

3-2004

# Of Urban Blockheads and Trousered Apes: C.S. Lewis and the Challenge of Education

Paul E. Michelson  
*Huntington College*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pillars.taylor.edu/inklings\\_forever](https://pillars.taylor.edu/inklings_forever)

 Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#), [History Commons](#), [Philosophy Commons](#), and the [Religion Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Michelson, Paul E. (2004) "Of Urban Blockheads and Trousered Apes: C.S. Lewis and the Challenge of Education," *Inklings Forever*: Vol. 4, Article 19.  
Available at: [https://pillars.taylor.edu/inklings\\_forever/vol4/iss1/19](https://pillars.taylor.edu/inklings_forever/vol4/iss1/19)

This Essay is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for the Study of C.S. Lewis & Friends at Pillars at Taylor University. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Inklings Forever* by an authorized editor of Pillars at Taylor University. For more information, please contact [pillars@taylor.edu](mailto:pillars@taylor.edu).

**INKLINGS FOREVER, Volume IV**

A Collection of Essays Presented at  
The Fourth

FRANCES WHITE EWBank COLLOQUIUM

ON

**C.S. LEWIS & FRIENDS**

Taylor University 2004  
Upland, Indiana

---

**Of Urban Blockheads and Trousered Apes:  
C.S. Lewis and the Challenge of Education**

Paul E. Michelson

## Of Urban Blockheads and Trousered Apes: C.S. Lewis and the Challenge of Education

Paul E. Michelson

### I. The Problem Described

“There was a boy called Eustace Clarence Scrubb, and he almost deserved it. His parents called him Eustace Clarence and his school masters called him Scrubb. I can’t tell you how his friends spoke to him, for he had none . . . Eustace Clarence liked animals, especially beetles, if they were dead and pinned on a card. He liked books if they were books of information and had pictures of grain elevators or of fat foreign children doing exercises in model schools.”<sup>1</sup>

Eustace Clarence Scrubb was, to be blunt, a prime example of the informed ignoramus that C.S. Lewis labeled the urban blockhead. In many ways, poor Eustace Clarence had very little going for him. His parents were also urban blockheads: “He didn’t call his father and mother, ‘Father’ and ‘Mother,’ but Harold and Alberta. They were very up-to-date and advanced people. They were vegetarians, non-smokers and teetotallers and wore a special kind of underclothes.”<sup>2</sup>

I’m afraid that Eustace Clarence’s education wasn’t much help either. He attended a school of the modern sort called Experiment House. “Owing to the curious methods of teaching at Experiment House, one did not learn much French or Math or Latin or things of that sort . . .”<sup>3</sup> Sad to say, Experiment House was the epitome of mid-twentieth century political correctness, the educational philosophy that places a premium on reflex instead of reflection. The bottom line, Lewis tells us, is that “Eustace had read only the wrong books. They had a lot to say about exports and imports and governments and drains, but they were weak on dragons.”<sup>4</sup> (This turned out to be a serious handicap when Eustace Clarence Scrubb wound up in Narnia.)

In his book, *The Abolition of Man*,<sup>5</sup> subtitled “Reflections on Education.” Lewis captures the

“irredeemable urban blockhead” thusly: he is someone “to whom a horse is merely an old-fashioned means of transport.”<sup>6</sup> Your urban blockhead is a person who has training but not education or learning, whose information is technical without being real knowledge—a person with an engineering mentality. The urban blockhead is a person who reads books, but not for enjoyment. He is usually spiritually impoverished, often stunted in imagination. He is one who has been taught to mindlessly debunk anything that smacks of sentiment or philosophy or moral reasoning. In short, he has learned to be rationalistic without being truly rational.<sup>7</sup>

The modern student is often drawn into becoming an urban blockhead, Lewis says, “on the very dangerous ground that . . . he will prove himself a knowing fellow who can’t be bubbled out of his cash.” Unfortunately, the result of this mis-education is that his teachers will “have cut out of his soul, long before he is old enough to choose, the possibility of having certain experiences which thinkers of more authority than they have held to be generous, fruitful, and humane.”<sup>8</sup>

Instead of developing a sensibility for inspiring symphonies or majestic natural beauty or lyric poetry, the urban blockhead has only a sense of his own “knowingness.” He learns to laugh at “ordinary human feelings about the past or animals or large waterfalls” which feelings he thinks “are contrary to reason and contemptible . . .” Ironically, the truth is that instead of achieving any real insight into life and reality, says Lewis, “Another little portion of the human heritage has been quietly taken from” him without his knowing it.<sup>9</sup>

Is the urban blockhead a problem today? Look around you. Ask a music teacher or a literature teacher. Surely an educational system that neglects the arts, trivializes and politicizes the humane studies, and ignores the richness of our past will produce urban blockheads, people with information, but not

understanding, with data, but not knowledge.

The poster boy for urban blockheadery is might be software billionaire Bill Gates, who proclaims confidently “All the neurons in the brain that make up perceptions and emotions operate in a binary fashion. We can someday replicate that on a machine.”<sup>10</sup> As for religion, Mr. Gates is equally forthright: “Just in terms of allocation of time resources, religion is not very efficient. There’s a lot more I could be doing on a Sunday morning.”<sup>11</sup> I’m afraid Mr. Gates may have read all the wrong books.<sup>12</sup>

Unfortunately cerebral dunces are not the only problem generated by the processes and assumptions of modern culture. The urban blockhead has a counterpart which, incredibly, is also ascendant in our times: the instinct-driven entity Lewis calls the trousered ape.

In the final Narnian Chronicle, *The Last Battle*, one of the more unpleasant characters is the villainous Shift the Ape:

“The Ape . . . looked ten times uglier than when he lived by Caldron Pool, for he was now dressed up. He was wearing a scarlet jacket which did not fit him very well . . . He had jewelled slippers on his hind paws which would not stay on properly because, as you know, the hind paws of an Ape are really like hands . . . And he also kept on pulling up the scarlet jacket to scratch himself.”<sup>13</sup>

Then the Ape spoke, “I hear some of you saying I’m an ape. Well, I’m not. I’m a man. If I look like an Ape, that’s because I’m so very old: hundreds and hundreds of years old. And it’s because I’m so old that I’m so wise. And it’s because I’m so wise that I’m the only one Aslan is ever going to speak to. He can’t be bothered talking to a lot of stupid animals. He’ll tell me what you’ve got to do, and I’ll tell the rest of you. And take my advice, and see you do it in double quick time, for He doesn’t mean to stand any nonsense.”<sup>14</sup>

Shift, the trousered ape, is a ludicrous figure, a sad parody of humanity, but the whole thrust of our post-Rousseauian, post-Darwinian, post-modernist society has been increasingly in his direction. As Lewis notes elsewhere, once Darwin started “monkeying with the ancestry of Man, and Freud with his soul, and the economists with all that is his,” man became “the business of science.”<sup>15</sup> The distinctives of humanity—rationality, purpose, volition and freedom, imagination, commitment, the image of God—were stripped away, leaving only instinct-driven, feeling-extolling trousered apes.

Where the urban blockhead is emotionally retarded, the trousered ape is intellectually stunted. Where the urban blockhead’s imagination and aesthetic senses are woefully underdeveloped, the trousered ape is rationally dwarfed and logically-challenged. Where the urban blockhead wanders around in an affective desert, the trousered ape wallows in a swamp.

Is the trousered ape a problem today? Need one really ask? Beavis and Butthead were supposed to be parodies, but the pathetic fact is that our cultural realities these days parody any parody: Are we surprised if a society that neglects education in moral reasoning, minimizes the intellect, and decries rather than explores the richness of our civilization, produces a surplus of trousered apes, people governed by their stomachs rather than their heads, people who revel in appetites and experiences, but have no way of discerning what is true, noble, right, pure, admirable, excellent or praiseworthy? If so, then only explanation is that we ourselves might be urban blockheads.

## II. Dealing With the Problem: Men Without Chests

This, then, is the educational problem: we live, learn, and teach in a world populated by urban blockheads and trousered apes.<sup>16</sup> How does Lewis propose to deal with this? His solution is to point back to the ancients. The classical sources describe the human being as a three-fold entity, composed of the head, the chest, and the belly. The head is the seat of reason, and “should rule the mere appetites . . . The head rules the belly through the chest (which is) the seat . . . of emotions organized by trained habit into stable sentiments . . . these are the indispensable liaison officers between cerebral man and visceral man.”<sup>17</sup>

We are rational beings, we are physical beings. It is by the mediation of the chest, based on objective moral laws, “that man is man: for by his intellect he is mere spirit and by his appetite mere animal.”<sup>18</sup> Thus, we are also moral, volitional beings.

Indeed, it is only through the functioning of the chest that we can even act morally. Lewis writes: “no justification of virtue will enable a man to be virtuous. Without the aid of trained emotions [i.e. the chest] the intellect is powerless against the animal organism . . . In battle it is not syllogisms that will keep the reluctant nerves and muscles to their post in the third hour of the bombardment.”<sup>19</sup>

Now the point here is not that the intellect or the appetites are bad, but that they need to be disciplined and integrated by the chest. We are rational beings, we are emotional, imaginative beings, we are moral beings. But we are integrated beings only through the “unnatural” processes of education, training, and teaching. And it is the chest, the moral sentiments and

dispositions, that requires the most attention.

A major function of education then, in Lewis's view, becomes that of developing the chest. Here, too, the classics provide guidance. According to Aristotle, we develop the chest by making "the pupil like and dislike what he ought"; according to Plato, by training the student "to feel pleasure, liking, disgust, and hatred at those things which really are pleasant, likeable, disgusting, and hateful"; and according to Augustine, by leaning to give to every object "that kind and degree of love which is appropriate to it."<sup>20</sup> The goal should be to help us "recognize a quality [in things] which demands a certain response from us whether we make it or not . . . [to develop] approvals and disapprovals [that] are thus recognitions of objective value or responses to an objective order." In short, "the task is to train in the pupil those responses which are in themselves appropriate, whether anyone is making them or not, and in making which the very nature of man consists."<sup>21</sup>

Education should, of course, also deal with the mind and with the development of intellectual muscle<sup>22</sup> (such as knowledge of the academic disciplines and their principles, of logic and method). Some of Lewis's fondest memories related to his teacher, W. H. Kirkpatrick, from whom he learned that one's thoughts needed to be founded on fact and in logic. In his autobiographical *Surprised by Joy*, Lewis recounts his first meeting, at age 16, with "Kirk." Lewis had come from Northern Ireland to Surrey in Southern England.<sup>23</sup>

"A few minutes later we were walking away from the station.

'You are now,' said Kirk, 'proceeding along the principal artery between Great and Little Bookham.'

I stole a glance at him. Was this geographical exordium a heavy joke? Or was he trying to conceal his emotions? His face, however, sowed only an inflexible gravity. I began to 'make conversation' in the deplorable manner which I had acquired . . . at parties . . . I said I was surprised at the 'scenery' of Surrey; it was much 'wilder' than I had expected.

'Stop!' shouted Kirk with a suddenness that made me jump. 'What do you mean by wildness and what grounds had you for not expecting it?'

I replied I don't know what, still 'making conversation.' As answer after answer was torn to shreds it at last dawned upon me that he really wanted to know. He was not making conversation, nor joking, nor snubbing me; he wanted to know. I was stung into attempting a real answer. A few passes sufficed to show

that I had no clear and distinct idea corresponding to the word 'wildness,' and that, in so far as I had any idea at all, 'wildness' was a singularly inept word. 'Do you not see, then,' concluded the Great Knock, 'that your remark was meaningless?' I prepared to sulk a little, assuming that the subject would now be dropped. Never was I more mistaken in my life. Having analyzed my terms, Kirk was proceeding to deal with my proposition as a whole. On what had I based (but he pronounced it *baized*) my expectations about the Flora and Geology of Surrey? Was it maps, or photographs, or books? I could produce none. It had, heaven help me, never occurred to me that what I called my thoughts needed to be 'baized' on anything. Kirk once more drew a conclusion—without the slightest sign of emotion, but equally without the slightest concession to what I thought good manners: 'Do you not see, then, that you had no right to have any opinion whatever on the subject?'

I suppose today, heaven help us, that it occurs to far too few people that what they call their thoughts need to be "baized" on anything.

At the same time, it is Lewis's view that education should also deal with our imaginations and spirits. One reason is that "the resemblance between the Christian and the merely imaginative experience" is not accidental. This is because "all things, in their way, reflect heavenly truth, the imagination not least."<sup>24</sup>

The case for the importance of the development of our imaginative facilities is beautifully stated in Lewis's *An Experiment in Criticism*.<sup>25</sup>

"The nearest I have yet got to an answer is that we seek an enlargement of our being. We want to be more than ourselves. Each of us by nature sees the whole world from one point of view with a perspective and a selectiveness peculiar to himself . . . To acquiesce in this particularity . . . would be lunacy . . . We want to see with other eyes, to imagine with other imaginations, to feel with other hearts, as well as with our own . . . The man who is contented to be only himself, and therefore less a self, is in prison. My own eyes are not enough for me, I will see through those of others. Reality, even seen through the eyes of many, is not enough. I will see what others have invented. Even the eyes of all humanity are not enough. I regret that the brutes cannot write books . . . in reading great literature I

become a thousand men and yet remain myself. Like the night sky in the Greek poem, I see with a myriad eyes, but it is still I who see. Here, as in worship, in love, in moral action, and in knowing, I transcend myself; and am never more myself than when I do.”

Since the Enlightenment we have been increasingly successful at producing “Men without Chests.” Secularized, rationalistic approaches, in effect, Lewis argues, “remove the organ and demand the function. We make men without chests and expect of them virtue and enterprise. We laugh at honour and are shocked to find traitors in our midst. We castrate and bid the geldings be fruitful.”<sup>26</sup> And, at the same time, “we continue to clamour for those very qualities we are rendering impossible.”<sup>27</sup>

To the assertions of trousered apes and urban blockheads that “ethical standards of different cultures differ so widely that there is no common tradition at all” Lewis replies: “The answer is that this is a lie—a good, solid, resounding lie . . . . [There is a] massive unanimity of the practical reason in man . . . . the pretence that we are presented with a mere chaos . . . is simply false and should be contradicted in season and out of season wherever it is met.”<sup>28</sup>

As Lewis argues in *Mere Christianity*: “If no set of moral ideas were truer or better than any other, there would be no sense in preferring civilized morality to savage morality, or Christian morality to Nazi morality. In fact, of course, we all do believe that some moralities are better than others . . . . The moment you say that one set of moral ideas can be better than another, you are, in fact, measuring them both by a standard . . . admitting that there is such a thing as a real Right, independent of what people think, and that some people’s ideas get nearer to that real Right than others.”<sup>29</sup>

Further, Lewis points out that appeals to factual information or to “science” to provide a new morality ignore the “is/ought” problem, the reality that from “propositions about fact alone no practical conclusion can ever be drawn.”<sup>30</sup> Appeals to instincts, or pure reason<sup>31</sup> or natural selection beg the question of why we ought to obey them and fail to tell us what to do when they come in conflict with each other.<sup>32</sup>

Finally, “Neither in any operation with factual propositions nor in any appeal to instinct can the Innovator find the basis for a system of values.”<sup>33</sup> The attempt to manufacture a chest in modern times (i.e., create a “new” morality, a “secular” morality, or whatever) is thus a failure.

### III. Educational Consequences and Implications

The consequences are significant. Without chests, education declines into conditioning and mankind itself is in danger of being abolished. Already in the 20th century we have seen several runs at such destruction of human freedom and of humanity itself.

Secondly, we must keep in mind that we will usually be dealing with men without chests, be they urban blockheads or trousered apes. We must be both wise and innocent.<sup>34</sup> What strategy should be pursued in dealing with a culture in which urban blockheads and trousered apes predominate? This would depend on whether we are dealing with cerebral dunces or hyperactive emotionality.<sup>35</sup> In Lewis’s time the principal problem was the urban blockhead who needed “to be awakened from the slumber of cold vulgarity. The task of the modern educator is not to cut down jungles but to irrigate deserts. The right defence against false sentiments is to inculcate just sentiments. By starving the sensibility of our pupils we only make them easier prey to the propagandist when he comes. For famished nature will be avenged and a hard heart is no infallible protection against a soft head.”<sup>36</sup> Our approach should be to inform the sentiments through a curriculum that includes books which are strong on dragons. Do we consistently stress the importance of imagination-stimulating, mind-stretching works of literature, philosophy, and history? Or do we just stick with textbooks and boring compendiums of information about “exports and imports and governments and drains”? Now more than ever, cultural literacy should be primary on the agenda.

Dealing with trousered apes is another matter. Here we must “cut down jungles”<sup>37</sup> and drain “foetid swamps.”<sup>38</sup> “Until quite modern times, all teachers and even all men believed the universe to be such that certain emotional reactions on our part could be either congruous or incongruous to it—believed, in fact, that objects did not merely receive, but could merit, our approval or disapproval, our reverence, or our contempt.”<sup>39</sup> In short, the basically relativistic assumptions of our time (currently masquerading as “tolerance”) need to be attacked. Here, healthy doses of philosophical and historical knowledge are essential measures regardless of the subject.<sup>40</sup>

Trousered Apery can also be remedied by the restoration of a sense of respect for reasoning. As Lewis argued in *The Screwtape Letters*, people used to know

“pretty well when a thing was proved and when it was not; and if it was proved they really believed it. They still connected thinking with doing and were prepared to alter their way of life as the result of a chain of reasoning. But what with the weekly press and other such weapons” this has been changed.

The average person “has been accustomed, ever since he was a boy, to having a dozen incompatible philosophies dancing about together inside his head. He doesn’t think of doctrines as primarily ‘true’ or ‘false,’ but as ‘academic’ or ‘practical,’ ‘outworn’ or ‘contemporary’ . . . Jargon, not argument” is how they are kept from the truth.<sup>41</sup>

We need to provide the antidote.

In coping with trousered apes, we will have to abandon the current stress on self-esteem as the primary focus. Lewis wrote: “The basic principle of the new education is . . . that dunces and idlers must not be made to feel inferior to intelligent and industrious pupils.” Teachers are “far too busy reassuring the dunces and patting them on the back to waste any time on real teaching.”<sup>42</sup>

In short, we need to pursue excellence while avoiding the very real pitfalls that face us in connection with integrating faith and learning. In the words of Alister MacGrath, “Perhaps the greatest challenge to evangelicalism in the next generation is to develop an increasingly intellectual commitment without losing its roots in the life and faith of ordinary Christian believers.”<sup>43</sup> As Lewis wrote:

“If all the world were Christian, it might not matter if all the world were uneducated. But, as it is, a cultural life will exist outside the Church whether it exists inside or not. To be ignorant and simple now—not to be able to meet the enemies on their own ground—would be to throw down our weapons, and to betray our uneducated brethren who have, under God, no defense but us against the intellectual attacks of the heathen. Good philosophy must exist, if for no other reason, because bad philosophy needs to be answered. The cool intellect must work not only against cool intellect on the other side, but against the muddy heathen mysticisms which deny intellect altogether.”<sup>44</sup>

We badly need new efforts at integration. Not just faith and learning, but head, chest, and belly. This would require more than just the disciplinary specialization that academic people are trained in and for, and far too often seem to be happy with. In the end, we need education and teaching in which “the trees of knowledge and of life” can get “growing together.”<sup>45</sup> This means that we have to give a lot more attention to both knowledge and life. C.S. Lewis was a brilliant example of how to go about this task.<sup>46</sup>

Lastly, we need learning that fosters discernment

and wisdom. Modern education has failed dramatically in this regard.<sup>47</sup> Lewis writes “Our deepest concern should be for first things, and our next deepest for second things, and so on down to zero—to total absence of concern for things that are not really good, nor means to good, at all.”<sup>48</sup> Where are they teaching us this? And how can we learn and teach about first principles and first things when many of us don’t even believe that such exist? Once more, I’m afraid, we stand accused as “men without chests,” as trousered apes and urban blockheads.

It is good for us to attend and participate in conferences and discussions such as this. However, it is also essential that we leave with things that we can take with us into action. I close with Aslan’s ever-relevant exhortation:

“. . . remember the signs. Say them to yourself when you wake in the morning and when you lie down at night, and when you wake in the middle of the night. And whatever strange things may happen to you, let nothing turn your mind from following the signs . . . Here on the mountain, the air is clear and your mind is clear; as you drop down into Narnia, the air will thicken. Take great care that it does not confuse your mind. And the signs which you have learned here will not look at all as you expect them to look, when you meet them there. That is why it is so important to know them by heart and pay no attention to appearances. Remember the signs and believe the signs. Nothing else matters.”<sup>49</sup>

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>C.S. Lewis, *The Voyage of The Dawn Treader* (New York: Macmillan, 1952), p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Lewis, *Dawn Treader*, 1952, p. 1.

<sup>3</sup>C.S. Lewis, *The Silver Chair* (New York: Macmillan, 1953), p. 7.

<sup>4</sup>Lewis, *Dawn Treader*, 1952, p. 71.

<sup>5</sup>C.S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man* or Reflections on Education with Special Reference to the Teaching of English in the Upper Forms of Schools (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1943). References below are to the American paperback edition: New York: Macmillan, 1965.

<sup>6</sup>Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, p. 22. Margaret Thatcher once said “You and I travel by rail, but economists travel on infrastructure.” Quoted in Edwin J. Feulner, Jr., “The Conservative March: A Long View,” *Heritage Foundation*, March 3, 1997.

<sup>7</sup>The urban blockhead is oblivious to the point Lord

Acton was making when he stressed that the “main thing to learn is not the art of accumulating material, but the sublimer art of investigating it, of discerning truth from falsehood . . .” See Lord Acton, “The Study of History,” in: Lord Acton, *Essays in the Study and Writing of History*, edited by J. Rufus Fears (Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1985), pp. 528-529. For a slightly different account of the rationalistic urban blockhead, see C.S. Lewis, *The Pilgrim’s Regress: An Allegorical Apology for Christianity, Reason, and Romanticism*, revised edition (London: Geoffrey Bless, 1943), Ch. 7-9, pp. 60-64.

<sup>8</sup> Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, p. 20.

<sup>9</sup> Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, pp. 22-23.

<sup>10</sup> Compare Lewis’s comment in *Miracles*, revised edition (New York: Macmillan, 1960), p. 40: “Reason is something more than cerebral bio-chemistry.”

<sup>11</sup> The Gates quotes are from *Time Magazine*, January 13, 1997, online edition.

<sup>12</sup> Mark Studdock, in Lewis’s *That Hideous Strength* (New York: Macmillan, 1946), is another model urban blockhead; appropriately enough a social scientist. Of course, once the system itself is increasingly dominated by people who are clever but not really educated, a sad downward spiral has been inaugurated, as Lewis noted in “On the Transmission of Christianity,” in his: *God in the Dock: Essays on Theology and Ethics*, edited by Walter Hooper (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), p. 116: “This very obvious fact—that each generation is taught by an earlier generation—must be kept firmly in mind . . . None can give to another what he does not possess himself . . . Nothing which was not in the teachers can flow from them into the pupils.”

<sup>13</sup> C.S. Lewis, *The Last Battle* (New York: Macmillan, 1956).

<sup>14</sup> Lewis, *Last Battle*, 1956, pp. 26-29.

<sup>15</sup> C.S. Lewis, “*De Descriptione Temporum*,” the 1954 Cambridge inaugural, reprinted in his *Selected Literary Essays*, edited by Walter Hooper (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1969), p. 7.

<sup>16</sup> It should be noted that in Lewis’s thought, teaching functions on three levels: training, education, and learning: “Schoolmasters in our time are fighting hard in defense of education against vocational training; universities, on the other hand, are fighting against education on behalf of learning . . . if education is beaten by training, civilization dies.” C.S. Lewis, “Our English Syllabus,” in his *Rehabilitations and Other Essays* (London: Oxford UP, 1939), pp. 81-82. Our concern here is

primarily with education as such.

<sup>17</sup> Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, p. 34.

<sup>18</sup> Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, p. 34. Compare Albert Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus* (New York: Vintage, 1948), p. 136: “Whereas the Greeks gave to will the boundaries of reason, we have come to put the will’s impulse in the very center of reason, which has, as a result, become deadly. For the Greeks, values pre-existed all action, of which they definitely set the limits . . . Modern philosophy places its values at the end of action . . . with values, all limit disappears . . . The conflagration is spreading . . .”

<sup>19</sup> Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, pp. 33-34.

<sup>20</sup> Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, pp. 25-27.

<sup>21</sup> Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, pp. 29-31.

<sup>22</sup> C.S. Lewis, *Surprised by Joy* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1955), p. 137.

<sup>23</sup> Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*, 1955, pp. 133-135. Amusingly, Lewis had arrived harboring the erroneous impression created by his father that Kirkpatrick was a romantic, sentimental kind of person.

<sup>24</sup> Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*, 1955, p. 167.

<sup>25</sup> C.S. Lewis, *An Experiment in Criticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1961), pp. 137-141. Cf. Tolkien’s comments on the importance of “escape” in his: “On Fairy-Stories,” in: J.R.R. Tolkien, *The Tolkien Reader* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1966), pp. 59 ff.

<sup>26</sup> Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, pp. 34-35.

<sup>27</sup> Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, p. 35.

<sup>28</sup> Lewis, “The Poison of Subjectivism,” in his *Christian Reflections*, edited by Walter Hooper (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967), pp. 77-78, for the quote and Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, pp. 57ff. Compare William H. McNeill, *The Shape of European History* (New York: Oxford UP, 1974), p. 33 note: “the remarkable way in which all the important moral systems of civilized mankind converge in practice toward what Christians know as the Golden Rule” is “unquestionable.”

<sup>29</sup> Lewis, *Mere Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1952), Bk 1.2.

<sup>30</sup> Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, p. 43.

<sup>31</sup> Alasdair MacIntyre has shown how “The Enlightenment Project of Justifying Morality” has “decisively failed,” while the attempted “secularization of morality by the Enlightenment” has led to a situation in which “Moral judgments lose any clear status and the sentences which express them . . . lose any undebatable meaning.”

Cf. Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, second edition (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984), pp. 36 ff.

<sup>32</sup> Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, pp. 42-52.

<sup>33</sup> Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, pp. 52-54.

<sup>34</sup> Cp. Matthew 10:16 "I am sending you out like sheep among wolves. Therefore be as shrewd as snakes and as innocent as doves."

<sup>35</sup> Lewis doesn't appear to have considered the possibility that someone might simultaneously be both a trousered ape and an urban blockhead. However, one consequence of the Kantian bifurcation of knowledge into the physical and the metaphysical spheres has been to allow for compartmentalization of the sort illustrated by Carl Sagan, a man who on the one hand dabbled in New Age thinking and on the other derided Christianity as unscientific superstition. Cf. "Discover Dialogue with Ann Druyan," Sagan's widow and collaborator, *Discover*, November 2003, pp. 21-22, and online at [www.discover.com/issues/nov-03/departments/featdialogue/](http://www.discover.com/issues/nov-03/departments/featdialogue/).

<sup>36</sup> Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, p. 24.

<sup>37</sup> Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, p. 24.

<sup>38</sup> Lewis, *Pilgrim's Regress*, 1943, p. 11.

<sup>39</sup> Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, pp. 24-25.

<sup>40</sup> On philosophy, see the essays in Lewis's *Christian Reflections*, 1967, especially "De Futilitate," dealing with purpose, "The Funeral of a Great Myth," dealing with evolutionism, and "The Poison of Subjectivism," dealing with relativism. On history, cf. C.S. Lewis, "Learning in War-Time," *Transposition and Other Essays* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1949), p. 51: "Most of all, perhaps, we need intimate knowledge of the past. Not that the past has any magic about it, but because we cannot study the future, and yet need something to set against the present, to remind us that the basic assumptions have been quite different in different periods and that much which seems certain to the uneducated is merely temporary fashion. A man who has lived in many places is not likely to be deceived by the local errors of his village: the scholar has lived in many times and is therefore in some degree immune from the great cataract of nonsense that pours from the press and the microphone of his own age."

<sup>41</sup> Lewis, *Screwtape Letters*, 1962, pp. 7-8.

<sup>42</sup> Lewis, *Screwtape Letters*, 1962, pp. 166-168.

<sup>43</sup> Alister McGrath, *A Passion for Truth* (Downers Grove IL: Inter-Varsity, 1996), p. 243.

<sup>44</sup> Lewis, "Learning in War-Time," 1949, p. 51.

<sup>45</sup> Lewis, *Abolition of Man*, 1965, p. 18.

<sup>46</sup> A principal theme of Lewis's *Surprised by Joy*, 1955, revolves around his efforts to integrate reason and imagination.

<sup>47</sup> Cp. C.S. Lewis to Warren Lewis, 11 February 1940, *Letters of C.S. Lewis*, revised edition edited by Walter Hooper (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1993), p. 338, on the occasion of an outstanding lecture by Charles Williams: "I have at last, if only for once, seen a university doing what it was founded to do: teaching Wisdom."

<sup>48</sup> C.S. Lewis, *Letters to Malcolm: Chiefly on Prayer* (London: Collins, 1966), Ch. IV.

<sup>49</sup> Lewis, *Silver Chair*, 1953, p. 20-21.

### Bibliography

Acton, Lord. "The Study of History," In Lord Acton, *Essays in the Study and Writing of History*, edited by J. Rufus Fears. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1985.

Camus, Albert. *The Myth of Sisyphus*. New York: Vintage, 1948.

Lewis, C.S. *The Abolition of Man or Reflections on Education with Special Reference to the Teaching of English in the Upper Forms of Schools*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1943.

———. *Christian Reflections*, edited by Walter Hooper. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.

———. *An Experiment in Criticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1961.

———. *God in the Dock: Essays on Theology and Ethics*, edited by Walter Hooper. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.

———. *The Last Battle*. New York: Macmillan, 1956.

———. *Letters of C.S. Lewis*, revised edition edited by Walter Hooper. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1993.

———. *Letters to Malcolm: Chiefly on Prayer*. London: Collins, 1966.

———. *Mere Christianity*. New York: Macmillan, 1952.

———. *Miracles*, revised edition. New York: Macmillan, 1960.

———. *The Pilgrim's Regress: An Allegorical Apology for Christianity, Reason, and Romanticism*, revised edition. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1943.

———. *Rehabilitations and Other Essays*. London: Oxford UP, 1939.

———. *Selected Literary Essays*, edited by Walter Hooper. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1969.

———. *The Silver Chair*. New York: Macmillan, 1953.

- . *Surprised by Joy*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1955.
- . *That Hideous Strength*. New York: Macmillan, 1946.
- . *Transposition and Other Essays*. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1949.
- . *The Voyage of The Dawn Treader*. New York: Macmillan, 1952.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue*, second edition. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984.
- McGrath, Alister. *A Passion for Truth*. Downers Grove IL: Inter-Varsity, 1996.
- McNeill, William H. *The Shape of European History*. New York: Oxford UP, 1974.
- Tolkien, J.R.R. *The Tolkien Reader*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1966.