

HAIDT: Okay, so two quick announcements. First, the coffee breaks, we'd forgotten to announce them yesterday, but as you got the message, they will always be in the lobby of KMC and they'll always ... they have the schedule so they know when our breaks are. The afternoon break is at a different time each day. And we have one other evening plenary, so there will be again right out here in Founders Lobby or Patrons' Lobby, there will be, again, a coffee break, as last night. That's for Adam Grant tomorrow.

Second announcement is, so after my talk yesterday morning when I showed the video of the Moral Dumbfounding, I heard from five students who were bothered by the discussion in the video about consensual sibling incest, and then the comparison was made to Scott Murphy, who was an undergrad at UVA. He makes the comparison to watching gay sex. And several people who were offended by that, and they came to talk to me, and at first I resisted because I thought, well, Scott is not being homophobic. He's making the point that it's perfectly okay. There's nothing wrong with gay sex, and the fact that I don't like it, the fact that it bothers me to watch it doesn't make it wrong. So at first I thought, well, he's not being homophobic. He's not saying anything that I thought was inappropriate. And certainly it is the case that sexual interests, sexual arousal, and sexual repulsion is very personal, and something that we can't legislate. And certain is the case that lots and lots of men love watching two women having sex, and really hate watching two men having sex. So I was sort of focused on that. And I thought ... (Laughter) ... so I thought there's really nothing wrong with what Scott said.

But then I started thinking about the wisdom of showing that video in class. And especially once I put myself in the position of a gay student, here in the class, listening to that, and I did see some of the nuances, like where Scott says, "Well, it's looking like a genetic sort of thing," like implying, "Well, there's a ... it could be a disease or something like that." So I do understand, even though Scott ... I don't think Scott was being homophobic, I do understand that it was not wise or appropriate, or really strictly necessary for me to show that video in this class to make those points. So I do thank the students ... oh, there's Turchese, so thank you, Turchese, for bringing that to my attention.

I've shown, as I told Turchese yesterday, I've shown the video at least 50 times in academic conferences, in classes. Nobody's ever raised an objection. But odds are that there were students who were offended and they just didn't have the guts or feel comfortable, I should say, enough to come up to me. So thank you for bringing that to my attention. I won't show that in

student gatherings any more. Is there something else you want to say?

WOMAN #1 (OFFSCREEN): I don't see how the comment you just made this morning isn't as offensive as the video last night, saying that men love to watch women have ... two women have sex. I think it's disrespectful of the women to women relationship.

HAIDT: Of the what? Of the women's relationship?

WOMAN #1: Of a lesbian relationship. I don't see how ...

HAIDT: Well, okay, now, hold on a second.

(Slight Applause)

HAIDT: Hold on a second. This is a university. We are here to talk about truth, reality, facts. I am a social psychologist. I can say things about sexuality. There are big differences between male sexuality and female sexuality. On average, there are lots of exceptions. And if you can find a citation or if you can find evidence in pornography, there's a vast amount of pornography, appealing to men, that shows two women, there is some showing two men, but much, much less.

WOMAN #1: Right, but you're apologizing for something that was inappropriate yesterday, and yet you continue to bring things that are irrelevant to the apology. I don't see how bringing up the fact that there are pornography with two women having sex, how is that relevant to yesterday's video?

HAIDT: It's relevant because Scott was making an argument in a discussion. Scott was saying that he was talking about his personal preferences. He is allowed to do that. That's not offensive.

WOMAN #2 (OFFSCREEN): I think what I'm hearing, and I was someone who also felt discomfort by it, is that sexual relations, or love ... amorous relations are deeply personal, and intimate, and so to have them discussed in a space that is very public without having set ground rules, without having ensured that those relationships would be respected, even right now, just the laughter might suggest disrespect, whether it was intentional or not. And so I think it's a broader issue of, when there is something so intimate and so personal, we really do have to set a context that makes that treated in such a way. And that was lacking yesterday. So there's probably more that I'm missing, but I did just want to speak to an element that I felt ... that I think is commonplace for facilitation of personal conversation.

HAIDT: Okay, thank you. I agree with that. I ...

(Applause)

HAIDT: I agree with that comment, and in academic settings, we often do touch on ... we often do touch on sensitive topics. It is helpful to have ground rules. It's also extremely helpful to have the principle of charity, which is that you assume the best about your interlocutor's motives and not the worst. I listened yesterday. As normal, as I said in the lecture yesterday, at first I resisted. I came up with arguments why I was right. But last night, while I was thinking about it, and I watched the video, and I made an effort to put myself in the shoes of gay students in this class. And I changed my mind. And I apologized. So I think the principle of charity would require saying that I have done my best here. Thank you. Thank you. Okay.

(END OF TAPE)