

Pittsburgh Lecture

1910?

Lecture II.

The Art of Loyalty.

The apparent conflicts between opposed loyalties which beset the life of the loyal, and which at the last time I exemplified gave you examples, suggest to me, personally, one comment upon the nature of duty with which I should like to begin the present lecture. There is an old idea, deeply rooted in the minds of many of us, that the moral law is a collection ^{of commandments} ~~an exhaustive collection - one~~ of precepts, ^{adapted to all}

(2)

possible situations, and of such a nature that, if you are confronted by a difficult situation, you have only to look into your moral code to find, ^{somewhat clearly} set down just what it is that you ought to do in this particular case. Now this idea is unjust to the wealth of life. ~~and~~ ^{It is also} unjust to the dignity of the dutiful spirit. Not all situations in life can be reduced to a catalogue and the Moral Law cannot be codified. Of course there are moral codes. But they are more or less ^{incomplete} catalogues of impossibilities. The Ten Commandments represent, as everyone knows, only a few aspects of the dutiful life, and those under a form suited to ^{a remote and} ~~existing~~ ^{in a sense} ~~existing~~ primitive people. As for the

(3)

Sermons on the Mount, ^{it is no code,} ~~are given~~
~~is far~~ from pretending to be a collection
of ^{specimens for all occasions} ~~adapted to all peoples.~~ It is the embodiment
of the spirit of a new life
in a series of illustrative words,
adapted now to this, and now to that
phase of our endlessly wealthy
existence. ^{The phases in question are selected merely as} ~~illustrations of the spirit in question.~~
~~example.~~ The Thirteenth Chapter
of First Corinthians is again no
code, ~~only~~ but rather the exalted portrayal
of a spiritual attitude. The divine
spirit is indeed precisely a spirit.
No letter is able exhaustively to
characterize it. If it is indeed
impossible adequately and finally

(4)

to codify our civil and our criminal law, - ^{even} ~~and hence~~ ^{of such law} of the certifications, so often attempted ~~are~~ ^{is} ~~become~~ lost to the view of all but the experts under a maze of new judicial decisions, - shall it be possible to write down ^{a code} ~~an~~ adequate to the infinitely more subtle and delicate problems of the moral life, - of that life wherein the human spirit seeks its most noble and growing and individual expressions?

No, whoever seeks simplicity and clearness as to his duty must seek it in the form of simplicity.

(3)

and directness of spirit, not in
the form of a memorized set of
maxims, suitable to all individual
cases that may arise. I believe,
as I told you, that we ^{divide vastly}, ~~divide greatly~~ simplify our
duty ~~presently~~ when we conceive it
under the form of loyalty. But
by loyalty I mean not a code,
but first an attitude towards
life, and secondly, an art of
living. I tried to tell you about ~~that~~
attitude at the last time. When
later I portrayed some of the
conflicts that loyal people have
to face, I introduced you to the

(6)

problems of the art of loyalty. Now I believe that art, ^{of loyalty} to be beautifully simple in its spirit, and like all fine art, endlessly complicated in its details. I believe that its complexity is simply due to the wealth and the ~~beauty~~ ^{mysterious situations} ~~beauty~~, sometimes beautiful, sometimes tragic and terrible, in which life, ^{daily} places us.

I believe that the loyal, without being in the least infallible, can be as clear and simple and reasonable in spirit in dealing with ^{all} these mysteries and, ^{with} these complexities, as the ~~connoisseur~~ ^{artist} can be who somehow

(7)

adapt their fine art to undertakings
which appear to the inexperienced,
wholesomely confirming. ~~Only~~ ^{But there is one} ~~one~~
difference between the art of loyalty
and the other great arts. ~~Only~~ ^{It is this.} ~~one~~

The art of loyalty is for everybody, however
simple minded he may be, so long as
he is awake to the true value of life.

The plainest of souls, if only steadily
faithful, can become a great artist
in loyalty. For it is of the essence of
loyalty to live, amid all the compli-
cations of life, with the single eye
and ~~the~~ ^{with} the love of unity and ~~of~~ ^{personal}
that essential harmony of ideal branch.

(8)

the service of ^{abiding} any cause inevitably
gives. And I have known very
simple minded ~~bold~~ people
^{very} humble station, who readily
could solve such problems as we
at the last time ~~desires~~ portrayed,
could solve them not ^{always} perhaps as
you or I would solve them, but
would solve them in such wise
that the spirit of loyalty was manifest
in all that they did, so that the
cleverest reason could only applaud
their spirit, however much it might
observe their fallibility.

(9)

In my reasonings today I am not trying to replace the loyalty of such people by mere abstract formulations. I am trying to put in necessarily inadequate words what the genuine spirit is in which the plain minded but loyal folks try to meet such complications.

I.

Let me try to bring to your minds some of the considerations which by which my loyal person is likely to ~~be more~~ less instinctively or consciously guided when he faces any of the conflicting loyalties which at the last time we

(10)

exemplified. I shall express these considerations in the form of what I shall call principles of the last Loyalty exemplified. The conflicts that we mentioned were, you remember, these:-

First, conflicting obligations with regard to telling the truth; secondly, conflicting forms of family loyalty,

such as the duty of the son to his father, considered as in conflict with the apparent loyalty than ~~the~~ was supposed to elder brother ~~owed~~ due to the cause of his erring younger brother; thirdly the conflicting loyalties that romantic love often seems to bring to pass; and then, in general, the apparent conflicts of loyalty when business obligations and public duties, party and country,

(11)

province and nation, - and similarly opposed social concerns, seem to make contrary demands upon a loyal man. Now I have just insisted that no conventional moral code, no mere set of rules handed down by tradition, can ever be adequate to all the complicated life problems thus suggested. Each problem is likely to be, in some respect, novel. Each case is unique. And yet I assert that the loyal spirit in dealing with such problems is something essentially simple and universal, - adequate to lead even the blindest person in the direction in which we want all men to be led. If I had acted in that loyal spirit, mighty would indeed be India's countrymen; but the world would never have carried my countrymen off this view of me next least that, whenever we have to do with such conflicts, the first way to triumph over

(12) situation, the first principle of the Art of Loyalty is this: how to dwell upon the loyal spirit itself, to get us make clear to ourselves what ever wears us it must be done, not capriciously, but logically. Our first step is to get into the right attitude by ^{(who have to face these various problems,}
^{knowing what we most need in life.)} hearing what we most need in life. This first principle then of the Art of Loyalty is: Try to remember what always it is in which you are trying to serve your art. Now what we most need is not a happy fortune, nor a ~~satisfied~~ satisfied emotional life, nor a satisfaction of our caprices, nor anything that can be defined in terms of mere sentiment, however true, willing that can belong to ourselves as mere individuals. What we need is some steadfast and life long loyalty to an absorbing cause. And this cause must be one ~~that~~ whose service helps other people to be loyal. Our first will ^(in dealing with such conflicts) must be the will that ^{the} conflicting loyalties, when they ^{thus} appear, shall be harmonized, shall be

(13)

brought into unity with one another
and with the central cause of our
own personal life. Often the apparent
conflict of loyalties is due merely to our
own flickering ~~of~~ attention, to our
forgetfulness of that will to have
unity which inspires all the greatest
and most effective lives. Often the
mere memory ^(the rarely attentive emphasizing of the daily) of the unity is enough
to clarify the situation, thus the
family tragedy may be averted, in
many cases simply by insisting, ~~that~~
^{conflicting loyalties} with respect to one family loyalty: "I am
not thinking merely of father, or of mother,
^{nor even all the individuals together} or of brother ~~or~~ who always conflict. I am

(P.P. (14))

concerned that the family shall be
one. That is my first concern. That is
my cause. That is our cause. If this
or that member is pleased or pelted or
served, and that one snubbed or thwarted,
nothing is ^{essential} gained unless the
family is thereby made more a whole
than it was before." It is always well
to see whether simply thinking
of this fact, simply dwelling upon
the ^{together, and in family councils} common
service, does not of itself go far to
clear up the tangles in question. Of course
the people concerned would have to consider such
things together. ^{in a conference (not a wrangling discussion)} And, for instance, the brick
^{you or they purchased} and seek family, each of whose members
^{ending in a conflict}

100 (15)

feels a conflict of loyalties because each at once distrusts the ~~other~~ discretion and endurance of the others, and yet wishes to help the others, can get out of its ~~wisdom~~ ^{ignorance} of errors only in case

somebody says: "We are one; why this stupid secrecy as to what concerns us all alike. Let us out with it and be done with the trouble, simply by mutual ^{at critical moments} understanding". In such cases frankness, as to the common interest ^{may} produces the unified loyal spirit, and so solves the conflict, without in the least encouraging any tendency to nag one another henceforth about

(C) (16)

or to dwell upon a past ~~that~~, once loyally faced
the petty details. ~~as much the~~
~~together, may well become forgotten. In much~~
~~the same way, many of the apparent~~
~~problems of the lovers are due to the~~
~~(conflicting Loyalty in case)~~
fact that they do not think of love
as simply one of life's best opportunities
to win loyalty, and to find a ^{personal} cause.
If you view
~~less~~ love as an experience, ^{then it is} often a dazing or a distracting or a terr-
ifying ~~one~~; and for just that reason
one then grows fickle, because one
needs a rest from the heart-pangs, or
grows weary of the ^{merely emotional} sweetness. But think
of love in terms of the loyalty & active
life to which it may lead, and then
love helps life to its task, to its duty,

(17)

to its singleness of purpose. The lover who wants nothing so much as a worthy singleness of purpose in life is forearmed against ^{essential} fickleness.

But the lover who ^{habitually thinks of his} ~~refuses~~ ^{and superpersonal} love apart from active loyalty, may dream dreams as Shelley's lovers do in the song in Prometheus, and, say, when fickleness comes:

"Ah, sister, desolation is a delicate thing,
The best way to avoid fickleness, and
the conflict of loyalty in love, is to
intend from the first that if there is
to be love at all, there shall be loyalty.
Love is precious just because it opens
a spiritual world. But the only life of
that world is the loyal life.

(18)

The first principle then, making
will the apparent conflict of loyalties:-
Deliberately will that your cause ^{in life} shall
be One, despite all its varieties and
vicissitudes. And embracing this as
the common ~~feeling~~ ^{will whenever you like} the counsel
with your friends about their conflict I shall
II. ^(deliberate search for the definition of the) call the principle of the Common
Loyalty. It is plain that most conflicts
of loyalty arise as incidents in a ^{social} life
that actually possesses interests and
ties andunities that lie much deeper
than the conflict. It is often possible
to make out what these deeper ties
are, and in terms of them to show
how the conflict can be solved.

(19)

I begin here with the case of the fairly obvious family conflict over the daughter's marriage. And, of course, I need only tell the judgment of ~~the disinterested people, friends and neighbors usually pass~~ marriage. The daughter, already come to years of discretion, decides in favor of a marriage that appears, to her affectionate relatives' surprise. ^(The persons directly concerned) The more ~~they~~ discuss the conflict upon its own merits, the further apart the interests involved appear. ^{Since} ~~the~~ the ~~out~~ results of the proposed marriage lie in the unknown future, those ~~who~~ who object to the match and those ~~who~~ ^{are} determined that it shall be, are able to imagine the consequences much as they choose; and

Ques (20)

Nobody can convince anybody as to the predicted consequences. As a fact, we all know that we can none of us predict whether or no a proposed marriage will prove a happy one, or a successful one. But now there is one consequence, not of the marriage, but of any possible decision about the marriage, — there is one consequence that anybody can predict. This decision, namely, will have an important effect upon the future unity of the families of those concerned. And these families, — they will go on living and living and quarreling or cooperating, according as their members are or are not at critical moments, well,

(21)

Let all concerned then make this their starting point, - not the question: - What do you want or what do I want? - nor yet the ~~present~~ ^{at present quite} insoluble question: Are you to be happy or am I to be happy? - but only this question: What does the family tie, the ^{spiritual} unity of those who are now in one house, but who will not always be in their present relations, - what does this unity require of all? This last question has an obvious general answer: No family can be made one, ^{at least} under our present conditions of civilization, by thwarting the deliberate marriage choices of its members. Parents, when loyal, do not want to pass their old age as

~~CC~~ (22)

parasites, living upon the spiritual sacrifices of their faithful daughters, who are to remain at home simply as thwarted beings. The family lives for the sake of helping each of its own members to live his or her own life, in unity of spirit with the rest if possible, but with just that essential opportunity to choose one's own cause which is the only freedom which the loyal prize. On the other hand, the daughter who marries simply in order to get away from her ^{fathers} home, has probably missed her best opportunity to earn the loyalty that begins ^{(and is therefore little likely to make great success) from} at home. A natural way of viewing the case is to say that

208 (23)

The family councils, in such a case, ought to be based upon the principle that nobody wants a daughter to be thwarted as to her own best ideal, while no daughter ought to forsake her ^{first} home, for such an unwelcome marriage, unless she is perfectly clear that she would willingly ^{and heartily} consent to leave her own sister or her own future daughter, ~~contract~~ go against her ^{own} judgment and contract a marriage as repugnant to her private wishes as her own is now repugnant to her relatives. In brief a hearty effort on the part of all to ~~of~~ the common family loyalty speak as the one interest which is surely to be

(24)

considered, will go far to relieve the tension of every such situation.

at this

III.

It is this same principle of the common loyalty which is, in fact, in the minds of most people when that deep and general objection to untruthfulness is in question which I mentioned at the last time as an objection common to all essentially loyal minds.

I mentioned, ~~as~~ in my sketch of the processes of and conflicts of loyalty, in my discussion at the last time,

(24a)

the numerous cases where it ^{may} appears
~~that~~ if a lie were required of the loyal man
in order that his cause should thereby be
protected. Now I shall have occasion, ^{in a} ~~at the~~
~~moment~~ ^{to} speak of the really difficult cases
of the casuistry of truth-telling. Here, how-
ever, I want to point out how many
of the difficulties that seem to arise in
this field are, in fact, only apparent
difficulties, and that, if only we think
steadily of the common loyalty, the
reasons which may appear, in our
thoughtless moments, to be more or less
strongly in favor of saving our cause
by ^{apparently} ~~an~~ loyal lie, vanish in the light.

'Q 37)

deeper considerations which show that the common loyalty neither demands nor tolerates the particular lies that a narrow view of our situation ^{may have} seemed to render expedient. This, I say, is usually the case. Let us see what general grounds in favor of truth telling are, from the point of view of the ~~genuine~~ spirit of loyalty, very deep and far-reaching. In the long run, regarding most matters, the truth will out, precisely in so far as the truth is of central practical importance to those concerned in any notable and long continued enterprise. The person who habitually uses, for the sake

(26)

of a show of loyalty, false compliments,
addressed to his husband, or to anybody
else, comes to be known, ^{as a man of}
mere phrases, and his judgment is
disregarded accordingly. The physician
who systematically misleads his pa-
tients as to their true condition, has his
power to say the ~~only~~ ^{really} ^{and inspiring} comforting word
when his patients are beset by falsehoods.
The husband and wife who mask mutual
distrust under false phrases ~~and~~ ^{that} are invented to ~~hide~~ ^{for} to misrepresent
their common troubles, use the precious
right to say, when trouble has to be
faced: Let us face it together, ~~and~~ ^{for} ~~each~~ ^{us}
trust each other, and therefore can
face it together, whatever it is. The

(27)

cause that has to be served by systematic
lying, comes in the end to be regarded
by its own servants as more or less
of a bad joke, and they can no longer
be clear in their own minds whether
it is a sacred cause, for which they would
give their lives, or a scandal. Since facts
especially facts that relate to our deepest
moral interests, to our most cherished
causes, to our friendships and loves and
social tastes, remain always ~~true~~^{facts}, and
come constantly afresh to mind, while our
hasty words, ^{of deceit} our transient devices for mislead
the facts, pass away, and leave us merely
the perplexity of trying to repeat in some
consistent fashion whatever fiction we

have imagined to be a loyal device for getting our cause out of its difficulties, — ^{since all this is} the result of trying to deceive is surprising, tiring, disheartening, and so is deeply opposed to the loyal spirit.

Now these observations are not intended here as in any way new. They simply make articulate some of the reasons which cause loyal people more or less instinctively to shrink from the use of the lie as a device for even the most loyal purpose. The complications such as can justify the use of lying for generally loyal purposes, must ^{therefore} be such as somehow in the particular case overrule these

(29)

far-reaching considerations. ~~The art~~ of loyalty can very seldom permit the use of the lie as a tool. So much the better.

Moreover, there is still another and a ~~very~~ ^{still} deeper consideration, which makes the loyal spirit opposed to the lie. ~~Speech~~ Speech is an universal human instrument. Whoever employs the ^{customary} means of communication, sets an example to all men by his mode of communication, precisely in so far as his words ^{hence to} become known. He speaks not only to this or to that man with whom he is directly concerned when he speaks. He speaks, in a sense, to all men; for his words may become known to any stranger, or may be recorded, by chance, so that they remain a permanent

(30)

documents, allowing howat least one man used his opportunities to speak to his fellow. Now the cause of Truth; ful communication amongst men is a cause of the most universal ^{Human} interest. Loyalty to the cause of the spread of universal ^{Human} Loyalty amongst men ~~is~~ ^{is} the ~~most important~~ ^{most important} ~~and deepest~~ ^{and deepest} fact that men are of all creatures most persistent hindrances to the growth of the loyal spirit amongst mankind at large. Hence if one of the interests of every loyal person is indeed the furthering of the common loyalty of all mankind, no loyal person can willingly use an instrument that, whatever the special end for which it is this time used, tends to

(31)

make men in general disloyal, precisely so far as they know that this instrument is used.

The thought then of what the common loyalty demands, - the thought that lying tends to breed lying, and that liars, like the vampires of the old stories, not only make victims of those to whom they lie, but tend to make these victims, ^{like} themselves liars, liars, according to the stories, the victims of the vampires became in turn themselves vampires, well, this thought goes far to correct ~~those~~ those natural

(32)

confusions which tempt us to suppose
that lying is often a useful instru-
ment of loyalty.

But now, even ^{by stating}, these far-
reaching principles, I am not
attempting to codify the moral law.
The loyal lie remains a possible, some-
times a necessary instrument. When
is the use of that instrument justified?
I reply, ^{It is justified} in this class of cases, - and so
far as I can now see, ^{the general statement being, it is justified} only in these
~~class of cases~~: - ^{which I will first illustrate by the following} The prisoner of war, whom
I mentioned at the last time, - the
prisoner questioned by the enemy,
may indeed be put, against his
will, in the position of having to

(33)

choose whether he will lie to the enemy, in case the enemy's question is cannot be evaded, or whether he will betray the trust that his cause has put into his hands, and that he is bound, perhaps aware, to protect. In sum then, he has, against his will, to choose which of two lies he will tell, or again, to choose which of two deeds, each of which is substantially equivalent to a lie; that is, each of which is a breach of faith, - which of these two ^{I say} he will commit. Here indeed the common loyalty ~~demands~~ demands of him the lie to the enemy. If he told the truth to the enemy, the enemy would in fact be bound, as a matter of good sense, to

(34)

receive his report with distrust, since it would be, ~~on~~ upon its face, the word of a cowardly traitor. To tell the truth to the enemy would therefore, in this case, ~~would~~ do more ^{even} to make the enemy despise ~~the~~ ^{the power} treason, than to teach the enemy how loyal men behave. So here indeed the attitude of the truth lover is only to be expressed by saying: "If you, the enemy who have taken me captive, ~~you~~ will question me, you must take your own risks as to believing my answers. I ~~must~~ speak to you as a prisoner, but you shall not find me speaking as a traitor. I will tell you nothing that you want to know to the detriment of my cause. You trifle with my loyalty when you ask me to do so." This can be openly

(35)

rigid at the outset. Or again this can be sometimes more
discreetly ^{known by the prisoner's bearing without revealing} ~~known by the prisoner's bearing without revealing~~
~~the extreme case of the~~
~~now that~~

prisoner of war, ~~defends~~ simply illustrates
a class of cases which includes a
small, but fairly definite range
of necessary and loyal lies. There's
principle ^{on the whole, I think} is clear and rigid; although
here again I am attempting no
code that predicts every individual
case. If you are placed, against your
will, where you have to choose which
two lies you will tell, which of two
pledges you will break, which of two
deeds, each substantially equivalent
to a falsehood, to a breach of trust, or
to a broken pledge, you are to com-

(36)

mit, - if your choice as between these two acts is indeed your only choice - then, ^{so far as I can see} but only then, you must ^{consciously} choose not against telling the truth, but against telling the greater lie, or against breaking the more binding pledge. In such a case you can clearly know the principle of your act. You can say, I act for the sake of the essentially whole truth. It is not my disloyalty but my fidelity to the common truth which bids me choose to be false to the lesser obligation simply because, otherwise, I should ^{inevitably} be false to the greater. This is no case of "the end justifying the means". It is simply the case of the art of being as truthful as one can be.

(37)

Now such cases may arise when one has a sacred confidence to keep, - a confidence which belongs to the cause to which one is loyal, and ~~is~~ not to the private self, and when, on occasion, the intrusive questioner cannot be truthfully answered, and when his question cannot be evaded, without fidelity to the cause, - that is, without a betrayal ^(of the cause he has it to keep) of confidence. In such cases, one must ~~not~~ be truthful. But one may also be forced by the situation to be truthful to the whole common cause, by giving the misleading answer to the question. Honorable people do not choose to stand in such situations when they can avoid them. They seek no

(38)

occasions to mislead. But when they face the situation and must choose which of two obligations to sacrifice, they sacrifice the less to the greater.

The principle thus defined does not justify the lie told merely for the sake of calming a sufferer's fears, or of keeping up appearances on behalf of the cause when, as a fact, the cause has fallen upon evil days. On the whole, lies told to keep sick people in good spirits fail of their purpose. Out of your dearest dreads, when we are weak and suffering is often this, that we ^{suspect} fear lest our best friends will now deceive us for what they take to be our good. One of the first things to do if you have to help

(34)

a nervous sufferer, is to win his confidence. And in the long run you cannot win his confidence unless you deserve it. Of course you say ^{to him} whatever encouraging things ~~to tell~~ you believe to be essentially true. Of course you are reticent as to matters which ^{wisecrude} he cannot reasonably consider and fairly judge, and which he therefore ought to leave to other people. But you must, as they say, be "square" with him. He will love you for that. Occasionally for instance it may be the truth, and it may be very wise to tell him, that, in this or in that respect, he is a fool. There are nervous sufferers who take great comfort in

(40)

Learning this very fact properly stated by a really ~~well~~ sympathetic, but also cool and calm friend, to whom they appeal for advice. Some of them come periodically to their ^{wounded} advisers just for the sake of getting this wholesome ^{into their own fold has} insight ~~unexpressed~~ upon them. In any case, reticence about non-essential matters, accompanied with ~~the~~ simple frankness as to whatever it really concerns the patient to know, is the proper policy in dealing with the weak. The truth is, on the whole, ^{sustaining} to us. Lying is enervating, in general, both to the liar and to the one who is fed upon lies.

On the other hand, the principle

(41)

just enunciated, namely the principle
that when you are placed where you
have to break one of two pledges, it is loyal
to choose which one you shall break,
is not confusing, but clarifying.

As to the traditional lie of
politeness, — such as the lie of the host
guest on taking his leave of the host, —
we shall see, in a moment, how very
elementary ~~processes~~^{practice in} of heart/loyalty
enable one to get into a position
wherein no such lies are likely even
to appear to be necessary. In such cases
the supposed necessity of lying is mainly
due to a bad technique. It is comparable to the
necessity to strike false notes in playing on the piano.

Oct (42)

I now introduce a third principle ~~of the~~ of the
of loyalty, — a principle that
I propose to those who meet
with the case of ^{apparently} conflicting
loyalty. This is
~~loyalty~~, the principle of —
In case of doubt, ~~prefer~~ ^{your true} loyalty,
demands that, in the conflict, you ^{give preference to the} service
^{of} ~~call~~ to whose service
you ^{were} ~~are~~ ^{most fully} already committed
before the conflict ~~arose~~ ^{appeared to}.
And — ~~unless obviously~~ ^{if} you are already committed
to both of the conflicting causes,
prefer the one to which you
have first, or most certainly com- ^{been}
mitted yourself.

(43)

I may call this the principle
of the prior, or, if you will, of the ~~attorney~~^{one's attorney}
loyalty. In business, and in the
professions, this principle is extremely
well known, and is constantly applied.

The lawyer who has once accepted a
retainer, is bound to undertake, ~~as~~
a lawyer, ^{later professional} no obligation that would even
indirectly bind him to serve interests
that conflict with the just and legal
^(so long as the relation to his client lasts)
interests of his client. But, on the other
hand, since, as a lawyer, he is ^{professional} an officer of the court in which he practices
and a servant of the law, his ^{professional} duty

(43)

science, if he is indeed a thoroughly loyal man, will forbid him to further his client's interests by means that bring essentially illegal or unjust conflict with his prior loyalty, which is owed to his profession and to the law. In business, if two ~~existing~~^{existing} or two other business obligations, ~~exist~~^{appear}, conflict, the prior agreement is, in general, the obviously binding one. The exceptions here, if there are exceptions, would be determined by the technical ~~peculiarities~~^{peculiarities} of the business in question, and would again involve a fidelity to which all concerned are understood to be committed. In case of war, a loyal

(43)

might might have decided that it was
his duty to fight on the Northern side;
another might have decided, in an
equally loyal way, to fight for the South.
~~But in case like that of your girl dear, where only
one person could serve who was right,
neither man could change sides~~
during the conflict without treason.
I may decide for myself as to where
my loyalty lies; but I am not at
liberty to change my decision unless
I clearly see that the cause to which
I have committed myself is indeed an
essentially bad cause, ^{and bad because it is} really false to
the principle of serving the universal
loyalty.

(46)

The principle of the prior loyalty is thus essentially opposed to fickleness. Fickleness is the most dangerous foe of the art of loyalty. I admit however that there are cases where one may discover that the cause to which he is committed is a cause so much opposed to the interest of universal loyalty that a growth in knowledge forces him to abandon it as a bad cause. He is, for instance, the legal member of a robber band, brought up in blindness to the evil of his cause, might be constrained by consciousness so as to perceive that his band was living by malice

(43)

war on the universal loyalty. Or again,
after the war, a former Confederate might
well come to see that any further con-
spiracy made for the sake of renewing
the Confederacy, would indeed ~~be~~ be
an attack upon humanity itself. In such
cases, it may become duty to let a
prior loyalty lapse. But such cases
arise only when our knowledge of
our world is profoundly altered, ^{or} and
when our ^{social} world itself has essentially
changed its whole situation. In general,
I may not capriciously abandon my
once chosen cause. Loyalty involves

(48)

a pact for life. And nobly, I repeat, can ask anything better than a cause which binds for life. Of course the circumstances of our loyalty may often be altered at our own will, as when a teacher or a clergyman accepts a call to a new place; but even such changes must not be matters of caprice. They must be due to the discovery that one can better serve the essential cause through the new undertaking.

The principle of the prior loyalty solves many of the conflicts of life. The calm assurance that falsehood can never be, ⁱⁿ itself, the way

(49)

to the loyal life, goes far ~~in helping~~ to calm the storm ^{feeling} of passion. The art of loyalty, in the presence of our endlessly changing moods, depends upon knowing, and resolving that, although our cause can be and should be endlessly developed and idealized and universalized, we do not propose to break with it so long as it is a morally sound cause at all. And its moral soundness must be judged by the fact that it is a cause by means of which we serve, in our own way, the ends of helping all men, through the example of our fidelity, to be themselves faithful.

(VI, 50)

Three principles of the Art of Loyalty have thus been set before you. First the principle: Steadfastly train yourself to the resolve that your various causes shall be harmonized; Secondly the principle: In case of the appearance of conflict, look beneath the superficial conflict to find, ^{if possible} the deeper common loyalty, and act in the light of that common loyalty; Thirdly, the principle: If conflict cannot otherwise be resolved, act in consistency with your prior loyalty, remembering that, ^{if change} of flag may indeed be sometimes required by some transformation of your master;

~~60~~ (37)

Fickleness itself is never a part of loyalty.
Your cause, once chosen, is your
larger self. Fickleness, if deep and
deliberate is moral suicide.

With these three principles
in mind we are able, I believe, to
solve by individual choice, and by
native tact and skill, most of the
problems of the conflict of loyalties.
The art of loyalty is a long art. It
ought to be the art of Efemial Rogers.
It is no art to be carried out by thumb
thumb. But it has principles, and
some of these I have been trying to
state.

(52)

Some of you may still be anxious to know what further I should say regarding ~~certainty~~ ^{what I conceive} to be the application of the art of loyalty to the certain of the special cases that I mentioned at the last time, and that I have not ~~ever~~ yet fully considered today. I add a word or two by way of illustration.

First, and simplest of all remaining cases is the problem of the loyal word of acknowledgement to one hostess at one takes leave. Here, I have already said, a reasonable skill in the art of loyalty requires

(52)

one, in general, of any even apparent
obligation to lie. His first duty of guest
to host is loyalty to the social enterprise
in question. Where it is not in my power,
or is not my will, loyalty to approve of
the social enterprise in which I am
invited to take part, it is my simple
duty, and of course my right, to decline
the invitation. Having accepted, it is my
only loyal act to go prepared to co-operate,
and to find the occasion an opportunity
and not a bore. If under these conditions
I am bored, it is I myself who am, under
normal ^{social} conditions, the worst bore present
at least to myself; and about this

(3'3)

fearful fact, if it is indeed a fact, I owe to
all concerned a reasonable reticence,
because the mere accidents of my
words are nobody's concern but my
own, unless my words are of some
positive social service. My will, mean-
while, ^{should} remain throughout one point:
the loyal devotion to the cause of the
whole social unity in question, — a cause
which my trustees personally repre-
sent. If I can retain this will, I shall
sincerely appreciate the devotion shown
by my trustees, and I shall be ready
to say as much, in any fitting way, at
the end of the enterprise. If I cannot

(54)

^{(during the inter-}
return this will, if I move about my
tumultuous ^{whole} content, my presence at the affair

is one living lie, which my concluding
last speech only gives the final seal. But
if I am indeed practised in the art of loyalty,
what I say at the end will simply be
a sincere expression of the only spirit
in which I have any right whatever to
accept anybody's hospitality. In case I
have this right spirit, however, I shall
say nothing, ~~unless~~ and I shall not
be tempted to say anything, about
the affair after I have left the house,
which my hostess, of in her right mind
~~she~~ would be unwilling to hear. And

(55)

This last remark gives the sufficient test by which I can know that my compliment, if sensible, was indeed essentially sincere. Whatever ^{social} compliment is more than this, connotes vanity, and is an offense in the end to all sensible people. More flattery is not loyalty. Loyal people may be amused by such flattery; but they do not really prize it. They expect what they offer, — namely a hearty willingness to express, by word and by deed a wholesome devotion to the common cause.

One other ^{type} of doubtful case

(56)

remains to be mentioned. The elder brother, ^(tempted to) concealing from the austere father the younger brother's misdeeds, — the lovers, tempted ^{after} to conceal from each other their fickle moods, or else to break their engagement by saying, "I believe that I love ^{now} grown weary"; — all such persons are in a position where they are too deep in the complexities of their passing moods and of their confusing ~~sorrows~~ situations to see at the moment wisely where their deeper loyalty is seated, what the common cause requires them to do, and what their prior

(57)

obligation demands. Their one resort is very often this, to lay their cases before almost any sensible and experienced friend, who, having himself sometimes been between the devil and the deep sea, and who, himself offering loyalty, can help them to see clearly what their cause is, and what their loyal will is. Such a friend might be ~~host~~ mediate between the austere father and the erring younger brother. Or he might be able to help the lovers to distinguish the false fire from the true, — the calm light of loyalty.

(58)

from the mere will o' the wisp of
ill humor or of transient passion.

Such a friend need not be infallible.
He may be quite unable to decide for
them. But he may be able to ~~help~~ help
them see how to decide for themselves.

For after all, the art of loyalty
is the art of discovering what your
own rational will is, and of then
discovering how to be true to that
will, whatever your humor, your
words, or your life. The only advisor
worth having is the one who will ^{help} ~~help~~
you to know how to make your own loyal decisions.