Plato, *Republic:*

“But to come now to the decision between our two kinds of life, if we separate the most completely just and the most completely unjust man, we shall be able to decide rightly, but if not, not. How, then, is this separation to be made? Thus: we must subtract nothing of his injustice from the unjust man or of his justice from the just, but assume the perfection of each in his own mode of conduct. In the first place, the unjust man must act as clever craftsmen do: a first-rate pilot or physician, for example, feels the difference between impossibilities and possibilities in his art and attempts the one and lets the others go; and then, too, if he does happen to trip, he is equal to correcting his error. Similarly, the unjust man who attempts injustice rightly must be supposed to escape detection if he is to be altogether unjust, and we must regard the man who is caught as a bungler. For the height of injustice is to seem just without being so. To the perfectly unjust man, then, we must assign perfect injustice and withhold nothing of it, but we must allow him, while committing the greatest wrongs, to have secured for himself the greatest reputation for justice; and if he does happen to trip, we must concede to him the power to correct his mistakes by his ability to speak persuasively if any of his misdeeds come to light, and when force is needed, to employ force by reason of his manly spirit and vigor and his provision of friends and money; and when we have set up an unjust man of this character, our theory must set the just man at his side—a simple and noble man, who, in the phrase of Aeschylus, does not wish to seem but be good. Then we must deprive him of the seeming. For if he is going to be thought just he will have honors and gifts because of that esteem. We cannot be sure in that case whether he is just for justice' sake or for the sake of the gifts and the honors. So we must strip him bare of everything but justice and make his state the opposite of his imagined counterpart. Though doing no wrong he must have the repute of the greatest injustice, so that he may be put to the test as regards justice through not softening because of ill repute and the consequences thereof. But let him hold on his course unchangeable even unto death, seeming all his life to be unjust though being just, that so, both men attaining to the limit, the one of injustice, the other of justice, we may pass judgment which of the two is the happier.”

Plato. *Plato in Twelve Volumes, Vols. 5 & 6* translated by Paul Shorey. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd. 1969.

Kant: *Grounding of the Metaphysics of Morals:*

“There is nothing it is possible to think of anywhere in the world, or indeed anything at all outside it, that can be held to be good without limitation, excepting only a good will. Understanding, wit, the power of judgment, and like talents of the mind, whatever they might be called, or courage, resoluteness, persistence in an intention, as qualities of temperament, are without doubt in some respects good and to be wished for; but they can also become extremely evil and harmful, if the will that is to make use of these gifts of nature, and whose peculiar constitution is therefore called character, is not good. It is the same with gifts of fortune.”

“The categorical imperative is thus only a single one, and specifically this: Act only in accordance with that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it become a universal law. Now if from this one imperative all imperatives of duty can be derived as from their principle, then although we leave unsettled whether in general Because the universality of the law in accordance with which effects happen constitutes that which is really called nature in the most general sense (in accordance with its form), i.e., the existence of things insofar as it is determined in accordance with universal laws, thus the universal imperative of duty can also be stated as follows: So act as if the maxim of your action were to become through your will a universal law of nature.”

Immanuel Kant. *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals.* Trans. Allen W. Wood. New York: Yale University Press, 2002, pgs. 10 and 37.

Aristotle: *Nicomachian Ethics:*

“While the same things are not frightening to all people, we speak of some things as beyond human being. These then are frightening to everyone, or at least to anyone with sense, but frightening things that are on a human scale differ in magnitude and as greater or lesser, and similarly with things that inspire confidence. But the courageous person is as undaunted as a human being can be, and while such a person will be frightened even of such things as vary in magnitude, he will endure them in the way one ought and keeping them in proportion, for the sake of the beautiful, since this is the end that belongs to virtue.” Nicomachean Ethics, 1115b 6-15.

“…Excellence of character comes into being as a consequence of habit, on account of which it even gets its name by a small inflection from habit. It is also clear from this that none of the virtues comes to be present in us by nature, since none of the things that are by nature can be habituated to be otherwise; for example, a stone, which by nature falls downward, could not be habituated to fall upward . . . Therefore the virtues come to be present in us neither by nature nor contrary to nature, but in us who are of such a nature to take them on, and to be brought to completion in them by means of habit.” Nicomachean Ethics 1103a 11-30.

Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics.* Trans. Joe Sachs. Newberryport: R. Pullins Company, 2002.