Moral Courage
By Rushworth M. Kidder

C H A P T E R O N E

Standing Up for Principle

You gain strength, courage, and confidence by every experience in which you really stop to look fear in the face. You are able to say, "I lived through this horror. I can take the next thing that comes along." . . . You must do the thing you think you cannot do.
—Eleanor Roosevelt

Like most private schools, St. Paul's School for Boys posts athletic schedules on its Web site. In the spring of 2001, it listed baseball games, tennis matches, and crew events on its leafy campus in suburban Baltimore. But not lacrosse. Not that spring. Despite being ranked number one in a nationwide lacrosse poll earlier in the year, this prestigious 151-year-old institution canceled its entire varsity season on April 3.

The reason? Earlier in the spring, a sixteen-year-old member of the lacrosse team had a sexual encounter with a fifteen-year-old girl from another private school—and, without her knowledge, videotaped the whole thing. He was apparently mimicking a sequence in *American Pie* (a movie some of the students had recently seen) in which a character broadcasts a live sexual encounter on the Web. When his teammates gathered at another player's home to look at what they thought would be game tapes of an upcoming rival, they saw his video instead.

None of the teammates objected. Nobody tried to stop the showing. Instead, they watched.

What happened next is a tale of moral courage—a lack of it among teammates who failed to stand up against the video, and the expression of it by an administration that took a formidable public stand. Their debate was a wrenching one. At St. Paul's, lacrosse has a sixty-year history. It garners solid alumni support, which translates into funding. And it attracts some of the best young players in the region—so many that St. Paul's runs the risk of being seen, as one administrator put it, as "a 'jocks rule' type of school." But its students are still required to attend chapel. As an institution affiliated with the Episcopal Church, it retains a serious tradition of ethical concern. And it seeks to be a private community dedicated to serious education in a very public world.

What do you do when a popular sport crosses swords with an ethical collapse? In this case, the answer was clear. The headmaster, Robert W. Hallett, stepped in immediately, asking not only (as some who were there recall), "What happened to our school?" but more particularly, "What happened to this young woman?" The boy who made the video was expelled. Thirty varsity players were suspended for three days and sent to counseling with the school's chaplain and psychologist. Eight junior varsity players were made to sit out the rest of the season. And the varsity season was terminated.

"At a minimum," Hallett wrote to parents, "we should expect each boy here will, in the future, have the courage to stand up for, to quote the Lower School prayer, 'The hard right against the easy wrong.' "

He might well have been speaking for his own administration. Choosing the "right" was, in fact, hard. It meant disappointing parents, students, alumni, and national lacrosse

fans. It meant facing a spectrum of criticism that ran all the way from "You made a mountain out of a molehill!" to "You let them off too easily!" It put at risk an array of crucial relationships with donors and friends, religious affiliates, advisers and counselors recommending the school to potential enrollees, and the entire Baltimore community. It set in motion a pattern of events that might have either plunged the offending students into deep reflection and self-improvement or pushed them out of the educational arena altogether. And it brought the young woman, who remains anonymous, into the center of a national story over an incident she wanted to put behind her.

Moral courage doesn't always produce an immediate benefit. In this case, however, it did. The student at the center of the controversy later graduated from a local public school. The young woman moved out of state and continued her education. Both appear to have landed on their feet. Hallett, who moved on to an executive position outside education, was swamped with letters praising his stand, which he kept, and requests for interviews on national television, which he turned down. And in the months following the decision, St. Paul's found that requests for admissions materials actually increased, and that a smattering of financial gifts arrived from new donors far beyond the Baltimore community who wanted to express their gratitude.

Standing up for values is the defining feature of moral courage. But *having* values is different from *living by* values—as the twenty-first century is rapidly learning. The U.S. soldiers who abused Iraqi prisoners at Abu Ghraib prison, the CEO of Italian food giant Parmalat who kept quiet as financial malfeasance proliferated, the Olympic athletes who succumbed to steroids, the American president who deceived the world about his sexual escapades—these were not horned and forktailed devils utterly devoid of values. Yet in moments of moral consequence they failed to act with integrity. Why? Because they lacked the moral courage that lifts values from the theoretical to the practical and carries us beyond ethical reasoning into principled action. In the defining moments of our lives—whether as a student watching a videotape or a president facing a nation—values count for little without the willingness to put them into practice. Without moral courage, our brightest virtues rust from lack of use. With it, we build piece by piece a more ethical world.

SHARING THE QUARTER LOAF

Juan Julio Wicht doesn't look like a hero. He never intended to be a player in a high-stakes global tragedy. A researcher at Peru's University of the Pacific, this soft-spoken priest had been studying national policy issues when he was invited to a gala event at the Japanese embassy in Lima. He thought of himself as a kind of poor academic cousin to the glittering guest list of government ministers, ambassadors, military officers, and business executives assembled there on December 17, 1996.

That was the night that members of the Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement shot their way into the embassy grounds. Rounding up the guests crowded around sumptuous buffets, they ended up holding more than four hundred prisoners—the largest hostage taking in history. Dr. Wicht was among them. Speaking to a group of us in Mexico City following his release, he observed that "there are no words to describe" what went on during that siege. It lasted more than four months. Early on, as the guerrillas sought to reduce their captive population to manageable numbers, they offered him, as a man of the cloth, the opportunity to leave. But as a man of the cloth he refused, choosing instead to remain inside until it was over.

What kept him there? What was it that overcame the natural human impulse for freedom, causing him to put some higher principle ahead of his own needs and opportunities for survival? The ethics of his vocation had something to do with it. But to hear him recount his tale, he was even more committed to staying after seeing a simple demonstration of collective moral courage among his fellow captives during their first days together.

Those days, he recalled, were especially intense. The guerrillas were inundated with hostages. There was no food, no place to lie down. Tightly packed into once-lavish embassy rooms, the prisoners squatted together for hours on end. Not wanting to appear to negotiate with the terrorists, the Peruvian government maintained silence. The guerrillas grew increasingly threatening, telling the hostages they would never see their families again. No one knew whether they would eat another meal.

And then someone in Wicht's crowded room found several small loaves of bread. The group calculated how many mouths there were to feed. Slicing carefully, they gave each person a quarter of a loaf. But just after the pieces had been distributed, a newcomer—an ambassador—was shoved in from another room. Without hesitating, one of the hostages divided his already small quarter loaf in half and shared it with his new fellow captive.

In theory, of course, that's not supposed to happen. According to popular interpretations of economics and values, individuals under pressure don't act that way. Humans, we are told, are primarily self-interested. As competition increases for scarce resources, the commitment to such moral values as compassion and sharing goes out the window. In such cases, we're assured, Maslow's hierarchy of needs takes over, insisting that our priorities can be reduced to four words: *food first, ethics later.* So even in a hostage taking, would someone share what might be his or her last loaf of bread? Of course not. To think otherwise is simply naive.

Yet "in that entire experience," Wicht recalled, "I didn't see one sign of selfishness." Was that because all these people were already friends? Hardly. They came from different backgrounds and a variety of countries. "What did we have in common?" he asked rhetorically. His answer was elegantly simple: "We were human beings, and solidarity developed among us." And out of that solidarity—a commonality of values that put something above their own needs—a collective moral courage rose to the surface that put life itself at risk so that others could live.

TESTING THE CORPORATE METTLE

Eric Duckworth, an ebullient Englishman with an impish wit, notes with self-deprecating modesty that where moral courage is concerned he "usually fails." But "on one occasion when I was young and idealistic," he recalls, "I succeeded—and have been proud of it ever since."

In 1949 Duckworth and his wife were newly married and applying for a mortgage to buy their first home in suburban London. A metallurgist by training, he had joined the Glacier Metal Company, now part of Federal Mogul, a firm that specialized in making bearings for internal combustion engines. Among his tasks were examining damaged bearings returned by customers to determine the causes of the failures, reporting back to the customers, and if necessary recommending changes in production processes to correct the problem.

Most of the time, he recalls, the failures were due to problems such as misuse, improper installation, and lack of lubrication. But "very occasionally," he says, Glacier had

supplied a faulty part. As Duckworth got more experience, he came to understand that those occasional faults were not being accurately reported. His boss, the chief metallurgist, regularly tried to cover up such faults by refusing to divulge all the facts." He salved his conscience," Duckworth recalls, "by saying that he was prepared to commit sins of omission but not of commission."

As a result, bearing failures for which Glacier should have taken responsibility were attributed to mishandling by the end users, and no effort was made to compensate customers.

"After a while," says Duckworth, "I disagreed." He had been with the company for only six months when a particularly egregious case of failure by Glacier came to his attention. Instead of shifting the blame, he "wrote the report with complete honesty." When his boss rejected his findings, Duckworth recalls that "in my altruistic, youthful fervor, I said I would resign."

Moral courage or rash bravado? At the time, says Duckworth, "It was very foolish of me." The sales department, agreeing with the chief metallurgist, protested his report vigorously, certain that such an admission of mistakes would cost them this customer and perhaps many more. Fortunately, Duckworth had already made suggestions that had increased the productivity of the manufacturing line threefold. Those actions, he suspects, had won him the admiration of the CEO, who backed him against his boss. The report was sent to the customer.

Shortly afterward, Duckworth says, "we got back a very congratulatory letter saying that the customer had always suspected concealment in some of our reports." Welcoming the company's newfound candor, they increased their orders as a result.

THE COMMON THREADS OF COURAGE

These three stories—of exploitation in Baltimore, terrorism in Lima, and dishonesty in London—would seem to have little in common. The first happened amid suburban comfort, where the risks were shame, suspension, or expulsion. The second happened at gunpoint, where death was the threat. The third happened in the corporate world, where a career was at stake. One made the local and national papers. Another occurred below the radar during an incident that drew glaring global publicity. The last never reached print until now.

Moral courage comes in a palette of colors. It happens to people who may or may not have any notoriety. Yet it happens in a social context that includes morally courageous actors and—in these three cases, although not always—a supporting cast of others who also exhibit moral courage. Hallett's faculty at St. Paul's, Wicht's fellow captives in Peru, and Duckworth's CEO all resonated to the sound of moral courage, making it easier for the actor to display the courage needed in the moment.

And through each of these tales runs the three-stranded braid that defines morally courageous action: a commitment to moral *principles,* an awareness of the *danger* involved in supporting those principles, and a willing *endurance* of that danger. Think of these three as intersecting domains:

Figure 1. The Three Elements of Moral Courage

Notice how these relationships play out in these three stories:

• At St. Paul's School for Boys the principles involved an expectation of responsible sexual attitudes and behaviors. The danger Hallett and his staff faced had to do with parental wrath and financial hardship. The endurance arose in their collective stand for the "hard right."
• At the Japanese embassy in Peru the principles centered on compassion and responsibility. The danger Wicht faced had to do with pain and discomfort, perhaps even death. The endurance arose in his commitment to be present to help even when he himself might be rendered helpless.
• At the Glacier Metal Company the principles centered on honesty and fairness. The danger facing Duckworth concerned unemployment and self-condemnation. The endurance arose in his willingness—due to a clear understanding of values, youthful chutzpah, or something in between—to risk the full consequences of that danger.

DEFINING COURAGE

Most definitions of courage put it at the intersection of the two bottom circles, danger and endurance. According to the third edition of *Webster's New International Dictionary,* courage is "that quality of mind which enables one to encounter danger and difficulties with firmness, or without fear, or fainting of heart." That definition may be overwrought in using the phrase "without fear": John Wayne's comment that "courage is being scared to death—and saddling up anyway" reflects a recognition, common throughout the literature on courage, that the greatest courage may in fact arise in moments of the greatest fear.

More usefully, the same dictionary cites a simpler definition of courage by General William T. Sherman (after whom the Sherman tank is named) as "a perfect sensibility of the measure of danger and a mental willingness to endure it." Courage, as those two bottom circles suggest, is all about assessing risks and standing up to the hardships they may bring.

In common with other core attributes of humanity, courage is not peculiar to Western culture nor the modern age. Courage, notes the British intellectual Isaiah Berlin, "has, so far as we can tell, been admired in every society known to us." In our modern usage, however, courage typically subdivides into two strands, which we tend to describe as *physical* and *moral.*

Physical courage has to do with the guts to climb up one rock face or rappel down another, the valor to continue running uphill into enemy fire, or the bravery of a mother plucking a drowning child from the surf. For each of these acts, the word *courage* easily springs to mind. We make no requirement that these acts be related to principles, values, or

higher order beliefs in "doing the right thing." On some occasions, to be sure, physical courage may be driven by a sense of honor. It can be shaped by a concern over reputation. It can even be enhanced by a recognition that good things will come by being bold. But while physical courage may be principle-*related*, we don't require that it be principle-*driven.*

Moral courage, however, is just that: driven by principle. When courage is manifested in the service of our values—when it is done not only to demonstrate physical prowess or save lives but also to support virtues and sustain core principles—we tend to use the term *moral courage.* Moral courage is not only about facing physical challenges that could harm your body—it's about facing mental challenges that could wreck your reputation and emotional well-being, your adherence to conscience, your self-esteem, your bank account, your health. If physical courage acts in support of the tangible, moral courage protects the less tangible. It's not property but principles, not valuables but virtues, not physics but metaphysics that moral courage rises to defend. Where the physically courageous individual may be in full agreement with the momentum of the occasion and is often bolstered with cheers of encouragement and team spirit, the morally courageous person often goes against the grain, acting contrary to the accepted norm. Acts of moral courage carry with them risks of humiliation, ridicule, and contempt, not to mention unemployment and loss of social standing.

Simply put, moral courage is *the courage to be moral.* And by moral, as we'll see later, we tend to mean whatever adheres to the five core moral values of *honesty, respect, responsibility, fairness,* and *compassion.* In figure 1, then, the point at which the circle of our deepest values, or principles, intersects with the twin circles of danger and endurance is the point at which we find moral courage most clearly in evidence.

MORAL COURAGE IN PRACTICE

Some of the evidence for moral courage is found in the lives and practices of admirable world leaders:

- Mahatma Gandhi advocating his philosophy of nonviolence in the struggle for a free India despite repeated internment
- Nelson Mandela enduring eighteen years of degrading imprisonment on Robben Island and still being able to forgive his oppressors in the apartheid regime of South Africa
- Lech Wal esa rising from the shipyards of Gdansk to lead the Solidarity Movement that ultimately played a decisive role in toppling Communism in Poland
- Václav Havel, a dissident playwright, enduring three prison sentences for organizing strong opposition to Communist rule of Czechoslovakia
- Aung San Suu Kyi defiantly resisting her imprisonment in Myanmar and remaining an outspoken voice for democracy

But more frequently it appears in the deeds of ordinary individuals—not necessarily in stories of great moments but in narratives of daily lives that have little to do with broad national and global trends. Consider a few homely examples:

- Early in his career as a consulting engineer, Larry Elder of Palm Desert, California, designed a feed mill for an international company in the nearby Imperial Valley. His design placed all the components of the mill—including a 110-foot-tall bucket elevator—on a concrete slab.

Needing to calculate the load-bearing capacity of the ground beneath the slab, Elder retained a soils engineer. Only after Elder's design was accepted by the company, however, did the soils engineer realize the slab would be supporting such a tall structure. Given the prevalence of earthquakes in that part of California, he advised Elder to revise his plan by placing the slab on piles—at an additional cost of $25,000.

Elder concurred. But the company manager rejected the revision and ordered Elder to begin construction. Elder refused, standing his ground despite a series of angry phone calls. "For a new consultant in the area," says Elder, "it seemed like a tough stand to take; but it just seemed right, so I stayed with it."

In the end the manager relented. And despite thirty small earthquakes in the first sixty days after completion, the elevator stayed upright.

• "I have never forgotten an incident that occurred twenty-five years ago, when I was a graduate student in the South in a mental health counseling program," writes a woman who is now a university professor in Florida.

"My job at the time required that I earn a Ph.D., so I was under a great deal of pressure to succeed. The beginning students were randomly paired and expected to work with each other as a client-therapist dyad, each taking the turn of client and then counselor throughout the semester. I was paired with a younger woman, and one evening we met at a local pizza place and settled into getting to know each other over our meal. When the conversation turned to racial issues, my counseling partner began to use the 'N word' in reference to African Americans and to express her negative feelings toward people of color.

"I was shocked that a future therapist would harbor this type of intolerance based on race. At the same time, I was faced with the ethical dilemma of whether to confront her or let it go, as the outcome of my shared clinical work with her would certainly have an impact on my grade in this class. After a few minutes of hearing her use such demeaning language, I could no longer bear my discomfort and asked her not to use the word in my presence. She apologized for offending me, and we went on to other topics of conversation.

"Although this may seem like a minor incident, for me it was a major challenge to my ethics and basic belief in justice, compassion, and respect. I don't think I could live with myself easily if I had not so acted."

Though modest, these examples each evidence the three elements of moral courage: a significant danger (losing future work as an engineer, failing to attain a doctoral degree), a willingness to endure (refusing to compromise, confronting disrespectful language), and a commitment to principle (long-term safety, racial equality).

Sometimes, by contrast, the importance of moral courage appears most vividly by its *absence:*

• A woman in California writes about her uncle, Pete, a quiet man who kept to himself and who served in the U.S. Army in Vietnam. He was stationed there, she says, with "a mishmash of people from all over the country—big cities, small towns, farms. This was downtime—training, rest, routine.

"My uncle had befriended a big country boy from some tiny Midwestern town. He had grown up on a farm, was a little slow, very shy. One day a bunch of guys were in the process of planning a particularly cruel joke on this country boy. My uncle overheard them, and they invited him to join in. He declined. They went through with their prank, and it was successful.

"My uncle says he remembers afterward sitting on the bed across from this country boy, who didn't say a word. But his face was full of hurt and humiliation. My uncle said the look on his face said to him, 'You knew, you knew what they were going to do, and you didn't try to stop them.' From that day on he made a vow to himself that never again would he stand by and let someone be hurt if there was something he could do to prevent it."

• When Officer Mike Bocelli was working a bike patrol on August 24, 2003, in Fort Myers, Florida, he cited a man for carrying an open container and having a mutilated driver's license. The man was so upset that he returned several hours later and attempted to slash the tires on the patrol bike of Officer Bocelli's partner. Having no lack of physical courage, Bocelli gave chase and arrested him after a violent scuffle.

Bocelli wanted to include in his written report the fact that the man had slashed the tires—until he realized that the tires had not actually been damaged. So, taking the man's knife, he punctured the tires himself. Three months later Bocelli resigned, having been charged with lying about an arrest and tampering with evidence.

The case surfaced because one of the officers who saw Bocelli slash the tires had the moral courage to stand up against the unspoken but powerful code of fraternal loyalty within police ranks and report the incident to his superiors. Attention then turned to a second officer who saw Bocelli slash the tires but said nothing. His lack of moral courage in failing to notify his superiors cost him a three-week suspension without pay and probation for a year.

• When twenty-seven-year-old Andrew Hamerling, a securities research analyst at Banc of America Securities, analyzed the performance of one of the firms he followed, he concluded that its earnings did not adequately reflect the company's performance. So in September 2001 he drafted a negative report on the company, SBC Communications.

That draft never appeared, largely because SBC, after Hamerling improperly gave them advance notice of his findings, threatened to pull valuable corporate underwriting business from Banc of America. So Hamerling issued a much more positive report. He continued to recommend privately against SBC, however, warning at least one client in an e-mail that its stock would fall because "[SBC] has nothing fundamentally sound going for it."

More than two years later, he was fined and suspended by the National Association of Securities Dealers (his profession's regulatory and disciplinary body) because he "failed to disclose negative facts about the company as well as [his own] actual views in violation of NASD rules." His failure to abide by his conscience cost him this stern rebuke.

Each of these individuals—Pete, the unidentified police officer, and Andrew Hamerling—had an opportunity to express moral courage by taking an action that was ethically right: defending a friend, reporting a perjury, or standing for truth. But Pete was dissuaded by fear of ostracism. Within the police force, the inhibitor was a culture of fidelity to fellow officers. For Hamerling, intimidating threats stifled his conscience. In the end, each paid the price of self-condemnation, sanction, or damage to reputation.

WHY MORAL COURAGE MATTERS

Why should moral courage matter so much to us these days? In part because we see so many examples of its lack—in corporate settings and legal proceedings, in politics and sports and entertainment, in personal and social relationships. But there's another, deeper reason. If

courage is indeed one of the core virtues of humanity—as I will argue in the coming pages—we need to find ways to express it, support it, and teach it. The proving of one's own courage, after all, has long been a rite of passage from youth to adulthood. When young men went to war and pioneers took to the wilderness, they were carving out new opportunities for themselves. But they were also testing their mettle beyond the comfortable regulation of civilization.

Times have changed. John Wayne's Wild West has disappeared. The warfare once thought so glorious—and which Aristotle felt was the only place to find true courage—now depends less on the physical courage of the individual warrior and more on technology, information, and weaponry launched from a safe distance. In most developed nations, ordinary citizens rarely have to do what their ancestors routinely did: train to defend themselves and their loved ones against physical threats. Today, the satisfaction of basic needs typically entails little hazard and demands no physical bravery: fighting traffic on the way to the grocery store is categorically different from battling bears on the way home with the deer you've just speared.

With physical courage less obviously in demand as we move into the twenty-first century, where is courage to be learned and practiced? How will the young, in particular, celebrate this age-old rite of passage? Where, specifically, will the risks come from that test their courage? Will they find those risks in dangerous lifestyles that include unsafe sexual behavior, chemical dependency, and gang activity? Will they find them in newly popular forms of contrived risk taking—extreme sports, survival treks, or even perilous financial ventures? It's as though the young are saying, "If nature, war, and the need for survival are not going to test our courage, we'll invent other ways, for we need to prove to ourselves and others that we really are courageous!"

Is it possible that, among those other ways, the young could begin testing themselves against a courage that is moral rather than physical? If the need for physical courage in everyday life is dwindling, the opposite is happening for moral courage. As the examples in this book indicate— and as daily headlines reconfirm—the opportunities to prove oneself morally courageous are manifold. It may be, in fact, that what most defines maturity in the twenty-first century will be not physical but moral courage.

This book is all about that defining attribute of maturity. What is moral courage, and how does it play out in our lives? Specifically, as we approach situations where moral courage seems to be required, how do we know what to do? What guideposts are available to help us decide whether the issue we face defines the blockbuster moment of our lives or a secondary distraction on the emotional horizon? How can we decide whether to stand and fight or to retreat and retrench? If it seems right to take a stand, how can we tell whether we're being truly bold or merely brazen? How can we nurture and promote moral courage, in ourselves and for others?

There are seven checkpoints along this path:

1. **Assess the situation.** Do I think it calls for courage? Is the problem here a lack of valor or fortitude? Is physical courage all that's needed? Or does this situation need moral courage?
2. **Scan for values.** Moral courage is *the courage to be moral*—to take a stand for values. What are those values? Can I spot them and build on them?

3. **Stand for conscience.** As I think about the uppermost of the three circles in our diagram of moral courage, what principles need to be articulated and defended in this situation? What one or two key values stand out here?
4. **Contemplate the dangers.** Do I have a clear picture of the risks I'm facing? As I examine the second circle, can I properly assess the threats facing me?
5. **Endure the hardship.** Do I have the willingness to endure this situation? If I take this stand—represented by the third circle of our diagram—will the hardship make me give up, or will I be able to persist? What gives me the confidence to persist?
6. **Avoid the pitfalls.** Can I stand firm against the numerous inhibitors of moral courage? Among them are timidity and foolhardiness, which are the opposite and the counterfeit, respectively, of moral courage. Am I alert to these and other traps?
7. **Develop moral courage.** Can moral courage be learned? If moral courage is not simply innate—so that some have it and others don't—how can it be nurtured, taught, practiced, and attained?

Each of the following chapters broadly addresses one of these checkpoints, and each ends with a brief "Moral Courage Checklist" that helps us identify what we're seeing. A final chapter examines the role of moral courage in the public square. Looking at the ways courage applies to some key issues of domestic and international affairs shaping the twenty-first century, this concluding chapter suggests that moral courage is not only a personal but a collective attribute of successful cultures. By the end, several key characteristics of moral courage should become clear. Morally courageous leaders appear to have at least the following five attributes in common:

- Greater confidence in principles than in personalities
- High tolerance for ambiguity, exposure, and personal loss
- Acceptance of deferred gratification and simple rewards
- Independence of thought
- Formidable persistence and determination

There's nothing contrived, academic, or strained about these attributes or checkpoints. They grow up out of hundreds of examples, gathered over years of observation and tested in innumerable conversations with colleagues, friends, and audiences. Not surprisingly, this is a book rooted in real-life stories. Some are drawn from historical accounts or public media sources. But most come from interviews, conversations, letters, and e-mails in the United States and around the world. Where they can be attributed to their sources, I use full first and last names. Where they must remain anonymous, I use only a first—and deliberately invented—name. Even when anonymous, however, these stories are rooted in the accurate details of those who shared them with me: as Pulitzer Prize–winning historian Barbara Tuchman, from whom I have learned so much, once put it, "I do not invent anything, even the weather." Taken together, these stories reflect a natural but invisible decision-making logic that each of us can put into practice as we encounter the demand for moral courage. Continue reading, and this book will continue developing a process for putting that logic into action for ourselves and others.