TAFT BROOME: See, what I have in mind today is to make an assignment that will be due Tuesday. Now, here's what I want to do with that assignment-- I want you to write up an analysis of the A7-D case, but I want you to allow something that isn't entirely scholarly, and it won't sound entirely scholarly to you at first. I want to micro-manage this homework assignment. I'm going to tell you exactly what I want done.

Now, the reason for that is that once you see what I think is a good way to lay out something, now you can start talking about how you want to lay it out. And then you can start talking to me about that you want to lay it out a different way, how can I respond to that, and that kind of thing. But let's see it one way first and tear it up.

And when you turn that thing in Tuesday, you'll have a format and some ideas just laid out. So my philosophy is, in a classroom, imitate then liberate. Now, what I want to do today is actually just to lay out this analysis.

Then I want to discuss, to some extent, this movie. And then I want to deal with some pedagogical issues. I've got the percentages for the grades laid out, all of that.

So give me a 15-minute high sign before the class is over. That'll give me five minutes to stop and 10 minutes to do that. Can you see this all right? OK.

First thing I'd like for you to do in this homework assignment is to state your purpose. Then state your objectives. Those are the main parts of the paper that will develop the purpose.

Then I want you to give me a rationale. That is why you're doing it, why you're setting it up the way you're doing it. And then lastly, I want you to tell me, write down, tell me something about the scope of your analysis.

Now, here's the beauty of this-- this tells you what we're going to do, what you're going to do. This tells me what you are going to do. And of all the things that come to my mind when you've told me what you're going to do, you've got to tell me what it is that you're not going to do. You see the metaphysics in that? You say what a thing is, and then to sharpen your meaning, you say what it isn't.

Then the second thing is to lay out your argument by categories of objectives. And then at the end, give me a summary and conclusions. Basically, what you want to do is to tell me, did you fulfill your purpose.

Now, what I want you to do in this purpose here is to say that you want to do a moral analysis of the A7-D case. And the scope is that you're going to do that analysis twice, one using a utilitarian analysis, and the other one is to use what's called a deontological analysis. So we're going to use Mill and Kant. In your conclusions, I want you to evaluate both methods relative to the A7-D case.

Now, I can tell you what you might want to put in there, that you can see already. And that is that one of the problems you're going to have with the utilitarian approach as applied to the A7-D case is that nobody got hurt. So you're going to have to tell me, is that a powerful method relative to this case?

One of the problems you're going to find with the deontological approach is that you're going to find it hard to say one should never lie about anything. Because you're going to have conflicts with telling the truth all of the time. We're going to have to ask ourselves, is that possible in real life?

Now, in your back matter, of course you're going to have references. I would like to see at least one reference that's not this book. And lastly, this is a little something new, haven't lectured on this, but this can be pedestrian, and that is to take what you have done and see if you can analyze your paper in story terms.

Does it have a beginning? Does it have a middle? Does it have an end? Does make a point?

Look where I'm pointing. Does it make a point? Is there a point of view?

Remember from *Moby Dick,* does anybody remember the first sentence in*Moby Dick?* "Call me Ishmael." Tells you what point of view you're looking at the story from. You can see that if it was somebody else, the story would be played out a little bit differently. Ahab would tell a different story, wouldn't he?

So give me your point of view. And give me your voice. Is it first person, second person, third person? And then put anything else in there that you can tell me about how what you have just done can be looked at as a story. Now, that gets you ready for something we're going to cover later.

What I would like to do now, unless you have any questions-- let me see if you've got any questions, that's fine. Any questions? Yes.

STUDENT: So we're supposed to do the analysis [INAUDIBLE] with [INAUDIBLE] the argument in the paper to have two sequential sections, one with the first analysis and one with the second analysis?

TAFT BROOME: As opposed to--

STUDENT: As opposed to parallel?

TAFT BROOME: Oh, you mean in one paragraph.

STUDENT: Comparing and contrasting the methods?

TAFT BROOME: That's your style.

STUDENT: No, no, it's not. I mean, I could do it either way. I'm just trying to get a clearer picture.

TAFT BROOME: You decide that. You just decide how you want to do it. Now, I think that in these objectives, one of the things you want to do is to state the case, a summary of the A7-D case, so you want the facts.

So that might be objective one. Objective two would be a utilitarian analysis. I tell you what-- let's keep them separate. I'll change that. Let's keep them separate.

Objective two will be utilitarian. Objective three will be deontological. So you may feel compelled to put in another objective, but I think that three will do-- summary of the case, analysis one, analysis two.

I would expect something like this, the whole thing, to be about three pages. If you get two pages and can't think of anything else to put in there, please don't put anything else in. If it goes over five pages, submit it. If it goes to 10 pages, we've got a problem.

Talk to me about it. It might be something that you didn't need to say. But if you really feel compelled to say 10 pages worth of stuff, then fine.

The only thing that was really going to irritate me about 10 pages is if you download nine pages of it. I mean, if you're writing out of your heart, and I'll know the difference, then we need to talk about it. And I'm going to grade this, but I'm going to-- like I said, I'm going to micromanage this, just this first one, this only one. Yeah.

STUDENT: As for references are you hoping that we'll look more into the facts of the case or--

TAFT BROOME: Good question.

STUDENT: --the deontological and utilitarian [INAUDIBLE]?

TAFT BROOME: Yes. What I'm getting ready to do now is to go more deeply into those methods right now. Look at Chapter 6. Actually, when I say look at Chapter 6, that's not what I mean. Look at the Table of Contents and look at the citation for Chapter 6. What's the title?

STUDENT: Honesty, Integrity and Reliability.

TAFT BROOME: All right, that's not what I want. I was looking at the old version of this book. And there's a section which is Chapter 6 called Tests in Moral Problem Solving. Do you have a chapter like that?

STUDENT: We have Methods for Moral Problem Solving.

TAFT BROOME: What's the one right after that?

STUDENT: Organizing principles.

TAFT BROOME: That's the one, so it's Chapter 4. And chapter 4, what they call "respect for persons" counts as one particular case, but it's the deontological approach. And then utilitarianism, I think they spell it out right there.

But I'm going to cover that material, but I'm going to cover it in a way that I think makes best sense for me as a teacher, particularly because there are some subtleties in this material that I think that you ought to pick up. And secondly, because most philosophers complain that Kant is very hard to understand. Not all philosophers believe he's hard to understand.

STUDENT: British philosophers believe he's hard to understand.

TAFT BROOME: They think he's impossible to understand.

STUDENT: Because they don't see it. So you've got to ask the Germans, do they have a hard time?

TAFT BROOME: Right, they don't. All right, so some of them blame it on the translations. No, it's not. So what I'm going to try to do is to lay out these two approaches in a context so that you can see the meaning of it.

And I think once you get this context and the meaning of it, the stuff falls out pretty clearly. It falls out clearly to me. And I've been successful arguing it. Let me try it with you. So let's see if the context is going to work.

So with that, that's what I'll cover now. Any more questions or comments? Whenever I ask for questions, I'm also leaving the possibilities open for comments. Graduate class, comment. Undergraduates, they don't have any authority.

You say, I remember the day. I was told about this professor at Oberlin, Philosophy professor, who would come into class, and lie down on his desk, and put his role book on his chest, and say, now, when somebody says something interesting, I'll give you a grade. Nobody asked if he was really asleep back down there, but the students would start discussing. It would really intimidate them.

I'm not going to do that because I might wind up going right to sleep. But I guess the main point of what I just said is that I really do appreciate the imaginative pedagogy. I really do.

STUDENT: 325 on purpose because of the Council?

TAFT BROOME: Yes, but I put circa because they said fourth century, so I put up a circa there, but 325 because of the Council. Let's see how we're doing. Tell me about these lights. Can you see it better?

STUDENT: If you turn the front ones off, yes.

TAFT BROOME: Better?

STUDENT: Yes.

TAFT BROOME: Roman Empire, roughly 325 AD-- the color coding in this particular picture is there just to show the differences of the provinces. This being red, and this being red, and this being red have nothing to do with it. And in 325 AD was right after Constantine the Great unified the Empire and made Christianity the state religion of the Roman Empire. Now unify the Empire.

The Empire is divided east and west in at least three ways-- geographically, culturally, and politically. It is divided east and west geographically pretty much along this vertical line that you can just barely see here, where you've got Greece on one side and all of what we now call Turkey, and the Middle East, and some of Egypt. And the west is North Africa, and Spain, and France, and England, and Italy, and others.

Culturally-- this is the most important part-- have you ever read *The New Yorker* magazine? Do you like the covers? The covers always have some kind of message. Ostensibly, if you're a New Yorker, it picks up better. You can understand it better than other people.

Well, there's a cover and it's done by Steinberg. I should have brought it in. I have the big poster of it in my apartment. I carry it wherever I go, not if I'm at a hotel, but if I'm going to stay at some point, I carry that and put it on the wall. It's about this tall.

And he's numbered his posters. I have something around 355, so it's an original and it's the 355th one that he did. And what it does is, it's just incredible.

It has a picture. I think it's called "The New Yorker's View of the World." It has a picture of some buildings in New York City. That's the foreground. Then as you go up, you go back.

So as you go up, the next thing is the Hudson River, and everything else is wilderness. There's a little place over there that says, "Chicago." There's a little hill over there, and they say "Los Angeles." There's a pond up here called "The Pacific Ocean."

And then there is some land, and there's a little word says Japan, and USS . I mean, the New Yorker picture of the world is that everything that is civilization and that is happening is here. When you walk across, when you get out of one of those bridges, then you're in the wasteland.

The people who lived in the eastern part of the empire felt that way about the west. This was high culture over here. This was a wasteland over there. Even Rome, forget about what they say about Hollywood.

And the Romans, any one of them who had been out to the east, felt pretty much the same way. They didn't even speak the same language. In the west, the language of choice-- mainly of the scholars and the upper classes, but of anybody else who could speak-- Latin was the language of the realm in the west.

What was the language of the realm in the east? It was not Latin. Want to guess?

STUDENT: Persian.

TAFT BROOME: That's a good guess. She said Persian. Would you say Hebrew?

STUDENT: Sure.

TAFT BROOME: OK.

STUDENT: Greek.

TAFT BROOME: Greek. It was Greek. That's why they call it the Hellenistic part of the Empire. And in the west, the people out here were just like the Romans that made the Empire. They were very concerned about militarism.

Because at this time, there was a great flood or several waves-- I don't want to use the word [INAUDIBLE] -- several waves of people coming in to this part of Europe from Asia, the Teutonic tribes. Now, they came in in more than one way. There was an earlier wave where they came in and occupied these northern parts, Vikings.

But the big waves came in around this time. And we know why they came in. It was a big drought.

Now, the historians and anthropologists that I read, when they say that they don't know why somebody migrated from one area to another, it does not mean that they don't have some idea about why they do it. It's usually some drought, or disease, or population expansion of some sort, or persecution by somebody else further out.

But this time they pretty much know. They had a series of bad droughts up in Asia. And great numbers of people came in here, and they were all your Goths, which include the Ostrogoths and the Visigoths, the Vandals.

All of these people came in from this area here. And they terrified the Empire because they had a fighting nature to them. And they would raid over these borders. And in 410 AD, Alaric the Goth sacked Rome.

Now, here's the cultural point that I want to carry into the universities, and it's going to be one of my major points in this lecture. Here it is. Ready?

In the period between 650 BC and 650 AD, all of your major religions except two were founded. [INAUDIBLE] Judaism was founded before all that, and Islam was founded after, but everything else was coming around this time.

STUDENT: Not just there, but when you think of Buddha.

TAFT BROOME: Buddha-- it was the whole world.

STUDENT: It was very broad.

TAFT BROOME: It was a very magical period. And when Christianity was formed, there were some issues. And one of the issues was this. This is going to be a theological point, but I'm going to make it an educational point that's going last you for the rest of your career.

The theological point is this-- the question, which is most important or which comes first, faith or works? Do you have it in your mind that you are a good person and that will cause you to do good things? Or you'd best do good things otherwise you won't get salvation?

Now in the East, when all of these religions were vying with one another-- and I say that there were people long before this time who knew that paganism could not last the Romans in peacetime, because paganism was a warrior religion. And I think that many of these religions were vying with each other to be the state religion of the Roman Empire. They just didn't know when it was going to come. Now, that's my take on it. I emphasize the word M-Y.

But in the East, the problem of getting people to accept your religion was a problem of reason. You had to argue with them because all of them had studied. All of your intellectuals had studied Greek philosophy.

They knew all about Plato and Aristotle, all of these people. And so you had to sit down and reason it out with them. You had to get their faith before you could get their works.

Guess what in the West? You had to get their works. People didn't want to hear about all of this theorizing. What do you want me to do? So works came before faith in the West. Faith came before works in the East.

Now, what does that have to do with universities? Well, as you saw from the film, whatever theologians were thinking about had something to do with the universities. They were the professors.

Now, this is around 1500 AD. And now I want you to put in your mind that film that I showed, where Julius II is the Warrior Pope. This is during his time. Actually, circa 1500 is pretty much his time.

This is a map of Europe. It's kind of hard to see, but you don't need to see. I'll see for you. This is a map of the universities in Europe at that time. There was about 75 of them.

This part of the map, including most of Italy, but certainly all of what we call Germania was what is called the Holy Roman Empire. That was established after the Roman Empire had fallen, after Islam had come in, and after Islam had pretty much gone back. Charlemagne came to power in around 1800.

And depending on who you talk to, it's either Charlemagne or Otto the First that began the Holy Roman Empire. If you talk to a Frenchman, guess what a Frenchman will say? Charlemagne. If you talk to a German, what will the German say? Otto the First.

It's important for me to say that this is what the Germans in the 20th century called the First Reich. You had an emperor that was located up around in here. And guess who the high priest of the empire was? The Pope.

And then you had everybody else. So there is, remember, the three principles of social order-- regal, priestly, and popular. The regal principle was the Emperor. The priestly principal was the Pope. And the popular principle was that if you belong to the Empire, you would be safe from marauders, and you could enjoy some of the wealth of the Empire.

So there it is. And this is the mood in which these universities were founded. Now, here comes my point-- here it comes.

The first universities that were founded, and were founded in Italy before this time-- we're talking about just around the time and just before the time of the Name of the Rose, which, depending on who you're talking, about 1100, 1200. These universities in Italy-- they were Bologna and elsewhere-- they were universities that taught medicine, law, theology, and/or administration.

Now, this is what gets me excited-- they were right close to the Pope, and it made sense for those institutions to be institutions focusing on works, the practical arts. So if engineering was a learned discipline at that time, and was taught at a university, where would it most likely have been found? Down there near the Pope.

Something happened that is important about this time, that made the professors get interested in Greek philosophy. Remember from your film, who was the bad guy in the film? The venerable York. And why was he the bad guy? Tell me in your own words. Why did he commit all those murders?

STUDENT: He was afraid of the knowledge from Aristotle.

TAFT BROOME: Yeah, keep talking. Just keep going. You can't say too much on it.

STUDENT: The liberation of people's minds, people's sense of joy, and people's desire to search for new knowledge-- he was afraid of all those things destroying the Church and civilization as he knew it.

TAFT BROOME: Keep going. Let's get some more ideas. You saw that movie. Come on, tell me, what do you think about it? Were you impressed? I mean, did this movie make an impact on you?

STUDENT: It did. And it mentioned what we were talking about. And I think I got most of it, but [INAUDIBLE] just afraid of the change.

TAFT BROOME: Terrified-- notice that in the eastern part of the Empire, everybody's steady. Over here, they were terrified. Well, one of the ways you can talk about terror of it all is that reason was challenging faith. Don't tell me anything, and tell me that my faith has to make it so. Appeal to my reason.

STUDENT: That was sort of Sean Connery's character.

TAFT BROOME: Yes. A word or two about Sean Connery character-- this is Hollywood it its best, in my judgment. Sean Connery's character was a conflation of more than one person. But I think the main character, the main person that Umberto Eco had in mind was a man called William of Ockham.

William of Ockham-- you can read about him and the philosophies that he had. And William of Ockham and others belonged to one of two-- ooh, this thing's leaking-- one of two six-- they were--

STUDENT: [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: Actually, I don't want to throw it away. I want to wipe this off, if nobody has any tissues? Got any tissues? This thing is leaking.

The Franciscans and the Dominicans-- could you pick them out in the film? The Franciscans were the poor ones. Thank you. And they wore just the plain cowl. We're talking about the film. And the flamboyant ones were the Benedictines.

Actually, they reflect, for the most part, class differences of the members. The Benedictines, for the most part, were people who came from wealthy families, and the Augustinians were-- did I say Augustinians? I should have said Franciscans. I'm sorry. Franciscans mainly did not come from those families, which meant that their competition for intellectual equality was keen, and the Franciscans enjoyed beating the Benedictines.

What happened was that the Benedictines and the Franciscans were, at first, together in the faculties, particularly at the University of Paris. And then the Franciscans decided to go off. And they established Cambridge and Oxford.

Now, because science had become the new vogue in those days-- we had just discovered the Americas. We're creating a new middle class. The notion of science and exploration are now important.

That's why the venerable York was having a hard time, because people thought that we need to learn Aristotle now. And the Benedictines and the Franciscans believed that. So the further they got away from the Pope, the more successful they were in studying and teaching Aristotle.

At the same time, something very interesting was happening over here. We're now talking about what happened to-- what was going on? How did Christianity take with the Goths and some of the other Teutonic tribes that I said had just started coming in, in the early, early part of the 4th century?

Well, these are what they thought were the way the world was divided up. You just take a little look at that. Separate the first one and the last one from the middle.

The first one, the sky gods, came in from Christianity. The last one, the Realm of the Dead, Hel, this word H-E-L, is supposed to be where H-E-L-L came from. But it also came in from Christianity. The middle was what the Goths had before they even came over here, to Europe.

And the point I want to make is that when Christianity was introduced to the Goths and others in the Germanic part of Europe and Eastern Europe, it never fully overtook people's thinking. The middle part remained. There's something very significant about this middle part, very significant.

And that is that when you look at their religion-- pick a religion, and ask which of the gods lives in those parts of the world, what you are going to find is that M-A-N-I-G. I don't if it's pronounced "manick" or [INAUDIBLE]. But look at it.

The individual has will. Christianity, at least during these times, would attribute will to God. God had will. But here, they are talking about every human being having a will, and that will being a part of your body.

And it even goes further than that. The will could overdo the [INAUDIBLE] which was the god of your destiny. And that is, you could say that I have destiny and I have faith out in front of me. And there are these gods who say that this is where I am going in this life.

But guess how you could, how a human being, could overcome the gods? With the will. I will it. I will not go that way-- free will.

Do you see it coming? That's the basis of Kant's deontology. He lived in this area. That's the point I'm going to make.

It was out of this thinking about the will that took on, in the West, the notion that faith is more important than works because faith is of the mind just like the will is. And it was Luther, Martin Luther, who started the Reformation with his "95 Theses," the most important one being it's between you and God to decide whether or not you're good, not the Pope, not the Pope judging what you do. And what you do mainly is paying those tithes.

At a time when there's a new middle class that wants to enjoy the money they're making, they don't have a whole lot of money to be giving over to the Pope. So Martin Luther was just acting out of what was ordinary and normal for people around him at the time. So now, I think that's the end of that show.

Now I want to talk a little bit in depth about the two points of view. And I want to say how I want you to put those points of view into this homework assignment. Let's start with utilitarianism.

We've had a pedestrian discussion of utilitarianism. Now let's go a little deeper. And before the class is all over, we'll go one more step in depth, and we'll take something back that we said before.

We'll shape it right, but this is the next step. You'll be 90% there. The rest of it is just going to be icing on the cake. This will get you 90% there.

We're in a place in the world-- we're in England-- where they're teaching Greek philosophy. But they are still motivated by the notion that works are more important than faith. So when they teach science, what are they going to be interested in? Empirical science.

They're going to be interested in rational science and mathematics, too. Let's not forget that. One of the best mathematicians around in olden days was a guy by the name of Bishop George Berkeley. So it doesn't apply to all of them.

But basically, they're in an environment where works are still more important than faith. So when they start talking about science, they're going to talk about rational science a little bit, the theory, but they're mainly going to be interested in empirical science. When they get to ethics, they're going to be mainly interested in ethical arguments that have its basis and roots in facts, not ideas.

Now, let's characterize the times. John Stuart Mill gets all the credit for utilitarianism. There are a lot of utilitarianism before him. He gets the credit because he more or less perfected the theory.

But the one that I want to talk about, which is not one the first, but what really gives it its context, is a man named Jeremy Bentham. I'd like you to know that name. And here's why he gives the context-- Jeremy Bentham did most of his writing around 1800, a little bit before, a little bit after. Now let's talk about 1800.

Less than 30 years before, 1776, we have the American Revolution. 1789, you've got the French Revolution. 1803, the Holy Roman Empire collapses. You get the feeling there's a whole lot of revolution going on.

And the revolutionaries are coming up with new philosophies for the new government. Jeremy Bentham was interested in new laws for the English people. They did not have a revolution.

STUDENT: They should have had. It would have done them a lot of good.

TAFT BROOME: It would have done them a lot of good. But there was a guy by the name of-- I just learned about him-- it turns out my son's elementary school was named Edmund Burke School. And Edmund Burke wrote a paper to the aristocrats in England saying, don't worry, we're not going to have a revolution over here. Turned out he was right, but it turned out he was wrong in another way.

It just was not about, things did change dramatically. And they were called the Reforms of the 1830s.

Jeremy Bentham was one of the leaders. Jeremy Bentham was interested-- well, his movement was primarily interested in new laws, particularly laws favoring the upper middle class as opposed to the aristocrats. Jeremy Bentham's starting point was morality, ethics-- that what he wanted to say was that when we build these new laws, we want them grounded in ethics. They have to be right.

You get the context now? So what he wants to do is to come up with an ethical theory that is compelling upon the people around him. What would that ethical theory have to do? Be grounded on facts, not on ideas.

And here's the way the utilitarians did it-- they got their clipboards and their pencils, and they went out into the world and asked people questions. They did not sit down under a tree with a loaf of bread, and a bottle of wine, and think through a great idea. They went out, and here's what they did-- they just asked themselves-- they used a method by Plato-- they asked themselves, they asked people, why did you choose to do x instead of y?

They might ask you a question, why are you in graduate school? Make up an answer. Don't give me the truth. Just make up an answer, a reason why. "I'm in graduate school because I want to make more money when I get out."

And they did something. And they did something. It sounds like-- actually, I understand that Plato got his method of ends and means from watching mothers quiz children-- no, watching children quiz their mothers. Because a child at the right age, I think it's about three, when you tell them to do something, they'll say, why?

Then when you tell them why, guess what they'll say? Why? And what Plato would do is he'd ask you something, and then you give an answer, then he'd say, why, then you give another answer. And he would keep asking why until you stopped giving new answers.

That last answer is what they call an "end." The rest of it was means to ends. It's a theory called teleology. I'd like for you to know this word. I'd like for you to use this word in your homework assignment-- studying ends and means. So what they came back from the field with was two things-- number one was that they-- listen to me carefully because you're going to get this kind of language when you read philosophers.

The end of life is happiness, not the end may be death, but the end being in relationship to means. When you ask people, why are they living, and how do they make their decisions, they came up with, in the end-- when you got down to the end, when they ask you why, and after a while, you just keep saying the same thing over and over again-- in the end, they said it was pleasure as opposed to pain. It was happiness as opposed to unhappiness. It boiled down to that.

Then they asked them, well, what are the kinds of things out here in the world that you think are good? And which are things that you think are bad? Which are the things that you think are moral? Which are the things that you think are immoral? They just asked people.

And there was a collection of things that most people sort of agreed on. It's wrong to murder somebody just because I feel like it, things like that. Then they came back, and they said, how can I organize my life in terms of ends but respect those morals? And the answer was, act in such a way that I not only try to maximize my own happiness, but maximize the happiness among all the affected parties of my action, all the parties affected by my action.

Let's pause for a second. Let's try to interrogate this idea. I mean, sorry, I didn't want to say, "idea," but it is an idea. But let's interrogate utilitarianism a little bit.

Let's interrogate all that. I will play the game, but I want you to get into it at your own leisure. And I want you all to be a little bit more aggressive about getting into these conversations, not necessarily today, but as you go along, particularly for credit. And this is where you really want to interrogate this thing.

I want to start out with what I think is the hard question, the hardest question. Why should I maximize your happiness? Now there are two ways to answer that question-- what you think is a good answer to the question, or what you think that a utilitarian would say. I'm really interested in the last one.

STUDENT: Do you want us to--

TAFT BROOME: Yeah, that's not a rhetorical question. Why should I care about your happiness? Why should I maximize the happiness of all the affected parties?

STUDENT: So the utilitarian would say, I think, I should maximize other people's happiness because later on, they will take action that affects me. And if, in the past, I have made them happy, then they will take action to make me--

TAFT BROOME: That's a good utilitarian answer.

STUDENT: [INAUDIBLE] maximize my happiness in the end [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: Well, then, I would say, well, is that really the first principle? Is it really the first principle maximizing the happiness of all affected persons, when then actually what you just said was the end is your own personal happiness? Why not say maximize my own personal happiness, and then reason it out that in a society, I cannot maximize my own personal happiness without trying to help maximize other people's happiness, too?

That's not the end. The end is your personal happiness. Well, then, let's be bold. Maybe the utilitarians got it wrong. Hold on a minute, and I'll pass this around.

All they do in this book is tear up utilitarians. So let's tear it up. Answer my question-- maximizing the happiness of all the affected parties, according to what you just said, is not the end.

STUDENT: Right.

TAFT BROOME: Maximize my own-- in other words, there is a branch and a philosophy of ethics called hedonism. Bentham was a hedonist. Can we escape hedonism in utilitarianism?

STUDENT: Well, maybe [INAUDIBLE] you are connected, in some sense, to other people, and you can't just maximize your own happiness without worrying about other [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: I agree, but my problem is--

STUDENT: The end is still [INAUDIBLE]

TAFT BROOME: My problem is that the end of hedonism is not this maximization of everybody's happiness. The end of hedonism is maximization of my happiness, even though maximizing your happiness is a means to maximizing my happiness. So why don't we just call a spade a spade-- that we don't want to be utilitarians.

We want to be hedonists and we want to maximize our own individual-- that the end of hedonism is to maximize our own individual pleasure or happiness. And the smart thing to do is to help maximize others', if we can do it. Why not just say that?

Why don't we just come back and tell the lie, we want to maximize everybody's happiness? I'm being a devil's advocate. Maybe they got it wrong.

STUDENT: What if we place equal value on social order, equal value on our own happiness and social order. And so then, you need everyone's happiness to be happening in order to have social [INAUDIBLE]

TAFT BROOME: I'm trying to think-- I did hear-- I remember somebody saying something like that. And I can't remember who it was. But if you said that, the question would not be the question of reason. The question would be compulsion.

How many people going to buy that? You've got to give me an end. I'm not going to believe you got two independent, equally valued ends. I'm just not going to believe it.

STUDENT: [INAUDIBLE]

TAFT BROOME: Fear?

STUDENT: [INAUDIBLE]

TAFT BROOME: Faith.

STUDENT: [INAUDIBLE]

TAFT BROOME: Oh, there is a certain amount of faith in all of this because there's this unwritten-- well, it is written. And you have to read it when you read these people. They will all say that what we're talking about applies to rational persons, which does not apply to children, does not apply to schizophrenics.

But it doesn't apply to a whole lot of other people, and it doesn't apply to faith. And it does not apply-- there's another category of person out here or a category that we all find ourselves in from time to time. That's the category of when we say, I will allow my emotions to take charge of my reason.

If you don't believe it, is there a Dance Department here at MIT? Is there an Art Department?

STUDENT: I believe art [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: In architecture?

STUDENT: Architecture and [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: Gordon. You'll find that there's something more important than faith and reason. That's being able-- you know a Frenchman? A Frenchman from France?

STUDENT: Yes.

TAFT BROOME: Go ahead, talk to a Frenchman. See what they find out is the most important thing in life. Might not be reason, might not be faith, either. It might be stuff that comes from your heart.

A word that they will use from time to time, that I don't like to use because it isn't strong enough, is intuition. But that's not really what it is. It's something else.

All right, here's what I think that a utilitarian will say, that might have some compulsion. I invite you to read more, and to bring this up again, and take me on in this. But I think that a utilitarian will say, well, look, I didn't make up this whole business of morals.

I went and asked you before I put this theory together. You told me already what you thought were morals and right and wrong. All I'm doing is putting it into a logical, rational order. So the utilitarian would blame you for the whole thing.

STUDENT: But what is the end? That doesn't-- I'm not understanding how that solves the problem you pointed out.

TAFT BROOME: Right. I think the best way to explain that one is by a person named Schopenhauer. Schopenhauer tells a story. Schopenhauer says he's walking along one day, and gets to a bridge, and there's some other people on the bridge.

And one person gets up, and decides to commit suicide, and tries to jump off the bridge. Just as he gets off the bridge, another person runs over, and grabs him by the nape of the neck and holds him. And then everybody else pulls them all back in.

And Schopenhauer asked the guy, said, why did you do that? Why did you risk your life for this guy when you almost went over? If we weren't here to pull you back, you would have gone, too.

His answer was, I could not live with myself if I hadn't tried. So the point is very much like what you had said before. Some people cannot separate their individual selves from your individual self.

Better stated-- some people cannot separate their feelings of pain and happiness from your feeling of pain and happiness. I'm sitting here eating a hamburger, feeling good, you're sitting there starving, I can't enjoy my hamburger. So it is some people just do not see that there is a difference between your pain and their own pain. It's called empathy and other things.

Well, then, you say, what about people who are not empathetic? Now here's what I think a good Bentham utilitarian would say-- well, this is only the starting point for laws. We're going to force you to be this way.

The whole point for him was to get a good, sound basis for law that was enforceable. And I really think that a utilitarian who doesn't see it that way is going to offer you an argument that you won't find compelling. Now, let's go back across the world.

There was a man who wrote his-- Kant wrote his most important piece in, if I got it right, 1776? I was going to say 1780, but yeah.

STUDENT: Which one, *Critique?*

TAFT BROOME: *Critique,* so we're talking about the same period of time.

STUDENT: Like Adam Smith also [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: Adam Smith-- so a lot of things were going on intellectually in these times. So now, we're going to go over to-- I'm going to call it Germania. And we're going to go to a little town called Konigsberg.

Did I get that right, Konigsberg? The O has an umlaut on top of it. So if you know your German, you tell me how to pronounce it.

STUDENT: Konigsberg.

TAFT BROOME: Konigsberg. And it's a small college town. And there's a man there named Immanuel Kant. And Immanuel Kant, in his whole life, has never left that little town. He's going to talk about the nature of humanity, but he's never left that little town.

Immanuel Kant-- here's what I think helps me see what Immanuel Kant sees. May not help you, but try to see it through my eyes, first, then tear it up. Immanuel Kant was first and foremost a Professor of Logic. He was a logician.

And he looks at this question of teleology, about why people act in certain ways. And he says that he's just looked at the universe of what everybody says about ends and means, and he can find only one end that human beings are capable of. And he says that human beings-- remember that piece I had up here about the Gothic religion? He says that every human being has the capacity-- hi, we're out of here at five of.

STUDENT: [INAUDIBLE].

TAFT BROOME: I have a class, yeah, so we're out of here at five of. Immanuel Kant says that every person has the will, the capability called the will, to do, to act. And, he says-- you have to understand this-- that that will is not the effect of any other cause.

Nobody else, including God, gave you that will. That was yours. That's the end.

So he says, now let's see if we can build up an ethical system based on the will. Notice the will is in the mind. I'm not going out here to make any tests.

I've never left this little village-- not village, little town, little college town. I don't have to leave it. I don't have to get my clipboard and ask anybody anything. Because if it's in my mind, it's in yours, and I can talk about the mind as a universal. Shouldn't use that word [INAUDIBLE].

So he says, what about the will? I have the will to act this way or that way. Now, he's a logician, and he's looking for first principles, like a mathematician looking for axioms.

He says, if I have the will to act this way or that way, I act this way, but then I don't act that way. Why is it that I make this choice instead of that? So it's free will, but a logician is asking, why did I make this choice instead of that?

And then he does something that lets you know how deep he's trying to get. He's saying, I have the will to hold out this piece of chalk and drop it. After I let that piece of chalk drop, that piece of chalk it is subject to some laws of nature, of gravitation, that govern what happens to it.

While I was acting upon my will, my will has some laws. But I invent those laws. Somebody else invented the law of gravitation, but I invent the laws by which I will choose to do this instead of doing that.

Which laws, what laws, shall I adopt? Then he asked one more question and gets to the final part. Well, I want some basic laws. I want the fundamental laws. I want something that's on the level of an axiom in mathematics.

And what he says is-- see if I can put it in the right words because this has to be done right-- what he says is that I want some laws that tell me what I should do or tell me what I should not do. I'm going to call these imperatives. Now here's the subtlety about these imperatives-- now listen to me carefully.

This is a subtlety-- I think it's a subtlety-- because philosophers tend to take it for granted. I think it's the difference between life and death for us in the class. An imperative is something that you should do all of the time, not when the situation arises. That's empirical.

You should never lie, not wait till the occasion comes. What can I write down as an imperative that I should always do or that I should never do? That's an imperative.

If I should try to maximize your happiness in order that we all maximize our happiness, then Immanuel Kant is going to say, well, that's an empirical test that lasts for that particular instance. That's not a general principle of the will. What is a general principle of the will?

He's a logician, it's logic. What can I do? Here's the way Immanuel would say why you should never lie. No, no, I got a better one-- steal. Why should you never steal?

Better stated, why should you never steal? Why should I always act so that I never steal, every day, all the time? Now here's the way Kant would argue that out-- got nothing to do with whether or not it makes other people mad, and whether or not they're going to hurt me so that I will not maximize my pleasure. He's a logician.

Kant will say that stealing implies property. And if I steal all of your property, and all of your property, and all of your property, and all your property, and all your property, the time will come when I cannot act, that I will steal, because there's nothing for me to steal. If I say that I can-- see how he's-- let me say that again. Can you say it better?

STUDENT: So you're saying the choice is-- the imperative is either you should not steal all the time, or you should steal all the time. And if you go with you should steal all the time--

TAFT BROOME: You cannot do it.

STUDENT: There will be a point when you can never do that anymore.

TAFT BROOME: Logically.

STUDENT: But if you go with you should not steal, for one's entire life it is always possible.

TAFT BROOME: It's always possible not to steal, logically, meaning from the branch of the learned discipline called logic, not in terms of something genetic that we call reasoning out of the brain and people can come up with. I'm talking about opening a book that has logic in the title. He's a logician. So he is going to say that the fundamental principles are principles of logic.

And then he's going to say that everybody should reason that way. Look at logic now. Logic is not going to give you some alternatives. That's not always true.

But the basic ideas that he's talking about when it comes to imperatives is always true. So what he is trying to do is give you some imperatives, the kind of imperative where I said, do x because y will help maximize your pleasure. He's going to call that a hypothetical imperative.

Never lie-- he's going to call that-- guess what-- categorical imperative. I want you to know those terms, the categorical imperative. So he's going to build up a system of logic based on the equivalence of axioms called these categorical imperatives, and that those imperatives are imperative upon you all of the time by reason of logic.

My last piece on this is the same belligerent question I asked of the utilitarian. Why should I maximize your happiness or the happiness of all of the affected parties? I'm going to ask Kant, why should I be logical?

And I'll tell you what Kant is going to say. Kant is going to go all the way back to the Stoics. And for me, those were the real philosophers, the Stoics, not because their ideas were any good, but because they did not eat unless they stood up in a crowd and debated a point. And if they won, the crowd would give them some money. That's the only way they can feed themselves. So that's a real philosopher. What do you say, Joel, not so?

STUDENT: Well, I mean, to convince people-- that's a politician's job.

TAFT BROOME: All right, so there was this story about this Stoic talking about reason and logic. And somebody in the crowd said, oh, wait a minute, hold on. Folded his hands across his chest, became very confident, looked at that philosopher, and said, why should I be logical?

And the philosopher said, do you want a logical answer? The answer was yes. The basic idea was, you should be logical because you compelled me to be logical.

You're going to compel all of us to be logical. How do you get to be so high and mighty that you can be the only one in here who's not logical? So that's what he means when he says universal. It's got to apply. Whatever you do has got to apply to everybody.

So when you make these analyses of the A7-D case, when you get to the deontological analysis, don't give me anything that tests facts. Don't give me any test based on facts. Try your best, and I'm going to assume that you haven't had a formal course in logic. That's OK, at least give it a try.

Go back and see if you can put this thing in logical terms. If you can't, say so, but say that Kant would. You don't know how, but that's what he would do.

Now, since time is just-- I calculate I got one more minute. I promise to do something that I didn't do yet, and that was put the grades and Dr. Moses' presentation in the email. I'm going to do it today or tomorrow. That'll cover that.

And give me this homework on Tuesday. And then, we'll start talking about some matters of the calendar, when the test is coming up, and all of that kind of stuff. Good? Yes.

STUDENT: Question [INAUDIBLE]. In terms of the imperative, is there a difference between having an imperative and the ability to conceal the imperative? So for example, if the imperative is, I'm going to steal and I'm always going to steal, and maybe there's some point in time where there's nothing left to steal, but I can still have the imperative that I'm going to steal.

It's just that I can't fulfill it. There's nothing left to steal until someone makes something, and then I'll steal it. So is there a difference between just having an imperative and fulfilling it?

TAFT BROOME: Right. Now, I'm not going to answer your question directly because that presumes that there's a unique answer to your question. What I'm going to do is say what I think Kant and other deontologists will say. What they will say is that they're going to assume that the will, at first, is all powerful. They're not going to limit that right now, and say that you have the power to do these things.

The question is, will you make the choice to do it? So they're going to eliminate that a priori. I shouldn't say that a priori. They are going to eliminate that before they get into the argument.

The rest of us are going to have to deal with that on a case by case basis. And let's see how far you can make that argument. And the question is, can you make it compelling, just like Dr. Moses was talking about at the beginning of the class?

You could probably make that case-- I'm going to be-- you'll be more likely to make that case in Germany than you would in England today, even. Though the world is globalizing, and it doesn't apply to everybody, but it depends on who you're talking to. There are some orientations that are going to see more sense in it. A utilitarian culture is not going to see any point in it.

We can have a brainstorming discussion next time. We can devote most of the class to that. I won't talk most of the time. How about that?

Right. Thank you all very much. You got something for me?

STUDENT: I was just going to ask if it would-- I know the first time we did a little paragraph about the A7-D case, we weren't supposed to do a lot of reading or look at examples. Is it OK to do that now, to use our book?

TAFT BROOME: A lot of reading means use the book and use at least one other reference. That's all that needs right now.

STUDENT: OK.

TAFT BROOME: And it means Chapter 4.

STUDENT: OK, great. Thanks.