## Spielberg stinks up math, politics, and film-making

By C.S. Morrissey Special to The B.C. Catholic

The reason why Steven Spielberg's *Lincoln* is such a disappointment is perhaps evident to those who have studied philosophy. For example, Trinity Western University professor Grant Havers, in his book Lincoln and the Politics of Christian Love, offers a philosophical counterpoint to the vision of history found in Spielberg's movie about Abraham Lincoln, the 16th U.S. president.

Havers argues against those who "contend that Christianity is too exclusivist to live up to the truly universal ideas of Lincoln." Such people "portray Lincoln as the paragon defender of natural rights while downplaying the religious particularity of his own thought."

On the contrary, argues Havers, "Lincoln's ideas are most comprehensible to a people already steeped in knowledge of the Bible. Lincoln honestly believed that the people of north and south were capable of understanding the injustice of slavery, although such an understanding rested on the Bible rather than mathematical reason.

"Even as the president of a divided nation, Lincoln assumed that the people of the south were good, and would eventually overthrow their usurping regime on their own; unfortunately, this did not happen," and Christian statesmanship was required.

The debate over Lincoln is important. On one side are those who maintain "Christianity is far too restrictive to be the foundation of a true universal politics." Because "self-evident truths cannot be exclusively Christian," it would seem that only selfevident truths, not Christian charity, should be at the basis of a just society.

On the other side is Havers' insistent counterpoint. His key thesis is that Lincoln "called for a politics of charity."

He points out that although "the very language of 'self-evident' truths of liberty and equality in the Declaration" of Independence seems to "suggest that acceptance of this kind of truth should be immediately



Actor Daniel Day-Lewis portrays U.S. president Abraham Lincoln in a scene from the movie Lincoln. Chris Morrissey writes the movie has a philosophically deficient script, but Day-Lewis gives a great performance.

intelligible to all, Christian ident truth that things which or non-Christian," this was definitely not Lincoln's view and cannot explain Lincoln's

Havers argues that Lincoln instead "called for a politics of charity precisely because the truths of the Declaration were not selfevident to all." Even if human reason is a universal fact rooted in human nature, "it would not be enough to encourage the practice of self-evident truths."

The movie gets this philosophical point completely backwards. Instead, screenwriter Tony Kushner portrays Lincoln's pursuit of the Thirteenth Amendment as flowing, not from Christian charity, but from mathematical reasoning analogous to the abstractions Lincoln read about in Euclid's *Elements*.

"Euclid's first common notion is this," says Lincoln in the film: "things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other. That's a rule of mathematical reasoning. It's true because it works. Has done and always

"In his book, Euclid says this is 'self-evident.' You see, there it is even in that 2,000-year-old book of mechanical law. It is a self-evare equal to the same thing are equal to each other."

The scene is a fiction. The truth is more interesting. Lincoln himself actually said this: "One would start with confidence that he could convince any sane child that the simpler propositions of Euclid are true; but, nevertheless, he would fail, utterly, with one who should deny the definitions and axioms.

"The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society. And yet they are denied, and evaded, with no small show of success. One dashingly

is it to teach and apply the truth of the Declaration of Independence about human equality ('that all men are created equal"). Havers's book thus high-

calls them 'glittering gener-

alities'; another bluntly calls

them 'self-evident lies'; and

still others insidiously argue

that they apply only 'to supe-

teach someone mathematics

(and to apply its self-evident

truths in a process of rea-

soning), even more difficult

Difficult though it is to

rior races.""

lights what Tony Kushner's film script has deliberately omitted: "Lincoln's explanation for the persistent denial of equality rests on the biblical concept of sin. Sin is the deliberate violation of the moral law of charity.

"It is deliberate because the agent of sin knows the good and yet still chooses evil. Indeed, he convinces himself that the good is the evil, while he knows that this act is still a willful denial of the good."

This is what the philosopher Kierkegaard meant, notes Havers, when he observed our elaborate psychology when sinning: we always still "will the good" in our own minds, even when mind-independently, in action, we will the bad. We know we will the bad, yet at the same time we reinterpret that action in our minds as good.

"The entire people of America, North and South, knew better than what they merely professed about the injustice of slavery. Because they were both Christian peoples – they worshipped

and prayed to the same God The school community of Our Lady of Mercy bid you and your family a very blessed Christmas and our best wishes for a Happy New Year.

- they differed over slavery only because one side denied the truth that it already knew," writes Havers.

The greatest failure of the movie is that its drama fails adequately to communicate this internal struggle of the sinning human person. In-

film merely offers the spectator a chance to cheer for the winning side.

stead, it focuses on the externals.

The passing of the Thirteenth Amendment is reduced to a spectacle of contesting wills and power politics. The film merely offers the spectator a chance to cheer for the winning side.

The greatest success of the movie lies in the performance of Daniel Day Lewis, who transcends the philosophically deficient script and gives viewers a real sense of what it must have been like to be in the presence of Lincoln. It is a truly astonishing dramatization of how a human being, by cultivating the virtues of prudence and charity, achieves human greatness.

However, as Aristotle teaches in the Nicomachean Ethics (in a famous disagreement with Plato), prudent action cannot flow from mathematical calculation, which is why the movie miscalculates Lincoln's greatness so badly with its emblematic Euclid scene.

C.S. Morrissey is an associate professor of philosophy at Redeemer Pacific

For more on the film's cinematography and musical score see bccatholic.ca.  $\square$ 

