

<http://www.blackfriarspublications.co.uk/el-lib.htm>

Ethics, Morals and a Liberal Education

Robert Buckenmeyer, Ph.D.

THE purpose of this discussion is to make clear what to me is a fact, namely, that ethics and morals are essentially different and that the purpose of a liberal education is to induce a person to be ethical after the model of Socrates in the *Apology*, not to be moral like the model of Ivan Ilych in *The Death of Ivan Ilych*. This discussion uses the movie entitled, “Word of Honor”, starring Karl Malden as a newspaper reporter Michael McNeil as a practical example of what some might think a theoretical argument.

Introductory definitions

First, however, it is necessary to define the terms, ethics, morals and liberal education as to their root origins. After all, as with humans, so with words, knowledge of one’s mother and father as well as past ancestors is necessary before an understanding of oneself is possible; so the understanding of current uses of a word is almost impossible until and unless the knowledge of the root meaning of the word is known. So, ethics is from the Greek *ethos*, which means the way one has oneself, that is, one’s *character* or the way one is both biologically and honestly. Morals, on the contrary, is a Latin word which means customs or the manner in which one is raised and the culture which one has acquired through habitual conformity. Liberal is from the Latin and means free in the sense of the ability to make a choice without compulsion or necessity. Education also comes from the Latin, a prefix *e*, a shortened form of *ex*, out of and *duco*, *ducere*, the verb *to lead*, so the root meaning of education is to lead a person out of a parochial or myopic view of self and the world into a broader, deeper view of self and the world so that one might achieve understanding rather than just a superficial knowledge of self and of the world.

The Story Line of “Word of Honor”

Karl Malden, as the newspaper reporter Michael McNeil gives his “word” of honor that he will not reveal the name of a young lady when she first calls McNeil to inform him of the whereabouts of a missing out-of-town girl whom McNeil’s newspaper advertised as missing at the request of her frantic parents; she describes where she saw the young lady last and McNeil drives to the location, seeking the missing girl. He finds that the cabin was lived in but that no one currently is there; McNeil returns to town and asks the town’s property assessor to provide McNeil with the owner or owners of the property on which the cabin sits. Subsequently the assessor calls and tells McNeil that Sam Clemens, a powerful force in the city as the town’s banker, owns the property; a puzzled McNeil asks his newspaper editor if he might further investigate the disappearance of the young lady; the editor “oks” his involvement, emphasizing his complete backing and guaranteeing McNeil the newspaper’s complete support. McNeil then writes a front page article about her, again requesting information about her disappearance. McNeil soon

receives a second telephone call from the young lady who impatiently asks why McNeil did not follow the lead of her first call to the newspaper. McNeil explains what he found and then requests an interview with her, but she demurs; McNeil persists and Beverly Sims reluctantly gives her name and address.

McNeil sets out for Sims' house, not telling his family where he is going; when he arrives, Sims blocks his entrance until he again promises he will not reveal her as the source of the information; McNeil again gives his "word of honor". Sims discloses that Clemens held her captive as a sexual slave, until she became pregnant with his child; he then gave her money and told her to "go home and get an abortion". But, she decided to have the child, subsequently met her current husband who knows nothing of her servitude and who adopted the child "no questions asked"; she begs McNeil to re-promise her, out of fear that she will lose her husband and everything that she now has. McNeil once again gives his "word of honor". The town police obtain a warrant to search the property and cabin based upon the evidence which McNeil provided them, literally "hear say" evidence since Sims was the "eye witness". The police search the cabin, finding porn pictures of Sims, the missing girl, as well as other town young ladies as well as cameras and drugs used to dope the young ladies; as they search the property, the police also turn up the body of the missing girl buried near the cabin. The District Attorney files multiple felony indictments against Clemens, including murder and orders his arrest. Now begins a struggle of life and death proportions: on the ethical side, Mike McNeil and, on the moral side, positive law, the town's people as well as the owner of his newspaper and, most significantly the District Attorney and the Superior Court judge.

Clemens' attorneys move that the judge throw out the charges, arguing that the warrant is a violation of Clemens' constitutional right of privacy since it was issued on the basis of reporter McNeil's "hear say" evidence; the District Attorney, of course, urges McNeil to reveal his source, arguing that otherwise Clemens will go free without the informant's eye witness testimony. The judge lectures McNeil on the law concerning evidence, states that McNeil's "word of honor" has no basis in law and accuses McNeil of acting as a felonious obstructor of justice, refusing a direct order of the court. At the same time, McNeil's owner and publisher orders him to reveal his source, as a result of the banker, the newspaper's substantial financial lender Clemens' pressure to "call in" the loan; of course, McNeil's editor remains silent as to his promise of full support for McNeil's reporting.

McNeil argues that he gave his "word of honor"; that his source is privileged without which he would not gain public confidence and, therefore, could not obtain information as a reporter to insure community security and justice. But, the judge directs McNeil to reveal his source in order that Clemens might obtain a fair trial; McNeil refuses because he gave his "word of honor" and, as a reporter, his right of promised secrecy stands as privileged. The judge orders McNeil to jail and orders Clemens released until the trial is rescheduled in one week while McNeil, says the judge "decides freedom is better than silence"! The publisher-owner fires McNeil; McNeil's wife begs him to disclose his source, especially since his elder daughter is getting married in two weeks; his friends accuse McNeil of scheming to let Clemens go free so McNeil might secure a loan he

desperately needs to finance his home improvement. The week passes and McNeil returns to the court room, still refusing to disclose the identity of his source; the judge orders McNeil back to jail and vacates the charges against Clemens ordering Clemens set free. His wife begs him to give the name of his source since he will miss his elder daughter's wedding if he does not; McNeil upbraids her and tells her not to ask again.

Similarities with Socrates in the Athenian court

McNeil is guilty of the crime of withholding evidence and refusing a court order to disclose the evidence whereas the defendant is innocent before the law as a result of his privacy rights! Of course, the judge thereby insures that "justice is served", which, of course, means nothing more than that society's morals prevail over a person's ethics; so a man guilty of murder and sexual mayhem is set free and an honest man, "guilty" of keeping his word is sent to jail. Indeed, the guide for judicial prosecutors, judges and attorneys is *Black's Law Dictionary* and one finds that ethics and morals are defined as synonyms, so legally they have the same meaning! Of course, more than two thousand years ago, Socrates faced the same dilemma when the Athenian Supreme Court found Socrates guilty of sedition and treason because he would not accede to stop asking questions in his search for wisdom as ordered by the Athenian Court. Socrates' ethical decision found no status in Athenian law and before the Athenian Court.

Again, two thousand years later, McNeil's practical dilemma dramatizes the basic conflict between society's positive law and morals dictated by personal or economic interests and an individual person's ethics beholden to no outside influence or attraction, based solely on a person's virtuous decision and action. An act of virtue, in this case McNeil's integrity and honesty are beholden to nothing and stand as their own "reward"; indeed, a person is virtuous only because such an action is the right thing to do. Of course, all the segments of McNeil's civil society, even his wife, his neighbors and the judicial system moved, as they are by moral or customary rules and laws pressure him to trade his "word of honor" for "freedom", popularity and to be accepted! We witness that in spite of so-called civilized progress from "B.C or BCE" to "A.D. or CE", humans repeat the court room drama Socrates experienced in third Century B.C.; Socrates too was condemned because he refused a society's order that, as a teacher, he stop asking questions of his fellow citizens in his search for the meaning of wisdom.

The Relevance of this Story

But, what relevance can McNeil's dilemma have to the title of this discussion: *Ethics, Morals and a Liberal Education*? McNeil's and Socrates' dilemma exists wherever human beings live and work, no matter what the year, the person's culture, level of education, vocational skills or work environment. Whenever a person's principles, specifically honesty and integrity conflict with a society's morals, the society looks to a citizen's "formation of conscience" and the dilemma becomes a matter of academic debate or, worse, legal action. As Confucius stated in his *Analects*, Book VI, Chapter 17: The Master said, "Man's very life is honesty, in that without it he will be lucky indeed if he escapes with his life". Of course, the irony of this Confucian statement is that

Socrates' honesty and integrity cost him his physical life while conserving his virtuous life, since the law ordered him to drink hemlock so he obeyed the law.

Should, and how can, Ethics be taught

Now, two questions face us: first, whether or not a course in ethics can be taught; secondly how should such a course in ethics be taught? Should ethics stand alone and be taught as a philosophy course within a liberal art's college, as it has been traditionally; or, should each school within a college or university teach its own ethics course to its own majors; or could the liberal arts college teach the so-called "general" ethics course and the individual colleges within a university teach "special" ethics courses to their own majors? Plato's *Meno* gives us a foundation for discussion these questions as Plato investigates how a student learns. Does formal instruction convey knowledge or does instruction merely stimulate the student's memory to remember knowledge somehow already present to the student? Traditionally, Aristotle, Augustine and Aquinas answer this question both with a "yes" and a "no": "no" particular knowledge is actually present in the student's mind; "yes" knowledge is present both as to actual general principles thanks to which humans can inductively and deductively reason; and "yes" particular knowledge is present potentially, subject to the person's ability to actualize that knowledge through learning.

So, how does this apply to being ethical? Well, my thinking is that naturally a human being seeks the comfort of being honest and thereby healthy and whole, yet is pulled by parents, teachers and peers to conform to customs, that is, their way of doing things and living. But, when, because of this "pull", the person "goes" with the external influence, be that a parent, a teacher or a peer, the person feels an alien division and challenge to being honest with him or herself; the person feel his or her integrity is compromised. However, a serious difficulty arises when we ask about that kind of knowledge called "ethical" knowledge, merely as a result of possessing such knowledge? The basic difficulty is whether or not knowing something *as true* means that the person acts on that true knowledge? Return again to Plato's *Meno*. Plato argues that we humans "forget" about the knowledge we possess; however, a teacher like Socrates can awaken a student's memory to recover this knowledge through a process of questioning. This view of learning led the Greeks to the Greek term *aletheia*, from the verb *alethein*, literally, *a* the alpha prefix and a privative meaning *not*, and *lethein*, meaning: to *forget*, to *hide*, to *bury* and to *cover up*. Thus, the Greeks considered what we translate as *truth* to be that which humans *do not forget, hide, bury or cover up*!

Back to the Situation in "Word of Honor"

Does this mean that all McNeil needed to do was remind his publisher, the Superior Court judge the district attorney and the townspeople, even his family of the truth of the principle guiding his decision not to divulge the source of his information by appropriate questioning and thereby get them to understand the primary importance of being honest and the integrity of keeping one's word? No, because the problem of ethical knowing and acting defines a simple answer: namely, the ability to determine the truth of an ethical

action is not the same as the ability to determine the truth of the answer any more than the ability to determine the truth of the difference between a square and a rectangle is the same as the ability to determine the truth of why and how they are different! One is a principle; the other is a conclusion resulting from its practical application, so although all the parties might agree that Socrates and McNeil were principled, the parties would not agree that either of them performed the right action!

As Aristotle argued: if a person is knowledgeable in logic, this does not mean that the same person will be capable in rhetoric, so knowing the principles of reasoning does not mean that a logical thinker can apply them and become an effective rhetorician. Also, to be knowledgeable in language, grammar and linguistics, as Noam Chomsky is, does not enable him to be a famous prose writer; nor does a Political Scientist's knowledge of politics enable him to be an effective politician as California's Willie Brown was. In other words, if a person possesses a given theoretical knowledge and its corresponding habit, does not mean that the person is capable in a corresponding practical application of that theoretical knowledge.

So, Ethics can be taught – can it?

Now, to answer the two questions central to this discussion, specifically, whether or not ethics can be, and how it may be, taught? Return to the movie "Word of Honor" and compare the major players with those found in Plato's *Apology*: the reporter, McNeil compares to Socrates; Clemons, the banker, the District Attorney as the prosecuting attorney, the judge and the publisher, as professionals within the community compare to the Politicians, Poets and Craftspeople in the *Apology*. Clemons is skilled in banking knowledge; the publisher is skilled in newspaper business knowledge; Socrates, however, is skilled only in a limited knowledge he calls *wisdom: head applied wisdom*, in Greek *sophrosoune*, knowing that he does not know. Whereas the banker, lawyer, judge and publisher are leading public lives and acting in the public domain, each skilled in his own applied knowledge (or subject area), Socrates claims only one skill, namely, that he is living the examined life, so he questions himself and his fellow citizens on private matters in public, namely in what the nature of human wisdom, and virtue consist? The radical difference between these two is that whereas Socrates self examination is a private endeavor which became a public exercise, the others divide their private beliefs and activities from their public actions! Socrates, therefore, is acting honestly, conserving his integrity, whereas the others are hypocritical, not acting in public as human persons, but as public personas!

Socrates and the Reporter in "Word of Honor"

Socrates, therefore, lives a private life of self-reflection in public, showing himself in public by being honest, true to the way he is, namely, knowing that he does not know, beholden to no one, whether political or public authority, free to search for the truth of what it means to be a human being by questioning self and others; likewise, McNeil lives a private life in public by being honest to his word, true to the way he is, namely, by pledging his word of honor and maintaining that pledge. Both seek one thing and one

thing only, namely, to be a virtuous human being, that is, to be honest. Both, therefore, are lovers of wisdom because each recognizes that to be a human means to possess a very limited knowledge, one that seeks the spiritual good of the soul first, and then only any and all other goods, be that a job or recognition or the fruits of obedience to authority, namely, acceptance and adulation. The simplicity of living humanly and the complexity of not living at all echoes in Confucius' statement: "Man's very life is honesty, in that without it he will be lucky indeed if he escapes with his life".

The other citizens, whether in Athens or in McNeil's home town, live public lives separate from private self-reflection, if any of them do self-reflect! Their public lives are committed to applying their knowledge skills in which they are educated for the sake of reputation; all their professional skills are autonomous, that is, ends in themselves, so their skills become the sole guides as to how they live their lives. As autonomous, these knowledge skills separate each from living as a human being – the business professional lives his or her business life five days a week and his or her personal life the other days, if then! – hardly a reasonable life and certainly not a life of integrity! Clemons seeks his rights, as specified in positive law; the judge seeks to protect the accused person's positive law rights; the publisher seeks to protect his business rights. All of these rights become ends in themselves and disregard a person being truthful or willing to live humanly. McNeil, on the contrary, asks only what is the right thing to do, so he focuses on his responsibility, having given his word to protect an eye witness from public exposure.

Socrates castigated the Athenians for honoring wealth, honor and reputation and ignoring virtuous living and the care of the human soul. Socrates also would castigate McNeil' detractors for trading public rights for an ethical right. Contemporaneous college and university presidents and deans need to reflect whether or not they are selling out the integrity of college curricula, including Philosophy, for the cost of building, or are bartering exemplary instruction and actions in ethical living for moral statements and instruction which might generate alumni or alumnae monetary bequests. Of course, their basic question must be: whether or not their art's curriculum is freeing students from the slavery of not being literate? Again, we must return to the root meaning of this word, liberal arts and comment on its historical origin and context so we might understand how it did and must contribute to an ethically educated and acting person.

The Liberal Arts

The expression *artes liberales*, chiefly used during the Middle Ages, does not mean arts as we understand the word today, but those branches of knowledge which were taught in the schools of that time. They are called liberal (Lat. *liber*, free), because they serve the purpose of training a man to be free, in contrast with the *artes illiberales*, which are pursued for economic purposes. The aim of the arts is to prepare the student not for gaining a livelihood, but for the pursuit of science in the strict sense of the term, that is, accurate knowledge, not opinion which then and today most people possess. These liberal arts are seven in number and may be arranged in two groups, the first embracing grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic, in other words, the sciences of language, of oratory, and

of logic, better known as the *artes sermocinales*, or language studies.

Currently, four year American colleges and universities are complaining about the students entering as to their ineptitude in language skills, both written and spoken. Considering the fact that even Medieval education was unavailable to the masses and available only to students who entered the parochial schools attached to Catholic churches whose headmaster was usually the parish priest or priests. Yet, that would mean students who would be the age of American contemporary middle and high school students; as a community college philosophy teacher for thirty-three consecutive years, I can attest to the fact of the continuous and progressive lack of language skills in the high school and adult students who enroll in my Philosophy classes: they are progressively terrible in speaking, writing and thinking skills and, worse, they are interested only in what the Medievals called the illiterate economic skills, forgetting that literate skills are the basis even of economic skills. This first group was and is considered to be the elementary group, whence these branches are also called *artes triviales*, or *trivium*, that is. a well-beaten ground like the junction of three roads, or a cross-roads open to all. These are literally the three ways to literacy so that one may be free from illiteracy and can walk down the road of life with basic human competence rather than the incompetence of being illiterate which makes one dependant upon other's skills rather than one's own.

The second group comprises arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, that is. the math-ematico-physical disciplines, known as the *artes reales*, or *physicae*. These mathematical disciplines are *artes quadriviales*, or *quadrivium*, or a road with four branches. These four branches equipped and equip a person with arithmetic skills of the mind so one might be free to study the world, *geos metros*, literally, *the measure of the earth* in which one lives, as well as the heavens and even the world of practical mathematical skills as applied to music, thereby becoming a well-rounded person who is free from opinions leading to superstition concerning the heavens and the relationship between earth and the heavens. The Medieval teachers thought of music as did the Greeks, namely, as that practical application of mathematics which not only put a human in touch with nature, but freed the human from the mundane and provided one both mental and physical enjoyment.

The seven *liberal arts* are thus the members of a system of studies which embraces language branches as the lower, the mathematical branches as the intermediate, and science properly so called as the uppermost and terminal grade. Though this system did not receive the distinct development connoted by its name until the Middle Ages, still it extends in the history of pedagogy both backwards and forwards; for while, on the one hand, we meet with it among the classical nations, the Greeks and Romans, and even discover analogous forms as forerunners in the educational system of the ancient Orientals, its influence, on the other hand, has lasted far beyond the Middle Ages, up to the present time. Given these seven arts and their purpose, to make the human free and independent from dependence upon others or, indeed, influence of opinion which might have been right, rather than wrong, but, nevertheless and as right could not explain why or how the opinion was right. These seven arts, however, provided the human being with

the accurate knowledge, which was self-corrective, rather than other-directed, and dependant.

'Positive' Science

So, can ethics be taught in our contemporary American sense through the transmission of positive knowledge? No. Why? Well, first of all, American education is skewed to the economic, the acquiring of only those skills which equip a student for obtaining a job – indeed, this writer is convinced that the subliminal purpose of this public educational content and intent is strictly political in its economic thrust, that is, to ensure that those citizens so educated will pay their taxes, payroll, state and federal so as not be a burden to the public bureaucracy. If I am correct in this assumption, the American public educational system is bankrupt, anti-human, the opposite of virtue and counter productive both in its intended end and its curricular method. Anyone who promotes this kind of educational intent and curricular method is undermining the literacy of its students and worse, making them more submissive and susceptible to being used; such a system makes students become moral in their thinking and living, dependant upon the latest opinion and television or radio rhetoric; as such, they are literally mindless and subject to nothing higher than material attachments and emotionally driven actions – in one word they are living morally.

The second reason ethics can not be taught in our contemporary American sense through the transmission of positive knowledge is that American public education whether at the “lower” levels or the college and university levels is becoming more and more fragmented and solipsistic precisely because of its purpose and method being economic and turning out “professional” job skilled workers. Such economic education is fragmented in that it is exaggerating this illiterate education into learning itself – a practical example are American community college graduation requirements: forty units of skills courses and only twenty units of general education requirements. The skills units outnumber the so-called “general education” units by two to one and currently many four year colleges and universities are receiving more and more illiterate student transfers; so now “remedial education” courses are becoming a major part of four year institutions of higher learning so that these transfers might even succeed in the course curricula of the four year colleges and universities! Not only are curricular courses becoming more fragmented, but they are becoming solipsistic in the sense that they lead to a professional job placement and even businesses are providing “remedial education” for their employees so employees might perform the job for which they were hired! Such an American public educational system is self-defeating because it does not educate its students to be free, that is, independent, as did the Medieval instruction of pre-college and liberal arts college and university students.

Now, given this American economic educational purpose and method, anyone who has a vested interest in such a professionally goaled system cannot by definition “step out” of that professional occupation; thus, they resemble the Politicians, Poets and Craftspeople of Athens who were so skilled in each professional area and, because of such a habit, could not self-reflect. They were by habit tethered to the material world and could not

free themselves to lead a self-examined life! Ethics requires and involves that a person be free to apply his or her self-knowledge and that requires a person to love wisdom and the care of one's soul; such love of wisdom frees a person for self-reflection and liberates one to practice self-knowledge. Only the love of wisdom renders all knowledge for its own sake as a mere means as contributing to the making of a human being which is the purpose of living itself. So, just as love cannot be taught, so ethics cannot be taught. Just as an act of love, so an ethical act is a gift, a unique gift first to self, free and independent to another and to society whose ethical purpose is to be itself in virtuous living, nor to exist in the pursuit of economic well-being. Both acts of love and ethics are gifts of who one is, a unique, irreplaceable human being, not a technocrat, to a commercial society and an economic world, seeking productivity, profit, protection from liability, indeed, conformity, sometimes called democracy, but always involving some kind of property rights – ironically and historically, Samuel von Pufendorf, the German Lutheran is the first to establish marriage as a legal contract in order to preserve the economic gains of a father for his children; he also originated the will as an economic conduit so that a father's children literally could get a physical “leg up” on spiritual redemption – he adopted the Hebraic view that business success was a sign of Yahweh's preference of the person for eternal life (Samuel von Pufendorf, *De Officio Hominis et Civis juxta Legem Naturalem Liber Duo.*)

Self Knowledge

So, given the fact of Socrates' use of self-questioning to achieve self-knowledge in order to lead an examined life, who can not teach ethics? Personally, I question whether or not anyone who has a vested interest in a profession can by definition “step outside” the professional habit to question the value of professional knowledge to being human, that is, being virtuous? Being professional closes the loop on self-reflection and examination as a human being. Any developed habit becomes second nature, so the very nature of a specific knowledgeable habit precludes the possessor of that technical knowledge from questioning the value of possessing and using that specific knowledge for the sake of being human – since one's attitude toward being professional precludes one's self-reflection and prolongs one's search for economic gain.

Back to 'The Law'

Can any nation, or, the United Nations act in an ethical way? Well, take the example of Rwanda. The United Nations had little trouble in obtaining food and other emergency supplies for the refugees who fled the genocide when the UN made its request for emergency aid. But, why? The answer is simple: such a request merely required a technical decision; in addition, such giving is popular and provides the appearance of charity, compassion and of being humanitarian. However, when the UN appealed for money and international forces to police the refugee camps in surrounding countries, such as Zaire, no pledges of money or manpower were forthcoming, nor was the placement of an international police presence in the refugee camps forthcoming. Why? Again, the answer is simple: such an appeal required an ethical decision which would be unpalatable since it would call into question national sovereignty and local authority and

expose any respondents to have a “clean house at home” or be subject to cries of hypocrisy!

By way of further question, I provide an American example: can a practicing American lawyer be ethical, much less teach ethics within a law school or within a college or University? Again, I say No and the reason is simple: given the fact that *Black's Legal Dictionary* defines ethics and morals as synonyms and given the fact that American law, as does western positive law stand on precedent, American and western positive law is essentially and practically moral. Precedent by definition means that the published opinions of the United States and State Supreme Courts are the law of the state and land respectively! Indeed, the universal American claims are “this is a land of laws” and “no one is above the law”; indeed, “law brings order” – after all, our Athenian “forefathers” cried the same claims and found Socrates deserving of drinking hemlock because he was guilty of sedition and treason because he persisted in asking questions, although he was ordered to refrain from such activity!

Lawyers by definition, at least in California, are admitted into the State Bar as a condition of practicing law, therefore, they are required to swear to uphold the laws of the State of California and the United States' Constitution, so of necessity, such lawyers must practice law “by the book” and according to precedent. Such “swearing” precludes a lawyer from practicing law ethically and requires each lawyer to practice law as this elite group has decided, that is, morally. This fact explains why both the Superior Court judge and McNeal's defense lawyer required McNeil to reveal the source of the knowledge provided in the Grand Jury's indictment of Clemens! Honesty, whether in the case of Socrates or McNeil is no defense against the legal finding of guilt and, if the positive law requires it, honesty receives the sentence of death or jail. Of course, we all know that professionally, honesty runs the gauntlet from “hanging one's dirty laundry in public” to “being blackballed” if one is a “whistle blower”; indeed, such people do not qualify for membership in a professional organization! This is why Time magazine's Persons of the Year (issue of 30 December 2002), Cynthia Cooper of Worldcom, Coleen Rowley of the FBI and Sherron Watkins of Enron were chosen and, of course, were all “blackballed” and/or fired by their respective employers!

The Nature of Ethics, Morals and Law

Therefore, can a professional person teach ethics? Startling as this is, the answer again has to be No. No one, as a professional can teach ethics. Of course, this view of the professional extends to all academic disciplines, even that of Philosophy, which in many cases outdo technocrats in being professional rather than being a lover of wisdom, as was Socrates. Indeed, I carry this question further: Can a professional person as professional be ethical? Well, if I may introduce the New Testament Jesus Christ into this discussion, again the answer is NO. The legal professionals of the *Torah*, the Pharisees as the legal interpreters of the *Torah* (which in Hebrew means *The Law*) could not understand Christ's practical application of loving *Yahweh* and neighbor to include those who hate and injure us, pagans and Samaritans, even women caught in adultery with one's whole heart, mind and soul. (Mt 5:20-48; 15:1-20; Mk 7:24-30; Lk 6: 27-35; 7:36-50; 10:29-37)

The consequence of their inability to understand as professionals led them to engineer Christ's crucifixion because he disobeyed their laws and dared to challenge their legal interpretation of the Old Testament and as a result their leadership of the Hebrew people. (Matthew 22: 34-40) How, therefore, can one anyone wonder why I call Christ the "Socrates" of the New Testament? Yet, in a text which lays bare the difficulty surrounding how to be ethical, or, indeed, how to be holy – Moses Maimonides, *the Torah* commenter states that being ethical and being holy are synonymous within his *Eight Chapters on Ethics* – Christ states unequivocally that He comes not to do away with the law, but rather to fulfill the law (Mt 5; 17-19; Lk 16:17).

My goodness, does this mean Christ implies ethics enhances biblical law, the Torah itself and perhaps law itself? Might being ethical even enhance a professional's, a lawyer's very professional life and living? Of course, this would require that all legal experts and professionals would have to expand their love beyond the "sacrality" of their law and their discipline! But, this question needs to be more specific: would this require both Pharisees and all lawyers to love themselves first because only then would they be able to extend that self-love to friends and enemies alike. As the world turns, however, professionals as such are the most solipsistic and selfish people walking the earth. Indeed, we learn ethics through loving rather than teach it through knowing. What commences in love of self evolves into the love of others in a unique way. Such historical examples, Socrates and Christ sought the love of wisdom through loving to question self and others; if such a way of living can be found guilty of obstructing justice and jailed or a way of living can be found wanting and crucified, we must remember that such love is stronger than even death because we know none of the 501 Athenian judges who found Socrates guilty of sedition and treason, nor do we know the names of any of the Pharisees who engineered Christ's crucifixion, yet the names of both Socrates and Christ echo through the labyrinth of years into our present day. Both men loved and their unique ethical love penetrates the darkness of over two thousand buried years to create the shadows reflected in our days. Now, if we are speaking of philosophers and if we advocate the imitation of Socrates for philosophical living, then we must prepare for the possibility that we shall drink hemlock, or, if a Catholic Christian that we might experience crucifixion. Being ethical will never become a professional vocation and seldom will being ethical be popular – except with the young, the Athenian youth who followed and imitated Socrates or the children whom Christ said we must become, if we are to have the possibility of eternal happiness after this temporary journey between the womb and tomb ends with death.

28 December 2004

Robert G. Buckenmeyer, Ph.D.
 2475 Blue Heron Loop
 Lincoln, CA 95648
 tel: (1)-916-543-7699
 email: robertbuckenmeyer@hotmail.com

