

Donna
D. O'Brien
Brian Kopke

I wondered how, believing evil was all around them, these people could ever, in the words of the hymn - Trust the dawning future more. Life would always be the same old struggle.

(Brans)

I want to thank you, Donna, for a thought provoking paper, and especially for the vignette of the bell ringers. It stands in sharp contrast to the dilemma which you and Jung leave us with at the end of the paper. There we are left with a lingering bad conscience that will make us uncomfortable enough to notice its presence, reflect on it, and possibly integrate a portion of it into our self understanding regularly enough to avoid that shadow so dense and repressed that it springs forth into our consciousness in moments unawares - or even worse drives us to acts we do not understand or have any control over. With reflection, knowledge & growth + insight, a person at least has a chance at trusting the dawning future more.

I agree wholeheartedly with your statement that we must tame the dragons, be more tolerant of all sides of ourselves we certainly do not to promote the unfettered reign of one side over the other we must also practice especially for all parts of ourselves if we ever expect tolerance must always have a critical side or it of self esteem. But that tolerance allows anything to exist - including pure evil.

Your listing of six methods we may use to deny evil - and doing it in only two minutes - was helpful especially when you made the admission you were talking about yourself as the perpetrator. I must admit, ~~however~~, that I was a bit resistant to the descriptions as they came forth. I did not feel

included in the "WE". I ~~also thought that some of~~
~~the examples missed the mark, e.g., especially,~~
short section on denying what we have done. I take
what others say seriously. ~~and~~ Though I may know
that my intention was not to do something upsetting
for another person, that they were upset by what I
did, means ~~that~~ I did upset them, ~~regardless of my~~
intent) ~~I wish had not~~
~~The difficulty for me arises around the~~
~~assumption that I would live my life in such~~
isolation from others. ~~I know few people who live~~
~~their lives that way, though I do know a few who~~
~~do.~~ Most people I know, even if they do not express
it in these terms, attempt a close approximation to
Buber's I-Thou when confronted in a loving way. ~~The~~
flat denial is a pretty I-It oriented response and I
rarely see it in an unmediated form. ~~Perhaps we live~~
~~in different worlds, or perhaps you choose to make~~
~~your examples a bit one sided.~~ At any rate, I was
helped greatly when you said these were things you
did. I could relate to guilt...too easily...though
for me it is more often because I did not do
~~it~~...rather than ^{some things} "I did not do it right. Some time
ago I gave up believing that I had to do things
"right," or the rather Platonic notion that there is a
right way.

Your call to balance is a sober one. But
underneath the agreement I have ~~several~~ ^a major

disagreements ~~arise~~ ^{to start with, too} with the tie between evil and the shadow side. You say, "The problem is, that whatever you want to call it, there is evil." This refers to that list you gave, guilt, denial, perfection, etc. It also seems to include "laziness, thoughtlessness and mean-mindedness and envy and vindictiveness and cruelty." I just can not make this jump to calling some natural human traits ~~evil~~ "evil." I do believe that sometimes these things can lead to evil - but so can tolerance if practiced with no critical bounds. Pure tolerance allows evil acts to go unchallenged and therefore supported.

I agree that we have all these things inside us. But they in and of themselves are not evil. ~~But~~ what is evil? You have called it the equal and opposite partner of Good in Jung's words. But that does not tell me much. Good is not defined ^{as} ~~for~~ a reference point. Now I know that I am nit picking here - but I do believe that it is a fundamental point. I believe you talk a lot about what brings evil about without ever defining evil. For example, you say that to lose the balance of our opposites is where the problem for the individual lies. I agree there are problems there. But is it evil to loose that balance? If so, anyone taking the Meyers-Briggs personality Inventory who does not

come out perfectly balanced is evil? ^{Do we} Neither ~~of us~~
believe ^{I trust not.} that - nor is a simple imbalance evil or
bad. Too much of an imbalance may not be healthy,
but I know some people who have quite unbalanced
personalities who also get along ~~quite well~~ ⁱⁿ life
and are in no sense of the word evil people, nor do
they committ evil acts.

I ~~really~~ look at the human being as neutural
in this process of evil - and of good. There are
not good people and evil people. There are people
who can do monstrously evil things and ^{do} terribly good
things. The evil things, according to the Oxford
English Dictionary would be bad, wicked, or
viscious. But these are terms of meaning. Someone
who shoots a dog for the fun of it can be wicked.
Someone who shoots a rabid dog who is about to
attack a child can be a hero. The event can have
different meanings. Evil is also discribed as
causing harm. But is the harm inflicted as a soldier
disables a terrorist about to blow up a plane really
evil? Joseph Fletcher would love these excursions
into situation ethics. Situation ethics does leave us
with ambiguity + the feeling is uncomfortable.

My fundimental difference is still over
calling traits of humanbeings evil. I believe that
this is an area fraught with difficulty and can lead

us back to the guilty, perfectionist, and saintly games of Calvinism. I will not tell my children they have evil residing in their breast. I will tell them we all have the capacity to hurt others and ourselves - and sometimes it is possible for us to do evil things. What do you tell Eliot & Charlotte

The problem, as Jung points out in Memories Dreams and Reflections is an ethical one. For both evil and good are judgements - they do not reside in

anything, they are judgements about actions. He also points out that succumbing to either good or evil carries grave peril. For even in succumbing to good it will lose its ethical character - "The criterion of ethical action can no longer consist in a simple view that good has the force of a categorical imperative, while so called evil can be shunned. They are both relativized and converted into a paradoxical whole."

You call this to our attention.

Jung then goes on to talk about the shadow side - not as evil, but as part of a process which can be very hard for us to enter and live with wholly. The natural process is to flirt with the shadow side but not delve deeply - for we naturally avoid pain which arises when we dig into the shadow side. As a result we often know very little about

ourselves or the reasons why we do what we do. You say that the most dangerous people are those who spend great energy denying their evil side, I suggest that just as dangerous are those who do not know it exists, ^{(And I wonder if we do not know of ~~our~~ our potential for evil.} or who willy-nilly trapse through the gardens of life without a thought to deeper goings on. Any of these will avoid the forced moral reflections that come when we dig deeply. It is only those forced moral reflections which will make us stand up against ^{what} ~~these things~~ we come to know are evil - acts of such unfairness, injustice, greed, lust, indifference, etc., that we call them evil.

Jung says that the person who wishes to have an answer to the problem of evil, as it is posed today, has need, first and foremost, of self knowledge, that is, the utmost knowledge of his and her wholeness.

This is what I hear you calling for and why I agree with the paper in its direction - if I disagree, even nit pick, at times with its arguments.

Now I am also not sure I agree with your pointing to ministers as being ~~as~~ much more one sided than most people. From the numbers of

ministers I know who have been in intensive therapy,
and Jung says that therapy is a requisite to knowing
the shadow side better, we would seem to fare ~~better~~ ^{as well}
~~as~~ the average person - and add to that the ^{in his Div Sch}
numbers of ministers I know who take Emerson to
heart and really do ^{make their path} alone and refuse the good
models, ^{men + women} who know that ~~the~~ imitation can not go
above its own model. ^{Emerson} ~~He~~ exhorts us to breathe new
fire into our old forms, to be alive, so that the
forms become plastic. And finally to speak the
truth of our lives, as our ~~lives and our~~ conscience
teaches it. ^{I believe this is found in much of}
^{our preaching.}

Perhaps I am blind. But I am more hopeful
about us than you seem to be. At the same time I
know ~~we dare not~~ ^{Jim H. H.} give up the vigilance and the hard
work. Henry Nelson Wieman argues persuasively, as
does Jung, that these are very dangerous times. Such
little movement can do so much damage. So few people
can destroy so much. We have no choice but to know
ourselves, ferret out our shadow side, the
undeveloped, the unconscious, so that we never are
hoodwinked into thinking that what is evil is good,
or what is good is evil. Knowing what helps us form
the ideas and inclinations we have can free us so
that we are not slaves to the past - so that we can
^{be free enough} indeed, in the words of the hymn, ^{so} Trust the dawning
^{future more.}