Abstract

Drawing on an example from the popular young adult novel The Outsiders, this article provides a working definition of “courageous compassion” and argues that this character quality must shape our responses to the current immigration crisis. In order to respond compassionately to immigrants, we must first overcome the fears that surround this issue. Additionally, to cultivate compassion for immigrants, we must imaginatively enter their lives through the power of story and recognize them as fundamentally like us, created in the image of God and thus inherently valuable.

Ponyboy Curtis, a young “Greaser” growing up on the wrong side of the tracks in Tulsa, Oklahoma, fills his days with petty crime and gang fights. A seemingly harmless conflict between the Greasers and the Socs (the Socials, kids from the elite part of town) escalates until Johnny Cade, Ponyboy’s constant companion, kills a Soc with a switchblade to save his friend’s life. The two boys flee to the countryside and hide out in a deserted church. Returning to the church one afternoon after making a run
for supplies, Johnny and Ponyboy find the old building in flames and soon discover that there are several young children trapped inside. Without a moment’s hesitation, the two Greasers dash into the burning building, risking their lives to save the children. Seconds after handing the last child to safety, Ponyboy leaps out the window but Johnny is hit by a falling timber from the collapsing church, breaking his back and leaving him badly burned. Johnny is rushed to the hospital, where he tragically dies a few days later.

Many readers will recognize this episode from S. E. Hinton’s novel *The Outsiders*, one I have taught frequently over the past 30 years to both high school and college students. In classroom discussion, students often ponder whether they would have the strength of character to do what Ponyboy and Johnny did. Although Ponyboy insists he and Johnny just did what any decent person would have done, my students are unanimous in celebrating their “courageous compassion.” “Could I have done the same thing?,” students almost always wonder—but in my experience no one questions whether they *should* have done it. Every student with whom I have discussed *The Outsiders* would agree that the world would be a better place if more of us were like Ponyboy and Johnny, willing to risk our own well-being for the good of others, especially the weak and defenseless.

Our responses to Ponyboy and Johnny’s act of self-sacrifice can help us define and investigate the concept of courageous compassion. Understanding and embracing courageous compassion, then, can enable us to reframe our responses to the immigration crisis and our attitudes toward refugees—issues which are currently such a prominent part of American public
policy debate and presidential campaign rhetoric. I argue that any policies regarding immigration reform must be shaped by compassion, compassion which may require genuine courage in order to resist the current climate of fear surrounding the issue of immigration. In the final section of my essay, I examine the fears which create a need for courage in responding to immigration compassionately, along with other obstacles to practicing compassion towards immigrants. I conclude by suggesting some ways we can cultivate compassion in thinking about immigration.

**What Is Courageous Compassion?**

Johnny and Ponyboy’s actions in *The Outsiders* offer us a perfect illustration of “courageous compassion.” What could be more compassionate than seeing others in desperate need and responding without hesitation? What could be more courageous than risking one’s own life to rush into a burning building to save the lives of others? Let’s consider “courage” first. Whatever else courage may imply, it certainly involves the knowledge that one’s actions involve significant risk to one’s own welfare. In fact, as Aristotle defines courage in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, the possibility of death is central to the highest form of courage: “we show courage in situations where . . . death is noble” (book 3, ch. 8).

Aristotle also asserts that courage must always involve noble ends: “Therefore it is for a noble end that the brave man endures and acts as courage directs” (book 3, ch. 8). There can be no true courage in the pursuit of ignoble ends; thus, the fearless displays of the Greasers in their “rumbles” with the Socs cannot rightly be called courageous. But clearly Ponyboy and Johnny’s actions in rescuing children from a flaming church pass both of Aristotle’s tests of true courage.

“Compassion” is, perhaps, trickier to define, but here too we can appeal to Aristotle for help. According to Aristotle’s definition, an
act of compassion requires us to believe three things about a suffering person. First, we must believe that their suffering is serious and not trivial. We don’t feel compassion for someone who has broken a fingernail. Second, we have to believe that the sufferer is not responsible for her own suffering. Life in prison is certainly not trivial, but we don’t feel compassion for the convicted murderer who faces a life behind bars. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we must believe that it is possible for us to suffer in ways similar to the one for whom we would feel compassion. In other words, we must have the sense that “there but for the grace of God go I.” According to Aristotle, when each of these conditions is met, we are able to experience compassion for another.¹

It’s easy to see that Johnny and Ponyboy’s response to the children in the fire meets each of these conditions. They can have no doubt that the suffering facing the children they rescue is serious: what could be more serious than the fate of being burned alive? And they know the children are not responsible for the danger they face – they are innocent victims of a fire they did not cause. Finally, especially given the disadvantaged status of the two Greasers, they must possess “an awareness of [their] own weakness and vulnerability [which] is a necessary condition for pity” (Nussbaum, “Compassion: The Basic Social Emotion” 34). As a working class orphan, Ponyboy certainly has the necessary understanding for practicing pity as Rousseau outlines it in Emile: “Make him understand well that the fate of these unhappy people can be his, that all their ills are there in the ground beneath his feet, that countless unforesseen and inevitable events can plunge him into them from one moment to the next” (qtd. in Nussbaum 34).²

Throughout the remainder of the novel, characters’ responses to the courageous compassion demonstrated by Ponyboy and Johnny become an index of their character and virtue.³ Clearly, in terms of the moral code Hinton asserts in the novel and of my
students’ reaction to it, there is nothing controversial about the morality of risking one’s life to save children one doesn’t even know. As I noted earlier, we can argue about whether we would have done what Ponyboy and Johnny did, but we don’t argue whether we should do so. Thus, the courageous compassion demonstrated by these two fictional characters offers an appropriate model of courageous compassion for us, one we can draw on in responding to the current immigration crisis.

**Facing Our Fears Regarding Immigration**

To advocate courageous compassion in response to the immigration crisis is, first of all, to recognize that many Americans see reasons—some more legitimate than others—to be fearful about the potential impacts of immigration. Novelist Marilyn Robinson, in her essay titled simply “Fear,” notes that “contemporary America is full of fear,” and that public policy debates about issues such as immigration are increasingly shaped by “the marked and oddly general fearfulness of our culture at present.” Thinking compassionately about immigration will require a willingness to act in the face of such fears.

Indeed, many would agree that true courage only exists where there is cause for fear. Here again we can appeal to Aristotle, who states that “he who is undisturbed in face of these [feelings of fear] and bears himself as he should towards these is more truly brave than the man who does so towards the things that inspire confidence. It is for facing what is painful, then, as has been said, that men are called brave” (book 3). Thus, in calling for courageous compassion, I am not arguing that all fears concerning immigration are irrational or unworthy of consideration, but rather that we should reason compassionately about immigration despite such fears.

What is it that Americans fear if we respond compassionately to immigration? These fears can be broadly divided into three
categories: 1) Immigration as a threat to American identity; 2) Immigration as a threat to our economic well-being; and 3) Immigration as a threat to American security. It can be shown that each of these fears is frequently overstated, and readers should examine for themselves the facts relating to each. But even if these fears remain, we are called to respond compassionately and courageously in spite of them.

Perhaps the most basic fear concerning immigration is that our country will not continue to look like what we are used to. Immigration, in this view, threatens American identity, our most fundamental image of who we are as a nation. For many Americans, the defining features of our country include the notion that it is a majority white and majority Christian nation. Our most prominent origin stories, those of the settlement of this continent by the Pilgrims (1620) and the Puritans (1633), closely align American identity with both European ancestry and Christian faith. Almost four centuries later, however, it is clear that a decreasing percentage of immigrants are likely to be white, and to the extent that increasing numbers of immigrants are Asian or Middle Eastern, they are less likely to be Christian. Predictions that white Americans will be a minority within a few decades—the so-called “browning of America”—undoubtedly frightens some Americans. For others, the greater fear is that immigration threatens their understanding of the United States as a predominantly Christian country.

My purpose here is not to debunk these fears but simply to acknowledge that such fears exist and thus that compassion in response to immigration will require courage. It is worth noting, however, that similar fears were expressed about—among others—Irish Catholic immigrants in the nineteenth century, immigrants from Europe after World War I, Jewish immigrants before and after World War II, Japanese immigrants (and Japanese-American citizens) during the Second World War, and Vietnamese, Cubans, and Haitians in the past four decades. Those
who fear for the Christian identity of the nation might note that a nation can be identified as “Christian” not only by the percentage of its population that share that faith but by the degree to which the nation displays Christian character. As the apostle Paul instructed the early church, “Therefore, as God’s chosen people, holy and dearly loved, clothe yourselves with compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness and patience” (Col. 3.12). In this sense, showing compassion, kindness, and humility towards immigrants will in itself make our nation more Christian.

Until very recently, the most prominent fears being expressed concerning immigration, especially in regard to Mexican and Central American immigration, were framed in economic terms: the fear that these immigrants will steal jobs which would otherwise be filled by current American citizens and that an influx of immigrant labor will drive down wages for native-born American workers. All measures of the impact of immigrants on the U.S. economy show that they contribute significantly to the size of the American economy, substantially increasing our economic output.

The question remains, however, whether immigrants draw more resources from the American economy—for health, education, etc.—than they contribute toward it. The fiscal impact of immigration can, I assume, be answered by economists. But whether our responsibility to other human beings calls us to sacrifice some portion of our economic wellbeing to allow them some measure of human flourishing is a moral and ethical question. The moral imperative to practice courageous compassion is likely to call us—like Johnny and Ponyboy—to act in ways counter to our own self-interest in order to protect those in truly desperate situations.
In 1883, in the midst of one of the largest waves of immigration in our nation’s history—immigration which aroused all of the same fears being expressed today about identity and economics and about whether we risked admitting enemies of the state to the U.S.—the poet Emma Lazarus penned words which now adorn the base of the Statue of Liberty and which have become part of our national creed, along with the “self-evident” truth that “all men are created equal”: “Give me your tired, your poor,/Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.” Significantly, Lady Liberty invites not only those with the education or high tech skills to boost our economy but also “the homeless, tempest-tost,” “the wretched refuse of your teeming shore.”

When I began thinking about this essay early in the fall of 2015, it seemed obvious to me that the primary “immigration crisis” to be addressed concerned ongoing undocumented immigration from Mexico and the flood of child refugees from Central American countries—some 50,000—which hit the United States in 2014. Since then, the conversation has largely shifted to the Middle East, however, and specifically to the tidal wave of refugees from Syria. According to the relief organization World Vision, “4.3 million Syrians are refugees, and 6.6 million are displaced within Syria”; half of those displaced are children (Jonson et al.).

This humanitarian crisis, coupled with the rise of Islamic State-sponsored warfare and terrorism, has given birth to what is now clearly the greatest fear governing American responses to terrorism: the fear that opening our doors to immigrants—especially Middle Eastern refugees—amounts to an open invitation to ISIS to export terrorism to our shores. These fears increased enormously following the ISIS-sponsored attacks on Paris on November 13, 2015, which left 130 dead and at least 350 injured, followed soon after by the shootings of 14 innocent victims in San Bernardino, California, on December 2, 2015.
Americans have two basic responsibilities in light of the culture of fear which currently surrounds the issue of immigration. First, we should recognize how much of the fear that we attach to immigration is not, in fact, entirely justified. An objective assessment of the fears I’ve noted above will reveal that the financial impact of immigration includes many economic benefits (Nadadur), that immigrants are statistically less likely than native-born Americans to commit crimes (Ewing et al.), and that legitimate fears of terrorists entering the country as refugees are largely overstated—in fact, no refugee granted asylum and admitted to the United States has ever committed a terrorist act (Bier). For those of us who respond to the immigration crisis from a foundation of Christian belief, Marilyn Robinson offers another important reminder:

[F]ear is not a Christian habit of mind. As children we learn to say, “Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me.” We learn that, after his resurrection, Jesus told his disciples, “Lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age.” Christ is a gracious, abiding presence in all reality, and in him history will finally be resolved.

Second, having thoughtfully analyzed our fears, we must proceed courageously in the direction of what philosopher Nicholas Wolterstorff calls shalom, the practice of bringing social justice and human flourishing to a broken world.8 Courageous compassion calls us to extend care to vulnerable fellow human beings, even when certain fears remain.

Imagination and Compassion

As I noted earlier, Aristotle identifies three requirements for extending compassion to another individual: that we see their suffering as serious rather than trivial, that we believe that their own actions are not the cause of their suffering, and that we
connect our own possibilities to the suffering we see them experiencing (that is, that we can imagine that we could potentially share the same fate). The first two of these requirements are easily established with regard to refugees. Certainly the suffering of Syrian refugees faced with drought and starvation on one hand and ISIS-sponsored violence on the other is serious! That these refugees did not cause their own suffering seems equally certain.

In addition to the fears I discussed above, however, the great difficulty for many Americans in responding compassionately to the plight of immigrants seems to lie in this third requirement for compassion: we are simply unable to imagine that we could experience a similar fate. We often fail to practice compassion when our imaginations fail to connect people in some distant corner of the world to our own current possibilities and vulnerabilities. As the philosopher Rousseau observed, “kings don’t feel compassion for their subjects because they count on never being human, subject to the vicissitudes of life” (qtd. in Nussbaum, “Compassionate Citizenship”). So, too, Americans can fail to feel compassion for others in desperate situations because, given the prosperity and relative security of our nation, we find it impossible to imagine being in the predicament faced by those such as the Syrian refugees.

The November 13 terrorist attacks on Paris illustrate how varied our ability to empathetically imagine the predicament of a suffering person can be. Understandably, these attacks prompted from Americans an outpouring of sympathy for the victims, for their families and loved ones, and for Paris as a whole. Millions of Facebook users took advantage of the ability to add a French tri-color overlay to their profile picture with a single click, in order to express their solidarity with and compassion for Parisians. Few of us seemed to notice, however, that a double suicide bombing of a bustling urban area in Beirut had left 43 Lebanese dead on the previous day.
Perhaps, as some have argued, the difference in response—the utter lack of recognition and compassion extended to the victims in Beirut—is evidence of racism or at least Eurocentrism. As the *New York Times* noted, “The implication, numerous Lebanese commentators complained, was that Arab lives mattered less. Either that, or that their country—relatively calm despite the war next door—was perceived as a place where carnage is the norm, an undifferentiated corner of a basket-case region” (Barnard). But it seems equally likely that most Americans felt much more compassion for Parisians because we found it much easier to imagine ourselves as the victims of those attacks. Perhaps we have been to Paris or dream of going there some day. At the least, we, like Parisians, live generally secure lives far from the open warfare that we may think of as defining life in the Middle East.

Sharing the fate of Parisians who lost their lives simply by heading out for a night at a cafe, a concert, or a soccer game feels much more likely than sharing the fate of the Lebanese victims in Beirut. If it *seems* that “Arab lives matter less,” it is probably because we fail to imagine any link between their suffering and “our current possibilities and vulnerabilities.” So, too, the plight of Syrian refugees or Guatemalan children can seem so far out of the realm of possibility for our own future that they remain outside of what Nussbaum calls our “circle of concern” and so we are unable to respond compassionately to them (“Compassion and Terror” 236).

**Extending the Circle of Concern**

In order to extend compassion to others such as Syrian refugees, we will need to find a way to imaginatively link their plight with our own possibilities. In addition, we will need to find a way to make them real as persons, to see them not just as abstractions but as flesh and blood human beings to whom we can feel some sense of connection. As University of Iowa theologian/philosopher Diane Fritz Cates states,
compassion is not something that we can do-feel for people “in general.” It is something that we must do-feel for them “in particular.” That is, it requires encountering persons in pain in their particularity, feeling attracted to them, wanting to be with them, and wanting to benefit them as the unique persons that they are. (233)

So, how do we encounter in their particularity those suffering on the other side of the world? Occasionally we may find individuals in our midst who are enough like those we seek to extend compassion to that meeting them enables us to think of others like them as flesh and blood individuals rather than vague abstractions. For example, coming to know some of the many Saudi Arabian students on the University of Dubuque campus on a genuine personal level might well transform our thinking about Arabs generally and Muslims specifically as we think about those in Syria. Such opportunities are probably too rare, however, to be relied upon to transform us into people of courageous compassion. But we do have two readily available resources which can enable us to understand distant others as those for whom we can and must genuinely care.

Meeting the Other through the Power of Story

If it isn’t likely that we will meet face to face the immigrants and refugees who so desperately need our compassion, we can nevertheless encounter them and come to know them in their full humanness. Through the power of story—whether fiction or non-fiction, print or film—we can in fact come to know those who are otherwise remote from us in ways that can engage our compassion. In fact, without an intense experience of the Other’s story, we are unlikely to be moved to respond to their needs. As Nussbaum points out, “The moral imagination, it seems, is highly particularistic, moved to emotion and thence to helping action by the vivid imagining of another specific person’s plight” (“Teaching” 220). She cites the work of psychologist C. Daniel
Batson who has demonstrated that deep engagement with another person’s “story of woe” dramatically increases the likelihood that one will respond with compassion.

Hearing, reading, or viewing a vividly told story is tremendously powerful in triggering a compassionate response; “without such a narrative, subjects fail to experience emotion, and helping behavior is not triggered” (Nussbaum, “Teaching” 220). Novels are particularly powerful in this regard, engaging our imaginations at the deepest levels and allowing us into the world and experience of those otherwise far removed from us, but the same thing can be accomplished by seeking out films or biographies of immigrants and refugees.

**Recognizing the Other as an Image Bearer of God**

Though Christians have too often failed to extend courageous compassion to others, the Christian faith offers important insights for thinking compassionately about those whom we might otherwise think of as outside of our circle of concern. First, as Marilyn Robinson reminded us earlier in this essay, Christians, of all people, should be least fearful of the Other and of changes to their world. Second, Christians have a clear and constant calling to care for the most vulnerable—most often described in Scripture as the “widows and orphans,” but frequently including “foreigners,” as well. For example, in the chapters of the book of Exodus immediately following the Ten Commandments, the laws God lays down to govern the communal life of Israel include this instruction: “Do not mistreat or oppress a foreigner, for you were foreigners in Egypt. Do not take advantage of the widow or the fatherless” (Exod. 22.21-22).

The apostle James sums up this aspect of Christian responsibility: “Religion that God our Father accepts as pure and faultless is this: to look after orphans and widows in their distress and to keep oneself from being polluted by the world” (Jas. 1.27). Too often
Christians pay attention to only the second of these responsibilities, retreating from the world rather than seeking to mend it.

The Christian scriptures also make clear that we are connected to every other person, affirming that every human being is created in the image of God and, therefore, inherently valuable. And, as South African human rights activist Nontombi Naomi Tutu declared in her recent lecture at the University of Dubuque, “Part of recognizing God in the other is to recognize that God didn’t make a mistake in the other.” Not only did God create humans in his image, but he also sacrificed himself to redeem all of humanity. The central claim of the Christian Gospel, that Christ died for all despite the fallenness and deep unworthiness of every human being—“While we were still sinners, Christ died for us” (Rom. 5.8)—calls us to see people everywhere as essentially like us.

Diana Fritz Cates states this truth beautifully:

> Encountering with Christ the reality of our own brokenness, we are able to encounter the brokenness of other human beings, and we are able to perceive their brokenness, not as something that makes them different from us, but rather as something that makes them like us. (210)

Cates concludes that we are able to befriend the Other because we have been befriended by God: “If we are compassionate Christians, we regard any human as being, in principle, befriendable by us because every human being is befriended by God (and God is a friend of ours)” (234).
Conclusion

Embracing an attitude of courageous compassion in response to immigration does not answer every question raised by this crisis. Questions will still remain about such matters as how best to extend care to others while still protecting the vulnerable already within our borders and whether we should direct our efforts toward welcoming refugees into our country or finding ways to meet their needs closer to their homes. Cultivating this virtue will, however, guide how we frame these questions. Courageous compassion will not allow us merely to ask how we can protect ourselves and those closest to us from whatever threats—real or imagined—immigrants and asylum seekers may pose. Rather, we must also ask what policies would best promote the full human flourishing of God’s image bearers, people wholly worthy of our concern.

When the United States finally put an end to slavery 150 years ago, one of the most compelling anti-slavery symbols showed a man kneeling in chains and pleading, “Am I not a man and a brother?” Courageous compassion calls us to hear refugees crying out, “Am I not a man and a brother?” and “Am I not a woman and a sister?” and to answer with a resounding “yes.”
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Notes

1 For an excellent discussion of Aristotle’s view of compassion, see Martha Nussbaum’s essay “Compassion: The Basic Social Emotion” which has shaped my discussion in this paragraph.

2 In fact, a secondary motivation for the boys in rescuing these children is their suspicion that they might be responsible for the fire that threatens innocent lives: “I bet we started it,” Ponyboy says. “We must have dropped a lighted cigarette or something” (81). While it could be argued that Ponyboy’s sense of his own culpability and the attendant guilt he feels minimizes the degree to which his actions are genuinely motivated by compassion, it is equally likely that Ponyboy’s fears that he caused the fire increases his sense that the fate the children are threatened with could have been his own.

3 Dallas Winston, the one Greaser who is a genuine thug—Ponyboy describes him as having blue eyes “cold with all the hatred in the world” — pleads with Johnny and Ponyboy to save themselves rather than the children: “For Pete’s sake, get out of there! That roof’s gonna cave in any minute. Forget those blasted kids!” (82). Although Hinton presents Dallas sympathetically as someone who has been understandably embittered by a brutal past—“The fight for self-preservation had hardened him beyond caring” (54)—readers are clearly not being invited to embrace his values, and no student in my experience has agreed with him that the boys should save themselves rather than the helpless children. Conversely, the Soc Randy, who has been part of the violence aimed at the Greasers, asserts his sense of Ponyboy and Johnny’s moral superiority based on their act of courageous compassion: “I wouldn’t have [done it]. I would have let those kids burn to death” (101). Ponyboy, however, offers absolution and affirms Randy’s humanity: “You would have saved those kids if you had been there. . . . You’d have saved them the same as we did” (103).

4 According to data from the Immigration Policy Institute, of the 42.4 million foreign-born in the United States in 2010, 48 percent reported their race as white alone, 9 percent as black alone, 26 percent as Asian alone, and 15 percent as some other race; more than 2 percent reported having two or more races. About 46 percent of the 42.4 million foreign-born population (about 19.4 million) reported having Hispanic or Latino origins (Zong and Batalova).

5 See Roger Ebertz’s article in this journal on anti-Japanese fears during World War II and one particularly courageous response to such fears (“Courageous Compassion in a Time of Terror”). Strikingly, presidential candidate Donald Trump, among others, has cited Japanese internment during World War II as a legitimate precedent for restricting immigration of Muslims into the United
States (see his comments on MSNBC on December 8, 2015) (“Morning Joe Mix”).


7 In his 1835 book Democracy in America, Alexis de Tocqueville offered a trenchant criticism of Americans’ compassion which still seems pertinent, noting how easily Americans espouse compassion while frequently being unwilling to suffer for the sake of another: “In democratic ages men rarely sacrifice themselves for one another, but they display general compassion for the members of the human race. They inflict no useless ills, and they are happy to relieve the griefs of others when they can do so without much hurting themselves” (book III, ch. 1, emphasis added).

8 For an accessible introduction to the concept of “shalom” and how it can be cultivated, see Wolterstorff’s Educating for Shalom: Essays on Christian Higher Education.

9 Bonnie Sue Lewis’s account in this journal of Dubuque’s Children of Abraham conversations provides a wonderful model for coming to know the Other among us in a way that can transform our thinking about—and caring for—the more distant Other (“Courageous Compassion and Interfaith Friendship”).
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