong direction, but he laid it out on the wrong lot.

He said the reason we do this to you all the first day is that we want to find out if you're suitable for field work, because making decisions like this is what we have to do. Now, we wouldn't fire you if you had made the wrong decision. We would have put a white shirt on you and a tie and sent you up to the office, to do estimating and stuff like that.

But out here in the field, it's a whole different dead end. And so the question was, first of all, would you make a decision? And second of all, would it be a reasonable decision? We would correct it if it was the wrong decision.

In later life, I asked, well, suppose a whole bunch of people got killed if I poured the concrete in the wrong place. So it was a moral decision, too. The lesson from-- that's the end of that story. That's the end of the whole story.

The lesson there is that this is the virtue ethics method, that you put somebody in your position, work them out, and do what they would do. Now, it turns out, I think, that in America today, people watch and go to the movies so much that we are very talented at doing this. We know a believable story when we see one-- believable. It doesn't have to be believed, in fact, but if it's believable.

The key issue here-- I got four more minutes. The key issue here is, who do you put in your position and why? We can no longer follow Plato with these virtues, because he's talking about virtues that we don't have any respect-- well, we don't use any more today, Achilles-type heroism.

So when I wrote this article, I had to go outside of Western ethics to find something that I thought would work. And I found this title in Nigeria called the [NON-ENGLISH]. It's called man-- literally translated, it's man of good character, but it's not necessarily man of good character. I found out later that-- from Joel, that if you go to Hebrew tradition, you find the man called the saddiq. I found out later from [? Arnie Veselin ?] that if you go to-- what's the name of this little country that he's originally from? It's right next to the Russian border and the North Sea. Oh, I'll think of it in a minute.

In other words, you go to a lot of different cultures, you'll find that there are people who are respected because they are icons of tradition. And the issue-- and I said, I'm going to put one of those-- Roy really fit in both ways. He was also-- he was parsable, but he was also one of these characters.

And I made the argument in the end that the objective of the character, which was non-Western, was not necessarily to do the right thing. The traditional character, when he has done it, or when she has done it, will be forgiven by the rest of them after they've done it. So I argued that this was multicultural ethics.

So now, that's why I've got you reading parsables, because my big theory is that whatever culture you come from, the right person to put in the situation is a cultural figure, an icon of a hero, not necessarily the warrior hero. But you have to understand that Irene was another kind of hero. So-- and that was a big-- but you see how this introduction-- that's a real case of solving a problem where there was something at stake, even potentially lethal, at least in my mind at the time-- in my mind now.

But that where you can use a story to solve your problem. And the first principle is that-- it goes back beyond even Chomsky, who says that certain language structures are wired into the brain. There's a new theory out now that language structures to tell stories are wired in the brain, that we naturally learn in story terms. Why? That's the way the brain is wired.

So it's the first principle. So what I want to say is that mythology in the mystical world can give you these characters. And once you've done it, why is it-- and I'm going to take one more 30 seconds-- that mythology can find a character that is a gestalt of the whole community all the time? If we get a gestalt of this community, let's say a person, in that gestalt, then we are parts of it.

Each one of us is a part of it. So when that gestalt does something, we're inclined to say, well-- to assume part of the responsibility. That's why we're inclined to say, well, we'll send him to jail. But when he gets out, he's still the mayor because he's part of us. We would have done maybe the same thing. It's who we are.

So that's the updated version of this method of virtue ethics. So class is officially over. I don't hear anybody rustling outside. I'm available for Q&A, and then we meet tomorrow. You all got the agendas? Agenda? OK, it's over.

I published these four stories, by the way. They were reprinted three times. And I'll bring in a hard copy of the original.

The first one was in a journal called-- it was a journal of sociology, actually. The second one, it was reprinted in the *Journal of Science and Engineering Ethics*. And that time, it was-- I presented the thing at an ethics conference. And it presented a whole lot of Hershey's.

AUDIENCE: Oh my gosh.

TAFT BROOME: So we're at this conference, and I tell this story. I said-- I start off my presentation by saying, let's not be ethical. And what I mean by that is the word ethics is a Greek word. Morals is a translation of Greek into Latin, *morales*.

And so what I wanted to say was that I wanted to talk about ethical problems, but I did not want to use Greek or Latin approaches. I wanted to go outside of that. I wanted to go outside of it, because that was the only way I could solve the concrete sumo problem. Yeah, what about the polio?

AUDIENCE: The question is, do you remember how you made the decision and the process that took place?

TAFT BROOME: No.

AUDIENCE: 30 seconds?

TAFT BROOME: No.

AUDIENCE: No conscious reason?

TAFT BROOME: I just remember seeing pictures in my mind of little kids in-- of hundreds of little kids in hundreds of iron lungs. And their mothers pointing to me, saying, you did it. No, that's-- I couldn't-- that's what I remember.

There was no logic. A picture came in there. And all of these mothers pointing at me, saying, he did it. And I said, I just-- I'd rather go in there myself.

But no, there was no logical process. I was-- my birthday was November. So I had just turned six years old.

AUDIENCE: It's interesting. This thought isn't worked out. I was doing the free association that you suggested. But my mind went to-- I don't if you remember. Maybe a year or two ago, it was the big thing to have what would Jesus do. Did you see those bracelets?

TAFT BROOME: No, I didn't see those.

AUDIENCE: It was the big thing. Everybody had-- do you know what I'm talking about?

AUDIENCE: Those bracelets that said WWJD.

AUDIENCE: WWJD.

TAFT BROOME: Oh, really?

AUDIENCE: Oh, it was the big thing. I lived in New York City for a couple of years. And everybody walked around with those bracelets. And so I think there really is something to think about your life, saying, OK, in this situation, what would Jesus do? Put Jesus-- and I mean, religious aside, let's not even talk about that.

TAFT BROOME: Yeah, right, right, the method.

AUDIENCE: Yeah, the method. I think there's something really attractive about that. And I think that that--

TAFT BROOME: That's a formal term, and that's Latin. It's about 15 years-- 15 years-- about 1,500 years old. It's what the Catholic Church says, solve all your ethical problems by putting Jesus in your situation. But the method goes back to Plato of using the story to do the same thing, because he says if you don't know what to do, put Achilles in your position, or choose the right hero from mythology and put that person-- and you know that person.

You know them cold. You know what they would do. And once you've said what they would do, everybody else would believe you that that's what they would do. And if you did it to the best of your ability, everybody else would say, well, it doesn't get much better than that.

AUDIENCE: Because even if you don't buy the Bible as a religious truth, it's so rich with stories that you're talking about.

TAFT BROOME: That's right.

AUDIENCE: You could totally do it with so many situations-- what would Jesus do in this situation-- if you wanted to.

AUDIENCE: It might not actually give you a very appropriate response.

AUDIENCE: It might not, but you could do it, though.

AUDIENCE: He does some pretty crazy things.

TAFT BROOME: If you did it, the rest of them will forgive you for it.

AUDIENCE: Exactly. And you could justify it that way, it seems like.

AUDIENCE: Do you think that's still that case now, that the public would still buy something that would come from the Bible?

TAFT BROOME: Yeah, I'll tell you why. Well, let me tell you why I think that's a hard question. It's a hard question because we just look for the United States right now. The hard question-- and y'all can get up and go anytime. I'm just talking.

The hard question is, do we have a mythology? And I think we do. Now, I want to divide the question between do we have a mythology, and what do I think it is? I think that we have a mythology that hasn't matured yet.

I think our mythology is science fiction. *Star Trek*, some of the old *Star Treks*. They get in there. I mean, that tells us who we want to be and what we're capable of being.

So I think we have a mythology that was in the stages of development, let's say, maybe 400 years before we saw anything written down, because they were the-- they had the liars. They were minstrels.

I mean, minstrels is literally the Middle Ages, but there's another term for it. But they sang their stories. They had memorized them.

They were in verse. And they told stories about real wars and real heroes. By the time they finished, half of it was on the unconscious level.

And we call that the fantasy level. But half of it was unconscious, but still truthful unconscious. And so the historians and the archaeologists find it very difficult to count back and calculate from mythology what really did happen because they're looking for conscious accounts of it.

But if you're looking for an unconscious account of a dragon, they're back there. They had things they were scared of. It wasn't a dragon.

Even the Oedipus story is a myth that Sophocles made three plays out of and just turned the myth around and made it a mystery story. But when Oedipus killed the Sphinx, what they say was that they know that there was a terrible plague around that time around that city. And maybe he came in there because he was a traveling man.

Maybe he came in there with a cure that he had gotten from someplace else and walked among the sick to give the cure. And that was the same thing as killing a dragon. But the story has powerful effects on people.

And I am about 40% competent to talk about those effects. I don't think the psychology is the place to go to. I think the place to go to is the literature.

A literary professor will start talking about why is it that this little story will last forever? And this one, no matter how many Oscars it won, people forget two years later. And so we don't know. We don't care to know.

We know that you can write down all of the attributes, take a test, and get an A, and that story will last and this one won't. And it will get to people and have them empathize with it. But to go back one more-- just one more time-- one more time.

And I'd like for you to comment on this, when it comes to judges in the legal system. I'm not a religious man. I really wasn't grown up in the-- grew up in the church. My mother was not religious. My father was quasi-religious.

But the church had a way of operating just like the shamans used to do in primitive societies. And the way that the church operated, and still operates, if there was some problem in the community-- let's say that brother Sam is running around with sister Sue, and sister Sue is married to brother Joe. So there is some problem.

And these women would come to their preacher's house and tell him about all of this-- no, tell his wife about all of this. And then the wife would tell the preacher, probably in bed later that night. And what the preacher's job to do was to go to the Bible and find a story where this actually happened, not actually happened, but find a metaphor, and go into church that Sunday and tell that metaphor. Now, the whole congregation would know exactly what he's talking about.

They know about this little triangle here. And they want it broken up. And then he'll say how it was that god came and struck him down for messing around with sister Sue. And brother Joe over here says, oh, man, I think I'm going to stop doing this. They cure the problem.

Now, I understand that in some Islamic countries that when the judges are sitting before an accused that they have the Quran in front of them. And they listen to what the accused says and tries to find a story in the Quran. Is that true?

Not really. Maybe it's not true. I just heard people say that.

AUDIENCE: Maybe they used to [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: Well, actually, it-- and I think I can be-- I'm not being metaphorical. It's going to sound metaphorical. But there's a kind of law in the United States called case law, which is the same thing, that if you do something, they'll try to find a case that matches it in some kind of metaphorical way, and what the judge prescribed, and whether or not chaos broke out in the end, or whether or not you had a ordered society.

AUDIENCE: We're just literally thinking, this judge sitting with a book. There's a whole body of knowledge in the discipline [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: I see.

AUDIENCE: They don't go directly to the Quran, because there's nothing in the Quran. All the examples, all the judgments that have been processed through, those are the basis of the law.

TAFT BROOME: I see. So there's something about it that's systematic here, isn't it?

AUDIENCE: Yeah, more done in systematic. So a judge can go and find it.

AUDIENCE: Why do you think that here, religion had to take that place where you say that it's science fiction, why do you think that Christianity is not adopted?

TAFT BROOME: Good question. Good question. As a matter of fact, I plan to touch upon this tomorrow. But no, I'll just tell you that-- real briefly-- that before the Civil War, 11 out of 12 college presidents in the United States had divinity degrees. They were ministers, 11 out of 12.

I've got some numbers that I'll give tomorrow. And education was basically what they call classical education, which was character development. And it meant good Christian character.

It changed when people like a man named John Quincy, who became president of Harvard around the time, stood up and said, we've got to change all this because we've got to get into the Industrial Revolution. Characters got to go. We got to start talking about applied physics, applied math.

All of this stuff, we've got to get into it. And so what happened was there was a big clash between two philosophies of education. One was classical, which was mainly religious, not so much in content as it was that the people teaching it were ministers of the church. And the objective was good character.

And the other one was what they call progressive education. And now, you get John Dewey and all of those people talking about, we've got to get people to work. And they finally killed classical education in the United States.

That's why we don't have it anymore. They killed it right then and there. Now, I think, as I'll say tomorrow, that our big problem is that we need to bring character development back. But we don't need to bring it back as Christian character.

So we need to cut that part of it out, leave Christian character in the schools of religion and in the churches. But we've got to have something-- something got to be character has got to get back in here. We can't just say do whatever you want, here are the tools to justify it, like Aristotle would say.

We've got to start talking about how to-- and so that's my answer to your question. What is your answer? You want to think about it?

AUDIENCE: I want to think about it.

TAFT BROOME: OK, yeah, but I think that's what killed it, the Industrial Revolution and the Christian hold on the universities, mainly because they were financing the universities. And after the Civil War, we got state-financed universities that the Christians didn't want to get us into Industrial Revolution, didn't want to have us compete, did not foresee World War I, which was entirely almost entirely technological. And I think that's what killed it.

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE] you made a comment [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: Now, that's a significant observation. I'm going to study that one.

AUDIENCE: I mean, the US was founded on this whole separation of--

TAFT BROOME: Church and state.

AUDIENCE: --church and state. [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: The more I think about it, the more I think that, ultimately, that's where it started. But it got us into education when the Industrial Revolution came. People thought they could get rich. People thought they would lose wars if they weren't. And they were right.

But that's an interesting point you make, too, that in the ideal situation, you've got a tradition and a mythology that will carry you through. And I think that we just don't have a tradition and don't see ourselves with a mythology here.

AUDIENCE: What was that thing [INAUDIBLE]? What was the relationship of [INAUDIBLE]?

TAFT BROOME: Oh, it was something I-- nothing. I had talked about it in an earlier lecture.

AUDIENCE: They made movies out of this story, is that correct?

TAFT BROOME: Yeah.

AUDIENCE: Can you recommend any?

TAFT BROOME: I can recommend one short story. I don't know about a movie. Well, wait a minute.

AUDIENCE: They made [INAUDIBLE]. I haven't seen it.

TAFT BROOME: Let me do some thought about it, and you do some thought about it. And Tuesday, when you come back-- if you come back here Tuesday or whenever you come back, we'll talk about it. No, I have a special presentation to make before some visitors here from Norway, from the Norwegian parliament. They want to talk about research ethics. And so the two students that are registered, I asked if they could come, and they said yes. No class for tomorrow.