

Do 166

160,
Oct. 8,
Intro

1. We are attempting to answer the question, What is conversion?

The reason for attempting to answer it
is that we have seen that sometimes
conversion is needed if personal development
is to occur.

Conversion is needed when a person is unwilling
or both unable and unwilling
to face the questions
that must be faced
if one is to develop as a human person.

2. As a first approximation to the notion of conversion,

I began to discuss the problem of evil.

We distinguished, ^{briefly} two kinds of evil:

- the evil of psychological suffering
- ✓ the evil I called basic sin.

The evil of psychological suffering

is the result of a non-integration
at the level of feelings.

Part of one's development

has not been affectively integrated,
so that there occurs a fragmentation of affectivity,
with certain unintegrated components
that are not harmoniously related to the rest
of one's being.

These components are the aspects of one's being
where one has been hurt, wounded, victimized, traumatized.

160,
Oct. 8,
Intro (2)

They constitute one's areas of psychological weakness,
and they make their presence felt
when one is in a situation
where they are called into play
yet can't respond in a harmonious fashion.

For example,

the person who,

because of a storm & guilt-ridden upbringing
can't harmoniously enter upon
a situation of responsibility for a job.

Or, to take the example of the person I mentioned
earlier in the course,

the person traumatized by the psychotic mother --
certain situations will call upon & demand
resources he hasn't integrated.

He may, for example,

have developed a fear of women
by association.

Whenever he is in a situation

of having to respond to women
in a mature, harmonious fashion,

he may fall to pieces. In different ways: silence &
withdrawal; machismo.

In both of these cases,

the questions that ~~call for~~ are called for
can't be faced.

These questions aren't intellectual,
but practical.

160,
Oct. 8,
Intro (3)

They aren't perhaps even explicitly asked.
But in either case,

if one is to respond intelligently,
it must be on the basis of insight --
and insight always comes
as the answer to questioning.

The evil of psychological suffering, then,
is an impairment of one's effective freedom
to be what one wants to be:

in this case, to be able to respond
in an intelligent
& responsible fashion
to a situation
that can only be dealt with properly
in this fashion.

Dein sin, on the contrary,

is the unwillingness, and not just the inability,
to respond intelligently and responsibly
to certain kinds of questions.

In either of these two examples,

inability can turn into unwillingness.

In the first,

the inability to hold a job

can turn into an unwillingness to take the steps

that are needed to improve one's effective responses.

These steps may involve, in some instances, therapy.

And if one is unwilling to seek the help one needs,

not just unable to respond

but unwilling to become able to face questions,
it would seem a decision has been made --

a decision for drifting,

which is decline,

a drifting into ever less comprehensive living.

In the second example,

one's inability to respond intelligently and responsibly to women
may become an unwillingness to learn:

either an unwillingness to seek help

or an unwillingness to treat women

in any other way than by machismo.

Then, with unwillingness,

machismo becomes, perhaps, sadism,

or the immaturity of the Playboy philosophy.

The unwillingness, in either case,

generates a hardness, a rigidity, a bias against change, ^{to the questions that promote change, a hostility,} a hostility.

This bias is a far more radical truncation of one's being as a person
than the psychological inability.

Furthermore,

we saw that the bias

can exist without any psychological inability to change.

There are people who are able to respond intelligently & responsibly,
but refuse to. This refusal, under any circumstances,
is basic sin.

160,
Oct. 8,
Intro (5)

In all instances,

basic sin is a refusal to do the intelligent
and reasonable
and responsible
thing.

If one is able to respond intelligently
and reasonably
and responsibly,

but refuses to,

this refusal is his basic sin.

If one is unable to respond in this fashion,
and refuses to do what is necessary
to gain the ability to respond
intelligently,
reasonably,
& responsibly,

one has still refused to do the intelligent,
reasonable,
& responsible
thing,

which in this case is to seek help.

And always, the intelligent,
reasonable,
& responsible thing

is to face the questions for meaning,
truth,
value

160,
Oct. 8,
Intro (6)

that have to be faced if one is to respond
intelligently,
reasonably,
responsibly.

The willingness to face these questions is character.

And so, once again,

character is necessary for personal development.

Is Evil a Reality?

We have now to face the question of the reality of evil.

It is a major difficulty in coming to grips with Jung,
and must be settled before we can go further
in dealing with his thought.

What is the evil in either of these two cases,
in psychological suffering
and in basic sin?

Jung fought all his life against the Christian metaphysical
notion of evil as privatio boni,
a "mere" absence of the good,
and frequently pointed to the examples of, e.g., the Nazis
and of psychological suffering
to back up his argument.

And if evil is a reality,
he maintained,

then, like all other reality,
it must be created by God.

Thus the dark or evil side of God, even the devil as a part of God.

So let's look at each of these instances of evil,
and see what we come up with.

1st, then, psychological suffering:

Psychological suffering, we said,
is the result of a lack of integration
at the level of one's feelings,
where integration of one's personality
takes place.

Parts of one's affective being
are split off from the whole,
so that fragmentation of one's feelings occurs.

Certain unintegrated components
are split off into what Jung calls complexes,
and these complexes constitute at least a portion
of one's shadow.

Now, in this instance - -

the psychological suffering is certainly a reality,
the feelings at the non-intentional
and then at the intentional levels
of anger, depression, anxiety, etc.

The complexes, the fragments of affectivity that
have not been integrated
are also quite real.

They are the dimensions of one's affectivity
that have been hurt, wounded, victimized,
traumatized.

160,
Oct. 8
Intro (8)

Oct. 11,
Sec. 2
Starts here

Reviews
this,
then
start class
w. basic
sin, next
page.

Oct. 11,
Sec. 1,
Starts
5 pages later.

But in what does the evil consist?

What is the root of the psychological suffering?

What is the "reason" for the fragments?

The root of it all is the non-integration of the fragments or complexes into the totality of one's affectivity.

The state of one's affectivity is really fragmented, but to say that is to say that it is not integrated.

The non-integration is not a reality:

the parts are realities,
they exist,

but the evil is their non-integration.

They themselves are not the evil:

a hurt part of my being is not evil.

The suffering of the hurt is evil,

but the evil consists in the non-integration of

this real complex

with the other real dimensions of my affectivity.

160,
Oct. 8,
Intro (9)

2nd, basic sin.

Basic sin is the unwillingness to transcend oneself
by asking the questions one must face if one is to grow,
if one is to meet ~~the~~ situations intelligently,
reasonably,
responsibly.

It is the refusal to face the questions that would promote growth.
Again, the act of refusal is real,
but it is not good.

The evil is the privation of the good in the act.

The act is deprived of good.

What results from the act is real:

ever further actions that are unintelligent,
unreasonable,
irresponsible,

because one has not faced the questions
for intelligence,
truth,
& value

that one needs to face to be intelligent,
reasonable,
responsible.

Basic sin is the privation of the good in the act.

The act is real,

but its evil consists in the absence

of what ought to be present:

self-transcendence.

160,
Oct. 8,
Intro (10)

The sin lies, not in the act,
but in what is not part of the act.

Basic sin is not an event.

The act of refusal is an event,
but basic sin is the non-self-transcendence
in an act that could be
or ought to be
self-transcending.

It is not something that positively occurs.

It consists in a failure of ^{occurrence,} ~~transcendence~~
in the non-event of an event that ought to occur.

The evil, as a non-event, then,
has no cause.

The evil act, the act of refusal,
has a cause -- me --

but the evil in the act
is the non-event of what could have been part
of the act but isn't:
of what the act could have been
but wasn't.

The evil act exists, occurs, is real,
and has consequences.

The evil in the act does not occur,
is a non-occurrence,

is the non-self-transcendence in act that could have been self-transcending.

160,
Oct. 8,
11

The meaning of the Christian notion of evil as privatio boni,
then,

is this, and nothing more:

it is not a denial of suffering,

or of acts that are evil,

but a statement of what the evil consists of:

in both of these instances

it consists of

the non-reality in reality,

a non-reality that is ^{also} a privation,

i.e., an absence of what could be there
and ought to be there

but isn't there.

Evil acts have a cause,

complexes have a cause,

but the non-occurrence of the good

has no cause,

is not an event.

And this is what evil consists of.