Zach O'Brien
GBT 5 Paper 2
5-30-08

"Have we in fact reached the end of history?"~ Francis Fukuyama

A Hegelian Approach to Understanding Today's Economics

Walk into my grandparents' living room on a holiday, and quite likely you'll find the TV turned way up, Uncle Kevin snoring on the couch, and my dad and my grandpa sitting alone in the corner, sipping tea, and debating some economic policy. My grandpa yells—he started yelling while raising his seven kids and now he's so deaf he can't even hear himself—while my dad talks in his soft, relaxed voice despite the TV. My grandpa, an Irish, Catholic, New Yorker, seamlessly spins left-wing agendas and anecdotes like the politician he used to be, while my dad, eyes twinkling, talks GOP rhetoric right back at him. While these good-natured debates will probably never really change either man, they serve as a microcosm of the philosophical clash between the ideological influences of Karl Marx and Adam Smith.

As I grow older, I am able to understand these debates on deeper and deeper levels. As a young child, I merely thought the whole scene to be somewhat hilarious. Perhaps I was wisest then. As I grew older, I began to understand how what my dad and grandpa talked about related to me and even how their views differed. However, as I began to study the great books, I gradually came to the realization that there was much more to the whole situation—that economics isn't a static debate between Republicans and Democrats; instead it is an ever advancing debate over the correct model for a dynamic market, where the status quo changes with an ever-changing society, and where models which were adequate yesterday may not be adequate in the future. Economics is a progression of trends, and when it is understood in this light the issues in today's economy become clearer.

An Introduction to Economic Trends: Plato

One of the first philosophers to examine economic trends was Plato, in his book the *Republic*. Although the *Republic* is largely about searching for the nature of Justice, Plato also demonstrates with his model of the rise and fall of the State how as man creates a better government for the State, the economy will grow. He later shows conversely how as men and government degenerate, so do the social and economic conditions.

At the end of Book II, Socrates traces the formation of the state. According to Socrates, "a state arises… out of the needs of mankind; no one is self-sufficing… and when partners and helpers are gathered together in one habitation the body of inhabitants is termed the state." This most primitive stage of Socrates' state only requires about five men to operate, which makes the economic situation quite simple. In this state, barter is the only type of economic transaction and there is little or no need for government interference in the economy.

However, all this changes when men decide to not only satisfy their necessary desires but also indulge their unnecessary pleasures. The "Luxurious State" is formed out of the primitive state, and a new economic trend is begun. "I suspect many will not be satisfied with the simpler way of life", says Socrates, "we must go beyond the necessaries of… house, clothes and shoes." This new mindset and new government model results in a more advanced economic trend. The state begins to engage in war to expand its borders for supplies and room for an increasing population. Further division of labor becomes necessary as people desire more and more luxury items. The trades of the carpenter, the teacher, and of course the merchant appear. The merchant engages the state in trade, expanding the state's sphere of influence. For the next few books Socrates develops laws and further administrative details, including that the "guardians" or leaders must be "True philosophers…lovers of the vision of truth." While Socrates adds many, many rules, this government, ruled by the philosopher king, basically serves as the model for his ideal state.

Further into the Republic, Plato revisits the concept of how changes in laws and government structure affect the economic conditions. In book eight, Socrates lists the five types of constitutions the state passes through as it declines. After the government has developed an elaborate division of labor and has become powerful, the government eventually falls into the next trend, a timocracy. Timocracy is driven by wise leaders who are focused largely on military action. This state is modeled after Sparta. As the leaders become greedy for money, an oligarchy forms. And eventually the people become overtaxed and unhappy and so revolt, forming a democracy. Socrates believes that a democracy cannot sustain itself, and so once again a revolt will take place and a military dictator will establish a tyranny.

Each time the state takes on a different constitution, the economic situation follows suit and adapts to the new governmental environment. When the ideal state turns into a timocracy, men are no longer all free to practice their trades, but the state is divided between those who fight and slaves who produce most of the goods. Soon oligarchy replaces timocracy and the economy becomes polar; "[The] State [becomes] not one, but two States, one of the poor and the other of the rich." Finally, the democratic economy is one of "excess liberty" where people are free to pursue whatever venture, and the tyrannical economy is stunted by fear of the bloodthirsty tyrant.

In his *Republic*, Plato demonstrates that the type of government the citizens live under dictates the economic trend or situation i.e. the transformation from timocracy to oligarchy creates a disparity between the rich and poor. However, he goes no further—he shows that a change in the type of government does not dictate a change in the natural economic principles that apply, i.e. in Oligarchic state people earn wealth by laboring and producing, and this does not change when the Democracy becomes the state's constitution. Neither do the changing economic trends affect the way governments should be run because the rules don't change—this would be a reverse of cause and effect because better government will create better economic trends and worse governments worse trends.

At the bottom of Plato's economic understanding is the basic assumption that the state of the economy is a function of the government. The better the government forms the economic environment, the better the economic situation. Thus the economic trends seen in history are all products of trends in changing constitutions.

Hegel

Over two thousand years later, another man named Georg Hegel reexamined the issue of economic trends. The model he comes up with is similar with Plato's; however, instead of considering economic and social trends a function of the type of government, Hegel considers the type of government a function of the economic and social trend. Hegel takes the inverse of Plato. In other words, government cannot really create economic trends; its role is to attempt to follow the changing trends in the economy and model a system or constitution which suits the present economic situation best.

In his book, *Phenomenology of the Spirit*, Hegel gives a comprehensive summary of the progression of history and philosophy. The Spirit (also called Idea) referred to in the title is another name for Hegel's concept of Truth. To him truth is not some static notion to be grasped once and for all. Instead, truth is dynamic, a coming and going, something to be understood in the trends it manifests itself in throughout history. " The stages in the evolution of the Idea…follow each other," writes Hegel in *Logic*. "[The] Architect has directed the work…to reach [higher stages] of its own being." Like the Matrix, truth is a sort of universal, all-encompassing existence which we are immersed in. However, it is important to remember that Hegelian truth is not "relative" in the technical sense; rather, Hegel believes that in each given era, the truth at that time is absolute.

Hegel's means of comprehending Truth (or Spirit) is comprised in the Hegelian logic. His logical method is anything but conventional; instead of using common inductive or deductive logic he introduces the "triadic logic". This logic assumes truth comes in trends, and so the triadic logic follows the manifestations of truth in stages. First, it deduces truth at its first stage, called the Thesis. This truth is a simple, all-encompassing set of principles which work perfectly at first. However, in the same way that "with equal justice, light and darkness might be styled different kinds of light", so the thesis gives way to its opposite, its negation which is called the Antithesis. With these elements co-existing existing in opposition to each other, a tension arises, and gradually out of these two conflicting entities forms another

entity called the Synthesis. This new synthesized truth forms the basis of a new thesis which starts the whole process over again.

In Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*, he uses this method of logic to paint a picture of the progression of social and economic trends in history. Like Plato, Hegel claims these historic trends correspond to psychological phases in an individual person's development. Hegel begins by expositing Sense Certainty, a basic trend where like in Plato's primitive state only the physical is important. Next is Perception: this trend is characterized by an emergence from the primitive. After Perception is Lordship and Bondage, portraying a feudal culture. As Hegel goes further he speaks of trends like Stoicism and Skepticism which depicts a state similar to the Roman Empire and the Beautiful Soul which could portray the enlightenment with its mercantile aspect. Hegel's last and greatest trend depicts man attaining "Absolute Knowing", seen by some as some sort of end of time and by others as the highest level of philosophic understanding.

At the foundation of this progression of economic trends is the assumption that the individual and even the state have little power to change the economic environment. To Plato, in some ways good economics is to government what justice is to a judge: the application of both justice and economics is an art, and the better the government understands the art of economics and the judge the art of justice, the better the results within their realm of jurisdiction. Perhaps the analogy goes even further because Plato would say both economics and justice have an *Adei*, meaning there is some unchanging, perfect way to administer economics and justice which governments and judges strive to master with their art. However, to Hegel it is the governments which must adapt to fit the ever changing economic situation. Economics is no art; rather governments must model their economic philosophy to best fit the changing principles which each new economic trend brings. This is important to understand: not only do changing economic trends contain the platonic implications of a change in prosperity; changing economic trends also imply changes in fundamental principles controlling the economic environment.

The difference between these two philosophies forcibly impacts our views on even those economic philosophers who are most influential in today's world. Here is an example—suppose Plato was living in today's society. To Plato, Adam Smith would have been the perhaps the greatest economist in history, because capitalism has proved to be the most effective capital-producing economic system yet. However, from Hegel's perspective, Smith is perhaps a great thinker of his time, but not one to necessarily treasure for the ages. For instead of an advanced form of art, capitalism is a model which fits this era well—and, as the economic trend changes, the boot may or may not fit the foot any longer.

At the heart of the differences between Plato's and Hegel's economic model, it is difficult to decide which is right. Hegel seems strange; while Plato, conventional. However, perhaps it is reasonable to consider Hegel right. When he is understood from the angle of saying that, as economics becomes more advanced, new principles sometimes apply and old ones sometimes become void, things seem viable. Consider the field of physics: today's scientists still believe that Newton's laws absolutely govern gravitational principles, but scientists also now know that once particles move at high speeds, Newton's laws no longer apply and new ones (Einstein's theory of relativity) do. In other words, a new level of velocity dictates a new trend of gravitational principles, where some new rules apply and some old ones do not. And if this is true of physics, why cannot the same concept be true of economics? Considerations such as these have led some to deem Hegel an important economic historicist.

"Hegel's historicism has become part of our contemporary intellectual baggage," writes Francis Fukuyama in *The End of History?*. "The notion that mankind has progressed through a series of primitive stages of consciousness on his path to the present, and that these stages corresponded to concrete forms of social organization, such as tribal, slave-owning, theocratic, and finally democratic-egalitarian societies, has become inseparable from the modern understanding of man." It is easy to agree with Fukuyama, and just from the Hegelian periods mentioned above, look at the difference between say ancient Israel's theocratic society and modern America's democratic-egalitarian society. Some of the economic principles governing the one state do not apply to the next; the types of government in the one society would not fit in the next. For instance, with the creation of computers, the principle that all revenue is derived from human labor (which applied in ancient Israel) no longer applies absolutely today: now computers can replicate software or MP3 files automatically and to infinity, while each program or file is still of value. Moreover, the ancient system of barter and monetary exchange would never work today—virtual transactions have become an essential part of trade.

Another useful aspect of Hegel's economic model is his triadic logic. His method for evaluating progressing economic stages nicely takes into account the way ideological tension drives changing trends. Liberal reactions to conservative movements, Lordship juxtaposed to bondsmanship—these are all tensions which are caused by changing trends and which also channel the progression of history. While Hegel's triadic logic and the phenomenology of spirit might not be good mediums for evaluating *truth* itself, they are good for evaluating economics.

But how does this talk of economic models and principles apply to the real world? Will Hegel ever give me insight into those delightful conversations between my grandpa and dad? The truth is right now, no. In order to understand the application of Hegelian dialectic in today's world, we will have to take the next step and evaluate modern economics from a Hegelian standpoint.

Evaluating Today's Economic State

The precursor to today's economic trend or era of capitalism vs. communism was mercantilism. Mercantilism involved the practice of exporting goods from one's homeland and importing money (in the form of gold or silver). During the age of exploration this worked to increase the national wealth successfully; however, as the world became more fully connected and the philosophy of mercantilism spread, the principles governing mercantilist era became obsolete, making the economy suitable for a new set of principles—those of capitalism.

Two factors ushered in the trend of capitalism. First, as powerful nations raked in more and more gold, their currencies become devalued in relation to poorer countries' currencies; and second, as this policy became globally adopted it turned into capitalism, because in the end everyone had to sell *and* buy from each other at least somewhat to provide for necessities. "Consumption is the sole end and purpose of all production," Adam Smith summarizes, "but in the mercantile system the interest of the consumer is almost constantly sacrificed to that of the producer; and it seems to consider production, and not consumption, as the ultimate end and object of all industry and commerce." By the time of the Industrial Revolution Smith's Capitalism had been fully adopted.

Born in 1723, Adam Smith presented mankind with by far the most productive economic system ever used. Perhaps his two most influential ideas are 1) that labor generates wealth and increased division of labor enables higher production and revenue, and 2) the concept of the Invisible Hand. In Smith's pin-maker example, he demonstrates that whereas one pin-maker can only make a few pins per day, if the pin-making process is broken down into steps in a factory then 40,000 pins per person per day can be produced. Moreover, Smith's invisible hand principle basically states that the economy left to itself will protect and balance itself. In other words, government should not legislate restrictions on the market, and men will best help the economy by looking out for their own needs. "It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker, that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest," writes Smith. "We address ourselves, not to their humanity but to their self-love, and never talk to them of our necessities but of their advantages." With capitalism, the economy was geared to face the expanding world.

Capitalism's emphasis on production and consumption threw many economies into a fury, sparking the Industrial Revolution. However, capitalism could only last as the sole economic trend for so long before problems arose. For example, machines began replacing some human jobs, and increased productivity forced many laborers into the factory to avoid competition against corporations. The reality is, the Industrial Revolution made the trades of many previously skilled laborers into jobs for mindless machine operators, subservient to the factory-owners who allocated huge portions of the profit to themselves and left the laborers with as little as possible. This monetary imbalance between the power of the factory-owners and the laborers prompted the emergence of what Hegel would call the "Antithesis"—Marxism.

Karl Marx wrote in retaliation against the injustices of the Industrial Revolution. Two emerging economic factors caused him to claim Smith's most important ideas were outdated. First, Marx believed Smith's division of labor principle had gone too far, because tradesmen (such as pin-makers) could no longer compete with factory prices and hence were forced to leave their job and join the assembly line; second, Marx believed Smith's invisible hand principle no longer worked, because as factory-owners controlled more and more overall production, competition diminished and producers where able to manipulate wages below laborer's just dessert. In other words, factory-owners were not balancing economic freedom with social responsibility.

But what is this to say? Was Marx actually correct? Well, Marx intended to place limitations on capitalism where the factory-owners were exploiting their employees. While he made the important point that what people are willing to work for is not necessarily a moral standard for what people *should* be paid, when Marx ventured into theoretical economics to declare the imminent approach of the last economic trend—a communal, agrarian utopia—he ran into a disaster. As Hegel points out, government cannot *force* the emergence of new economic trends, and as History shows, even if dictators could, they would never give up power once they control the people.

Today, we are at the same crossroads as in Marx's day. In fact, many of the economic factors that prompted the Marxist conflict with Capitalism have only progressed further with time. First, jobs have only become more divided and efficient. Corporations control the majority of the market in all but the new and emerging businesses. And machines (especially computers) are making labor so efficient that it is foreseeable that most people will become mere machine operators. In America this situation does not look bleak, because most factory labor is outsourced to other countries, while here people work as retailers. Our bipartisan democracy allows America to balance the economic shortcomings of Capitalism with a dose of Marxism, resulting in things like minimum wage and heavy taxes for the rich. However, in many other industrialized countries, laborers are simply not justly compensated by companies—for instance, in Bolivia the *average* yearly income tips $1400.

We also still face the issue of Smith's Invisible Hand, which basically boils down to economic freedom versus social responsibility. More and more, even if people do make reasonable money, they cannot find a meaningful job—in other words, one which both benefits society and allows a person to exhibit skill. It gets harder and harder to find these kinds of jobs; for instance, working assembly lines does not exhibit anything more than a mindless ability to perform repetitive motion; and most stock and land speculation does nothing to benefit society. Some of the few meaningful trades left include being a farmer or a clerk, both of which are slowly being taken over by machines like crop harvesters and vending machines.

This is not to say that the advance of these trends should be stopped; the advance of history cannot really be stopped. It is merely to say that as the trends of Capitalism and Marxism progress it will become more and more difficult to find a balance between the rights of the poor and the rights of the rich or to even find a meaningful trade. Follow the path business has taken and eventually there may be only two industries which are profitable and meaningful—entertainment and teaching. And even most teachers cannot find work outside of a bureaucracy. I cannot say which laws should be implemented and which should not; however, I will say democracy does the best job handling the tension between capitalism and Marxism because democracy is a balance of left and right.

Hegel's Triadic model depicts today's situation very well. As time moves on, the tension between the Thesis and Antithesis—Capitalism and Marxism—grows. As Hegel explains, eventually these issues will become too big to fit the present economic models. And this crisis must result in a synthesis, or a new trend with new principles. New models for government, new economic principles are all part of this deal. Capitalism and Marxism will both be philosophies of the past.

Standing on the Brink of History?

And so here we are, men caught in the tensions of the end of an era. Of the next age I am not so bold as to speak my own predictions. Although predictions of a new era there have been. One renown economist (Fukuyama) writes: "What we may be witnessing is not just the end of the Cold War, or the passing of a particular period of postwar history, but the end of history as such: that is, the end point of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government." And of course Marx infamously writes of a next era also—communism—one of perfect utopia where everything is held as common for the rest of history. Even in Daniel we find the picture of a statue with a gold head, silver chest, bronze stomach, iron legs, and clay and iron feet. Each layer speaks of an era, and when Daniel sees the feet, a rock crushes the statue. Most theologians believe the rock represents the end of the old earth and the establishment of a new earth governed by Jesus. Most Theologians also believe the statue's legs represent the Roman era—could we be the clay and iron feet, approaching the age of a new earth?

I will leave that question to you. And as for the perfect model of government in today's economic environment, I think it proper to also leave that to my grandpa and dad, ever talking, for theirs is an endless quest with perhaps no exact answer. Meanwhile, I am confident that though it is up to man to govern wisely in today's world of economic tension, the Divine Architect Christ is never far away, with His guiding hand evident in history. Hegel put it well: "For these thousands of years the same Architect has directed the work: and that Architect is the one living Mind whose nature it is to…bring to self-consciousness what it is, and, at the same time raised above it, [to bring history to a] higher stage of its own being. The different systems which the history of philosophy presents are therefore not irreconcilable with unity." Whether we are on the brink of History's close or only approaching a new economic era, our task is in understanding the workings of the Rational Force directing it. And whether we behold it from within Heaven or down on Earth, we will someday see the end of History—not an uneventful time of democratic boredom as Fukuyama predicted, not a time of simple coexistence with nature as Marx predicted, not a time of a vague reflective philosophic consciousness as Hegel predicted—but a time of perfected existence guided by Jesus Christ. And in this, Christ, not Man, will be proven the ruler of our destiny.

Nikolas Nunez
April 15, 2008
GBT V paper #2
Business Ethics

Throughout history, capital wealth and money have dictated a way of life to the masses. Wealth dictates the lives that the rich live and the lives of the poor that work for and surround them. In some cultures, wealth is of little importance, while in other cultures the idea of wealth is the only objective and the sole reason for discipline and education. This is the reality of a capitalist society that was first discussed by Karl Marx in the 19th century. When Karl Marx first penned his works on communism, he assumed that the relationship between workers and employers would always be opposing. While most rejected his overall theories, they did not argue with the basic idea that the interests of workers would always be at odds with those of owners. Marx puts it this way, "…capital has one sole driving force, the drive to valorize itself, to create surplus-value, to make its constant part the means of production, and to absorb the greatest possible amount of surplus labor. Capital is dead labor which, vampire-like, lives only by sucking living labor, and lives the more, the more labor it sucks". Overall, a selfish mentality to gain wealth is the driving force amidst the employee and owner's conflict; the owner seeks the simplest method in which to create capital despite its affect on the employee, and the employee seeks a way in which he can supply his labor while still being given reasonable working conditions and most importantly, a sufficient payment for his labor. This paper will discuss the relationship of the worker and owner in the division of labor while also exploring and paralleling with the Bible, the moral and social responsibilities one must pursue within business.

In Karl Marx's book, *Capital*, the division of labor is a necessary condition for commodity production. This division of labor is a process in which a worker or group of workers are assigned a specialized task in order to increase efficiency. Essentially, division of labor is the breaking down of large jobs into many tiny components. This division of labor is not only effective because laborers do not have to switch tasks during the day, but because it allows for a worker to focus his or her attention on one small part of the production process. Marx explains the usefulness of divided labor through an example of

making a needle. He compares two situations of the needle-making process: one factory has their employees work without a specialized focus, while the other uses the division of labor to accomplish the same task. The workers of the first factory do not incorporate a focused plan on what they wish to accomplish and they all, rather than working together, seek to accomplish their tasks by themselves. Without the division of labor, the employees of the first factory will have to carry out every process of making the needle. First, they must mine the desired metal for the needles, making proper assessments of its durability and potential to create a strong and straight product. Next, they will have to switch tasks and move their center of attention to the examination of the required depth, thickness, angle, and weight of the needle. Overall, the employees of the first factory are limited to how many needles they can make due to the fact that one person has to master every process of making the needles. Contrastingly, the employees of the second factory dedicate themselves to a single part of the needle-making process. One group of workers focuses on mining the metals while other groups focus on the other processes. The second factory is able to produce many more needles than the first, because they all worked together in their assigned specialties and made the division of labor their means of operation. Another example, aside from an economic view, of the division of labor and its worth can be seen in the family unit. Within the family, the tasks that need to be accomplished to achieve a functioning family are divided among each member. Typically, the father works, the mother upkeeps the house and raises the children, and the children obey and accomplish their assigned tasks. If the idea of specialized work was thrown out the window, the family would be dysfunctional and unable to maintain. If the father was forced to not only provide an income for the family but clean the house, watch over the children and take care of the small details that allow for a functioning unit, overtime the manner in which he carried out his responsibilities would become careless due to the stress of having to accomplish every task. It would wear him down and eventually deteriorate the family. In both economic and non- economic situations, one can see that the division of labor solves the stress of having to accomplish many tasks and forces individuals to dedicate themselves to one job. Despite its ability, however, to accomplish high rates of production in an organized manner, and its capability to keep a group functioning, we must understand that division of labor creates a conflict within the economic realm. There is a disagreement between the owner and worker; allow us to examine it.

The best way to understand this conflict is to examine the following scenario. Take for example, a company that manufactures pens. Also, for the sake of clarity allow us to call this company, ETS pens. Within this pen-making industry, some owners find that moving their company overseas to countries where they can find an abundance of people who will work pennies on the dollar, is most profitable to their business. In essence, the company moving overseas is simply seeking people who will work for less money in order that the company can increase their production while keeping the price to produce their products very low. In order for ETS pens to compete in the pen-making industry without moving overseas, the owner must find a way in which he can increase his efficiency and lower his cost. The most practical way to achieve this end is through the division of labor, hence, the owner divides the labor up as much as possible, establishes working conditions that have little money and thought put into them, and not only makes each part of the job easy to complete, but sets unfair wages so that output will increase while input will decrease. Although the owner has found a way in which to compete with the companies overseas, he has now created mind-numbing, unfairly- waged and uncomfortable jobs. A logical assumption can be made that no parent goes through the thick and thin of up bringing their children so that they can earn a job at a factory! With this is mind, the owner is then in essence, giving people jobs that he would not even want his children to have!

Whether the owner dislikes the notion of providing these jobs, he must do what ever it takes to compete. Some would say that it is acceptable to succumb people to a standard that does not benefit them, as long as you are able to compete within your industry and stay afloat! It seems logical to justify the means to reach this end by reasoning along the lines of this: If one has, from a very young age, taken education seriously and disciplined himself, working persistently towards his goals, in such a way that he is able to climb to the top of the social ladder, he should be given the right to pursue his typical desires in business in spite of its affect on the lowly employees. After all, the owner is not forcing his employees to work under his standards. If they wish to relieve themselves from, what they might call unfair conditions, they are free to leave. The owner does not tie their hands behind their back and force them to stay under his authority. Rather he sets his rules, and if the employees wish to leave, they may! All in all, because the owner is not forcing people to work for him, and because the owner has diligently worked toward his entrepreneurship, he should be given the right to set what ever standard he finds suitable for his subjects. This mentality can draw close parallel to Machiavelli's Prince and the discussion of how one must conduct his state. In chapter XV of the Machiavellian master piece, we are given a discussion that explores the correct behavior of a leader, or owner for that matter. Machiavelli admits that this subject has been treated by others and that he "shall be considered presumptuous in mentioning it again". However, he argues that a practical, rather than theoretical, view on the manner in which a leader should conduct himself is needed. Other philosophers conceive establishments built upon an idealized notion of how men should live rather than how they actually do, and Machiavelli argues that because men do not always lead virtuous lives and often times stray off course, a leader should not concern himself with living virtuously, but rather with acting so as to achieve the most practical benefit. In general, some personal characteristics will bring man praise and others will bring him condemnation. Courage, sympathy, devotion, shrewdness, and kindness number among the qualities that receive praise. Cowardice, cruelty, stubbornness, and avariciousness are usually met with condemnation. Ideally, a leader or owner contains all the "good" characteristics deemed by man; however, Machiavelli says that this expectation is unrealistic. A leader's main concern should be to safeguard his country, or establishment for that matter, and "bad" characteristics are sometimes needed to reach this end. Machiavelli states that, "It will be found that something which looks like virtue, if followed, would be his ruin; whilst something else, which looks like vice, yet followed, brings a man security and prosperity." Overall, Machiavelli believes that a leader should not shun a vice for the condemnation that it brings if it will ultimately benefit his cause. Rather, he should embrace it and call it friend, for it will create before him prosperous grounds thriving with success. Furthermore, a leader must not include a "good" amidst his actions even though it will bring him praise. If there is any characteristic, whether vice or virtue, praise worthy or condemning, fair or unfair, that does not benefit his establishment, it should be forgotten despite its known connotation. In general, this view on the matter, justifies and gives flexibility to the way a leader or owner conducts his moral and social responsibilities.

Now that we have explored the reasoning as to why a leader is inclined to conduct himself in such a way that ultimately benefits his establishment, allow us to turn the tables and see what there is to be said of the employee. As mentioned earlier, the owner seeks to extract maximum possible benefit from the use-value of his commodity. In other words, the owner seeks to gain a maximum profit from his workers while paying them the lowest possible wages. As the owner pursues his standards and needs, the voice of the worker, which had been previously stifled in the sound and fury of the production process, arises to explain frustration and concern. The employee is furious because, the commodity that he has sold the owner differs from the ordinary crowd of commodities in that its use creates value, a greater value than it costs. Despite the employee's worth, the owner still pays him the average low wage. Marx explains that "the owner pays the laborer for one day's labor-power, while he uses three days of it." That is against the contract between the owner and laborer, and the law of commodity exchange! This law of commodity exchange is simple; if the worker turns out a certain amount of whatever he is producing, he should be paid the equivalent of his work or the product he produces. Therefore, the less powerful employee becomes frustrated because he is not being paid his worth. The employee says to his owner, "you may be a model citizen, perhaps in the odor of sanctity as well; but the things you represent when you come face to face with me have no heart in its breast. I demand a normal working day because, like every other seller, I demand the value of my commodity!" We see then that the nature of commodity exchange itself imposes no limit to the working day, no limit to surplus labor. The owner maintains his rights as a purchaser when he tries to make the working day as long as possible, and, where possible, to achieve two working days out of one. And the employee maintains his rights through the law of commodity exchange. There is here therefore a contradiction of right against right. Whether the owner dislikes the notion of treating his employees unfairly, he must do what ever it takes to compete. This mindset seems very logical. However, there is still a conflict that must be settled between the owner and worker. The owner has the right to establish whatever working condition and wage he holds legitimate, and the employee has the right to get paid his worth. An inconsistency arises. An antinomy of right

against right, both obtained by logical and correct reasoning is still at hand! How does one conduct himself in a moral and socially responsible manner?

Marx says that between equal rights, force decides! Therefore, in essence the laborer does not have any right and the owner is the sole voice being heard through this conflict. As a result, with a Marxist mentality, we must focus on how an owner is to conduct himself in a moral and socially responsible manner rather than focus on the worker. The Bible contains many truths with regards to morals, and many of these truths can be applied to how the owner must conduct himself. Firstly we must understand that the world system, as the Apostle John says, "lies in the wicked one." (I John 5:19) The social, moral, political, and religious atmosphere in which unregenerate men and women live has been created by "the prince of the power of the air, the spirit who now works in the children of disobedience." (Ephesians 2:2) It is in our nature to seek glory, prosperity, and riches despite its affect of the underlying subjects. As discussed earlier, the mentality that might makes right overrides the typical socialist moral law and creates a vampire-like mentality which lives only by sucking living labor, and lives the more, the more labor it sucks! This selfish mentality often times consumes our every day decisions and we forget to keep our self-interested notions in check. If we incorporate a virtuous approach in our every day life, and live by doing unto others as we would have them do unto us, we will create harmonious relationships. Proverbs 10:2-3 says, "treasures of wickedness profit nothing, but righteousness delivers from death. The Lord will not allow the righteous soul to famish, but He casts away the desires of the wicked." If we are righteous the Lord will grant us life and prosperity. However, if we are men of injustice, we will have the desires of our heart cast away. Taken as a whole, despite our idea that injustice will bring forth the greatest profit, we must realize that if we are to prosper and thrive, we must act in justice and fairness always placing first the kingdom of God. Even Socrates mentions the importance of applying virtue and proper living to all aspects of one's city and its citizens. He firmly holds that a man of discipline and virtue chooses appropriately while a man of the opposite eventually finds himself in ruin. He states, "a disciplined man will not choose inappropriate objects either to pursue or shun; on the contrary he will pursue or shun the thing and people and pleasures and pains that deserve either course, and he will stand his ground firmly where duty requires it." Socrates carefully describes how leaders of injustice and vice often "implement policy on the basis of pleasure and to the esteem of their subjects, only for future generations to suffer from the eventual ills inevitable when the pleasant substitutes for the good." Socrates believes, contrary to Machiavelli, that a man who practices vice will lead a life of sure failure. If one wishes to live a life in harmony, Socrates believes he must "pursue and practice self-discipline running fast as his legs will carry him from licentiousness." In general, Socrates believes that we can "win happiness and harmony by bending all our own efforts and those of the state to the realization of uprightness, justice, and self-discipline, not allowing our appetites to go unchecked."

In closing, let us recap. The division of labor solves the stress of having to accomplish many tasks and forces the individual to dedicate himself to one job. However, despite its ability to accomplish high rates of production in an organized manner, and its capability to keep a group functioning, we must understand that the Division of labor creates a conflict. This conflict comes from both the employee and the owner. Now because the owner has taken his education seriously and disciplined himself, working persistently towards his goals, in such a way that he was able to climb to the top of the social ladder, he should be given the right to pursue his typical desires in business in spite of its affect on the lowly employees. Therefore, we see many owners setting standards that merely promote their well-being. While the owner seeks ways in which to achieve their selfish desires, the employees become frustrated because they believe that they have rights. They argue that the owner should not be allowed to set whatever standard he wishes because they equally bear the seal of the law of exchange. They should receive equal payment for the labor that they supply regardless of what the owners think; this is the conflict that Marx touches on. From the observation of this employee and employers' relationship, the question is then asked of how one should conduct himself in a moral and socially responsible manner. Before we answered this question however, we singled out the owner and established that he should be the focus of how one should conduct himself because, as Marx says, the greater force decides between equal rights. Therefore it was fitting to spotlight the only voice heard in this conflict. We then paralleled with the Bible how an owner should conduct himself, and found that a righteous man of discipline and virtue will not only choose appropriately in the matters of morals, but will be given the desire of his heart though his desire to seek first the kingdom of God. Overall, the only way that mankind will be able to find harmony in relationships, whether it be between an owner and laborer or sister and brother, is if they have a Godly and moral approach to the situation, seeking a standard that is not self-seeking but rather, beneficial to the whole rather than the part.

Emilie McDonald
GBT V paper #2
5/23/08

Two Shall Become One

Throughout history, many people have both formally and informally discussed and debated what the true roles of the husband and wife are in marriage. One of the questions debated is, is the husband supposed to have authority over the wife? Throughout the Bible, God states that the best form of marriage is with the husband in the leading role. Women and men see this organization of marriage in different ways. Some women seem to think that God is biased towards men, while some men see this organization as an excuse to abuse their position in marriage. The answer to how one can know if these specific guidelines are truly needed, can be found by looking through history and reading books. In these stories, there are examples of marriages that have succeeded and examples of some that have not. One is able to look at those cases to see if there is really a need for spouses to follow their designed role. Three classic books which have examples of failed and successful marriages, are, *The Oresteia* by Aeschylus, *The Canterbury Tales* by Geoffrey Chaucer, and *The Odyssey* by Homer,. This paper will examine the cases given in the books mentioned, and will compare them to the Bible. Finally it will show whether the guidelines set forth in the Bible are beneficial in the marriage.

Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra were married and had four children when Agamemnon, king of Mycenae, was summoned by his brother Menelaus to lead the Achaeans to war. The war, known today as the Trojan war, was caused by Menelaus' wife Helen, who had been carried off to Troy. During this great war, the Achaeans were faced with great strife as a result of the goddess Artemis. They had fine weather during their long voyages until Agamemnon slew a beast that was sacred to Artemis. She, because of bitterness against Agamemnon, took away the wind and thus made it nearly impossible for the Achaeans to sail. Agamemnon was told that the only way to bring back good winds, was by sacrificing a young girl to appease Artemis. Agamemnon chose to sacrifice his own daughter instead of sacrificing someone else's. While he did not want to do this, he believed that there would be no way to win the war unless he did that very thing. Later, before being reunited with each other, both Clytaemnestra and Agamemnon took lovers.

When Clytaemnestra heard about what Agamemnon did to Iphigenia, she was very angry and hurt that he would sacrifice their daughter. When it came time for Agamemnon to return home from war, Clytaemnestra along with her lover Aegisthus, plotted with him a way to avenge her daughter. Agamemnon arrived home and Clytaemnestra, annoyed about his concubine, yet still appearing sweet, welcomed Agamemnon home. She had a red carpet laid out for him, and lured him into a chamber, where she had prepared a bath for him. Agamemnon, got in and she took a blanket and threw it over his body to restrain him. She then stabbed him in the heart. Later she let the people who were with her know why she did it and how she felt. *"He thought no more of it than killing a beast, and his flocks were rich, teeming in their fleece, but he sacrificed his own child, our daughter, the agony I labored into love to charm away the savage winds of Thrace."* Clytaemnestra believed that he did not care for Iphigenia. She gave that as her reason for murdering him.

Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra, are an example of a marriage that was twisted by not following their own correct function designed for marriage. Clytaemnestra stated her problems with Agamemnon resulted from his sacrifice of Iphigenia. She seemed to believe that it was an unnecessary step to take but really Agamemnon had no other choice, he did it for the good of the Achaeans. He was noble in his choice to sacrifice his own daughter rather than someone else's. The problem was that when Clytaemnestra heard about the death of her daughter, she took out her rage upon Agamemnon who probably was grieving as well. A command is given in Ephesians that says, *"Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord. For the husband is head of the wife, as also Christ is head of the church; and He is the Savior of the body."* If Clytaemnestra had followed the designed organization of marriage, and had submitted to and honored

her husband's decisions, there would have been less stress in the marriage.

Another cause of their marital problems was them both taking lovers. *"Nevertheless let each one of you in particular so love his own wife as himself, and let the wife see that she respects her husband."* If Clytaemnestra had thought of honoring Agamemnon, she would not have considered taking a lover. Agamemnon also put stress in their marriage by taking a lover. Agamemnon, by having a concubine, demonstrated that he did not love Clytaemnestra. If he did truly love her, he would not have desired to take a lover.

In the book Canterbury Tales, there is another story with a marriage to be examined. In it, it tells the tale of a king named Walter, and his wife Griselda. Before they were married, when he proposed to her, he said that he was devoted to her, however he also gave a warning. *"I warn you to be ready to obey my lightest whim and pleasure; you must show a willing heart, ungrudgingly night or day, whether I please to offer joy or woe. When I say "Yes" you never shall say "No" Either by word or frowning a defiance. Swear this and I will swear to our alliance."* Griselda swore to do all that he said and thus accepted his proposal. Shortly after their engagement, they were married. However, their whole marriage would be haunted by this agreement. Walter decided to test her often, during their marriage to see if she really did love him.

Shortly after their marriage, they were blessed with a beautiful little daughter. It was at this time when Walter decided that he should test Griselda to see how devoted she was to him. While the baby was still an infant, Walter told Griselda that his people were not content with Griselda's child. Griselda was a commoner and the people believed that they deserved better than just a common child. Walter told Griselda that he wished to dispose of the child to appease them. Griselda told him that whatever was his will was the right thing for her. A few days later, he told Griselda that the baby was dead. When he gave her this sad news, he looked into her face for pain or any facial expression that showed opposition, however there was none. *"As glad, as humble and as quick to serve, and in her love as she was wont to be; In everything the same, she did not swerve, And of her daughter not a word said she."* In reality, instead of murdering the child, Walter had sent her to his sister's house. Shortly after, Griselda had another child. Walter decided to test her once again, and he again convinced her that he was going to slay their child. This time also he secretly sent their son to his sister's house. Once again, Griselda consented to his will, and once again was left childless. After that test, Walter was content in her commitment and love for him, for a while at least. When their daughter was about twelve years old, Walter decided that it was again time to test Griselda's love for him. This time he brought her divorce papers, and told her that his counselors had told him that he needed to marry a prettier and younger wife, who was not a commoner. She still didn't lose her countenance; she was cheerful and consented to what he had proposed. She therefore went back to her old village. A short while later, Walter decided to carry out the rest of his test upon Griselda. He visited Griselda once again, to ask her to host his wedding, to his new bride, in his castle. She consented and went straight away preparing for the event. When the time came for his wedding, Walter brought a beautiful young girl along with her younger brother to meet Griselda. He introduced the girl as his new wife. Griselda replied that she hoped that they would have a wonderful marriage, and also advised Walter not to test his new wife as he had tested her. This was all that Walter needed to hear. He flung up his arms and told Griselda that the new bride was really their daughter and her brother was their son. He also told her that the reasons for all the things that he had done, was so that he could be reassured in her love for him.

Many things can be learned from the story of Walter and Griselda. While Griselda was submissive, Walter abused his place in the marriage. He seemed to look at only the wife's place in the marriage, "*Wives, submit to your husbands as to the Lord*." Rather than seeing the instructions to the husband in marriage. *"In this same way, husbands ought to love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself."* In this verse, we see that husbands are supposed to love their wives as themselves. Walter would not have and did not put himself through the same pain he put Griselda through. He knew that their children were still alive, while Griselda was led to believe that they were dead. Walter's attitude toward Griselda seems to be the same attitude of the master to the slave. He seemed to see his wife as a creature whom he owned not as a human whom he loved and would give his life for.

Griselda on the other hand, was too passive in her families lives. She seemed insecure in Walter's love for her in so much as she was unable to make decisions for herself, this allowed Walter to trample on Griselda as he would a doormat. This behavior however is unbiblical *"She will do him good and not evil all the days of her life."* While helping Walter's ego which was helping him for the present, Griselda was hurting his character which would help him his whole life. *"But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."* Walter was supposed to provide and take care of his children. Griselda in knowing this should have discussed with him his decision. In a democracy, or a business firm there is a president, and next a vice president, and so on. The president always asks the vice president advice. "*As iron sharpens iron, So a man sharpens the countenance of his friend."* If a man is supposed to sharpen his friend's countenance, how much more should a wife who knows her husband intimately, strengthen her husband's countenance? An example of a wife sharpening her husband is given in the book of Esther. Kin Xerxes was deceived into making a decree that would annihilate the Jews, which were his wife's people. Queen Esther, his wife, had to make the decision to either allow him to do what he wished, or risk her life to save her people's lives. She made the decision to go to the king, and show him his mistake. When he saw that what he was doing was wrong, he changed it and made it right. The difference between Esther and Griselda is that while Esther went to her husband and told him his wrong doing, Griselda did not talk to her husband and put her insecurity above the good of her family and their future.

The story of Odysseus and Penelope is a story that shows marriage in its true form. Odysseus and Penelope had one child named Telemachus. Shortly after their son was born, Odysseus was, like Agamemnon, called off to help lead the Achaean army against the Trojans, in the Trojan war. Odysseus and Penelope would not see, or have contact with, each other for twenty years. However, the war only lasted ten of those years. Odysseus faced great trials during the war, yet the trials faced after the war were far worse than he could ever have imagined. One of the trials he went through was, being in the power of the goddess Calypso, and forced to be her lover for seven years. However he was not happy there. His time there was described as follows; visitors *"saw nothing of the great Odysseus, who sat apart, as a thousand times before, and racked his own heart groaning, with eyes wet scanning the bare horizon of the sea."*

Meanwhile, at home, after the long years of war, and then without Odysseus coming back, people started to lose hope that he would ever come home. Penelope's father counseled her to start over. He told her to move on and to get remarried. Many suitors after hearing of her father's counsel, were constantly at Odysseus' home trying to court Penelope in hopes that she might pick one of them for her new husband. Penelope however, never lost hope that Odysseus would come home, so she devised plans in order to make the suitors believe that she was going to choose one of them, however she really wouldn't do anything of the sort. One of her many schemes was she told all the suitors that she would weave a web, which when completed, she would make her decision on whom to marry. *"So every day she wove on the great loom but every night by torchlight she unwove it; and so for three years she deceived the Akhaians."* Penelope's scheme worked until one of her maids betrayed her secret to the suitors. They caught her that night unweaving it and forced her to finish it.

When Odysseus finally reached his homeland, he stayed with a loyal shepherd named Eumaeus. While at Eumaeus' house, Telemachus, Odysseus' son, visited Eumaeus and discovered who Odysseus was. He told Odysseus of the suitors in his house trying to court Penelope. Odysseus was furious, first of all because she was his wife, and second because he believed that possibly Penelope was encouraging it. Telemachus assured him that was not the case. Meanwhile, Telemachus returned to Penelope who was eager to hear his news. Telemachus told her that he had heard some news of his father, though he did not reveal that he had actually seen him. Nevertheless a man accompanying Telemachus addressed Penelope as *"O gentle lady, wife of Odysseus"* This was the first time Penelope had been addressed in that manner in a very long time. Normally she was addressed as widow of Odysseus. This fueled her hope for Odysseus to return home. Meanwhile, Odysseus was finally prepared to return to his home and defeat the suitors. He returned dressed as a beggar which made the suitors laugh at him. Penelope, not knowing his true identity, took interest in him and took him to her private chambers to talk to him. The next day Penelope was finally resolved to choose a husband. She devised a plan in which she told the suitors that anyone who could string and shoot Odysseus' bow and have the arrow go through twelve axes could win her. None of the suitors could even string the bow. When it came to be Odysseus' turn, still disguised as a beggar, he picked up the arrow and shot it through all twelve axes. He next went on to shoot all of the suitors with his bow, and Penelope and Odysseus were finally reunited. Odysseus satisfaction was described in the

following excerpt. *"Now from his breast into his eyes the ache of longing mounted, and he wept at last, his dear wife, clear and faithful, in his arms, longed fir as the sunwarmed earth is longed for by a swimmer spent in rough water where his ship went down under Poseidon's blows, gale winds and tons of sea."*

Odysseus and Penelope, are examples of a couple who were faithful to each other through great hardship and separation. Even though they were separated, for a long period of time, they both stayed faithful to each other. *"So husbands ought to love their own wives as their own bodies; he who loves his wife loves himself. For no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, just as the Lord does the church."* Husbands are supposed to love their wife as their own bodies. Odysseus did this in his love and commitment to Penelope throughout his long time away from home. He knew that Penelope did not even know that he was alive. He could have chosen to stay on any of the islands he landed on, however he did not. He sacrificed ten years of his life trying to get back to his home. He also showed that he loved Penelope as his own flesh by not taking another woman as Agamemnon did. Some may say that Odysseus was not faithful because of his seven years on the island of Calypso, however, while in the island, although comfortable, he still wished to be in his homeland.

Penelope also did her part when she was at home those twenty years. *"Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord."* Penelope did show her submission to Odysseus when she honored what she believed to be her husbands wishes by not marrying another man. While her father was unhappy about her not marrying again, Penelope was justified when Odysseus returned home to claim her. Penelope's age was also a good example of her commitment in marriage. Penelope would have been around the age of seventeen when Odysseus left, when he returned, she would have been approximately thirty-seven.

Another thing that is quite evident in Odysseus' and Penelope's marriage is their unity. *"For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh."* Even being parted for twenty years, Odysseus and Penelope's bond still had not failed. While in Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra's case, half that time was too long for them to keep their marriage together. But Odysseus and Penelope had really become one flesh. Odysseus had heard about Agamemnon's sad outcome, and he had to face the fact that Penelope could do the same thing to him that Clytaemnestra did to Agamemnon, however he trusted that she would stay faithful to him. Penelope also had to face the fact that Odysseus could be dead, and despite the pressure put upon her by her father to remarry, she made the choice to wait and hope for Odysseus.

After examining these three cases, it is evident that there is a need for each spouse to remember what their role in marriage is. From the case of Clytaemnestra and Agamemnon, it is evident that there needs to be a leader in the marriage who is to be followed. Agamemnon is the designed leader of the family and Clytaemnestra should have accepted, and dealt with the problem, rather than going into a deadly rage. Also, there was a lack of respect on both sides for the other partner, which was shown by both Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra taking lovers. Another element in a strong marriage is the ability to go through storms and be able to come out of them with a stronger marriage. Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra's marriage was unable to go through a difficult storm, and this made it evident that they never had a very strong marriage in the first place. From the tale of Walter and Griselda, it is apparent that while there needs to be a submission on the part of the wife, the husband also needs to love her and not abuse his power over her. One can also learn that the wife should not be passive in her marriage. In her insecurity, Griselda hurt her husband and family by not discussing with him what the right thing to do was. Walter and Griselda are examples of those who see the wife as inferior to the husband rather than seeing them equal and just using their roles correctly. Odysseus and Penelope are a very good example of a husband and wife who followed their correct roles. Even while being parted for twenty years, Odysseus loved his wife as his own body by thinking of her first and not just staying where he was comfortable in order to not make the difficult journey home. Penelope showed her respect for Odysseus by not following what popular demand told her to do by getting remarried. She decided to stay faithful to Odysseus even if it meant that he would never come home. Without activeness and love, there is unhappiness in marriage. With love and respect, there is a tie that can never be broken.

People seem to take offense at guidelines given in the Bible, such as the two distinguished roles in marriage. However, in a democracy, or a business firm, a level of organization is needed to keep everything working well. The order generally starts with a president and then a vice president. The President has his specific job and the vice president is supposed to help him. It is evident that in a marriage, there is also needed a set organization in order for the marriage to be a good, successful, long marriage. In a marriage, the husband is supposed to love his wife as himself. He needs to trust his wife, as without trust there is insecurity. He needs to be committed to her. The wife, like a vice president, needs to help her husband. She needs to be submissive, but not passive. She needs to be respectful towards her husband. She needs to be a good wife by discussing different options with her husband and thus sharpening him. She also needs to be committed to her husband. There is a need for these elements for the marriage to be successful. Even the writers of these books, pagans, recognized this. Without them, there is strife and pain which causes disunity in the marriage. With these elements, it is possible for the husband and wife to become unified even to the point of being one flesh.

Matt Eiles
GBT 5 Paper 2
Due Friday May 23, 2008 at Midnight

In February, 1804 A.D., the famous German philosopher Immanuel Kant passed away after succumbing to the illnesses that plagued him throughout his lifetime.

After drifting through darkness for an inestimable amount of time, Kant finds himself standing in a dark wood. Struggling to orient himself, he stumbles around in confusion. Despairing of finding the civilization from which he departed, Kant discovers another wanderer in the woods. The other man introduces himself as Virgil. His purpose is to guide yet another traveler into the afterlife as he has done so many times before.

Kant, surprised and still disoriented, determines that there is no other option for him but to believe the being claiming to be Virgil. Following Virgil into the forest, he descends with him into the first pit of hell, using the route Dante traversed long before him.

Virgil and Kant enter Limbo, the realm of the un-baptized but virtuous pagans. Kant recognizes many, as Virgil guides him through the landscape filled with those who did not follow Christ but lived moral lives. Spying Socrates in deep conversation in a corner, Kant asks Virgil to allow him to speak with the great man. As he approaches the Greek philosopher, he recognizes the other member of the active conversation – Thomas Aquinas. Sitting down next to them, he joins in on the dialogue.

Socrates: Why, hello. Welcome to this realm, my home for the last two millennia.

Kant: Thank you for the welcome, but I'm not sure I will be staying here for long. Virgil and I were just passing through…

Socrates: Oh? Well surely Virgil can wait while you join us in conversation. My friend Aquinas proves to be a man with brilliant knowledge.

Kant: Yes indeed. However, I hardly expected to see him here in Limbo.

Aquinas: Yes, that presents a common confusion for travelers through here. In my life and writings I sought to emulate the logic and reason of the ancient philosophers, seeking to combine Aristotelian thought with the doctrines of the Christian faith. Now that I have died, I often travel here from heaven to converse with the very men I admired and studied in life.

Kant: I wonder how many learned scholars on earth would debate the theological ramifications of that…

Aquinas: I know that I never considered it in my writings.

Kant: So what are you discussing now?

Aquinas: We just wrapped up a discussion on man's ultimate goal in life. It brought up the subject of ethics and morals, which we plan to debate next.

Kant: I deliberated on that topic extensively in the last ten years of my life, but I suppose neither of you have been able to read my treatises on it.

Socrates: No, that would be unlikely. Would you like to join us? I believe you would be an excellent contributor in our search for truth.

Kant: Certainly.

Socrates: Fantastic. Would it not be wise for us to begin with a definition of the subject of our discussion?

Kant: Indeed…although I'm afraid it will be difficult to come to a definition so early.

Virgil (cutting into the conversation): Not at all - that's a simple question, Socrates. Morality is simply what is deemed holy by the gods.

Socrates: The last time I heard a claim like that, I was about to be executed. Unfortunately, we run into many difficulties when examining that definition. Are the gods, as written down in your lore, always in agreement over what is holy?

Virgil: Certainly.

Socrates: Oh really? Did the gods often agree with one another, or did they often commit immoral acts towards each other and against mankind?

Virgil: Ah…yes, I suppose they did often disagree.

Socrates: So in matters where the gods disagree on a subject, is it not likely that some will decree an act to be moral, while others will decree it immoral? For example, in the *Iliad*, is it not true that the gods differ on their support of the Greeks and the Trojans?

Virgil: Yes, even to the point of warring against their fellow gods to aid their favored army.

Socrates: So would it not be true that in many cases, a certain act may be disapproved by some gods, and approved by others?

Virgil: I will concede that.

Socrates: So wouldn't that make the act both "divinely disapproved" and "divinely approved" …in other words, at the same time holy and unholy?

Virgil: Yes, I suppose so.

Socrates: Good, then it looks like we have reached a conclusion already - we can define holy actions as those which are holy or unholy.

Virgil: That conclusion cannot be; it is completely contradictory. I was always better at poetry than philosophy.

Aquinas: Before we abandon this line of thinking, maybe your original proposition can be salvaged with a change. I would propose that the definition for morals would be what God deems holy.

Socrates: And how does this definition correct Virgil's declaration that the holy is unholy?

Aquinas: Simply that God's will is consistent and what he approves of as holy is not subject to the disagreements and fighting that destroys the basis for placing morality in the gods. While Virgil's "gods" do not provide an unmoving basis for morality, a single God overcomes those problems by having an undivided will.

Socrates: So then you would declare that morality is what God approves?

Aquinas: Indeed.

Socrates: And this would keep a consistent basis for holiness for all actions?

Aquinas: Certainly.

Socrates: Well then, please consider this. Is the holy – a moral action – approved by God because it is holy, or is it holy because it's approved?

Aquinas: Your verbiage is confusing.

Socrates: It is rather simple, actually. Worded otherwise, does God approve of something because it is holy, or does his approval of it make it holy? Is there a standard for holiness that God justifies his approval by, or is holiness solely dependent on what God approves? Based on these options, we can clearly find that the 'divinely' approved is not holy, and therefore morality is not defined based on God's will – and we return to our starting place.

Kant: Where did you find that conclusion? In a bush among other faculties? I'm afraid I fail to follow the logic here. How so, Socrates?

Socrates: In the first option, I ask if what is approved by God gets approved because it is holy. In the second instance, the question I ask is if the holy is approved for the reason that God approves it. Both choices provide a dilemma for those who follow this concept of morality.

Kant: The first option is understandable; it clearly contradicts the idea that God is the ultimate standard for holiness and goodness by saying that he must conform to a standard of holiness. Therefore, this option cannot be considered. If God must judge what he approves based on a standard for holiness, then we may as well worship that standard rather than God. Therefore the second option must be acceptable, which I believe it is.

Socrates: I'm afraid it can be no more acceptable to you than the other.

Kant: How so?

Socrates: Think of it in terms of these examples. We say that a thing is 'being carried' or 'carrying', 'being led' or 'leading', etc. You understand that these are all different?

Kant: Certainly.

Socrates: So then something that is carried is 'being carried' for the very reason that it gets carried, correct?

Kant: Of course.

Socrates: And the same for what is led - it is being led because it gets led?

Kant: Presumably.

Socrates: Then accordingly you would agree that an object does *not* get carried because it is being carried?

Kant: What is the difference between this and your former statement?

Socrates: The order and causality of the verbs. Something cannot *get* carried because it is being carried, that fails logically and grammatically.

Kant: I see - but how is this relevant to our discussion?

Socrates: When we apply this logic to the case of divinely approved actions, we shed light on this proposition. Why is the holy *being* approved?

Kant: Because it *gets* approved by God. That is the reason for why it is holy, correct?

Socrates: Yes. And is it precisely because it *gets approved* that it is approved by God and thus 'divinely approved'?

Kant: Indeed.

Socrates: So then an action or object cannot *get* approved for the reason that it is *being* approved by God, but it must be by some other reason, correct?

Kant: Maybe…

Socrates: It is an issue of causality. Something cannot get approved because it is being approved anymore than an object gets carried because it is being carried. It is not for that reason, but it is because something objective determines it to be holy, that it gets approved. Does this clarify the two options?

Kant: I think so. It is contradictory to say that an object gets approved because it is being approved.

Socrates: Exactly - what *gets* approved cannot be the same as what is *being* approved. Thus, a holy action *cannot get* approved for the sole reason that it is *being* approved by God. To say that an action gets approved because it is being approved establishes the cause of the approval on the effect, which is fallacious. Any logician, or a simple grammar student, can determine that.

Kant: Indeed. So neither of these options are acceptable for a Christian.

Socrates: Correct.

Aquinas: That is a fascinating argument, Socrates, however I feel that there is a third option that you ignore.

Socrates: A third option? What might that be?

Aquinas: Your dilemma ignores an essential characteristic of the nature of God – His goodness and holiness. Can it not be that there is an objective standard to which morality is held, and that is inside God himself? Not having an objective standard would result in the dilemma of your second option, and having that objective standard exist outside of God demolishes the concept that God is the highest standard in the universe. However, God is holy within himself – "Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord," the angels proclaim. "The Lord our God is holy!" cries the Psalmist. If God *is* the standard for morality, then we can base our system of ethics upon His holiness and goodness.

Socrates: So you avoid the dilemma by saying that God is his own standard for morality?

Aquinas: Essentially, yes. You believe God and holiness to be two separate entities, where one must be superior – but to the Christian, they are one in the same.

Socrates: According to that definition of God, your defense appears correct.

Kant: This discussion has been interesting and productive, but unfortunately I feel we have accomplished nothing since the onset of our discussion – as I'm afraid the topic of our discussion began on a poor foundation and has been misled since.

Aquinas: Why is that?

Kant: The morality we have discussed up to this point has primarily concerned itself with the morality of the act – is this action approved or disapproved by God or the gods, is it holy or unholy, etc.

Socrates: And our conclusions have been quite fascinating along the way – that the holy is unholy.

Kant: Indeed. But I feel that we must look beyond the simple act to find morality. I believe the action is irrelevant, and thus it is the will behind the action we must consider.

Aquinas: I fail to see why that is. I find the end inseparable from the act itself.

Socrates: I believe I understand what our friend is saying. For would you agree that there are many temperate actions: wit, judgment, courage, resoluteness, perseverance, etc.?

Aquinas: Certainly.

Socrates: And yet, can these good qualities ever become corrupted by the will?

Aquinas: Not in any instances I can recall.

Socrates: Oh, but did not my peers during my lifetime, and many still during yours, value moderation in emotions and passions, self-control, and the like?

Aquinas: Certainly.

Kant: But clearly these "virtues" can be made extremely bad without the principles of a good will. Does not the coolness of a villain make him far more dangerous and also more directly abominable in our eyes than one enflamed by passion?

Aquinas: Perhaps, but that does not strongly correlate a negative influence of the will upon a good act.

Socrates: But other "virtues" also exhibit the same evidence. Can there be instances in which perseverance can be harmful?

Aquinas: Indeed, it can soon become an obsession.

Socrates: And courage foolishness?

Kant: Certainly. Then I propose that good will is *the* only part of an action that makes it moral. Even if this will is wholly lacking in power to accomplish its purpose, and even if the greatest effort the will makes to act should not avail it to achieve anything of its end, the will still has full usefulness and merit in itself.

Socrates: What do you mean?

Kant: The good will – the will in a man that makes him wish to do a good deed – is the only element of the good deed itself that makes it "good." Even if this good will is incapable of accomplishing its aims; if everything it wants to do it fails to do, it still has merit on its own.

Aquinas: I remain skeptical about this position. How can the will have any merit if it does not cause any action on the part of the person? Haven't you heard that the road to hell is paved with good intentions?

Kant: The will is the only part of us that can be good without qualification; thus, if it wishes to do something good, then that is good and moral of itself. The action that it may carry out as a result of this good will is negligible in moral worth.

Aquinas: It seems to me that if a will cannot carry out any visible good, it is of little use.

Kant: Perhaps, but from a moral standpoint an action need not be "visible" or even carried out, so long as the intention is there. This leads us to discover what the foundation for our morality is. If the will is good in itself, as we have proposed, then it must consist of a guideline that is good in itself. I propose that duty is that guideline; it contains the concept of a good will, though with certain restrictions and hindrances. Obviously, actions which are recognized as opposed to duty may be omitted from what is moral – if it is not dutiful to do an action, it has no inherent ethical worth.

Aquinas: I think anyone could agree with that.

Socrates: So what are the other limitations that duty imposes on morality?

Kant: We can discard actions that are in accord with duty but are impelled by another inclination. For example, it is a duty to preserve one's life, but everyone has an inclination to preserve their own life. This is not according to duty, but due to ulterior motives.

Socrates: So when can a person commit a moral act completely removed from inclination?

Kant: Keeping with the current example, if a man, with all the joys in life removed and his relish for living gone, wishes for death and suicide yet preserves his life in accordance with duty and duty alone, then his action has moral merit.

Aquinas: That appears to greatly limit the abundance of moral actions.

Kant: Certainly. Even if the most seemingly moral and virtuous deed is committed by a man, it does not have any moral worth whatsoever until he tears himself away from these motives and performs the action only from duty – then it has genuine moral worth. Thus, I will declare what I call my first proposition of moral worth – To have genuine moral worth, an action must be done from duty, without any other inclinations. And, as we have already seen, moral action is undetermined by anything except volition; an act is moral only because of the will behind it.

Socrates: These are understandable, we have already discussed them. So with all inclination put aside, how can we know what is in line with duty?

Kant: In order to determine if an action is in accordance with duty, before doing any action, I must ask: Would I want everybody to do this action? Would I want my act to become a universal law?

Socrates: So before, say, lying about something, I must ask, "would I want my action now to become a universal law?

Kant: Exactly. The answer to that question must clearly be no, because if I asked "would I want this action to become a universal law," I must conclude that I would not. It may be advantageous in the present to lie, but when I consider the consequences of this being a universal law, it is better to not lie in that situation. This is the categorical imperative we must all follow.

Socrates: What is this categorical imperative?

Kant: The categorical imperative commands that I act in accordance with universal law – that I act in a way that I could make that action a universal law. It is without regard to the end that I act; the will behind my action is the sole reason for it. Only by following the categorical imperative can we cause truly ethical actions.

Socrates: Perhaps some examples would help me to clarify this concept. We have already examined lying, what other vice might be a virtuous example?

Aquinas: Proverbs speaks of sloth as a sin: "the way of the slothful man is as a hedge of thorns: but the way of the righteous is made plain."

Kant: Sloth is an excellent example. For while sloth may contribute to our own happiness or to many of our own desires and "ends," when examined as a universal law, one must conclude that it cannot be moral. For were everyone to be slothful, society could not exist, at least for an extended period of time. Additionally, it is a duty unto yourself to use and cultivate your talents.

Socrates: That makes sense. And what of the 10th commandment: do not covet?

Kant: Coveting again contradicts the categorical imperative. One can easily see the negative results of a society of coveters.

Socrates: While your theory of morality conforms with what people would consider "normal" morality, I feel that it is unable to actually redefine morality, and makes morality an impossible system to follow.

Kant: How so?

Socrates: My initial difficulty is with the categorical imperative and duty – what reason is there for us to follow it besides an actual standard of duty?

Kant: In following the categorical imperative, we align ourselves with what would continue to push society towards progress and our own personal safety. In asking "would I like this to be a universal law," we judge our actions by what the majority of society would do if they followed our initiative.

Socrates: But what benefit is there for us in following that standard? Take the example of suicide once more. It may be my duty to preserve my life even when I have no inclination to, but why should I act in accordance to duty in that situation?

Kant: Because if everyone were to commit suicide once they had no inclination to live, then…

Socrates: But why should I care? I'll be dead. There must be a stronger reason to follow duty than merely trying to uphold society. If I'm faced with a choice between starvation or stealing food, am I to be expected to look after society's best interests over mine?

Kant: That would be the moral act to do, yes.

Socrates: But then there must be an extra influence on my will to persuade me to follow that morality over preserving my own happiness, or even my own life. There must be a reason to follow duty, or morality, outside of your categorical imperative.

Kant: There may be, yes.

Socrates: Then either your morality is not truly based on a solely humanist basis, as there must be an eternal standard of morality that dictates that we must follow duty, or man has yet to do a moral action. With moral acts only being those which are in direct and sole accordance to duty, and those being only the actions that we can wish that all of humanity would follow, has any man ever done a moral action?

Kant: It is hard to say if anyone actually has – it is doubtful as to whether virtue has ever been found according to this system.

Socrates: Then of what use is your moral system, if it cannot be followed? Of what use is it other than that it gives us in other than a claim that we are wise enough to determine our own ethics?

Kant: Without the certainty of a moral system, we must rely on what systems we can reason.

Socrates: But because you base your morality on duty, are you not already assuming that duty is a virtue we must follow?

Kant: Not in the sense that we cannot reason why it should be a virtue to follow. With the categorical imperative, we follow duty so that humanity can live morally and peacefully in society.

Socrates: But counterexamples where mere duty cannot justify the virtue of an action abound. Why should a person sacrifice himself for his country, for example, in wartime?

Kant: Because it is his duty…it may be rational for him to sacrifice himself in order to save his country, or fellow man.

Socrates: But duty to give up your life cannot be reasoned according to your system. Why should it be my responsibility to give up myself? Why couldn't it be your duty? The problem remains that there must be either an eternal and consistent system of morals that duty aligns itself with, or we must follow inclinations besides duty, and thereby do no moral actions. For I can die for my country out of love for it, but if that is my motive then I guess my action has no moral worth.

Kant: Surely not all people would follow this line of reasoning; some would do so because of duty.

Socrates: But morality remains far too subjective to define using your theory. If a murderer killed a robber in the interest of preserving society by removing the threat of robbery, would his action be in accordance with duty and thereby moral? Or if it is dutiful to die for my country, what is there to convince me that it must be me that dies?

Kant: The vigilante murderer could not conform his action to duty, because a universal law of murder like that would not be a safe place to live.

Socrates: Why not? If in killing the robber I would prevent myself from ever being robbed again, would that not be in my, and society's best interests? Or take another example of a moral law – "Honor your father and mother." What reason would we have in wanting to make that a universal law?

Kant: The duty we have in taking care of our parents, as they took care of us as children.

Socrates: But would it not be more beneficial to society if we focused our resources on taking care of our own children, our future, instead of our parents'? Again, the categorical imperative is insufficient to command our duty to do a moral action. There must be a different standard that would declare that it is our duty to honor our parents.

Kant: Perhaps you're correct – there must be a standard of morality that duty aligns with. If it is dutiful to not commit suicide, that must be in accordance with a system of ethics that commands that.

Socrates: Only with this standard can this morality have any weight in our lives.

Aquinas: I must confess I have to defend some of Kant's teaching here. While I agree with your problems, Socrates, I don't think that Kant's theory is wholly inaccurate.

Socrates: How so? I would imagine you siding with the conclusions made in the first part of this discussion.

Aquinas: I do, and I think to an extent Kant does as well. His morality is a refreshing example of what knowledge we can have of God and His laws on our own. Christians define it as general revelation – what God reveals to us outside of Scripture. God's existence, displayed through the wonders of Creation, is an example of one part of general revelation. A sense of morality and ethics is another example – while we can glean much knowledge about that from Scripture, we all have an innate sense of morality. A system such as Kant's, which develops this revelation into a full-fledged system of what is ethical, profoundly illustrates the existence of ethics found in general revelation. When we refuse to ignore this knowledge and try to base a system of morality off of it, we can achieve a morality very close to that prescribed in Scripture.

Kant: And the standard of morality that our duty must conform to, according to Socrates' brilliant reasoning, is this general revelation.

Aquinas: Indeed, your system of morality must be defined based on an outside commandment, such as God's moral laws.

Socrates: That may be, but as we've seen with Kant's system it cannot guarantee, or even try to guarantee, that we can follow these ethics. Where does that leave us, with a system of morality that we cannot follow?

Aquinas: It leaves us where the Bible says we are – incapable of saving ourselves through trying to be moral on our own. Moral systems can only provide so much for us before they break down. That brings me to the second attribute of Kant's morality. This is that it devastatingly reinforces the concept of how impossible it is to attain perfection ethically on our own, and how only Jesus Christ can even attempt to follow a morality such as this. Eradicating all selfish ambitions, even selfless inclinations to help others, it defines morality as that which is done entirely of a good will due to duty and without regard to its end. That sort of morality is, as you objected, impossible to attain – demonstrating how we cannot be holy on our own. The moral law defined by Kant based on general revelation cannot save us or aid us in reaching salvation, but it convicts us of our sin and of our complete inability to attain perfection.

Socrates: That is the most valuable lesson that can be learned from the thoughts of our friend – while those of us in Limbo sought to live according to similar thoughts as Kant, we lacked the goodness necessary to save us and thus our moral systems fall short.

Kant: In that regard, our time was well spent here. Perhaps that is the reason for my visit – it looks as if Virgil is anxious to move on, so I will say my farewells to you both.

Socrates: Indeed, thank you for the enjoyable discussion, and farewell on your journey to your destination.

Charlotte Blacklock
May 23, 2008
GBT V, Paper #2

Concerning Justice

Introduction

"Well said, Cephalus, I replied; but as concerning justice, what is it?" [1]

Plato devotes ten books to the ancient question, "What is justice?" If a person is wronged, what should he do to bring the wrongdoer to justice? How can he gain satisfaction from the wrongdoer? Although few have addressed justice as thoroughly as Plato did in his *Republic*, writers and thinkers since ancient times have searched for an illuminating definition. Aeschylus the playwright, although he lived in roughly the same time period as Socrates, offers a definition of justice almost opposite to that of Socrates. Dante the medieval poet has a definition that resembles Aeschylus', even though Dante was a Christian and Aeschylus a pagan. But does any of these thinkers offer a correct definition of justice?

Plato's Justice – The Ideal Man

In the first book of the *Republic*, Socrates, leaving town with his friend Glaucon, is waylaid by Cephalus' son Polemarchus and his friends. Polemarchus brings Socrates to Cephalus' house, and the question, "What is justice?" arises. Polemarchus first states that justice is that which does good to friends and harm to enemies: "If, Socrates, we are to be guided at all by the analogy of the preceding instances, then justice is the art which gives good to friends and evil to enemies."[2] This definition might at first seem intuitively reasonable; when a man does his friends justice, he does them good and gives them their due. He likewise does justice to his enemies by punishing them for their wrongs toward him. Socrates does not agree with Polemarchus, however, and eventually persuades him that justice according to this definition is next to useless other than in times of war. There is no need to harm enemies in peacetime and the only way a just man could do good to his friends would be to guard their money while they are not using it. For any other specific task, a man who is skilled or trained in performing that task is more useful than a man who is simply just. Socrates further shows Polemarchus how injuring another man could never be called justice – the just man is good and can therefore do harm to no man, whether he is a friend or an enemy. "Then if a man says that justice consists in the repayment of debts, and that good is the debt which a man owes to his friends, and evil the debt which he owes to his enemies – to say this is not wise; for it is not true, if, as has been clearly shown, the injuring of another can be in no case just." [3]

While Socrates does not explicitly offer his own definition of justice, his arguments reveal the characteristics of his just man: the just man is happy and wise and has an excellent soul, whereas the unjust man is ignorant and miserable; the just man does harm to none and never attempts to outdo any man, but does only good to friend and enemy alike, whereas the unjust man lives a wretched life, doing evil to his fellow men and trying always to surpass them. Socrates' just man, in summary, behaves altogether ideally. "Then this must be our notion of the just man, that even when he is in poverty or sickness, or any other seeming misfortune, all things will in the end work together for good to him in life and death: for the gods have a care of any one whose desire is to become just and to be like God, as far as man can attain the divine likeness, by the pursuit of virtue?"[4] Although he was a pagan, Socrates clearly had some concept of what God is, as he revealed when he denigrated the petty Greek pantheon. To be just, according to Socrates, was to be as much like God – unknown to Socrates, yet functioning as his ideal – as it is possible for a mortal human to be.

To a Christian, this definition of justice seems reasonable; Christ obviously fits Socrates' description of the just man. But the seeming implication of Socrates' definition is that all punishment is unjust and therefore unacceptable. Yet God, who is Justice Himself, punished His people even with death when they turned against Him. Does this mean that there is a flaw in Socrates' definition of justice? Although punishment may hurt temporarily, if it is justly dealt it does more good than harm overall to the sinner or the perpetrator of the crime. Socrates recognizes this and distinguishes injury and harm on the one hand and merited punishment on the other. Socrates shows how

---

[1] *Republic* I
[2] *Republic* I
[3] *Republic* I
[4] *Republic* X

detection and punishment of a crime only improves a man's soul; if he is allowed to go unpunished, his soul will deteriorate.

> What shall he profit, if his injustice be undetected and unpunished? He who is undetected only gets worse, whereas he who is detected and punished has the brutal part of his nature silenced and humanized; the gentler element in him is liberated, and his whole soul is perfected and ennobled by the acquirement of justice and temperance and wisdom, more than the body ever is by receiving gifts of beauty, strength and health, in proportion as the soul is more honorable than the body.[5]

Socrates does make clear that man is quite capable of misjudging his fellow man and therefore should not readily mete out punishment. "But see the consequence: – Many a man who is ignorant of human nature has friends who are bad friends, and in that case he ought to do harm to them; and he has good enemies whom he ought to benefit; but, if so, we shall be saying the very opposite of that which we affirmed to be the meaning of Simonides."[6] If a person is wronged, Socrates would say that he was just if he did no harm to his enemy, but only did him good, even if doing good would mean punishment.

Punishment therefore can provide a sort of recompense for the suffering of a wrong, as long as it is the proper punishment. But can a person attain true *satisfaction* from punishing the wrongdoer? The knowledge that he has been wronged still burns in a man's mind, and it is often difficult to forget a wrongdoing, especially when the consequences are permanent.

Aeschylus' Justice -- Revenge

Aeschylus the playwright, a contemporary of Socrates, offers a different definition for justice in his *Oresteia*. The *Oresteia* begins with Agamemnon's journey home from the Trojan War. Victorious Agamemnon returns wreathed in glory, only to be killed by his wife Clytemnestra, who has taken another lover in Agamemnon's absence. Even apart from her new allegiance to her lover, Clytemnestra desires revenge on her husband. Agamemnon had sacrificed their beloved daughter Iphigenia after the goddess Artemis instructed him to do so in order to go to Troy and attempt to recover the wife of his brother. Agamemnon's desire for glory trumped his love for Iphigenia, and he murdered her. Clytemnestra was therefore "justifying" her daughter's death by killing her husband.

> Praise
> me,
> blame me as you choose. It's all one.
> Here is Agamemnon, my husband made a corpse
> by this right hand – a masterpiece of Justice.
> Done is done...
>
> ...And now you sentence me?
> –
> you banish me from the city, curses breathing
> down my neck? But he –
> name one charge you brought against him then.
> He thought no more of it than killing a beast,
> and his flocks were rich, teeming in their fleece,
> but he sacrificed his own child, our daughter,
> the agony I labored into love
> to charm away the savage winds of Thrace.[7]

There is no doubt that Agamemnon committed an inexcusable wrong, cruelly putting his own daughter to death in order to continue his voyage. Yet was Clytemnestra justified in taking her husband's life? Her love for him had been extinguished with the life of her daughter, and she had already taken another lover. The only thing she desired now was satisfaction – terrible revenge on her husband for his crime against their daughter's life. But her satisfaction did not last long; returned from exile, her son Orestes now desired revenge upon her, under the mask of justification, for his father's death. He returned to his mother's palace at the command of Apollo, and murdered her.

> Here, unfurl it
> so the Father – no, not mine but the One
> who watches over all, the Sun can behold
> my mother's godless work. So he may come,
> my witness when the day of judgment comes,
> that I pursued this bloody death with justice,
> *mother's* death.[8]

Having thus justified his father's death, Orestes still cannot rest. Almost immediately after his terrible deed, he is pursued by the Furies, avengers of death, who now desire revenge, or "justice," for the death of Clytemnestra. This time, however, Athena and Apollo are on Orestes' side, and they call together a jury to determine Orestes' fate. The vote comes out even, and Athena claims that Orestes is exonerated, but the Furies insist that they are being dishonored and justice disregarded. But instead of attempting to employ justice to decide whether Orestes deserves death, Athena resorts to bribery, beguiling the Furies by promising to make them the Eumenides and to adorn them with royal robes and supply them with servants.

The play ends with everyone satisfied, but not because justice has been done. Throughout the *Oresteia* are typical examples of the ancients' view of justice, as family members kill each other off, each attempting to avenge, or "justify," the death of another. The characters of the *Oresteia*, in fact, use revenge and justice almost interchangeably. One might suppose that the Greeks generally held the same or similar definitions of justice during this time; ironically, however, while Socrates does not deal directly with revenge, he would never agree with the characters of the *Oresteia* concerning justice. What is revenge beyond trying to outdo and harm one's enemies? Revenge and just punishment are dissimilar; while punishment, when justly given, does overall good to the offender, revenge merely gives temporary satisfaction to one party. Socrates argues in the *Republic* that no just man would attempt to take revenge on his enemies, because a just man does not harm or try to outdo anyone.

Nor could the "justice" of the *Oresteia* bring much satisfaction at all, even to those who avenge themselves. Not only has a man lost something when he has been wronged, but if he vents his anger and avenges himself on his wrongdoer, he must also live with the knowledge that he has harmed another; and in many cases he will be subject to yet another man's vengeance.

Dante's Justice – Divine justice

We have now examined two pagan views of justice. Dante's *Divine Comedy*, in contrast, offers a Christian view. Dante enters the realm of Paradise after having traveled through Hell and Purgatory. Accompanied by his former love Beatrice, he travels through Heaven, halting at the different spheres and speaking with the inhabitants. The spirits are located on different heavenly levels according to their deeds in life, and Dante finds the spirits of the just on the sphere of Jupiter. These spirits form themselves into an eagle, the symbol of justice, and speak to Dante, instructing him about the nature of God's justice.

Dante wishes to know more about the "virtuous pagans," the people who go to Hell because they do not know about man's salvation through Christ. Why, he wonders, does God exclude them from heaven if they *could not* have known Christ? The eagle answers that the human intellect cannot understand divine justice; all we can know is that the will of God is the standard of justice and therefore must be just.

> Wheeling it sang and spake: "My song outspans
> Thy mortal wit, surpassing all thou know'st;
> So doth the eternal judgment matched with man's.[9]

Yet while it may still seem unfair for the pagans who were never told about Christ to have to spend eternity in Hell, we must remember that

[5] *Republic* IX
[6] *Republic* I
[7] *Agamemnon*, lines 1427 – 1444
[8] *The Libation Bearers*, lines 975 – 980
[9] *Paradiso*, Canto XIX, lines 97 - 99

all people have deserved Hell. This concept may make perfect sense to some people; to the extent that it still seems unjust, we must remember that God's justice, like His grace, is something that mortal human beings cannot fully understand. Because our human intellect is limited, there are some things about God that we must simply accept as true without fully comprehending. We mortals are not qualified to question the justice of the One who made us. As the eagle stated, we know that God is Justice itself, and therefore whatever He does is just. "Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth. Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will? Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?"[10]

In his Comedy, Dante expresses another idea regarding divine justice, however, that is not in accord with the Bible. Dante, who believed in the doctrine of Purgatory, thought that people had to redeem themselves after death, even though Christ had already died for them. Throughout the different levels of Purgatory, the dead souls justified their salvation by doing penance, punishing themselves according to the different sins they had committed in life. But this justice resembles the "justice" in the *Oresteia*: in each situation the person commits wrongs, and in each the person's wrongs must be justified. In the *Oresteia*, "justice" is achieved when a second person kills the wrongdoer. In *Purgatorio*, although Christ had already taken man's punishment upon himself, man still must punish himself in order to avenge God. Could divine justice truly be as crude as that depicted in the ancient plays of the pagans? As 1 John 1:9 instructs, "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from *all* unrighteousness." The purgatorial state could not exist, because Christ's blood washes away *all* our sins; indeed, if we give ourselves to Christ, everything is forgiven and we are fully justified to be with God.

Although Dante does not clearly define justice, it is possible to glean from his poems how he would define it. Divine justice, the justice Dante as a Christian believes is the true justice, bears this similarity to grace: we cannot know everything about it. Yet if we wrong God, as all of us do, we do not need to worry about justification, because Christ has already died for us. Dante's conception of justice is therefore incomplete, because the doctrine of Purgatory would defeat Christ's justification.

Biblical Justice

While Dante attempts to define divine justice, he fails in some respects. Christ justifies us so that we can spend eternity with Him; although we sinned against God, Christ placed Himself between us and Hell and died in our stead. We were therefore justified by Christ; we could not justify ourselves. God did not simply let His wrath descend on us so that we would be justly punished, as the characters of the *Oresteia* treated their wrongdoers. Instead, His Son died, and He granted us mercy. Our sins are paid for; why, then, should we need to redeem ourselves in Purgatory before we join God in heaven? We are indeed chastised in our earthly lives, because we as sinners bring misery upon ourselves. The Bible also offers us many accounts of crimes being punished by God Himself. Abel's blood cried out to God when his brother Cain murdered him; Sodom and Gomorrah went up in flames because the people had wronged God. The characters of the *Oresteia* might applaud these events, but would Socrates claim that God is supremely good and therefore would never do harm to His people? First, we must remember that God *is* Justice – He cannot commit an act of injustice. Furthermore, He does grant mercy: although He punished Cain, He did not kill Cain; and at the pleading of Moses, He did not destroy the tribes of Israel when they turned from Him. He sent His Son to die a terrible death so that we might live; Christ provided the justification needed so that we might be with God. But, you might ask, is this not exactly what the people of the *Oresteia* did? Did not someone have to die so that God might be appeased? There is a difference: God forgave us. Forgiveness brings complete satisfaction, not additional punishment. Christ Himself, with almost His last words, called out to His Father to "forgive them, for they know not what they do."[11] It is sometimes difficult for us sinners to forgive with absolutely no other satisfaction, but this is precisely what Christ did, and we as Christians are commanded to follow His example. While punishment, when it is used where it is needed, can be just, a man cannot truly achieve satisfaction from punishment. He has still been wronged, and not all wrongs can be undone. The only way a man can attain satisfaction is if he forgives.

Conclusion

The Bible shows that justice comes from God and that what God does is just – that God, indeed, is the standard of all justness. "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne: mercy and truth shall go before thy face."[12] Socrates approaches this definition in his arguments, even though he did not know God; he believed that a just man was a godlike man, an ideal man, who could never do harm to anyone. The justice of the *Oresteia* is far removed from that of Socrates. To Aeschylus' characters, justice meant no more than avenging themselves. The members of Agamemnon's family killed each other off, each trying to "justify" or avenge another's death. Dante likewise believed that we must be punished in Purgatory before God can forgive us, even though Christ has already justified us. What, then, is the true definition of justice? It is not for man to decide what another man's punishment should be; man cannot be his own impartial judge. Each man is a sinner, and we are all wicked in the eyes of God. This does not mean that a man may never be punished, however; God Himself punished the wicked when they refused to turn to Him. But, as the characters of the *Oresteia* show, pure revenge does not bring true satisfaction, nor is it always right. Man must therefore not use punishment for revenge, but exclusively for the sinner's good. Although forgiveness may sometimes be hard, man must forgive in order to be just. Is this, then, justice? Complete and absolute pardon? The reverse of the justice of the *Oresteia*, forgiveness is what God gives to us, who have sinned against Him more than any man can sin against another man. As God epitomizes justice, He cannot indeed be unjust. This, therefore, is the definition of justice: to do as Christ did, to forgive with no other satisfaction, to "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."[13]

Matthew Cook
GBT V Paper II
5/5/08

Throughout all the wars and disagreement of history, man has always been left asking himself who was more in the right. Obviously the question is not "Who is in the right", because we are flawed, so nothing we create or do is completely right or perfect. The closest we can get is who was *more* in the right. A good example of this is the Trojan War. Both sides had good reasons for fighting, at least in their opinion, at the time. The Greeks were fighting because of the oath that they had made when Helen chose a husband; to restore her to her rightful husband should anyone steal her from her rightful place. The Trojans on the other hand, were fighting not only for their very existence, but also because they had been invaded. A major mistake that the Greeks made, the possibly would have helped certain kingdoms side with Troy, was that they made war with a particular man's city, instead of just that man. Never mind that that man was a prince of Troy, his only claim to fame was that he was the brother of the first born child, who would one day take the throne of Troy. This, and many other questions will be addressed by answering this one question, "Who was more in the right? The Greeks? Or the Trojans." The best way to answer this is to look at different characters in this story and ask the question of "Why were they fighting?" The best people to ask this question about, would be the main characters, such as Achilles, Hector, Paris, Helen , and Agamemnon to name a few

In order to answer this question, we must first take into account a few certain variables. First, the definitions of right and wrong in the sort of matter quite possibly differed back then. At this time, things were quite different in some areas then they are today. For example, women were

[10] Romans 9:20

[11] Luke 23:34
[12] Psalm 89:14
[13] Matthew 7:12

considered property in quite a few areas, and it would seem that, even if the Greeks didn't think quite this way about their women, they certainly didn't hold them in quite as high esteem as they did men. So when Paris took Helen away, it was probably considered stealing by the people of Sparta in the sense of a thief stealing a valuable possession from the king's treasury. Very likely, they thought of Helen as a prized item of the king's treasury then as a co-ruler like many people today think of queens. So in this instance, it would appear that the Spartans and other Greeks were farther in the right then the Trojans. However, in the Trojans defense, they were not responsible for the actions of a prince of their city. In fact, King Priam had practically disowned Paris when it was foretold that he would cause the ruin of Troy. So it would seem that the Greeks and the Trojans thought of Helen as little more then a treasure of their kingdom that was worth more then gold or silver.

Many people assume that the Greeks were right, because they were trying to put Helen back where she belonged. What they don't take into account, is that Paris acted without the blessing of King Priam. In fact, the trip the Paris and his entourage took to Sparta was a mission of peace, not abduction. This all changed however, when Paris and Helen fell in love, or Paris felt that he couldn't live without her, so in the end, he kidnapped her, or they eloped, the poets differ on this statement, but according to Homer, it was more of an elopement. Herodotus in fact, challenges that Helen was never in Troy, but in fact spent the entire Trojan War in Egypt, because when Paris left Sparta with Helen, Herodotus says Paris traveled first to Egypt, where the Egyptians discovered that Helen had been kidnapped, and told Paris that he had to leave Helen and all other treasures that he had gotten from the Greeks there, and that he must leave their shores immediately. However, according to Homer and the other poets, Helen did indeed make it all the way to Troy, although they all differ on how she got there, whether it was an elopement or an abduction, they all agree that she did indeed travel to Troy. Whatever the case, Helen from all appearances in the Iliad, was a very willing “captive”, and appears to love Paris almost as much if not equally as much as she loved Menelaus. Helen does not appear to have much of an opinion on who was more in the right, or if she does, she keeps it to herself throughout the book. At different periods in the book though, she appears to sympathize with the different sides. In one instance, she is on the city walls, pointing out the champions of the Greeks to King Priam, and in an almost longing fashion, describing their achievements to King Priam, while in another instance, she is begging Hector to be wary while on the battlefield. This leads us to believe that Helen had loyalties for both sides, and, while she favored the Greeks because they were her people, she also sympathized with the Trojans, especially King Priam and Hector, when she saw what the war that was on her account was doing to them both. She almost seems to look upon Hector as an older brother, who blames Paris for the misfortunes of Troy.

Perhaps the strongest support of the cause of the Greeks is perhaps their greatest opponent, Hector. Hector, while he fought valiantly to keep the city of which he was the crown prince from being destroyed, evidently thought that the Greeks were perfectly justified in attacking Troy as it held not only their “treasure” but also the man who had taken that treasure from them. This opinion is evident in his frequent quarrels with Paris, calling him a coward for staying in his apartment with Helen, instead if defending the city that he put in harms way. These arguments appear to fall on deaf ears, as Paris rarely ventures into the battle, and when he does, it is only at Helen's insistence, or to make himself appear more bold and brave to Helen, and even then, apart from his single combat with Menelaus, never went farther then the city walls, from which is sent arrows flying into the ranks of the Greeks from a safe distance. King Priam also berates Paris from time to time, but this also has little to no affect on the prince, who continues to spend most of his time in his apartment with Helen, or watching the battle from the safety of the city walls.

King Priam seems somewhat indifferent to the fact that the city of Troy has to suffer because of what one of his sons has done; he seems to accept it as just another burden that he must bear as king of Troy. He obviously thinks that it is the duty of Troy to stand behind their prince no matter what he's done; otherwise, he would have forced Paris to give Helen back to the Greeks. However, it is doubtful that this would have assuaged the wrath of the Greeks, who most likely would have continued the siege of Troy until they had avenged Helen's capture as well as recovering her. Most likely, King Priam realized this, and saw that giving Helen back would do little to no good, and would instead remove part of the resolve of the people of Troy as well as weakening his position as king of the city that bent to the will of the Greeks. In fact, for the most part, he seemed to want to have little to do with the war, for the most part leaving it completely to Hector. This could be seen as a weakness in his character, or as a wise decision because he apparently knew much less about warfare the Hector did.

On the Greek side, there seems to be little visible unrest about the war and who's more in the right, except for Achilles. Achilles seems throughout the story to be more interested in winning glory for himself and his soldiers then in rescuing Helen and being able to return home. In fact, he has accepted the fact that he will never return home due to the many prophesies that he will die fighting in the battle at Troy. Even though, he is reluctant to be the first man to disembark from the ships when they reach Troy, as it was foretold that the first man to tough the shore would be the first man killed by the Trojans. He had no visible ties to the principles that many of the other Greeks were fighting for, and instead fought only for spoils and glory. So it would seem that there would have been little stopping Achilles from fighting for the Trojans instead of the Greeks, except that he had many friends among the Greeks, and very few among the Trojans, who, after the first few months of the war, would have very likely speared him from behind had he changed sides. His love of spoils and glory is painfully evident in the story of the priest of Apollo's daughter. This love of glory and spoils and more importantly, his pride, would eventually lead to his downfall and because of his pride, he almost caused the ruin of the Greek forces. Luckily for the Greeks, Patroclus was able to persuade Achilles to loan him his armor and his chariot, and allow him to lead his army against the Trojans, who thought that it was Achilles, and not Patroclus who led the onslaught.

Another one of the greater Grecian heroes, King Agamemnon of Mycenae however, while possibly in the war for the spoils and glory, was also fighting the war for the Greeks not only because of the oath that he took as one of Helen's suitors, but also because he was very put off by the Trojan's politics during that time. Keep in mind that at this time, Troy was in control of the very important strait between the Mediterranean and and the Black Sea. And since quite a bit of trade went through this area, the Trojans were in a very good position to demand fees of the ships that passed through here, which, in fact they did, which caused the Greeks much annoyance. So King Agamemnon, had the Trojan's given Helen back, would have most likely pressed for the attack on Troy to continue in order to rid the world of the entire city and it's trade fees, and also to win for himself glory and spoils from the city. His love of spoils is also evident in the incident concerning the daughter of the priest of Apollo. These he displays only a love of the spoils and contempt for anyone who would try to take from him his hard earned spoils and glory.

Another one of the Greek heroes/former suitor of Helen's, was Ajax. Of all the Greek commanders, Ajax seems to be among the most inclined to winning the war because of principles. That is not to say that he wasn't also in it for the glory and the spoils and because he took an oath that bound him to fighting for the Greeks. Greeks of that time were taught from a young age that to win a war or battle was to win glory and spoils and that those were the main reasons for fighting. To fight because of your principles was a rather new idea.

In Homer's edition of the story, we are also told about the gods' roles in the battle. For the most part, their roles were limited to creating omens, answering prayers, and occasionally whisking people to safety. What is interesting to note however, is that Homer, in his telling of this, does not use the gods to determine who is more in the right. He is very careful to have some gods favoring the Greeks, and some favoring the Trojans. It does appear however, that he has the majority of the gods favoring the Greeks, which makes sense, as Homer was a Greek himself, and therefore would want to make the Greeks appear superior to the Trojans. Some of the gods change sides throughout the battle though, such as Zeus, when he first frightens the Trojans with his omen of the bird carrying the snake when the Trojans are on the brink of the ships, and also when he allows Patroclus to destroy Sarpedon. Later though, the Greeks accuse Zeus of always steering the Trojan's spears to their mark, as the Trojans spears never miss. Now it is possible that the Trojans were incredibly able soldiers, but to have such accuracy as to astound the equally as able Greek soldiers suggests a godly interference. Apollo was for the Trojans from the start, and in fact,

according to Homer, guided Paris in shooting the fateful arrow that pierced Achilles heal, causing his death. So since the gods are so divided on this topic according to Homer, it is evident that it's foolish to base an opinion of who was more in the right in the war on the gods actions.

Going back to Hector for a moment though, it would seem that, while he does not wholly approve of his brother's actions, he also does not have a great love for the Greeks. This is evident by the relentlessness with which he pursues some of his opponents on the battlefield. He obviously has no great love for Achilles, and that could be partly due to jealousy, or possibly Achilles did him some wrong in the past, or possibly Hector just hated him because he was a Greek and the Greeks were trying to destroy Troy. Hector's loyalty to the city of Troy is a very good example of what is known as the "religion of the state". This "religion" is one of two that a successful state needs to survive. It is basically a loyalty to the state in the sense that the state is almost a god, and by being loyal to it, you are worshiping and honoring it. Hector could have quite easily have left Troy, given it up as a lost cause, which he probably realized it was from the beginning, and begun life anew in another land. His loyalty to his city-state wouldn't allow him to do this though, and so he stayed in the knowledge that he would eventually give up his life for his city-state in the ensuing struggle.

Achilles also knew that he would end his life in the ensuing struggle, and he could have simply refused to go. He wasn't a suitor of Helen's, and therefore, wasn't bound by an oath. Instead, he chose to go, much to his mother's distress, because he knew that he would die, but he would die with honor on the battlefield. Which was how he as the warrior to the bone that he was, wanted to "go out"

Finally, there are the people of Troy itself. While the story of the Iliad doesn't talk very much about them, they are still a pivotal part of the story, because at any time, they could have taken over the city, and thrown Paris and Helen out to the Greeks and wash their hands of the whole matter. However, they instead chose to stand behind their leaders, trusting in them to make wise decisions and lead them through the war. They do seem to care for the spoils that they would gain from the Greeks, from which they would become quite rich were the Greeks to lose the war, as, not only would they be able to retain Helen as their "treasure", but there is also the large amount of spoils that the Greeks had collected from the neighboring lands and places that they visited on their way to Troy. But even more so, would be the honor and prestige of having not only blunted the Greek attack, but also having defeated them and sent them cowering back to their homelands. Had the Trojans won, this story would be just as well known as it is now, only most likely, it would have been told from a standpoint sympathetic to the Trojans.

So in the Trojan War, who was more in the right? This is a question that scholars have been asking themselves down through the ages of time from Roman to modern times. There are those who sympathize with the underdog Trojans, and then there is the majority who sympathize with the Greeks, who appear to be more in the right, not only because they won, but also because, from the standpoint of the writer, they had been wronged by the Trojans by the abduction of Helen. There are many arguments from many different standpoints. From the Trojan standpoint, we have people such as King Priam, or his sons Hector and Paris, and from the Greek standpoint, we have Agamemnon, Menelaus, Ajax, and many others. We also have the impartial characters, such as the gods, and Helen, who never seems to really take a definite side, while some of the gods stay true to one side throughout the entire war and others switch sides throughout the war for no obvious reason. Both sides had their members who were in it solely for the glory and spoils, like Achilles on the Greek side, and many of the Trojan people on the Trojan side. Both sides also had those who were in it because of their loyalties, such as Ajax on the Greek side, who was loyal to the cause because of the oath that he took as a suitor of Helen, and on the Trojan side, Hector, who was loyal to his city through thick and thin, no matter what their decision was. And because of this, it would appear that neither of them is more in the right then the other. Because while the Greeks were right in fulfilling their oath to defend Helen and go to war with whomever took her away from her rightful place in Sparta, the Trojans also were right in defending their city for the same reasons that Hector did. They did it because it was their city, and they were bound to defend it through thick and thin because of their religion to the state.

Lauren Vader
GB5, Paper #2
May 30, 2008

The Sanctified Body

"And God saw everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good." ~Genesis 1:31

Death is the unnatural separation of the soul from the body, and is contrary to the perfect state, which God originally intended for man, who He fashioned in His image. This misery was a consequence of Adam's disobedience and, as he is our representative, resulted in mankind's separation from God and the corruption of man in his entirety. It was generally thought by the ancient Greeks, however, that death was freedom for the soul in captivity within the sinful body. In Phaedo, a dialogue on the immortality of the soul, Plato says, "And what is purification but the separation of the soul from the body [...]". The sinful body, he considered harmful to our pure soul and a hindrance to its achieving true wisdom because of its corporeal needs. We see this similar pagan belief, concerning the connection between body and soul, in the world; and while prevalent among mystics and spiritists, this misconstrued version of body-soul dualism can even be found in the modern Christian view that has an incorrect understanding of Paul. This idea has made its way throughout the centuries precisely because of its seeming obviousness, that is, that the root of our sin is linked with our sensual selves, our bodies. The monastic display of penance seems to be another example of the sinner's attempt to make the body submit, as it is given terrible pains and privations. In any case, today's age is definitely infected by the dualistic idea that the soul is at the mercy of the body.

A Rash View of Body-Soul Dualism

During the apostolic age, matter was reputed evil, and for the Gnostics, this supposition was considered a rational explanation for the existence of evil that would harmonize with the idea of an immaterial and good God. The Scriptural account of evil's origin was not accepted as truth, for it seemed contradictory that a gracious God would allow evil. Good and evil, therefore, were thought to exist with equal power, preventing Christ's conquering of sin through His death. Relying on reason alone, this group sought answers to the problem of evil. Christian historian, Phillip Shaff, describes Gnosticism as "an over-valuation of knowledge or gnosis, and a depreciation of faith, or pistis". As matter is evil, death was therefore thought of as a needed redemption for the immortal soul. For through death, man's soul, the divine and perfect part of man's being, is released from the material body, the seat of our sensual lust, from which it was believed sin had its origin. The combination of heathen philosophy with Christianity, the Gnostics thought, offered a more sensible reason to some of the most difficult theological questions. Oddly, as Shaff points out, while they rejected a Biblical view of evil, they apparently easily adopted Hindu mysticism and used it to assist them in their pursuit of truth.

Primarily, this pagan heresy was influenced by the Platonic view of the spiritual and material part of man. This philosophy is symbolized in Raphael's painting, The School of Athens, where we see Plato pointing up to the heavens, the divine, while Aristotle points below, to the material. For Plato, the non-physical aspect of man was judged as superior to his physical nature, as the body distracts the soul by its needs and desires, therefore, hindering the soul in its search for true wisdom and finally harming its divine nature. This evil was measured as the outcome of an overindulgence of material pleasures, which causes the soul to become fastened to the body, and eventually results in the mutual sharing of desires. As is said in Phaedo, "[…] each pleasure and pain is a sort of nail which nails and rivets the soul to the body, until she becomes like the body, and believes that to be true which the body affirms to be true; and from agreeing with the body and having the same delights she is obliged to have the same habits and haunts […] ". Wisdom, Plato teaches, is crucial to the prevention of this, for it is through knowledge, that the immortal nature of the soul is understood, and so also, made conscious of its well-being and fate in the afterlife. Separation of the soul from the body was considered as the only way for the soul to achieve this knowledge, and therefore, death was not to be feared. Thus, Plato speaks of philosophy as purification from evil. But to regard the soul as pure is contrary to Biblical truth. There is no spiritual good in man's soul, just as there is none in his body. In Romans 6:19, Paul makes the connection directly: "For just as you once presented your members as slaves to impurity and to lawlessness leading to more lawlessness, so now present your members slaves to righteousness leading to sanctification". Our whole nature is corrupt, and therefore we make use of our bodily members to indulge in sin. While incorrect in his belief of souls being pure before corrupted by the sinful desires of the body, it is important not to dismiss all of what Plato states regarding the protection of our souls, "[…] in order that the disease of injustice may not be rendered chronic and become the incurable cancer of the soul; […]." Unjust acts committed towards another are said in Gorgias, to scar the soul of the wrong doer. While the Christian soul is made regenerate in faith by the Holy Spirit's indwelling, it is still possible to slow down the sanctification process by becoming hardened to sins. Continued repetitions of sin can harm the soul's sensitivity and awareness, cauterizing our hearts to the knowledge of God's displeasure felt in our consciences through His law, which is written on the heart of man.

The Biblical View of Body-Soul Dualism

Inarguably there is a dualistic nature of body and soul as noted here by John Calvin: "Indeed, from Scripture we have been taught that the soul is an incorporeal substance; now we must add that, although properly it is not spatially limited, still, set in the body, it dwells there as in a house; not only that it may animate all it parts and render its organs fit and useful for their actions, but also that it may hold the first place in ruling man's life, not alone with respect to the duties of his earthly life, but at the same time to arouse him to honor God" . His view on the connection between body and soul is a succession of Augustine's, that the body is needful of the soul, which gives to it life and movement, and not the soul that is reliant on the body. While Augustine does not, in keeping with Plato, believe the body to be completely antithetical to the good, he does however, hold that the body is lower than the soul as it can, when tempted, distract the soul from divine things. The soul is the substance that alone possesses immortality and bears the image of the Divine, and therefore, is superior to the body. Evidence of body-soul dualism is all too apparent in the separation of soul and body at death. In Ecclesiastes 12:7, it is said, "[…] and the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit returns to God who gave it". This verse clearly states a separation of body and soul. Seeing that death was brought on by the disobedience of Adam, perhaps this dualistic relationship is a result of fallen nature. John Cooper, author of Body, Soul & Life Everlasting, believes this to be incorrect. He says, "Suggesting that dualism stems from the fall requires that God recreated human nature after the fall. If separation of body and soul were not possible in the beginning, then God would have had to redesign and rebuild human nature after the fall in order to preserve persons without bodies in death" . According to Cooper, God originally created man with his soul possessing the ability to exist independent of his body. A dualistic nature could presuppose a fall when the substance of man would be subject to the curse of death or just have simply been created with two natures. Nevertheless, though he objects to the possibility of a changed nature, the nature of man was altered by the fall from a state of perfection to one of corruption. For whereas he had the ability not to sin before the fall, possibility of sin will be wholly removed at glorification. Completely sanctified, the saint will no longer possess the potential for total substance separation, that is, death; but whether the body will have an entirely new kind of relation towards the soul and vice versa, is not known.

The Biblical version of body-soul dualism is very different from the Platonic or the Gnostic kind. Again, because the Gnostics believed that being rid of matter was a way of abolishing parasitical sin, they had the right contempt for sin, but their philosophy also led to contempt for all matter, calling evil what God had esteemed good. Plato does not have as harsh a view of matter. He speaks of beauty and goodness in matter as they partake to the likeness of the Forms that exist, but he believed the earth to be marred and less important than the immaterial. Modern Evangelicals too, have the idea that the separation from our bodies is a release from our extensive struggle with sin. While there is a release from the fallen nature that operates within a material body, death is not to be seen as a release from the struggle with the material. This wrong understanding comes from a misinterpretation of the apostle Paul's writings. In Philippians 1:23, he says, "My desire is to depart and be with Christ, for that is far better". And also, in Romans 7:24, "Who will deliver me from this body of death". Paul makes the distinction between our material bodies and our fallen nature, by referring to the former as soma, and to the latter as sarx. Release from

his fallen nature is what he desires, because sin displeases God. To believe that it is better for the soul to be in heaven with Christ, than in this life of suffering is Biblical, but the distinction between the material and the sinful must be made clear. From this false reading, some Evangelicals have arrived at a horribly mistaken view of death. For instance, at funerals the releasing of doves is used as an allegory of the body's enslavement to the soul, as they rejoice in their loved one's separation from the sinful body. Christian spiritist, Albert Cliffe, in his book entitled, Let Go And Let God, blames mourning on a Christian's lack of faith, and describes death as being merely sleep, and the body as a temporary home for the soul. However, death is an intermediate state before the resurrection and its reunion with the soul; it is unnatural and should be mourned, just as Christ mourned the death of Lazarus. Modern Christians can sometimes fail to understand this importance.

Christ died in order to conquer sin and by this, bodily death, and to restore man to goodness through His righteousness. He was able to accomplish this by means of His incarnation. Through taking on human nature, both body and soul, He was able to satisfy the wrath of God towards us by clothing us in His perfect righteousness. Augustine, in his Confessions, declares that he once struggled to understand how Christ could remain holy although conceived and born of a virgin and made human. However, and Augustine too came to comprehend, Christ was not lowered by the body in any way. Athanasius puts it thus, "Not even His birth from a virgin, therefore, changed Him in any way, nor was He defiled by being in the body. Rather He sanctified the body by being in it". He is not ashamed to call us brothers, but was willing and obedient to the Father unto death. This is illustrated by the author of Hebrews, "For it was fitting that he, for whom and by whom all things exist, in bringing many sons to glory, should make the founder of their salvation perfect through suffering. For he who sanctifies and those who are sanctified all have one origin. That is why he is not ashamed to call them brothers". And, "Since therefore the children share in the flesh and blood, he himself likewise partook of the same things, that through death he might destroy the one who has the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver all those who through fear of death were subject to lifelong slavery. For surely it is not angels that he helps, but he helps the offspring of Abraham. Therefore he had to be made like his brothers in every respect, so that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God, to make propitiation for the sin of the people. For because he himself has suffered when tempted, he is able to help those who are being tempted". The Christian's soul experiences a kind of death in life that comes about through the repentance of sins, which is a putting away of our former habits, as is said by Augustine. This is an act of fleeing temptation, restraining ourselves, practicing prudence, but moreover it is continual repentance and a desire to live in gratitude. To the monks of the Middle Ages, it was a punishment of our material bodies through the practice of asceticism. This was sometimes carried out in severe ways. Long fasts and scourging are examples of bodily punishments inflicted on the self or other penitents for failing to obey real commands, as dictated by monastic rules. Though their desire was to please God, they were wrong in believing that they could purge their sins by bodily infliction. Only through the imputation of Christ's perfect righteousness are we pronounced blameless, not only declared righteous, but the Holy Spirit now truly dwells within us. Yet constantly our new nature in Christ is fighting with our old nature in Adam. Slowly our souls are being sanctified in this life along with our bodies, as we keep the bodily passions and desires of our fallen nature in check, until our souls are with Christ, and our bodies are entirely redeemed at the resurrection. The re-uniting of body and soul at the resurrection is a confirmation of God's intent that the two be joined.

The Holistic Relation of Body and Soul

While Augustine did hold to the soul's superiority, as has been said earlier, he commends Varro for insisting that man is a body-soul unity. This unity, termed holism, is the belief that the combination of soul and body is greater, in that man is constituted of both. Varro's view is given in Augustine's The City of God: "[…] man is neither the body alone, nor the soul alone, but both together. And therefore the highest good, in which lies the happiness of man, is composed of goods of both kinds, both bodily and spiritually". With the body we can observe beauty in nature and art, and read great books; hear music, enjoy the taste of good food, and take pleasure in the presence of friends and family. The soul is the substance that understands what the body sees, hears, tastes, and touches, and differentiates between likes and dislikes; it is man's essence. That is why, as Aquinas indicates, "[…] the theologian considers the nature of the man in relation to the soul, but not in relation to the body, except insofar as the body has relation to the soul". Through the recognition and appreciation of God's grace that is witnessed in beauty, we can glorify God. In the Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism, Ursinus explains well the reason for God creating us as a unity of two substances. "He created, and united the soul and the body, so as to constitute, by this union, one person, performing such internal and external functions and actions as are peculiar to human nature, and which are just, holy, and pleasing to God." When all sin has been vanquished, God will restore the bodies of the dead to their souls, since through this bond, man is able to fully enjoy all good pleasures, the way in which God premeditated.

Similarly, Aristotle, in his De Anima, regarded man as a body-soul unity. He saw that there was division to a person and while he did not believe in an afterlife or an immortal soul, he did believe that the soul was the essence of man. The body is matter, possessing, as Aristotle describes, potentiality of life within it and must have a living substance of actuality to give it movement. Since we primarily live, perceive, and think with the soul, this is the form-substance that is actuality. This is an interchangeable dependence, however, as the soul also needs the body. For it is through the body's senses that the soul sees images and hears sounds by which it can

understand and know. The composite of soul and body is what generates a living thing and makes a unified whole, and, for that reason, it is not proper for the soul to be separated from the body. St. Thomas Aquinas thought that much of what Aristotle believed concerning the soul was in line with Christianity, and mentions him often in the Summa, when discussing the soul. He brings forward two arguments in favor of body-soul holism; firstly, that matter and form are part of the species man, and that each part is proper to the other in making up what is called a man; for it is not the soul that makes use of the body as Plato says. Secondly, that the body has sensation along with the soul. Here is where Plato is mistaken. He asserts that the soul alone senses, and that it makes use of the body. In objection to the idea that the soul alone is man's true self, Aquinas, speaking of Aristotle to make clear his own stance, explains in regard to the combination of soul and body, "According to the Philosopher, each thing seems to be chiefly what is most important in it. Thus, what the governor of a state does, the state is said to do" He explains that the part governing man can be referred to as the whole man, but sometimes it is the intellectual part, the inward man that is at that moment leading, and it is also sometimes the sensitive part with the body, that is, the tangible, the outward man.

Conclusion

Belief in dualism does not necessitate separation for the good of the soul; rather, man is a dichotomy of substances, and each substance performs a function for the good of man as a whole. This is the true sense of dualism found in Scripture that is in opposition to the Platonic and Gnostic belief, which leads to the impossibility of body-soul holism. For the wrong conception of dualism affects our understanding of the material body and like Gnostics we can have a convoluted view. Sometimes Christians, in their colloquial language, express their wrong to another by saying that they were behaving "in the flesh", rather than plainly apologizing for their sin that proceeded from their whole self. Augustine writing in his City of God, speaks of those non-Christians who may be abstaining from some sins while they are, nevertheless, living after the flesh, "Who that has enmity has it not in his soul?" Further, he questions those who would say, "'You have a bad flesh towards me,' and not rather 'You have a bad spirit towards me' ". The soul is still considered to be the essence of the whole human nature because it is what gives life. It is the person with its affections and thoughts, but is also the seat of perturbations..."[...] and it was not the corruptible flesh that made the soul sinful, but the sinful soul that made the flesh corruptible". The soul is good in that it has the remains of a recognition of its benefactor, and the ability to understand good and evil. The body is lesser in rank, so to speak, as it cannot have the knowledge of God, but being able to enjoy earthly blessings, it brings glory to God.

Beth Cook
GBT V, Paper #2
May 23rd, 2008

The Everyman's Guide to Being My Hero

Heroism is true, it is something that happens, and has happened, and will happen so long as people desire even a perceived goodness. There are, however, four main questions to ask about this idea. What makes heroes? How do they come to matter so much? Why do they emerge? And who are they?

As the first step into the deluge that these pertinent questions bring on is a look at different catalysts of heroism. Understanding the form of the concept will help to understand the concept itself. How do we come to understand the catalyst? Enter, the storyteller. Men who have become heroes have these men to thank for their remembrance, the storytellers are the ones who immortalize and revitalize the lives of heroes throughout time.

Heroes come in many shapes, and there is sometimes more than one shape of heroism found in a single man. These shapes that men take on are of many types. It is possible to readily understand this by looking at some of the stories that have been told. This is imperative to create a context for the further discussion of heroism. These types are general, but cover a wide range of lives lived and hopes given. Before we look at some catalysts of heroism though, there is a mold that should be understood. Heroes all have one thing in common; they fulfill an expressed need.

The first catalyst of heroism to help in the explanation shall be Patroclus. In the Illiad Patroclus is a unique character, he is a strong fighter, a military hero and a patriot. The military hero is arguably our original template for the hero. He has to display the strength and passion for his purpose that is characteristic of all heroes, but, unlike other heroes his very life is at stake. Patroclus is a good example of this particular aspect of military heroism. Patroclus did not let things that needed to be done slide away, he instead spoke to Achilles and showed his heroism by strapping Achilles' fatal armor on his back and going out to battle to save his countrymen.

There is so much in this that is easily honored in the story of Patroclus. He put the interests of others before his own, he gave his strength and ultimately his life for others' ends, thus making them his own ends. This is the power of the military hero, he has his life and every time that he risks it he is gaining more heroism because he has been the hero to more people and becomes more their rule for what a military hero ought to be.

The next type of hero is exemplified by a man named Alyosha from The Brother's Karamazov. Alyosha's heroism is also unique; he is an intellectual hero and a moral hero. He has a different lot than the previous because he deals in a realm where truth and absolute goodness are the only things that matter. The intellectual or the moralist can allow for no fault in his hero, he must be a good man through and through, with good principles. But, this is not to say that these heroes must be perfect, all that is really required is a belief that is the case. Alyosha Karamazov is such a prime example of this because not only was he this type of man, he was on the receiving end of this type of heroism as well, from his mentor Father Zosima. As Father Zosima spurred Alyosha along to his heroism Alyosha was doing the same for others. Though Alyosha's movements of morality were subtle they were not any less amazing. They were so much a part of him, but at the same time they were quite obvious to any who met him.

So, what did Alyosha actually do that made him into an intellectual and moral hero? He showed the people around him that thinking and acting according to truth and true goodness were good things to do. He buoyed sprits, he brought out hope with his words, he made lasting impressions by simply sharing what was in his mind. When a boy named Illyusha dies in the story Alyosha brings the boys together with only his words as a bond that will last them forever with "Hurrah for Karamazov!" as its seal. This is only from a speech that is all to do with goodness, and remembering people in goodness. Because he had dealt enough in and with goodness to help other people do the same he had

the mark of a moral and intellectual hero. He connected with the need of their minds and because of that was able to transform their souls.

Another type of heroism is the ironical hero. For this I will start with the example of Pierre Bezukhov from Tolstoy's War and Peace. I choose him for the ironical hero because of the lost and dilly-dallying nature with which he moves about in the world. This is the opposite of anything that would naturally be considered heroic. Pierre succumbs rather than makes any decided actions. From his often crumbling marriage to his also often crumbling philosophical and spiritual views this is readily apparent. Why he is considered a hero at all can be summed up in "One fool always finds a bigger fool who admires him," but is will also be explained more fully later.

There is then the melancholy hero. This hero has a wandering soul, and it is this perpetual state that causes his heroism. Because he bears with his feeling of living in a silent perdition he is respected, this bearing is his movement of heroism. In Shakespeare's As You Like It there is a character by the name of Jacques who fits this description. He cannot take any part in any joyous festivities no matter that he may try. He has the misfortune to have to turn to other for laughter, since he has none. In one scene he is speaking with Rosalind, at this point a woman dressed as a boy, and this dialogue passes between them: Jacques. 'I prithee, pretty youth, let me be better acquainted with thee.' Rosalind. 'They say you are a melancholy fellow.' Jacques. 'I am so; I do love it more than laughter.' In lacking laughter, indeed in having no love of it at all Jacques seals his fate to be un triste trobador who must wander because his soul has no rest. He is the hero to those pursuing a melancholy life.

Next is the absurd hero, which obviously must have for its example Don Quixote de la Mancha. The brilliance of this type of heroism is that it is beyond ironical into being completely backwards in its actions. Don Quixote makes imaginary movements of heroism in all of his exploits. He thinks that he fights in the name of a noble lady who is a whore and that he brings justice when he is often perpetuating evil deeds.

Romantic heroism is almost a subset of the absurd. The romantic hero undergoes trials for love, which has often made men out to be fools while they think they are acting nobly. This is not to say that love makes people out to be fool but that this is an extremity of heroism in which it does. Romeo and Juliet are a classic example of this. They believed that their love is the ultimate movement of heroism so all of their actions follow in accordance with that.

The final type of heroism is political. Political heroism is the largest and most obvious category of heroism because of its formal nature. A man who is in politics has intentionally been put over other men to lead them and decide what is best for them. Also, any man who is in a formal position of leadership life that which politicking necessitates may well end up in any range of heroism. Politics is densely populated with heroes because it often receives the heroes of all the other kinds under its umbrella, at least at some point in each respective hero's life.

Political life you might say is the peak of heroism because of this density of heroic visages that line its stories is books. But, it only seems so in the organization that has been synthesized here. But this cannot be the case, since it has been said that men often take on more than one shape of heroism. Simply because a man has reached into the political realm he is not more of a hero, or moved further as a hero, than any other man.

There are though two types of political heroism; there is first the heroism of the beloved politician and the heroism of the tyrant. The beloved politician makes his heroism movements in making people come to love him more and the tyrannical politician makes his movements in gaining more power. Many would not consider the political career of a tyrannical man to be heroic but according to the definition that will become apparent he is.

This brings forth an interesting question double sided. When is a hero a villain, and likewise when is a villain a hero? The answer to this lies in the definition of heroism itself. So far we have only described what types of heroism there are, and that heroism is not greatness. These are, however, important concepts to understand because now that all of these types of heroism have been put forward it is possible to talk more in depth about heroism as concept, and to answer real questions like this one concerning villainy, because there is now an established frame of reference.

Before turning to ask these very pertinent questions it is important to ask more fundamental ones. First, why do heroes affect so much? Second, why are there so many kinds of heroes? And third, why do people find a hero to be heroic?

In order to answer the first question a man needs to look no further than his own mind. Heroes exist because people have a use for them. It is human nature to emulate that which is around us that seems the best. Unfortunately, though, heroism cannot be prevalent in all aspects of a man's life, since if it were a man would achieve a perfection, which has been shown to be impossible, and will continue to be shown to be impossible by people all throughout the planet, through word and deed. But, since this is the case, men make heroes so that they may have a corporeal body to tie to the idea of a true greatness that they can look up to and to pattern themselves, or at least a certain aspect of themselves, after. Since a hero becomes this pattern they affect a great deal in the world around them.

As to why there are so many kinds of heroes there need only be so many as there is a need for them. But, as the people of the world continue to have children and as world cultures continue to grow and evolve we will only have need of more heroes because there will be specific facets of life requiring heroism. Each knew person is different from all other people and therefore will need a different person, or set of people, to look up to for his pattern. The same is true with the world at large. As new specialties separate themselves from more general work each will warrant a pattern, or hero, to follow.

The answer to the last question flows easily from the answer to the first two. A hero is found to be heroic because he has in his actions, and even within himself, at least some little glimpse of greatness in some aspect. To a person starved for hope of a better version of themselves a little glimpse of greatness in some aspect is all that they require in order to idealize that person as a hero.

It may seem that everything leading to this point would come together to bring the full answers the questions asked at the beginning of the paper. This is true to a certain extent, those questions have found some answers now. But, all that can really be answered now is half of each of those questions.

What makes heroes? We have seen that other people can make people out to be heroes because they have a need of a standard for greatness, but this does not answer for why the heroes act that way of their own accord. How do they come to matter so much? It is because heroes create the standards and patterns that they do that ordinary people are given hope to become a better version of themselves, even if only in a specific aspect, but this also only answers a social question. So, what is it about a hero, in and of himself, that makes him matter so much? And why do they emerge? They emerge because people have a need of them, but why do they bother to emerge heroic if it is not at all in their own interest? Who are they? There have been examples to show at least by name and action who heroes are and have been, but despite that we do not know if there is anything common in those examples that makes them particularly who they are.

In order to answer the other half of these questions it is necessary to look at the private side of heroism, that being the side of the hero. Kierkegaard in his discourse "Fear and Trembling" wrote about movements, movements of the very soul. These are his movements of faith. It is important to understand these movements to have any understanding of the private parts of heroism.

The movements of faith are movements in ability. A man moves through them and goes from merely acting as acting comes or to struggle to come to a paradox in which he can do anything. It is in degrees of this spectrum that heroism occurs in a man. That is not to say that the man who is the greatest hero has an absolute power to do whatever he wishes. A man who manages to struggle far enough to come to a paradox of this nature has only done so because of faith.

Faith is a peculiar addition of the modern idea of a hero, especially because this faith must necessarily be in God. It might fit modern ideas more to have faith in this context mean that people have faith in the hero or the hero has faith in himself but this cannot be the case. The faith of man in man is an extremely difficult reality because a man can

not be an absolute or a universal, as God can. This faith is the kind in a greatness better than yourself, and although you can have that in a man as you grow and adhere yourself to his pattern he may not any longer be greater than yourself and this pattern could well continue for your whole entire life.

Faith is a difficulty not foreseen by many heroes when they begin their movements. They often see only the corporeal world that they are affecting. But, a hero cannot continue to grow further until he has taken the time to see the world that consists of these movements within himself.

This inner life of heroism is more than the other life because without it the outer social life of heroism is not really anything at all; it would default to vague generalities because there would be no substance behind the outer movements. Heroism is, in a way, a necessity. There comes a point in this inner life when a decision must be made concerning movements, it must be decided whether it is truly necessary to become more heroic. So, when heroism is made it is out of the feeling of necessity, like there is no other path to choose.

Heroes act heroically because they feel a necessity to, like it is their set path. If they do not do this they are not acting heroically and therefore are not heroes. Why do heroes matter so much? It is because they demonstrate an optional necessity that is begat of greatness. It is with their inner movements that they truly matter. Why do they bother to emerge? Because they feel a necessity to continue to grow, and to continue their movements, and a necessity is always in man's best interest. So, who are they? What is the fundamental definition of that which a hero is? Heroes are great men, or at least men who have some aspect of greatness, who felt the necessity to make some movement into something greater than themselves, that is heroism.

Now there are only a few questions left to answer about heroism, real and pertinent questions which have some bearing on the future. These are questions concerning time and space of heroism, and the distinction of heroism from its antonym. Why do heroes emerge in any given time? And with that question, why can they affect events on such a massive scale? What is the difference between villainy and heroism? And, why are certain heroes remembered?

Heroes emerge in a specific time because there is a space that they can fill. This space is created by everything that is happening leading up to the time when the hero emerges. These happenings can all be summed up into the movements of other people that have come together to make the reality of the intellectual culture at this given time. The heroic, then, is an expression of the intellectual waters of a given time. Which makes heroes the embodiment of ideas, which is exactly what people need in order to follow through with such an esoteric thing as an idea.

It is a combination of the space and time in which a hero exists that affects the way in which they are able to change the world around them. When a hero affects things on an especially large scale it is because there was an especially fertile time and an especially large space available to them. This is why they can affect the world so much; the world is prepared to be affected.

Now for the much promised answer to what the difference is between heroism and villainy. There are two answers to this question, or perhaps really two different questions in this question. First there is heroism and villainy in relation to each other and then heroism and villainy in relation to an absolute good.

Heroism and villainy in relation to each other has all to do with perspective. In the story of Tristan and Isolde this is quite apparent. To his people he is a hero, but to Isolde he is like the devil himself because he has killed her love in battle. And yet, Tristan and Isolde come to be in love with each other, with the help from a change in perspective in the form of a love potion. Now, this is not to say that heroes can honestly be made and then changed into villains all so easily as it occurs with Tristan and Isolde. But, this still can he the case.

This is the ultimate reason for the categorization of heroes; heroism is relative to a point. What any given person finds to be heroic for themselves has to do with what type of movements they wish to make toward heroism themselves since they may have need for a hero to model part of their movements after.

Now to explain the relationship of heroism and villainy to the absolute we must look back at the private movements of heroism. It is because of the movements that require faith that there is a true difference between heroism and villainy. This is because villainy, true villainy, cannot make movements of faith because they are making them under their own power. If villainy had a perfect movement it would be that absolute power to be able to consciously do whatever they could manage to, regardless of the pain that it may cause others. But heroism is the ability to do whatever we need to do, despite the pain it may cause ourselves.

Now for the final question, why are heroes remembered? It is quite obvious that heroes are around us, heroes from the past and the present. But why the heroes from the past are remembered has to do with the truth either the truth that they perpetuated or the actions that they made to happen. But, as has been said, these large movements are only possible through the movements of other people, so it is really the time and space amount that helps their memory living past them. When a hero is afforded more time and space he has the ability to make more movements of heroism with which to make his mark on the intellectual culture of the world. andrw~n e}pifanw~n pa~sa gh~ ta/foj. (For illustrious men have the whole earth for their tomb.) Illustrious men has this amazing ability to spread throughout space and time because their will always be, in different times, people who require a hero that is not readily available to them. So, they create from the grand tomb of an illustrious man that has out lived himself.

There is now only one thing left to touch on, this is that, after a certain point there is no hero that can help you make movements. "People fancy that the single individual can make himself understandable to another single individual in the same situation. Such a view would be unthinkable if in our day we were not trying in so many ways to sneak slyly into greatness. The one knight of faith cannot help the other at all. The single individual himself becomes a knight of faith...or he never becomes one." A hero may help another individual to help himself, but no other person can actually make a movement for another person. This is why heroism is itself paradoxical and is slightly a falsity because it can only go so far as to offer initial encouragement for real actions.

Heroism is a continuing story that has been building all throughout history. This is why we examine where history has been, where it is going, and where it is now, so that there can be an understanding of both the inner and outer worlds. An understanding of these concepts creates eyes that see where there is space and time for a hero and eyes that see into themselves and can work in the inner world to move toward faith. This is an everyday heroism, all that it depends upon is a single action, a single real action toward faith and toward heroism.