SPRING 2013

ETHICS ROLL CALL

TO CHAMPION THE NOBILITY OF POLICING

Institute for LAW ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

C.S. Lewis, Confucius and the Education of the Heart

By Dan Primozic

Those of the readership that have gone through our Ethics Train-the-Trainer program will doubtless remember your reading and discussion concerning the *Analects* of Confucius. And you will also doubtless recall that a central concept for Confucius is *jen,* compassion, or more accurately, human-heartedness. Another ethical thinker, C. S. Lewis, also emphasizes this concept of human-heartedness from his Christian perspective. But, interestingly enough, he also compares it favorably with the Confucian concept: thus, showing us a little about what ethicists call "comparative ethics."

But before I get to that exposition, I would like to remind us of the importance of the concept of compassion, especially when it comes to its place in leadership. This important concept is emphasized in a recent blog entry for the Baldrige organization written by Christine Schafer regarding the compassionate leadership of the retiring director of the Baldrige Performance Excellence Program, Henry Hertz:

> Under Harry's leadership, compassionate communications, accommodations, and other forms of kindness have been offered to meet the needs of all who work for the program, including external volunteers. So I think it's worth considering where such kindness starts (with leadership, in this case with him) – and *what good it does*. . . I see practical and economic benefits of boosting and ensuring workforce engagement and productivity. At a deeper level, I see such kindness as meeting the immeasurable but essential needs that human beings have to feel deeply connected to and fully acknowledge by each other. . . Here I think it's relevant to stress that the culture of kindness in my office is not a fluke – not the serendipitous result of chance hiring of nice people. Instead, this culture is seeded by and reinforced through the personal actions of our senior leader. (Christine Schafer, "Where Kindness is a Core Value: Leadership with Heart, BLOGRIGE baldrige program@nist.gov, 5/28/2013)

There can be no doubt that C. S. Lewis, the Oxford and Cambridge don, was a man of very high intellect and in possession of a keen, incisive mind. But although he never advised the abandonment reason in the interest of finding one's ethical way through life, he places a rather high value on the education of the heart for that quest. Lewis should be the object of everyone's study who wishes to know more about living, about living ethically and about living authentically. He was quite unique in that he was a Christian academic and authentically lived his philosophy, which few have chosen to do throughout the history of Western philosophy. When one finds a thinker who means what he says so much that he actually "walks his talk," I think it wise for us to give what he says some careful scrutiny, to see the "draw." Lewis courageously took his positions on issues despite pressures to the contrary:

> First, C. S. Lewis was authentic . . . Lewis showed up. We have record of Lewis' bellowing laugh heard from his rooms in Magdalen College. His deepest friendships, fomented over Tuesday lunches at the Eagle and Child, testify to a hunger for genuine human relationships . . . To change the tense of an oft-used phrase, what one saw is what one got. Lewis was no pretender. He never rose to the occasion of his celebrity status. . . Lewis violated the unwritten Oxford law that prohibited tutors from expressing their faith in public or in prose. This don broke ranks with Oxford protocol when he wrote *The Pilgrim's Regress.* But in spite of his colleagues' criti-

Humility is not thinking less of yourself, it's thinking of yourself less.

C.S. Lewis

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

INSTITUTE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION
(THE CENTER FOR AMERICAN AND INTERNATIONAL LAW)
5201 DEMOCRACY DRIVE
PLANO, TX 75024
972.244.3430
972.244.3431 FAX
WWW.THEILEA.ORG

> criticisms, he continued to churn out books on theology, ethics, and apologetics in the years to come. (Reed Jolley, "Apostle to Generation X: C. S. Lewis and the Future of Evagelism," *C. S. Lewis: Lightbearer in the Shadowlands*, ed., Angus J.L. Menuge, Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway Books, 1997, pp. 83-24)

He joined the Army on June 8, 1917 and was billeted in Keble College, Oxford with a young man named "Paddy" Moore. His mother, Mrs. Janie King Moore and her daughter Maureen were staying in rooms in town near Keble. Lewis became part of the family quickly and spent a large part of his Oxford life with them. The two new recruits promised to take care of each other's family should only one of them return from battle. It was Paddy who cashed that promised by dying in battle on March 24, 1918.

Lewis, too, was wounded in the Battle of Arras on Mount Bernenchon on April 15, 1918: "I was really hit in the back of the left hand, on the left leg from behind and just above the knee, and in the left side just under the armpit." He returned to Oxford on January 13, 1919 to study and to keep his promise to look after Mrs. Moore and Maureen.

That promise-keeping, in itself, is noteworthy and is a mark of Lewis' own moral fiber, mainly because keeping that promise was anything but easy. Life at Oxford after the war was busy, tedious and exhausting for Lewis. Lewis joined the Moore household (an arrangement that endured until Mrs. Moore's death many years later), moved to eight different Oxford locations with them, performed most of the daily household chores and still took a First Class degree in Classical Honour Moderations, a First in *Literae Humaniores*, and a First in English in July 1923.

But the strain took its toll on him. Both he and Mrs. Moore felt that his best creative years were slipping quickly past him and leaving no intellectual results. He began to dream of the "state of an old, successful man of genius, sitting with all his work behind him, waiting to drop off." He was passed over for many fellowships at Oxford and had to live from his father's hand for many a year. So when Lewis performs moral comparisons concerning the ethical concept of human-heartedness it is not from a theoretical perch atop an ivory tower or a misty, mystical mountain top.

Before getting into a full blown comparison of the concept of compassion, I think Lewis would want to draw us to the fact that the rules or laws of right and wrong formerly were called the "natural law" of human nature. People generally believed that just as all entities have natural laws that govern and guide them, so do human entities. The law of human nature is different than that of gravitational force, however, only insofar as humans are free to obey or defy the moral law of their nature. This law is called the law of nature because people once thought that we all know it naturally enough and it needed no teaching. Lewis also did not fail to notice, of course, that there exist a number of odd individuals among us who seem not to know the law of nature, just as there are those among us who are color-blind and totally tone deaf. He meant, simply, that the human race, taken as a whole, in a largely by-gone era, thought that the laws and rules of decent and upright human behavior were obvious: indeed, they were simply natural.

Lewis also realized full well what the relativists could throw into his way on this point: he knew that cultural relativism could raise its head and snarl that nothing of a moral sort is universal. But, Lewis also knew that cultures, when really studied rigorously, are not so relatively different after all. He knew there are inter-cultural differences, but also knew that they do not amount to total differences. If we were to study the moralities of the ancient Egyptians, Hindus, Chinese, Greeks, Romans, Babylonians, for example, we would discover how similar they are to each other and to our own. He asks if we can think of cultures where cowards were admired, where one betrays those most kind to him. Lewis thought that we cannot.

> We were told about it all long ago by Plato. As the king governs by his executive, so Reason in man must rule the mere appetites by means of the 'spirited element.' The head rules the belly through the chest – the seat, as Alanus tells us, of Magnanimity, of emotions organized by trained habit into stable sentiments. The Chest – Magnanimity – Sentiment – these are the indispensable liaison officers between cerebral man and visceral man. It may even be said that it is by this middle element that man is man: for by his intellect he is mere spirit and by his appetite

Courage is not simply one of the virtues, but the form of every virtue at the testing point.

C. S. Lewis

> mere animal. . . Men without Chests. It is an outrage that they should be commonly spoken of as Intellectuals. This gives them the chance to say that he who attacks them attacks Intelligence. It is not so. They are not distinguished from any other men by any unusual skills in finding truth or any virginal ardour to pursue her. Indeed it would be strange if they were: a persevering devotion to truth, a nice sense of intellectual honor, cannot be long maintained without the aid of sentiment . . . it is not excess of thought but defect of fertile and generous emotion that marks them out. Their heads are no bigger than the ordinary: it is the atrophy of the chest beneath that makes them seem so. (C. S. Lewis, "Men Without Chests," *The Abolition of Man*, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1955, pp. 34-35)

In the quotation above, Lewis tells us that in his generation, young men were raised who had not the least bit of compassion or "heart" and went about the daily business of their lives either feeding their own bellies or their own intellects (and, in turn, again feeding their own bellies), without the faintest regard for the "other," or the community. Is that the case for our own time?

But what does a truly moral person look like? What does a "man with a chest" do and think and say? They follow the moral law within; they are people who have had a good and refined "education of the heart." Indeed, as Christine Schafer said, they *have* a heart.

That kind of heart contains a full complement of the quality of compassion and sincere care for others. That kind of heart is that which completes us as human beings in that it beats for others. That kind of heart, taken at the corporate level, is that which makes possible an authentic, concrete, fully human community. One needs the opportunity to know and exercise "human heartedness" in reference to other people *per se* in order to make one more than the very animals that Thomas Hobbes claimed that we are by nature: creatures of war and self-centered strife.

This is the point at we can begin looking to Confucius when he speaks of this "education" of the heart. Confucius is fairly clear on the ultimate value of *jen* or human heartedness.

> If a man is not a true man, what is the sense of rituals? . . . This touches the very heart of Confucius' philosophy of life, which demands integrity in one's good will . . . The Superior Man *feels* like practicing *li* [societal laws, rules and rituals] because he is realizing his own magnanimity (*jen*) through it . . . the *li* are imposed on man from the outside. But beside this outer mold, we each still have within us something which we may take as a model for our conduct. If we can find in ourselves a rule for the similar treatment of the other; if we do to others what we wish for ourselves and 'do not do unto others what we do not like ourselves,' then the outpourings of our nature will of themselves be in accord with what is proper . . . This is why *jen* is the all pervading principle of Confucius' teaching, and the center of his philosophy. (David S. Noss and John B. Noss, *A History of the World's Religions*, 8th edition, New York: Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1984, p. 297)

Men without chests, as Lewis would say, claim to debunk matters of the heart, of sentiment, in order that they can more deftly take a pragmatic, intellectually "objective" and profitable approach to life. This approach allegedly is the ultimate value one should pursue and one must sacrifice matters of the heart to it.

> And this end must have real value in their eyes. To abstain from calling it 'good' and to use, instead, such predicates as 'necessary' or 'progressive' or 'efficient' would be subterfuge. They could be forced by argument to answer the questions 'necessary for what?', 'progressive towards what?', 'effecting what?'; in the last resort they would have to admit that some state of affairs is good for its own sake. (Lewis, *The Abolition of Man*, p. 40)

Yet why should one be good, or do good for its own sake? Why, indeed, take others into account at all? Why, furthermore, should one serve others, even to the point of self-sacrifice, perhaps the most profound self-sacrifice: i.e., unto the point of one's own total demise? Is there anything "in it" for the servant? Can this question find an answer in the logical and rational sphere? Lewis answers this way: A refusal to sacrifice one's self is not any more rational than a commitment to sacrifice, for neither has much to do with rationality.

But neither can instinct be the source of moral or heroic action. I do not find the instinct to do so in myself and neither did Lewis. And there is nothing intellectual that drives me to preserve the species, as Lewis has already pointed out. If anything, instinct and an intellectual use of my wits might tell me that self-preservation is more to the instinctual and intellectual point – certainly self-sacrifice would not surface on the list of things to do. There is another, more fundamental, less intellectual, but nevertheless built-in kind of Reason that Lewis claims for the source of moral

A superior man is modest in his speech, but exceeds in his actions.

Confucius

action that is positioned between the instinctual (appetitive) and the intellectual (mind) that he called his Christian God and that both he and Confucius called the *Tao.*

It is certainly true that one need not argue with someone who makes the instinctual appeal for the self-sacrifice that results in the preservation of the species any more than one must argue with salmon for doing the same. Yet, the appeal to instinct can yield unwelcome fruit as instinct will also allow one to do anything one wants when one wants to do it, up to and including some of the more unhealthy and heinous activities humans and animals engage in. And it is so with appeals to the intellect as well, for our minds can tell us that it is wise for us to be selfish and unwise for us to be unselfish. Therefore it must be the case that only appeals to the *heart*, or what Lewis called the "chest" in the opening passage of this chapter, will be found to be the root of human values and moral living. And the source of that heart is, for Lewis, his Person called God and, for Confucius, the source is the *Tao.* Clearly then, the pure intellectual and the pragmatist "debunker" cannot find a good foundation for a value system. He cannot find it in a rational operation with true propositions, nor can he find it as a result of instinct. The first principles of a value system must be found elsewhere:

> 'All within the four seas are his brothers' (xii. 5) says Confucius of the *Chun-tzu*, the *cuor gentil* or gentleman. *Humani nihil a me alienum puto* [Nothing human is foreign to me] says the Stoic. 'Do as you would be done by' says Jesus. 'Humanity is to be preserved' says Locke. All the practical principles behind the [debunker's] case for posterity, or society, or the species, are there from time immemorial in the *Tao*. But they are nowhere else. Unless you accept these without question as being to the world of action what axioms are to the world of theory, you can have no practical principles whatever. . . they neither demand nor admit proof. But then you must allow that Reason can be practical, that an *ought* must not be dismissed because it cannot produce some *is* as its credential. If nothing is self-evident, nothing can be proved. Similarly, if nothing is obligatory for its own sake, nothing is obligatory at all. (Lewis, *The Abolition of Man,* pp. 52-53)

Another reason that one cannot rationally deduce propositions like "Society ought to be preserved," and like the golden rule, and cannot find evidence for them is that they are first principles, self-evident, and must be presupposed for the possibility of moral values *per se.* In short, they cannot be moral conclusions, but can only always exist as moral premises that constitute the very possibility of morality. Perhaps that is why Kant had no further reason for why one should be moral at all, other than the self-evident duty to do so. These are premises of the heart, so to speak. And they are the basis for rationality, if not rationality itself. That entails that we avoid sharply distinguishing value from fact, and sentiment from reason.

Hence the sole prop for the moral law, the natural law, God, the *Tao*, is the *Tao* itself and the dictates of the human heart. Therefore, moral education is the education of the heart. To give of one's self, from this basis of the "chest," is to be Christ-like; it is to be the servant, it is to give up one's life for one's friend, it is to be Confucius' "superior man" of *jen*. But one does get something quite remarkable in return for this self-sacrifice and amazing altruism.

> But there must be a real giving up of the self. You must throw it away 'blindly' to so speak . . . The principle runs through life from top to bottom. Give up yourself, you will find your real self . . . Keep back nothing. Nothing that you have not given away will ever be yours. Nothing that has not died will ever be raised from the dead. Look for yourself, and you will find in the long run only hatred, loneliness, despair, rage, ruin, and decay. (C. S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, Great Britain: Fontana Books, 1958, p. 188)

Do that, and Lewis and Confucius promise that you will have your reward as a treasure beyond all measure: you will have the joy of having followed the "Way," the *Tao.*

Wisdom, compassion, and courage are the three universally recognized moral qualities of men.
Confucius

Lewis claims that we must give ourselves over to the *Tao*, to the calls of the human heart. We do not give ourselves over to mere propositions or to mere instincts. We trust not a mere person but the moral law within. And we trust it despite evidence to the contrary for our doing so, and also without regard of evidence that may count toward confirming that trust.

> When you are asked for trust you may give it or withhold it; it is senseless to say that you will trust if you are given demonstrative certainty. There would be no room for trust if demonstration were given. When demonstration is given what will be left will be simply the sort of relation which exists from having trusted, or not having trusted, before it was given . . . Our relation to those who trusted us only after we were proved innocent in court cannot be the same as our relation to those who trusted us all through. (Lewis, *The Abolition of Man*, pp. 28-29)

Lewis began trusting and living the moral life after being an atheist and after having a conversion experience while he taught and wrote at Oxford. Thenceforth he tried to live the "Way" as an "imitation of Christ." He did not see this kind of life as a clinical and intellectually abstract moral duty *via* Immanuel Kant. It was a natural outcome of the education of his heart. But this life was not without its ethical tests for Lewis.

He gave away the royalties from his books. He lived up to a promise to an army friend and looked after and gave a home to the mother of a wartime friend and her daughter. This woman was Mrs. Moore and her daughter Maureen. Life under the same roof with them over many hard years was strenuous for Lewis. Nevertheless, it taught him to give. It taught him to consider others beside himself. It taught him the ways of the heart: putting aside Mrs. Moore's dominations, her abrasive attitudes, her warlike attitudes against spiritual things and the other matters that filled Lewis' mind and soul. And he did this for the two women for thirty-two years.

Afterwards Lewis brought into his home his brother Warren, an alcoholic and veteran, and helped him to deal with the alcoholism. Lewis defended and augmented Christian philosophy, even in the face of the ridicule that was brought forth against him by his fellow Oxford Dons. Meanwhile, Lewis tirelessly lectured about Christianity at Royal Air Force bases during World War II and gave a series of radio broadcasts on Christianity for the BBC. But the most powerful evidence of the moral law taking a great piece of Lewis was his marriage to Joy Davidman, an American divorcee. He did this, and also became adoptive father to her two sons, because by helping her to become a British citizen, she could avoid deportation back to the United States (something she did not desire) and also take full advantage of England's national health care which could help her fight her cancer.

All of that exhibited and augmented the education of his heart, and as Lewis might put it, created a "man with a chest." To people like Socrates, Confucius and Lewis this education was not foolishness as it seems to be for men of the head and of the belly. It is the greatest gift: a crucial education of the heart that would be later complemented by the understanding of the mind. "Human-heartedness" is a highly meaning-packed phrase composed of two words whose order of appearance is no mere accident. As Confucius insisted, human-heartedness is what it really means to be human.

C. S. Lewis lived robustly, merrily, forthrightly and most of all, ethically. The literary, theological, and philosophical works that he bequeathed to us have done the world great favors. Yet the best of his gifts was living his philosophy authentically, obviously and truly: giving the rest of us the heart and the hope for doing likewise. He also always lived with a great thirst for learning and the open-mindedness that comes with that thirst. Hence, he studied, appreciated and compared his beliefs with the time-honored wisdom from many other traditions and cultures. His heart and mind became more educated and much wiser as a result. Perhaps we can follow him in that as well.

A Good Read – *The Ethical Warrior* Values, Morals and Ethics for Life, Work and Service by Jack E. Hoban (2012)

By T. Neil Moore

For those in policing, a service-oriented discipline, we often think about, discuss and debate the topics related to the ethics of policing. Of the more recently released texts on ethics, the work by Jack E. Hoban, *The Ethical Warrior* commands the attention of the professional policing community. Hoban a former Marine Corp officer, was admittedly influenced by the late Dr. Robert L. Humphrey (also a former Marine) in describing a way of looking at the values we teach in service – oriented disciplines like the military and policing. For many in those disciplines, the concept of one universal, objective and innate value may seem so intuitive that it resonates as a blinding flash of the obvious. For those who have studied ethics from a more academic perspective, this universal value may require a little more support. The idea of a "life value" as this universal value, shared by all people, is profound in its ability coalesce the other relative values we teach in many of our ethics courses. The theory of the Life Value as posited in Mr. Hoban's book is most succinctly stated as:

Philosophy is common sense with big words.

James Madison

> unconscious, internally-driven and externally driven, proclivities and stimuli – in other words, our environments. An enormous num ber of elements go into driving our feelings and actions, but the qualifier of them all is one particular value: the value of life…it is a dual value. For most of us, that duality consists of self and *at least* some others. Life is an objective value, because it is the one value we all share. Therefore, logically speaking, it appears that when we refer to others, it would have to mean *all* others. Otherwise, life would be a relative value. No one wants their life to be treated as if it were of relative value to another's." (p. 172)

The duality of this value, as Hoban describes it, guides human beings to seek to balance this objective value between the need to protect self and the need to protect others. He lays out a manner of reflecting and seeing the other relative values as moral if they 'support and honor the Life Value' and immoral if they do not.

Using Dr. Humphreys' experiences commanding Marines at the battle of Iwo Jima and through his own experiences as a Marine and one of the developers of the Marine Corp Martial Arts Program (MCMAP), Hoban populates this text with experiences that pose distinct "thinking points" that support the concept of the Life Value. For instance, what makes a Marine (or a soldier for that matter) willingly place his body on top of an enemy grenade before it explodes? In battle this happens essentially by instinct. Hoban offers that example as being demonstrative of the way human beings are made. He attributes this action to the life value and our ability and willingness to protect self and others. The act of that Marine is an affirmation that the life value is alive and well in the vast majority of human beings. Hoban reinforces the existence of life value through a small group of experiences interspersed throughout this text. He effectively guides the reader through the description of the concept, briefly relates the theory behind the Life Value and does so in a way that allows the reader to reflect on this value and sense of life value as an innate part of what makes us all human beings. Along the way we also come to know a little bit about Jack Hoban and see how he arrives at this point in his life, where his acknowledged expertise in the martial arts and his ability as a teacher aid him in writing about this concept. We come to find out that the MCMAP has at its core the essentials of making our warriors ethical even in a battlefront environment. At 312 pages, this book is a quick and interesting read. It gently and subtly encourages the reader to reflect on this concept, the life value, as a potential value that brings all the other values into its fold.

For those with any interest in the ethics associated with service –oriented professions that are charged with the protection of human life, this text provides great perspective in promoting an ethical lifestyle. Life value is a concept worthy of a few minutes of the reader's reflection.

Here are the ILEA Programs scheduled for this Summer:

IACP Staff and Command School (July 8 - 12, 2013 in Fishers, Indiana, USA)

Fishers Police Dept.
4 Municipal Drive
Fishers, Indiana 46038

Police and Family Conference
Backing Up a Cop: Building Better Law Enforcement Relationships (July 20 - 21, 2013 in Plano, Texas, USA)

ILEA Headquarters
at **The Center for American and International Law**
5201 Democracy Drive
Plano, Texas 75024

Teaching Diversity
Learn Strategies for Promoting Harmony while Increasing Officer Safety and Managing Workforce Diversity (August 26 - 29, 2013 in Plano, Texas, USA)

ILEA Headquarters
at **The Center for American and International Law**
5201 Democracy Drive
Plano, Texas 75024

The circulation of confidence is better than the circulation of money.

James Madison

Editorial Staff:

Editor:

Daniel T. Primozic, Ph. D. ;972-244-3433; dprimozic@cailaw.org

Staff Assistant:

Karen Zaccardo; 972-244-3447; kzaccardo@cailaw.org

The Institute for Law Enforcement Administration

The Center for American and International Law

5201 Democracy Drive, Plano Texas 75024-3561 USA

1-972-244-3430

1-972-244-3431 (Fax)