

Do 167

160,
Oct. 11,
1

Introduction: On Friday, I compared two positions on the metaphysical status of evil. The question is important for us, as we prepare to do a full-scale treatment of Jung's psychology, to see what it has to offer us by way of clarification of Christian personality development.

For: 1) any treatment of the meaning of religion for personal development must take seriously the problem of evil;

and: 2) Jung took the problem very seriously, but arrived at a position very different from the Christian position, particularly as far as the notion of God was concerned.

Briefly, again, the two positions are contrasted as follows:

For Jung, 1) evil is a reality, it is every bit as real as good.

2) God is a reality

3) God is the creator of everything else that is real

4) God is then the creator of evil as well as of good

5) God is therefore a unity of good and evil

6) the self, made in the image of God, is a unity of good and evil

7) individuation, the process of becoming one's own self, in a conscious fashion, is a process of achieving a unity of good and evil.

160,

Oct. 11,

2

For such Christian theologians as Augustine and Thomas Aquinas,

- 1) There are evil conditions and evil acts. These are real.
- 2) The evil in the conditions and acts, that which constitutes them as evil, is the fact that they are not what one could reasonably expect them to be.
- 3) Evil is thus an absence of the good that ought to be present.
- 4) Evil is thus not a reality, but the lack of reality, the privation of the good.
- 5) God is thus not the cause of evil, for evil has no cause, since it is not anything, but the absence of being. The conditions,
- 6) God creates all reality, but since evil is not a positive reality, what God creates is good.
- 7) God is therefore good, not an integration of good and evil.
- 8) ~~The self's task, then, in becoming an image of God, is the transformation of~~
- 8) God deals with evil by transforming it into good, by bringing order into a situation where there was no order. This is the essence of what God is doing in the world & in our lives. Any action,
- 9) The self becomes whole by allowing God to transform evil into good, through the purification of one's sinfulness, ^{by co-operating} so that one becomes good by the grace of God. All such co-operation involves self-transcendence, the becoming other than what we are.
- 10) Thus the self becomes whole only by self-transcending action, in co-operation with God. Essential to this process, then, is facing the questions that must be faced if self-transcendence is to occur.

and the acts have causes, but their evil does not.

in accord with this is in accord with God's work in the world.

160,
Oct. 11,
3

The similarities in the positions are important to point out:

- 1) In either case, wholeness or personal integration occurs by way of a process. We are always in the process of individuation, of becoming our own selves.
- 2) This process inescapably involves our dealing with the problem of evil.

But the differences are quite significant: they can be summarized quite succinctly.

For Jung, the process is one of the ego
living its way into the self.
The self is the unity of good and evil,
and becoming one's own self,
individuation,
is becoming consciously
the unity of good and evil
one already unconsciously is.

For the Christian position, the process
is one of the transformation of the self
by conversion and redemption,
of allowing the totality of what I am
to become integrated at the depths
by the transformation of evil -- the absence of order --
into good -- the ordering of affectivity --
a transformation which influences the ego
and changes it, so that its perception & freedom
are focused on what is good, what is self-transcending.

160,
Oct. 11,
4

Thus for Jung,

the Self

is a pre-existent harmony of opposites
that is unconscious,

and individuation

is a matter of making these opposites conscious
as the ego lives its way into the Self.

For the Christian position,

the Self is simply the totality of what I am,
body, psyche, and spirit.

At any given moment it is relatively
differentiated and integrated,
relatively undifferentiated and unintegrated.

Its undifferentiation and non-integration
constitute its incompleteness, & sometimes the evil
and individuation is a matter of becoming ^{of psych. suffering,}
more differentiated and more integrated.

But for this to occur,

there is demanded the willingness to transcend oneself,
to transcend the totality of what I am,

self-transcendence and not just the ego-
transcendence of Jung,

and the refusal of this self-transcendence
constitutes a separate distinct kind of evil,
the evil of basic sin.

This evil is not integrated with good
in a pre-existent harmony of opposites.

but is a refusal of the steps that will
lead to integration,
and thus is radically the non-integration
of the personality.

To speak of a pre-existent integration of good and evil
is to speak of a myth,
for evil is non-integration
and the refusal of integration,
where integration can occur
only at the price of self-transcendence.

Individuation, the path to wholeness,
can occur only by self-transcendence.

In fact to be an integrated person
is to be a self-transcendent person,
capable of facing
v willing to face
the truth about myself v others v the world v God
v to respond
in accord with the truth.

Good and evil cannot be integrated with one another,
for evil is non-integration,
the absence of wholeness.

Non-integration cannot be integrated with anything.

Good and evil are contradictories,
not contraries.

Contraries do not exclude one another,
contradictories do.

160,
Oct. 11,
6

Is there any sense, then, in talking about individuation
as a unity of opposites?

If the opposites are contradictory, no.

If they are contraries, if they do not exclude one another, Yes.

And the two contrary opposites

that are united in the process of growth,
of differentiation & integration,
are spirit and body.

The uniting agency is the psyche.

This is the use that can be made by the Christian and Jung's
psychology.

Spirit and matter or the body
are in themselves neither good nor evil.

As Jung himself said once -- and it is a pity he did
not follow through on this insight --

"Both can be both." It depends on character.

So if we can flip this switch more decisively than Jung did,
we can find the key to individuation,
to genuine development.

Development is a matter of the progressive & cumulative
integration of spirit and body
into a whole person.

It occurs by the differentiation of skills, wh. in the world mediated
and the integration of differentiated skills
by feelings. by me is a
matter of
spirit.

The key to it all is the psyche,
which shares in spirit & body.

160,
Oct. 11,
7

But the psyche can only perform its task
if it is guided by a willingness
for self-transcendence,
and that willingness is essentially a matter of spirit,
of freedom, of character,
of ourselves as intelligent,
reasonable,
responsible beings.

Psyche is not free to take the initiative for development.
Rather, it responds to the initiative
or lack of initiative
of the freedom of the individual.

But to this we will return
when we study Jung.

There ~~is one~~ ^{are two} further points
to be discussed
in this introduction to Jung:

why is it called basic?
and what is the experience of conversion?