

Moral Courage: Definition and Development

**Ethics Resource Center
Rielle Miller
March 2005**

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	1
II. What is Moral Courage?	4
A. From Courage to Moral Courage	4
B. Moral Courage and Virtue	4
C. Definition of Moral Courage	11
D. Courage: Know Thyself	17
III. How is Moral Courage Developed?	20
A. Education and Habituation	20
B. Use of Stories & Heroes	22
IV. Conclusion	26

Moral Courage: Definition and Development

I. Introduction

Courage is something we all admire. When asked to describe courage, most people conjure up the image of an individual running into a burning building, or maybe a fictional hero saving the day. Images of courage are prevalent in our society; from the images of our soldiers overseas to the local hero who saved her neighbor from imminent danger. But when asked to go deeper, to really define courage, the only response that comes to mind is “I know it when I see it.” What makes courage so hard to define? I asked myself this question over and over while researching for this project. I concluded that my difficulties resulted from an entanglement of the various forms of courage. We use the word courage to honor the firefighters, rescue workers, and police officers who ran into the two towers that were on the verge of collapse. We also use the word courage to honor the individuals who blew the whistle on corporate corruption.

The two cases are very different: in the first case the individual’s very life was in jeopardy by the physical actions being performed; in the second case the individuals risked their jobs by telling the truth. My understanding came only when I separated the two distinct forms of courage. For the first case, we can distinguish the actions as being physically courageous. In the second case, we can say the actions were morally courageous. We use the phrase “courage of my convictions” in our society to assign the courage to less extreme actions, to mere “everyday” actions. We want to acknowledge the courage demonstrated when the right thing is done, especially when others looked away or chose to do nothing—the courage demonstrated through holding onto to one’s values is moral courage. It is this second type of courage that I focused on in my research. Specifically my project aimed to define moral courage, understand how it can be developed, and to identify specific ways organizations can implement strategies to develop it

within their employees/students. In this paper I focus on the first two steps—definition and understanding.

I begin my task of defining moral courage in chapter II, “What is Moral Courage,” by distinguishing moral courage from other types of courage. I specifically concentrate on the meaning of courage as ancient philosophers¹ understood it—which was a war-centered courage. I then explain the transition from the war-centered understanding of courage, to our contemporary understanding of courage. I end with a more thorough distinction between contemporary understandings of moral courage and physical courage.

In the next section of the second chapter I present the most difficult piece of my project: attempting to create for myself a conception of courage as a virtue. I read many books and articles, all of which pointed to one of two sources for a theory of courage as a virtue: Plato and Aristotle. Aristotle’s theory seemed the most applicable to my project at first. When I began my research I had initially looked to Aristotle’s theory since he focuses on the habituation of virtue. I knew that his theory would prove to be central to my understanding of how moral courage is developed. After reading contemporary analyses of both Aristotle and Plato’s theories, I found that each theory had problems when applied to contemporary society. However, both Plato and Aristotle contributed such important ideas to the understanding of virtue and courage, that it is impossible for me to disregard either theory. In this second section of the chapter I explain how both Plato and Aristotle’s theory can be brought out of the ancient context to help us understand moral courage as a virtue for today.

¹ As an explanation, I reviewed mostly Plato’s and Aristotle’s work on the subject of courage because of their focus on courage as a virtue. I felt that it was important to my understanding of modern conceptions of courage to see how the concept originated as a virtue. In addition, both Plato and Aristotle’s theories have an education component that fit in nicely with my intended goals for the research.

In the next section I detail my own conception of moral courage. To create my own definition I read numerous books and articles. Every time I came across a definition of courage or moral courage I would write it down. Once I was finished reading I compared all the definitions. From these I was able to identify a few main elements. It is from these elements that I compiled the five fundamental components of moral courage that I present: presence and recognition of a moral situation, moral choice, behavior, individuality, and fear. I explain the necessity for each component and the sufficiency of all five.

Following the explanation of my own conception of moral courage, I review the topic of the unwilling hero. The notion of the unwilling hero is my own understanding of the narratives I came across of the “Righteous Gentiles” of the Holocaust. Many of the interviewees of these individuals remark on the Righteous Gentiles’ refusal to call themselves, or their acts, courageous. Their accounts caused me to wonder if self-knowledge, or self-acknowledgement of one’s acts of courage, is a necessary component of courage. I explore specifically how the denial of applying the virtue of courage to one’s own acts affects my definition of courage.

In chapter III, “How is Moral Courage Developed?,” I turn my attention to the development of moral courage. I begin with Plato and Aristotle’s theories of habituation and education. It is Aristotle’s focus on habituation and education that is most applicable to a contemporary understanding of moral courage. Both Plato and Aristotle argue for the centrality of education at a young age to shape an individual’s character. I explain how habit and practice are good ways to develop moral courage, especially in youth.

In the last section of the chapter I review the use of stories and heroes as development tools. Plato felt that stories were an important piece of early education, but that stories had to be in the service of virtue. The hero, an individual who conveys the virtues of the society who

deems him or her a hero, is the perfect character for stories to teach children about virtue. I explain how contemporary psychologists and educational theorists give credibility to the educational theories of Plato and Aristotle. I end the paper with a summation of the arguments and theories presented within.

II. What is Moral Courage?

When I started this project I initially thought I could type in the words moral courage in the Library of Congress's online catalogue, and I would be greeted with numerous titles on the subject. I was wrong. There was not one book titled moral courage in all the land.² I settled for looking up any and all books, articles, and web pages that mentioned courage. What I found was an assortment of materials ranging from war stories to self-help guides. I soon realized that my first task was to separate moral courage from the other conceptions of courage. Section A of this chapter is my brief analysis of the entirety of courage, and my attempt to extract moral courage from the pack.

A. From Courage to Moral Courage

The word courage usually brings to mind battlefield heroics, and in fact this is what the term referred to when used by such ancient philosophers as Plato and Aristotle. Plato centers most of his discussions of courage in a military setting. Plato's *Laches*, a whole dialogue devoted to courage, does in fact begin with a question as to what type of military training is best for a child. The main interlocutors, Laches and Nicias, are Athenian generals, and are responsible for bringing Socrates into the conversation. The connection is made early on in the dialogue between military training and courage. When courage is first asked to be defined, Nicias says, "if a man is willing to remain at his post and to defend himself against the enemy without running away, then you may rest assured that he is a man of courage."¹ Further in the dialogue, Laches, Nicias and Socrates provide other components of courage such as "endurance of the soul,"² wisdom, and fear.³ And while it is clear from the setting and the interlocutors, that courage is mainly considered in reference to war, Socrates declares that he wants to understand the courage that individuals have in war as well as "in illness and poverty and affairs of state."⁴

² I conducted my research prior to the January 2005 release of Rushworth Kidder's book, *Moral Courage*.

Even in Plato's writings we can find evidence that courage can be expanded from the battlefield, but that its most common applicability is to war.³

Aristotle's discussion of courage in the *Nicomachean Ethics* is also focused on battle. He defines courage as something we reserve for those who face, with intrepidity, the fear of death. Aristotle specifically means the death that one will see in battle.⁵ Aristotle explains that there are many types of fearful things that any noble man should rightly fear, but the most fearful thing is death. Courage cannot be facing the fear of death in such instances as dying of disease or drowning. Rather it is the noblest death of dying in battle that earns an individual the distinction of courage.⁶ "Furthermore," Aristotle writes, "circumstances which bring out courage are those in which a man can show his prowess or where he can die a noble death, neither of which is true of death by drowning or disease."⁷ For Aristotle, there is something specific to battle that allows an individual to display courage that is not present during other situations of potential mortality.⁴

It is no surprise then that even to this day the actions most often called courageous are those linked with battle, and the individuals who are associated with courage are most often heroes of battles: e.g., the warrior Achilles, General Odysseus, General George Washington, etc. But in today's society, opportunities to battle for one's country, to sacrifice one's life for one's

³ Courage in war was important to Plato because Athens was involved in a war or military upheaval during most of his life. Around the time of Plato's birth, Athens entered into the Peloponnesian War with Sparta. This war lasted approximately 10 years. The Persian War also occurred during Plato's lifetime, and led to the overthrow of the Athens's democracy by the Thirty Tyrants—many of whom were relatives of Plato's. However, it is important to note that even in a life dominated by war and upheaval, Plato still implies that courage is possible off the battlefield. [Kraut, Richard. "Plato," *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2004 Edition)*, ed. Edward N. Zalta, From <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2004/entries/plato/> (11/27/2004).]

⁴ Aristotle's emphasis on battlefield courage had less to do with a personal association with war than Plato. Aristotle's view on the nature of courage can be understood as a product of his time. Great battles were still taking place and the known world was likely to change rapidly through military expeditions and battles. ["Aristotle (384-322 BCE.): General Introduction." *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. From <http://www.iep.utm.edu/a/aristotl.htm>. (11/27/2004).]

country are not as readily available or necessary as they were during either Plato or Aristotle's time. We have moved beyond the times of ancient Greece, and even colonial America, where every man was required to take up arms to defend his country. Grand battles between thousands, even hundreds of thousands of men occur with less frequency than they did previously. Our military strategies today are focused on not losing a single soldier. The opportunities for battlefield courage as described by Plato and Aristotle have become almost obsolete even for most of our military.

Battlefield courage is less available to us now than before, but it does not mean that courage is recognized less. We have accepted that courage can appear in other areas of life that have become prominent since the battlefield was left centuries ago. In our common understanding of courage in contemporary society, we distinguish mainly between two types of courage: physical courage and moral courage. These two types of courage can be shown to correspond to two different types of fear that are faced: physical harm or death, and "loss of moral integrity or authenticity, [or]...social disapproval" respectively.⁸ Physical courage is most reflective of the original setting of courage—deeds in battle—but today's physical courage has been expanded to extend beyond the battlefield and into everyday actions. Physical courage is often attributed to athletes, firefighters and police officers, as well as soldiers when a physical act is performed. Moral courage on the other hand is attributed to individuals who take moral stands, such as Martin Luther King, Jr.

The example of Martin Luther King, Jr. demonstrates one of the complexities to untying moral courage from physical courage based upon what fears are being confronted. While Martin Luther King, Jr. fought for moral principles he also gave his life for this fight. His example demonstrates that both physical courage and moral courage have their origins in the courage

described by Plato and Aristotle—courage in war. In the *Laches*, Socrates, Laches and Nicias attributed endurance of soul, wisdom and fear as well as the presence of battle to courage.

Martin Luther King, Jr. displayed all of these elements, except that his battle was not a military one.

John McCain provides a better distinction between the fears confronted by physical courage and moral courage in his book, *Why Courage Matters*. McCain writes that “Physical courage is often needed to overcome our fear of the consequences of failure, [while] moral courage, more often than not, confronts the fear of the consequences of our success.”⁹ In certain instances it is quite reasonable to assume that fear of bodily harm or death could be faced by an individual displaying moral courage if the harm or death came about from the consequences of his success. Focusing on success allows Martin Luther King, Jr. to be morally courageous while still giving his life for his cause. However, McCain’s distinction still does not give us the complete picture of the connection between physical courage and moral courage.

Could Martin Luther King, Jr. have stood up for his beliefs if he was a physical coward? William Ian Miller, author of *The Mystery of Courage*, says no. He writes, “A person of moral courage cannot be so physically a coward that a mere threatening glance would dissuade him from his noble purpose [;]...moral courage may not require physical courage, but it may be undone by physical cowardice.”¹⁰ So Martin Luther King, Jr., while not needing physical courage, needed to not be a physical coward or else he would have been dissuaded from his moral purpose by physical threats or acts. Is this relationship reciprocal? Do all acts of physical courage require that one not be a moral coward? We can take this question back to Plato, for in the *Laches* Socrates and his interlocutors have determined that physical acts without the knowledge of good and bad (morality) can never be courage.¹¹ If an individual does not know

what her values are and/or is not capable of defending them, she cannot act upon knowledge of good and bad excluding her actions from the realm of courage.

B. Moral Courage and Virtue

Now that I have satisfied my own desire to categorize the current conceptions of courage, I find myself in a quandary. Through the years, our concept of courage has seemed to have lost its virtue. More and more people are postulating the existence of the courageous villain—courage in the service of vice. I have said above that Plato distinguishes the displayer of courage as having knowledge of good and evil, but what does he say about servicing vice?

Both Aristotle and Plato wrote about courage as a virtue. However, their theories about why and/or how courage is a virtue are not specifically applicable to current society. Plato's theory of virtues is based on his conception of Forms—the actual existence of concepts like the good, beauty, and even courage outside of human reality. Today, philosophers have largely discredited Plato's approach to proving the a priori existence of these forms, but the idea that concepts like the good, beauty, and courage exist within society still holds true. Aristotle's theory also faces a problem in applicability to current society because he grounds his theory of courage in his idea of noble ends. The only noble end for courage, according to Aristotle, was victory in war. This is obviously no longer how we see courage, so I will explain how Aristotle's theory can be brought into the 21st century.

Plato mentions courage in conjunction with wisdom, justice and temperance in numerous dialogues. In fact, Plato implies that courage is one of the cardinal virtues. The cardinal virtues for Plato are the virtues that all other virtues spring from. The cardinal virtues cannot be reduced.⁵ In his article “The Cardinal Virtues and Plato's Moral Psychology” David Carr gives

⁵ It may be helpful to think of the cardinal virtues like the primary colors in art. All colors are a product of red, blue and yellow. For Plato, all virtues were a product of courage, wisdom, temperance, and justice.

proof for the cardinality of courage. Carr says that it is in the *Republic* that Plato introduces the will as an additional piece of the moral psychology. The will joins the body and soul, which were always separate in Plato's previous writings. Carr speculates that the addition of the will to Plato's moral psychology is necessary to give an account for the need of several cardinal virtues. Carr also thinks that it is in this period of Plato's writing that Plato refines his own understanding of the cardinal virtues. For it is in the writings of this period that Plato connects each of the cardinal virtues to a specific human fault, or vice. Courage, according to Carr, was determined to be a cardinal virtue because it is the triumph over the passions.¹²

The passions and the pleasures are both a part of the appetitive part of the soul⁶, but their key difference lies in the failure of control. The failure to control the temptation of vice that is associated with pleasure involves choice. A temperate individual chooses to avoid pain and hardship. However, Carr believes that Plato recognized that it is not always possible to avoid pain and hardship. It is here that control of vice associated with passions is necessary. What differentiates a courageous person from a cowardly person is not the amount or quality of pain or hardship, but rather the response to pain and hardship. Courage must be a cardinal virtue because all individuals will be faced with pain and hardship.¹³ The virtuous person will be best able to respond to these situations.

In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle also refers to courage as a virtue. For Aristotle though, there are no cardinal virtues. All virtues fall into two types: virtue of thought and virtue of character (moral virtues). Virtues of thought are developed through education, and moral virtues are developed through habit. Aristotle was also a scientist, and as such understood that things which are innate (or are a result of nature) could not be changed by habit. Through his

⁶ The appetitive part is one piece of the soul which contains the appetites like pleasures and passions. There is also a reasoning part. The appetitive piece of the soul is also associated with the body, while the reasoning piece is associated with the pure soul. The will allows the reasoning part to control the appetitive part.

theory about innate properties, Aristotle shows that he believes the moral virtues to not be innate characteristics. Instead, Aristotle believed that each individual had the capacity to receive the moral virtues from another. It is habit that allows the individual to appropriate the virtues to their greatest efficiency.¹⁴

Courage is developed through habit, and is therefore a moral virtue. Habituation is key to acquiring courage, but Aristotle was convinced that habit could not only produce virtues but vices as well. To use an example: if an individual practices the piano well, that individual will be a good pianist. However, if an individual practices the piano poorly, that individual will be a poor pianist. In this sense if an individual habituates response to fear well that individual will be courageous, but if an individual habituates response to fear poorly that individual will not be courageous.¹⁵

The moral virtues are also dependent upon the golden mean. Aristotle believed that both excess and deficiency could be disastrous. It is only the golden mean that can produce the good. To illustrate his point by using courage as an example, Aristotle writes, “The man who shuns and fears everything and never stands his ground becomes a coward, whereas a man who knows no fear at all and goes to meet every danger becomes reckless.”¹⁶ Courage is neither fearing everything nor fearing nothing; courage is a mean between the two. Specifically Aristotle writes that, “he is courageous who endures and fears the right things, for the right motive, in the right manner, and at the right time, and who displays confidence in a similar way.”¹⁷ The golden mean that produces courage is fearing what it is right to fear. Aristotle introduces another important element of courage, and all moral virtues, in this passage: “for the right motive.” Aristotle believes that only virtuous motives can produce virtue. Therefore, an act is only courageous if it has noble ends.¹⁸

Aristotle's insistence that courage is produced by virtuous motives has recently been called into question by suicide terrorists. The debate about whether courage can be attributed to unvirtuous acts has received public attention here in the U.S. as a result of terrorist attacks on this country. Those who say courage cannot be a virtue do not deny that many courageous acts are virtuous. Their denial of virtue is for courage itself. They base their claim on the fact that courage has sometimes been attributed to acts that are not deemed virtuous. Courage, they claim, is actually morally neutral.

James D. Wallace directly challenges Aristotle by claiming that courage has no particular motives, whereas other virtues—like generosity—do. Without specific motives, courage is therefore able to come from any motives, even unvirtuous ones.¹⁹ Wallace points to numerous examples of the courageous villain that abound in society (e.g., glorification of pirates, and the thieves code of honor), and says that these examples demonstrate that courage can be used for unvirtuous acts. It is this same image of the courageous villain that was used to exonerate the men who perpetrated the crimes of September 11th. In the 'Talk' section of the New Yorker not too long after the event, Susan Sontag called the individuals who hijacked the planes and drove them into the Twin Towers and the Pentagon "not cowards," and spoke of courage as "morally neutral."²⁰

What does it mean to be morally neutral? If courage is merely a skill like marksmanship, it could be morally neutral. "For example," David Pears author of "The Anatomy of Courage" writes, "we might condemn a murder on moral grounds but put a high value on the murderer's marksmanship—an assessment that would not be moral so would not be affected by our moral condemnation of his goal."²¹ However, both Wallace and Sontag still see courage as a virtue. A virtue must have intrinsic moral value, so courage cannot be morally neutral in this way. Pears

then hypothesizes that to be morally neutral, courage must have a moral value separate from the moral value of the goal of the courageous act.²²

I have already stated that Aristotle believed that courage is located centrally on the battlefield. But when we review Aristotle's theory of courage in depth, we find that he conceptualizes courage as a masculine virtue. The importance of the masculinity is to enhance the battlefield notion even more. Courage is about fighting in battle—not taking care of wounded or some other feminine quality. Pears states that for Aristotle, there was only ever one goal for battle: victory. Victory for the ancient Greeks had a value that was never questioned—it dwarfed all other values. Aristotle, Pears speculates, would have not thought of courage as having an intrinsic value separate from its goal. Pears claims that Aristotle's view of courage ties the moral value of the goal of courage to courage itself, leaving courage open to an assault on its own virtuousness.²³

Indeed, Aristotle does write that “a thing is defined by its end.”²⁴ However, Pears explanation of courage's ties to victory, and Aristotle's own writings that declare a death during battle as the most noble, demonstrate that for Aristotle there was only one end for courage. Since we have removed courage from the battlefield and the goal of victory, we seemed to have removed the innate moral value of the goal. However, Aristotle was adamant that courage, like all virtues, be used for virtuous ends only. That Aristotle only identified one end is a limitation that we must deal with now since that end is no longer deemed as salient today as it was for Aristotle. To define moral courage as a virtue, we must identify a new virtuous end.

I feel that Robert C. Roberts in his article “Will Power and the Virtues” presents a good candidate for the virtuous end of courage. Roberts identifies courage as a type of virtue that has no motivational aspect. The end for courage is to preserve the other virtues. By defining

courage as the preservation of other virtues, courage can be nothing but virtuous. Roberts establishes courage's virtue through two main points: 1) that virtues of will power (like courage and self-control) are actually skill-like, and 2) that Plato claims in the *Republic* "courage is a kind of preservation."²⁵ On the first point, Roberts says that courage is a determination of the will because it is a capacity to resist temptation. Courage must be a virtue of will power as opposed to a substantive virtue.²⁶

The substantive virtues "are psychological embodiments of ethical rules."²⁷ The substantive virtues are also motivational in the sense that the individual who displays substantive virtues is motivated by the virtues. For example, an individual who is just does just acts because that individual is motivated by a desire to be just. Drawing from Aristotle's claim that a good individual wants to be good, and that a good person is motivated by his or her goodness to do good deeds, courage cannot be a motivational virtue because being motivated by courage would not lead to courage but rather to rashness or foolhardiness (both vices).²⁸

Courage allows moral acts to be performed out of other moral motivations. This is the second point, I stated earlier—that courage is a preservative. "A preservative is in the service of something other than itself that is cherished, and needed because this cherished thing is in some way threatened. Courage, self-control and patience are in the service of the moral and prudential life, and needed because this life is beset with trials."²⁹ Courage and the other virtues of will power, in a few words, preserve the values and virtues that we have received from our society. Socrates describes how courage preserves the other virtues through a metaphor of dying wool. He explains that there is a proper way to prepare wool to receive the dye. All sorts of preparations are carried out to ensure that the dye will hold fast no matter how many times the garment is washed, or how harsh the soap. Courage acts like the careful preparations of the

wool, by allowing the individual's virtues to hold fast not matter how many times the individual faces temptation or how harsh the situation.³⁰

Roberts goes on to explain why we need virtues of will power that preserve the substantive virtues. He points to contrary tendencies for assigning moral credit: the “hero assessment” and the “purity of heart assessment.”³¹ The hero assessment refers to the individual who has an internal moral struggle. This side is characteristic of moral theories like Immanuel Kant's⁷, which stress that moral decisions may be difficult because moral reasoning and desire may conflict. The hero assessment praises a virtuous action the individual chooses to take because it was the virtuous course of action. The hero has distinguished him/herself as a moral agent, able to make rational *and* reasonable decisions. On the other hand, the purity of heart assessment praises those individuals who do not struggle. This assessment is based on theories like Aristotle's, which claim that excellent individuals desire the good so there is no struggle when it is time for a moral decision. The goal for us all is to be excellent—to never have struggle between desire and moral reasoning, but we must first go through the hero assessment stage. The hero assessment stage requires at least one of the virtues of will power to preserve the substantive virtues. Once an individual reaches the purity of heart level the virtues of the will power are no longer needed.³²

Roberts' assessment of the need for courage, does present us with an end for courage that fits our contemporary understanding of the virtue. We can still draw from Aristotle's theory of virtue, as Roberts' hero and purity of heart assessment demonstrates by mirroring Aristotle's

⁷ Immanuel Kant is considered to be one of the most influential philosophers of modern ethics. His works, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* and *The Critique of Pure Reason* (along with other titles) provide the foundation for many of today's ethical theories, including John Rawls's *Theory of Justice* and Juergen Habermas's work. Kant's theory of the categorical imperative can be compared to the Golden Rule: Kant asks us to reason if we would want to make our decision a universal maxim; do unto others as you would have them do unto you. Kant's ethical theory also tells us to treat each human being as if they were 'an end in themselves'—or not merely as a means to an end. Kant's ethical theory stresses the importance of human agency and reasoning.

own theory. Aristotle believed that there was a difference between an excellent individual and a morally strong individual. The excellent individual desires the good, but the morally strong individual does not. The morally strong person listens to her moral reasoning, and acts accordingly.³³ Both the excellent and the morally strong individuals perform virtuous acts, but the morally strong individual needs something else to ensure that the moral reasoning will win out over her desires. Courage is this necessary aspect that preserves the other virtues, and once the individual no longer has a struggle between desires and moral reasoning, courage will no longer be needed.

The conception of courage as a virtue of will power, and thus as a preservative, has also eliminated the problem of the courageous villain. Since courage is in service of the virtuous life, a preservative of this life, courage cannot be unvirtuous. Courage cannot be motivated by unvirtuous ends or motivations since the sole motivations for courage are the substantive virtues. Through this process, courage has been freed from its battlefield confines. Moral courage, a descendant of battlefield courage, can also claim its virtuousness.

C. Definition of Moral Courage

Now that I have established moral courage as a virtue with preservative powers, I can provide the definition or composition of moral courage. My conception of moral courage has five major components: presence and recognition of a moral situation, moral choice, behavior, individuality, and fear. The presence of a moral situation is necessary because an individual cannot be morally courageous if they are not faced with a morally charged situation (i.e., being given a taste test is not a moral situation). Recognizing that there is a moral situation is the first step toward moral courage. This may sound simple, but it is easy to ignore the big picture. When a moral situation is recognized, it immediately calls the observer to appeal to her moral intuitions, values, principles, etc. It lays a claim upon the observer, demanding that she do something. This leads us into the second component, moral choice. The individual when faced with a moral situation must choose the moral option. The observer must make the appeal to her moral intuitions, values, principles, etc. The decision must be based upon what she feels is right morally, not legally.

Once the individual makes a moral decision, to be courageous she must act on that decision. Behavior is indeed necessary because it separates moral courage from moral reasoning. It is all well and good to realize that there is a moral dilemma that needs your attention, and further to decide what is the right thing to do, but it is a far different thing to follow through with one's decision and act upon it. Aristotle places importance on behavior, too. He says that "one must not only know <what one ought to do>, but he must also be able to act accordingly."³⁴ Aristotle says that only those individuals with moral strength or excellence of character act according to their moral reasoning. It is the choice that these individuals make that signifies

their actions as truly virtuous, and not just accidental.³⁵ To really be courageous, one's behavior must follow through with one's moral decision.

I would like to explain why I chose to label the third component behavior rather than action. Action too often connotes motion. I want to be clear that the courageous individual can choose to not alter current behavior, and that this, too, can be consistent with courage. Behavior can refer to many different responses. Malka Drucker co-author of *Rescuers: Portraits of Moral Courage in the Holocaust* states that “the act of turning away, however empty-handed and harmlessly, remains nevertheless an *act*,...[and] whichever way we turn, toward or away—implies action.”³⁶

In this sense the morally courageous individual acknowledges the claim that the moral situation puts upon her. In some situations, others that seem not to act may actually be actively turning away (or shielding themselves) from the moral situation and the claim. The act of acknowledging the moral situation is not enough. There must be a moral decision and most importantly moral behavior. What makes someone morally courageous is that her behavior is consistent with her beliefs—morally—*no matter what*.

Moral courage is demonstrated in the following way: in the act of acknowledging the moral situation and the claim it then lays upon the observer, in the act of choosing the moral option, and the act of following through with the moral decision. But what about how these actions are done? The next component is of equal necessity to moral courage: individuality.

There is something about moral courage that it seems lessened if everyone is doing it. In fact, its very nature suggests that if everyone were to do the same act of moral courage, it becomes doubtful whether that act was morally courageous at all. An

act is deemed morally courageous if it is preserving the virtuous life. If everyone can perform that act it is doubtful that the virtuous life is really in danger. At the very least, if everyone is doing it, the individual struggle is left out of the act. The appeal to moral principles is lost; the significance of the acknowledgement and behavior is lost. Acts of moral courage must be done as an individual, like a leader who does not care if she ever obtains any followers. The morally courageous individual is on display for all to see, to judge. She alone must face the consequences of her success or failure.

That moral courage requires individuality does not mean that groups cannot perform morally courageous acts. What distinguishes the morally courageous individual is that even when she is involved with a group, she faces the consequences alone. For example, while there were many people who took part in the march from Birmingham to Mobile, AL each of those individuals took full responsibility for their acts. Each individual was considered equally responsible for his or her participation. They all knew that were each as likely to be beaten, harangued, or killed by the police officers in the blockade.³⁷ So while they took part in a group activity, it was with individuality that they participated.

The final component is fear. Moral courage can be categorized as facing a fear of the consequences of one's success—as noted earlier. Facing the fear is crucial to moral courage because this is the point where the individual is highlighted. The individual must face her own fear—no one can do it for her. Facing the fear allows her to act, to acknowledge the situation, to make the decision, and to behave consistently with that decision. It is critical to note that the morally courageous individual does have fear; she is not fearless. Having fear denotes that the

individual understands what the situation entails and what the consequences will be for a certain behavior.

Each of the above components is a necessary piece of moral courage. They are all equally important, and it is only when all five are present that moral courage is displayed. You may ask what proof I have that neither of the components are sufficient on their own, or that all five are necessary. I think the best way to answer such questions is through examples.

As I began researching this topic I kept stumbling upon all this work referencing the “Righteous Gentiles” of the Holocaust. The term “Righteous Gentiles” comes from the Yad Vashem project in Israel. In *Rescuers: Portraits of Moral Courage in the Holocaust*, Malka Drucker and Gay Block collected photographs and stories of the individuals honored by Yad Vashem. These individuals and groups have been honored because they in some way helped save Jews in Europe from the Nazis during World War II.⁸ Since the organization of Yad Vashem began, others have written about or for these righteous gentiles. Many researchers have interviewed the honorees hoping to understand what makes them so unique,⁸ for in all the accounts one theme is universal: these individuals were constantly being referred to as *the* examples of moral courage. These righteous gentiles stood up for justice and compassion when the majority did not.

While the details of the individual stories vary, overall each of the Righteous Gentiles satisfied the five components of moral courage. In each case the Righteous Gentile recognized that the killing/harassing/exportation of Jews was a morally charged situation. Each of the Righteous Gentiles made a choice to help Jews based on a virtue they held dear—the majority

⁸ See Monroe, Kristen Renwick. “Morality and a Sense of Self: The Importance of Identity and Categorization for Moral Action.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 45(3), July 2001, 491-507. From JSTOR Database (7/28/2004), Oliner, Samuel P. & Pearl M. Oliner. *The Altruistic Personality*. (New York: The Free Press [a Division of Macmillan, Inc.], 1988), and Monroe, Kristen R.; Barton, Michael & Ute Klingemann. “Altruism and the Theory of Rational Action: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe.” *Ethics*, 101 (1), Oct. 1990, 103-122. From JSTOR Database (7/28/2004), for review.

cited either justice or compassion. Each of them also took action from his or her decision to help and hid/brought food to/cared for/created escape routes for one or more Jews. While some of the Righteous Gentiles belonged to a resistance group or aid organization, they each acted with individuality. In some instances the individual actually kept his or her activities from a spouse or parent. For the most part, every one of the Righteous Gentiles mentions that they knew the Nazis would kill them if they were ever found out, and yet this did not deter them from their humanitarian efforts.³⁹ The example of the Righteous Gentile satisfies all of the components for moral courage.

Now let's compare that example with one from Miller's book. Miller recalls a story from young man's journal. Miller writes about Tim O'Brien, a Harvard-bound graduate student who took time off from his studies to serve in the Vietnam War. Miller focuses on O'Brien because O'Brien's journal offers a philosophic insight into the nature of courage. O'Brien was a reader of Plato who quoted *Laches* in his journal. O'Brien's tour of duty gave him plenty of chances to see courage in person. It is because of this opportunity that O'Brien begins a soul-searching journey to discover courage.⁴⁰

O'Brien writes a lot about his company's medic, Doc. O'Brien has witnessed Doc rush out through enemy fire to help a wounded soldier. On the surface this situation looks like it too will satisfy the criteria for moral courage: presence and recognition of a moral situation, moral choice, behavior, individuality, and fear. However, O'Brien interviews Doc on numerous occasions hoping to learn his motivations. What O'Brien discovers is that when Doc has rushed to help the wounded, Doc believes that it is his duty to provide medical assistance—there is no conception of right or wrong, just duty. It is not clear that Doc grasps the morality of the situation. If he does not believe the situation to be morally saturated, his decision and

behavior—though they are the morally right decision—were not based on virtues. In addition, to this point of failure, Doc even admits that he is not afraid when he performs his duty.⁴¹ I believe that in this case, Doc would fail to qualify for moral courage because despite his actions being right, he does not satisfy all the components.

D. Courage: Know Thyself

What is interesting about the examples of both the Righteous Gentiles and Doc is that both provided me with a large quandary. In both instances the issue of whether or not the actor had to assign courage to her actions herself haunted me. I was facing a complicated problem about how moral courage is assigned and if the actor had to be involved in this process.

What I noticed first when I read the interviews with the righteous gentiles was that these examples of moral courage, in most cases, adamantly refused to call themselves courageous. Most described their actions as something that had to be done, not going out on a limb. They claimed that they were only doing what was necessary.⁴² The denials of extraordinary behavior by these righteous gentiles confused me.

I thought that the denials threatened my understanding of courage. I did not understand how an act could be deemed appropriately courageous if the actor denied the courage of that act. The key to my understanding came from looking at courage as a preservative of other virtues. While the righteous gentiles denied courage, they did claim to have performed their acts out of motivation from substantive virtues like justice and compassion.⁴³ I believe that some, if not all, of the righteous gentiles are examples of characters of excellence, and their actions are always in tune with their virtues. It is clear, however, that the righteous gentiles are small minority, and their character is what makes them so unique.

Another problem arises though if we ascribe the excellence of character to the righteous gentiles. We, as a society, call the acts performed by these righteous gentiles courageous, and anoint the righteous gentiles with courage, but the righteous gentiles themselves maintain that there was no courage in their acts. We still need to call them courageous. I think that it is necessary for us to assign courage to the righteous gentiles because courage was needed to preserve the substantive virtues—not in the individuals who performed the courageous acts, but rather in the rest of the community where those virtues did not hold fast when faced with vice. So even if the righteous gentiles did not need courage to perform their acts, the rest of the world needs to attribute courage to them.

Philip Evans and David White, psychologists who study fear, researched the link between fear and courage. Their research can help explain the curious psychological twist of the Righteous Gentiles example. Philip and White discovered that sometimes we attribute courage to people because they do things we fear even though we are not sure if they fear it. This is because we want to define courage as a person overcoming fear, but sometimes it is hard to get around our own feelings of fear.⁴⁴ If the onlooker is afraid but would think herself courageous for doing the act, the actual actor is thus deemed courageous. The onlooker projects her own internal state onto the actor. For example, let's say I have a fear of heights. On a trip to the Grand Canyon I watch someone scale the wall of one of the cliffs in the canyon. If I were to replace myself with this rock climber I would think myself courageous for performing this feat. Since I do not know the internal state of that other individual I apply my standard to her. I believe that the rock climber is courageous because of my fear of heights. If we apply this research to example of the righteous gentiles it explains why as a society we have attributed

courage to the Righteous Gentiles, even though they do not: it is because we feel fear in the situation and would think ourselves courageous for performing their acts.

Miller also explores the tension between the actor and the observer. To O'Brien, his captain, Johansen, is the ideal hero. O'Brien has witnessed many brave deeds performed by Johansen, but O'Brien has also witnessed brave deeds performed by the company's medic, Doc. O'Brien knows that Johansen is courageous not just by his deeds, but because Johansen one day took O'Brien aside and confessed his uncertainties about his own courage. For O'Brien, Johansen's confession completed the necessities required for courage. By confessing, Johansen let O'Brien know that when he was performing these deeds, he was actually trying to be courageous.⁴⁵

Doc, according to O'Brien is not courageous. O'Brien has witnessed brave deeds the man has performed, but Doc does not express the same self-awareness of Johansen. Even when Doc is questioned specifically about an instance in which he ran out to a wounded soldier during heavy fire, he refuses to believe that he was courageous. Doc's answers to O'Brien's questions never show any hint that Doc was acting on any thinking level when he performed these deeds. Doc says that he did not act because it was the right thing to do, nor did he feel fear while performing.⁴⁶

O'Brien brings to light an important distinction that must be made about courage. While the righteous gentiles deny their acts were courageous, they do feel that their acts had moral weight. They all reacted from their own senses of justice and compassion. Doc recognizes his duty as a medic, but fails to recognize the morality of being a medic. I see Doc as representative of an automaton: he performs acts because he is told to perform acts. If his duty

was to kill and not to save, he seems able to perform equally as well. It seems that for Doc it is not about doing the right thing, but about doing what he is trained to do.

If a situation is not recognized as a moral situation, then the response cannot be courageous because there is no appeal to the virtues. Courage, being a preservative, can only be seen in situations where it is acting in service of the substantive virtues. If Doc has failed to recognize the situation as morally charged, than his actions cannot have any moral weight.

III. How is Moral Courage Developed?

I have provided an overview of where moral courage came from, its right to virtuousness, and its components. I also have explored the issue of assigning moral courage. But how is moral courage developed? As I stated earlier, Aristotle claimed that virtues could be acquired. I tend to agree with Aristotle, but whether or not you believe that virtues are acquired or innate, the issue of development is important: either you need to get some virtues, or you need to maximize the ones you have. In either case, taking my theory that moral courage is a preservative of the substantive virtues means that to develop moral courage, an individual needs to develop the substantive virtues first. This chapter looks at moral development in general as well as the development of moral courage in particular.

A. Education and Habituation

Moral courage must be taught and habituated. These are claims made by Plato and Aristotle. Each of these philosophers detailed specific educational reforms to produce not only the virtue of courage, but also a virtuous person in total. What follows in this section is a brief review of both Plato and Aristotle's theory of how virtue is developed, and then a short explanation of how moral courage, specifically is learned and habituated.

Education plays a key role in Plato's theory of moral development. In the *Republic*, Socrates discusses at length the type of education necessary to create the perfect citizens for his utopia. Socrates makes it clear that the education he wishes to provide will differ from the one currently being used in Athens. His education will focus on the soul, not the body. To nourish the soul, the citizens must be educated in the virtues.⁴⁷

Aristotle's theory of moral development relies heavily on Plato. Aristotle also focuses on education, but he wishes to educate not for the soul as Plato conceives it, but for the entirety of the human being. Aristotle believes that for the species of human beings, there is an excellence that should be obtained. This excellence can be achieved through full maturation into a human's nature—nature being equated to fulfillment.⁴⁸ To achieve this fulfillment, an individual must live one's life according to the virtues. It is only through the virtues that a human being's natural capacities can best be utilized. Aristotle does not believe that all the virtues are innate to human beings. Instead, Aristotle says that human beings are born with a capacity to receive the moral virtues. The moral virtues must be learned by the individual in order for them to be acquired.⁴⁹

Education is central to Aristotle's view of moral development. Children must be taught the virtues. Children when they are young, however, cannot fully understand the virtues. What they need is a role model, someone who can demonstrate the virtues. "To inculcate a good disposition in any person," Aristotle writes, "...is not a job for just anyone; if anyone can do it, it is the man who knows."⁵⁰ Children must be taught to habituate themselves toward virtuous actions. They need to develop good habits of soul. Aristotle was convinced that if children were not habituated toward the good, they would habituate themselves toward the bad. Regardless of education, children will form habits. As Aristotle writes, "Hence it is no small matter whether one habit or another is inculcated in us from early childhood; on the contrary, it makes a

considerable difference, or rather all the difference.”⁵¹ The role of education, for Aristotle, is to ensure that the proper habits are formed. Once children have formed proper habits, they can now begin the next phase of their education. The children (or young adults) can now be taught the virtues on an intellectual level.⁵²

In his article, Roberts says courage is a skill. As a skill, courage can be learned. Courage is also, according to Roberts, inherently strategic. Roberts describes the two strategies that an individual can use to control fear through courage: resisting impulse and reshaping emotion. A courageous person resists the impulses that would dissuade her from preserving her substantive virtues. The courageous person also reshapes her fear into constructive emotions that will not hinder her actions.⁵³ The strategies that Roberts provide should be practiced and habituated. Roberts also claims that the virtues of will powers, since they are so skill-like, can become automated.⁵⁴ Automation of the strategies just mentioned, help the courageous individuals continue using courage.

Using strategies to develop courage, which in turn requires courage in order to be implemented, seems contradictory. However, this is exactly what Aristotle was referring to when he wrote, “For the things which we have to learn before we can do them we learn by doing.”⁵⁵ Courage is one those things that we must learn before we can be courageous, but we have to learn to be courageous by doing courageous acts. John McCain echoes Aristotle’s statements in his own book. McCain tells us that in order to acquire courage, we have to force ourselves to use courage.⁵⁶ What McCain and Aristotle are telling us is that to habituate courage, we must practice using courage. We must seek out those situations where our substantive virtues are put to the test. We must prepare ourselves to hold fast to our values, by practicing. Courage will never come to those who wait to receive it.

B. Use of Stories & Heroes

In Book II of the *Republic*, Plato discusses the proper education for the youth of the city. This education is important because when children are young they are malleable. Socrates tells his fellow interlocutors, “You know, don’t you, that the beginning of any process is most important, especially for anything young and tender? It’s at that time that it is most malleable and takes on any pattern one wishes to impress on it.”⁵⁷ In Socrates and Plato’s time young children, like today, were told stories. Usually these stories were what Socrates called false,⁵⁸ or what we understand as fiction. While the stories are fictional, they usually had some truth to them, much like the fables we tell to children now. Socrates believes that the best way to use these stories to nourish the souls of the young are to eliminate any stories that portray the gods and heroes in a bad light, and to only tell children stories where the gods and heroes are shown as virtuous and good. Socrates was aware that children, in listening to these stories over and over, would develop a sense of virtue, and he wants the children of his republic to only love the good.⁵⁹

Socrates continues his discussion of good stories to tell young children in *The Republic* Book III. It is in this book that Socrates specifies what types of stories are needed to develop courage in the youth. Since courage is linked to fear of death, Socrates believes that children need to be told stories that do not portray the underworld as terrifying. If children are told horrible stories about Hades and the afterlife, they will never develop courage because their fear of death will consume them. Socrates wishes to eliminate any stories where the underworld is presented in poor light, or the dead are called by hideous names. He even thinks that the eulogy speeches of great men should not be read to the youth or any of the best individuals in the city. Death is not something that needs to be lamented for Socrates. To develop courage, the best in the city will need to fear slavery more than death.⁶⁰

Many contemporary writers have picked up Plato’s theory that stories are an influence on the young. William Kilpatrick, author of *Why Johnny Can’t Tell Right from Wrong: And What We Can Do About It*, is one such writer who believes that the moral stories we tell to children are what help children learn virtues. Kilpatrick insists that trying to teach children the moral of the story without the story does not educate the children. Without the context of the story, the moral is lost. Young children need the visual cues of the story to help them remember what was so important.⁶¹ Kilpatrick cites the loss of proper stories as the main failure of the current approaches to character education in elementary schools. Without the use of proper stories at a young age, children get the wrong idea about virtues. Children first need to learn to love virtues before they can get into debates about moral conflicts.⁶²

Kilpatrick believes that the proper stories children need to hear when they are young are stories that provide examples of morality. Specifically, the stories should emphasize self-sacrifice not self-development. Kilpatrick sees self-development as tied to egoism.⁶³ Stories of heroes are a great way to tell the tale of self-sacrifice. Kilpatrick writes that “the hero...is selfless. His energies have been channeled to serve the good of society.”⁶⁴ The hero is the perfect example of morality, and the stories of heroes are the proper way to educate the youth about virtues.

Like Plato, Kilpatrick also theorizes that the stories we tell to young children must be different from the ones we tell to older children or adults. Kilpatrick believes this difference comes from the difference in how children and adults conceive of a hero. Kilpatrick says that children admire heroes who are not tied down or burdened by commitments (like families).

Adults though need to find heroes in reality—an ordinary hero—whose adventure is at home. The hero of adults must accept the commitments imposed by reality.⁶⁵

Kilpatrick's insistence that children and adults need different heroes is corroborated by the research done by Gisela Szagun, a psychologist at the University of Oldenburg. Szagun found that as children age, their understanding of courage changed. Younger children understand courage as a risky action, and define a courageous person as fearless. Older children start to see subjective risks, and recognize that courage is an overcoming of fear. By age 11 or 12, children can start to understand courage as taking morally good risks, not morally bad risks.⁶⁶ Szagun's research shows why the heroes that young children respond to are different from the heroes older children need. Younger children don't understand that an individual can experience fear, but overcome that emotion. Their heroes need to be fearless, even if in reality that person was not fearless. As children get older, they can understand how courage acts in spite of fear, and their heroes need to be multidimensional. Older children can also understand how morality plays a role in courage. The stories for younger children need to be clear-cut about virtues because they are still learning what is good and what is bad. Stories for older children can have a little more moral ambiguity, and the heroes can be portrayed closer to their real life personas.

In another study Szagun conducted with Martina Schäuble, she found a difference in how children and adults understand courage. Children in this study viewed courage as an action. Adults viewed courage as exposing oneself to risk or injury. Szagun and Schäuble also found that the mention of fear as a component of courage increased with age. In addition, with an increase in age the internal aspects of courage were understood more often.⁶⁷ Their research explains why adults need heroes more in line with reality than children's heroes. Children react better to heroes that are on action packed adventures. Adults, however, understand more about courage. They know that courage is less about the action and more about the internal struggle the courageous person goes through. Adults' heroes need to reflect the everyday moral decisions that adults can relate to. Adults want to know how they can persevere when they are conflicted about what is right. Their heroes need to be a guide in this area.

We can imagine that the stories of heroes, depicted in the right way (good) are a type of preparation needed to hold the virtues fast in the individual. Children need to learn to love the substantive virtues first before they can use moral courage to preserve these virtues. Stories of heroes teach children virtues in a way that makes the virtues easier to remember. Stories of heroes also provide examples of courage that children and adults can model their own behavior after. The heroes in the stories become good role models, but only if they are age appropriate. Children's heroes should be one dimensional and easy for a young mind to understand, while heroes of adults should be complex and easy to identify with. Stories of heroes thereby provide a learning tool to educate children about the substantive virtues and also provide examples from which both children and adults can model behavior.

IV. Conclusion

Moral courage can be understood as an offspring of the virtue of courage as the ancients knew it. Once human beings left the battlefields, we were in need of another type of courage to help us preserve our moral life. Moral courage is a virtue of will power that acts as a preservative for the other virtues (the substantive virtues). It has become a necessity for all human beings who have yet to reach excellence, or the purity of heart stage. Since it is in service of the virtuous life it cannot be used for unvirtuous means or ends. The paradox of the courageous villain has been dismissed.

My conception of moral courage has five components. The first component is the presence and recognition of a moral situation. The second component is moral choice. The courageous individual must appeal to virtue and reason. Once a decision has been made, the individual must act. Behavior is the third component of moral courage. The behavior must follow through with the moral decision. The next component is individuality. Moral courage requires that the individual risk and accept all consequences *as an individual*. The final component of my conception of moral courage is fear. The courageous individual must face fear, but overcome it. Fear cannot impede action.

To develop moral courage, moral courage must be habituated and practiced. Moral courage is one of those things that can only be properly attained by doing it. To get courage, be courageous. Stories are also an important tool for developing courage. Stories teach children virtues. Once children have virtues, they can then work on developing courage. The substantive virtues must be acquired first, because they are what moral courage is preserving. Stories of heroes also provide models for children and adults to look to for guidance. Heroes can be role models for behavior.

- ¹ Plato. *Laches*. trans. Rosamond Kent Sprague (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1992), 190e.
- ² Ibid, 192c.
- ³ Ibid, 192a-197c.
- ⁴ Ibid, 191d.
- ⁵ Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. trans. Terence Irwin (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1985), III 6. 1115a.
- ⁶ Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. trans. Martin Ostwald (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1962), III 6. 1115a6-b5.
- ⁷ Ibid, 1115b1-5.
- ⁸ Putman, Daniel. "Psychological Courage." *Philosophy, Psychiatry & Psychology* 4 (1), 1997, 1-11. From ProQuest Database (6/14/2004), p. 1.
- ⁹ McCain, John & Mark Salter. *Why Courage Matters* (New York: Random House, 2004), p. 90.
- ¹⁰ Miller, William Ian. *The Mystery of Courage* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), p. 258.
- ¹¹ Plato. *Laches* (see note 1), 195c-197b.
- ¹² Carr, David. "The Cardinal Virtues and Plato's Moral Psychology." *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 38 (151), April 1988, 186-200. From JSTOR Database (6/14/2004).
- ¹³ Ibid.
- ¹⁴ Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics* (see Note 6), II 1. 1103a.
- ¹⁵ Ibid, 1103b5-15.
- ¹⁶ Ibid, II 2. 1104a20-23.
- ¹⁷ Ibid, III 7. 1115b15-20.
- ¹⁸ Ibid, 1115b15-25.
- ¹⁹ Cunningham, Stanley B. "The Courageous Villain: A needless paradox." *The Modern Schoolman*, 62, 97-110, January 1985, p. 98.
- ²⁰ Sontag, Susan. "Talk." *New Yorker*, 77 (28), 09/24/01, 32. From ProQuest Database (5/14/2004), p. 32.
- ²¹ Pears, David. "The Anatomy of Courage." *Social Research*, 71 (1), Spring 2004, 1-13. From ProQuest Database (5/14/2004), Third paragraph.
- ²² Ibid, First through third paragraph.
- ²³ Ibid, Sixth through 11th paragraph.
- ²⁴ Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics* (see Note 6), III 7. 1115b23.
- ²⁵ Plato. *Republic*. trans. G.M.A. Grube, rev. C.D.C. Reeve (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1992), 429c.
- ²⁶ Roberts, Robert C. "Will Power and the Virtues" *The Philosophical Review*, 93 (2), April, 1984, 227-247. From JSTOR Database (6/14/2004), pp. 227-228.
- ²⁷ Ibid, p. 229.
- ²⁸ Ibid, pp. 228-231.
- ²⁹ Ibid, p. 232.
- ³⁰ Plato. *Republic* (see Note 25), 429d-430b.

- ³¹ Roberts, "Will Power and the Virtues" (see Note 26), pp. 233-234.
- ³² Ibid, pp. 233-234.
- ³³ Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics* (see note 6), VII 1145a15-1145b15.
- ³⁴ Ibid, 10. 1152a5-10.
- ³⁵ Ibid, III 2. 1111b5-35.
- ³⁶ Block, Gay & Malka Drucker. *Rescuers: Portraits of Moral Courage in the Holocaust*. New York: TV Books, 1992, p. 18.
- ³⁷ Coles, Robert. *Lives of Moral Leadership* (New York: Random House, 2000).
- ³⁸ Block & Drucker, *Rescuers* (see note 36), p. 18.
- ³⁹ Oliner & Oliner, *Altruistic Personality* (New York: The Free Press [a Division of MacMillan, Inc.], 1998).
- ⁴⁰ Miller, *The Mystery of Courage* (see Note 10), pp. 29-32.
- ⁴¹ Ibid.
- ⁴² Block & Drucker, *Rescuers* (see Note 36).
- ⁴³ Oliner & Oliner, *Altruistic Personality* (see note 39).
- ⁴⁴ Evans, Philip D. & David G. White. "Towards an Empirical Definition of Courage" *Behavioral Research & Therapy*, 19, 1981, 419-424, p. 419.
- ⁴⁵ Miller, *The Mystery of Courage* (see note 10) pp. 32-33.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid, pp.42-44.
- ⁴⁷ Plato. *Republic* (see Note 25), 498 b-c.
- ⁴⁸ Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics* (see note 6), II 6. 1106a15-25.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid, II 1. 1103a15-25.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid, X 9. 1180b25.
- ⁵¹ Ibid, 1103b23-25.
- ⁵² Crittenden, Paul. *Learning to be Moral* (New Jersey: Humanities Press International, Inc., 1990), pp. 112-113.
- ⁵³ Roberts, "Will Power" (see Note 26), pp. 245-246.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid, p. 238.
- ⁵⁵ Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics* (see Note 6), II 1. 1103a32-33.
- ⁵⁶ McCain & Salter. *Why Courage Matters* (see Note 9), p. 47.
- ⁵⁷ Plato. *Republic* (see Note 25), 377a-b.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid, 377a.
- ⁵⁹ Ibid, 377a-380c.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid, 386a-388a.
- ⁶¹ Kilpatrick, William. *Why Johnny Can't Tell Right from Wrong: And What We Can do About it*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1992, pp. 129-143.
- ⁶² Ibid, pp. 78-95.
- ⁶³ Ibid, pp. 135-164.
- ⁶⁴ Ibid, p. 199.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid, pp. 199-201.
- ⁶⁶ Szagun, Gisela. "Age-Related Changes in Children's Understanding of Courage." *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 153(4), 405-420.
- ⁶⁷ Szagun, Gisela & Martina Schäuble. "Children's and Adult's Understanding of the Feeling Experience of Courage." *Cognition and Emotion*, 11(3), 1997, 291-306.