SRYAHWA PUBLICATIONS

Journal of Religion and Theology
ISSN: 2637-5907 | Volume 7, Issue 4, 2025
https://doi.org/10.22259/2637-5907.0704009

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Illness as the Demonic II why we must not Surrender to Explanations that Relieve us of Responsibility

Julian Ungar-Sargon MD, Ph.D

Borra College of health Science Dominican University IL Sept 2005, USA.

Received: 28 November 2025 Accepted: 12 December 2025 Published:15 December 2025

Corresponding Author: Julian Ungar-Sargon, Borra College of health Science Dominican University IL Aug 2025, USA.

Abstract

This essay argues against the tendency to conceptualize illness--particularly chronic, mysterious, or treatment-resistant illness--as a form of the demonic. While such framing may offer psychological comfort by providing a coherent narrative for suffering, it carries a profound danger: it relieves us of the responsibility to understand, fight, and ultimately prevent disease. The parallel to historical explanation is instructive. When we invoke the demonic to explain phenomena like Hitler and Nazism, we foreclose the possibility of understanding the social, economic, and psychological conditions that made such horrors possible. By rendering evil supernatural and inexplicable, we abandon the task of prevention. This essay develops the thesis that submission to demonic explanations--whether of illness or of historical atrocity--constitutes a moral and intellectual failure. We must resist such explanations precisely because they feel satisfying; their satisfaction is the measure of our abdication.

1. Introduction: The Seduction of the Demonic

There is something deeply satisfying about the demonic as an explanatory category. When we face phenomena that exceed our understanding--suffering that seems disproportionate, evil that appears motiveless, disease that resists treatment--the invocation of dark powers offers a kind of closure. The demonic provides a name for what we cannot explain, a cause for what seems causeless, an agent behind what appears merely chaotic. In doing so, it restores a sense of order to a world that threatens to dissolve into meaninglessness.

This satisfaction, however, comes at a terrible price. The demonic explanation, by its very nature, terminates inquiry. Once we have attributed a phenomenon to demonic agency, we have effectively declared it beyond the reach of human understanding and human intervention. The demon operates by laws we cannot fathom, through mechanisms we cannot detect, for purposes we cannot comprehend. Against such an adversary, analysis is futile, prevention impossible, and resistance merely a matter of spiritual combat rather than practical action.

This essay contends that such explanatory surrender constitutes a moral failure--not merely an intellectual error but a betrayal of our responsibility to understand and to act. The argument proceeds through two parallel cases: the conceptualization of illness as demonic, and the invocation of the demonic to explain historical atrocities like Nazism. In both cases, I will argue, the demonic framework offers false comfort while foreclosing genuine understanding. And in both cases, the stakes of this foreclosure are immense: the perpetuation of suffering that might otherwise be prevented.

2. The Persistence of Demonic Illness

The association between illness and demonic agency is ancient and nearly universal. In the Hebrew Bible, afflictions are sometimes attributed to evil spirits or divine punishment mediated by destructive angels. The

Citation: Julian Ungar-Sargon. Illness as the Demonic II why we must not Surrender to Explanations that Relieve us of Responsibility. Journal of Religion and Theology 2025;7(4): 108-120.

New Testament narratives are replete with exorcisms in which Jesus casts out demons responsible for conditions we might now classify as epilepsy, mental illness, or chronic disability. Medieval medicine, inheriting both classical humoral theory and Christian demonology, frequently understood disease as the result of spiritual corruption or demonic possession.

We might suppose that such frameworks have been definitively superseded by modern biomedicine. The germ theory of disease, the development of antibiotics, the mapping of the human genome--surely these achievements have rendered demonic illness a relic of prescientific thought. Yet the demonic persists, though often in disguised forms. When patients speak of their cancer as an "invader," when chronic fatigue is described as being "possessed" by exhaustion, when autoimmune conditions are framed as the body being "attacked by itself" in ways that defy understanding--the structure of demonic explanation reasserts itself even within ostensibly secular frameworks.

More explicitly, certain religious communities continue to understand illness--particularly mental illness and chronic conditions without clear etiology--as the result of spiritual attack. The proliferation of "deliverance ministries" in contemporary Christianity, the persistence of dybbuk traditions in some Jewish communities, the continued practice of exorcism across multiple religious traditions--these phenomena testify to the enduring appeal of demonic illness as an explanatory category.

The question is not whether such beliefs exist but why they persist and what consequences they carry. I will argue that their persistence reflects deep psychological needs that biomedical explanations often fail to address--but that satisfying these needs through demonic frameworks exacts a cost we cannot afford to pay.

3. What Demonic Explanations Provide

To understand why demonic explanations, retain their appeal, we must acknowledge what they genuinely provide to those who embrace them. This is not a matter of condescension toward the benighted; it is a recognition that explanatory frameworks survive because they serve real functions.

3.1 Narrative Coherence

Illness, particularly chronic and mysterious illness, disrupts the narrative structure of human life. We expect our bodies to function, our capacities to persist, our futures to unfold according to plans we have made. Illness shatters these expectations, introducing chaos into biography. The demonic provides a counter-narrative: you are not simply unlucky, not merely the victim of statistical misfortune, not subject to meaningless biological malfunction. You are under attack. An agent with purposes--malevolent purposes, to be sure, but purposes nonetheless--has targeted you. Your suffering means something.

3.2 Moral Framework

The demonic explanation locates illness within a moral universe. Disease is not morally neutral natural process but a form of evil--and evil implies the possibility of good, of resistance, of ultimate victory. The sufferer is not merely a patient but a combatant in cosmic warfare. This framing can provide tremendous psychological resources for enduring suffering: one fights demons; one merely endures pathology.

3.3 Community and Ritual

Demonic illness typically invokes community response. Exorcism, deliverance, healing prayer--these are communal practices that surround the sufferer with support and attention. The biomedical model, by contrast, often isolates the patient: one sits alone in waiting rooms, receives diagnoses in clinical settings stripped of communal warmth, undergoes treatments that may be effective but are rarely meaningful in the way that religious rituals are meaningful.

3.4 Explanation of Treatment Failure

Perhaps most significantly, the demonic framework explains why treatments fail. When biomedicine

cannot cure--when chronic conditions persist, when cancers recur, when symptoms defy diagnosis--the demonic provides an answer: the adversary is powerful, the spiritual attack is severe, the battle is ongoing. This explanation preserves hope in ways that biomedical acknowledgment of limitation may not. The demon can still be defeated; the incurable disease cannot.

4. The Cost of Demonic Explanation: The Termination of Inquiry

Having acknowledged what demonic explanations provide, we must now examine what they cost. The central argument of this essay is that such explanations terminate inquiry in ways that foreclose both understanding and prevention. This cost is not incidental to the demonic framework; it is intrinsic to it.

When we attribute illness to demonic agency, we implicitly declare that natural causation--the kind of causation that scientific investigation can uncover--is insufficient to explain the phenomenon. The demon fills the gap left by our ignorance. But this filling is premature. Our ignorance about the causes of many diseases is genuine, but it is not absolute or permanent. The history of medicine is a history of mysteries solved, of conditions once attributed to supernatural causes now understood in terms of pathogens, genetic mutations, environmental exposures, and complex systemic dysfunctions.

Every disease now understood was once mysterious. Tuberculosis was "consumption," understood in terms of constitutional weakness or moral failing before Koch identified Mycobacterium tuberculosis. Pellagra was attributed to infection or hereditary degeneration before Goldberger demonstrated its nutritional etiology. Peptic ulcers were blamed on stress and diet before Marshall and Warren identified Helicobacter pylori. In each case, the path from mystery to understanding required sustained inquiry--inquiry that would have been abandoned had we accepted demonic or otherwise supernatural explanations.

The demonic explanation does not merely coexist with scientific investigation; it displaces it. Once we have a satisfying explanation--and demonic explanations are, in their way, deeply satisfying--the urgency to seek further understanding diminishes. Why investigate the biochemistry of a condition that is "really" a spiritual attack? Why fund research into prevention when the true cause lies outside the natural order? Why modify behavior or environment when the adversary operates through supernatural means?

This displacement has concrete consequences. Every hour spent in deliverance ministry rather than medical consultation is an hour of potential diagnosis lost. Every dollar directed toward faith healers rather than researchers is a dollar unavailable for developing treatments. Every patient convinced that their condition is fundamentally spiritual may delay or refuse interventions that could help them. The demonic explanation does not merely fail to help; it actively impedes the processes by which genuine help might be found.

5. The Parallel Case: Hitler, Nazism, and Demonic History

The dangers of demonic explanation become still clearer when we examine their application to historical atrocity. The Holocaust and the Nazi regime that perpetrated it represent, for many, the limit case of human evil--events so monstrous that ordinary categories of explanation seem inadequate. It is precisely in such cases that the temptation to invoke the demonic becomes strongest.

And invoke it we do. Hitler is routinely described as "evil incarnate," as "possessed," as "demonic." The Nazi regime is characterized as an eruption of absolute evil into history, a manifestation of dark forces that transcend ordinary political and social analysis. This language is not confined to popular discourse; it appears in theological reflection, in literary treatment, and even, at times, in historical writing. The sheer scale of Nazi crimes seems to demand such language-seems to require categories that mark these events as fundamentally different from ordinary human wickedness. Yet the same dynamic that renders demonic illness explanations dangerous operates here as well. When we invoke the demonic to explain Nazism, we terminate inquiry. We declare that these events lie beyond the reach of social scientific analysis, beyond the explanatory power of economics, psychology, political science, and history. We exempt ourselves from the difficult work of understanding how such things happen--and therefore from the possibility of preventing their recurrence.

6. What Demonic Explanations of Nazism Obscure

The historical scholarship on Nazism is vast and sophisticated. Decades of research have illuminated the conditions that made Hitler's rise possible and the mechanisms through which genocide was implemented. This scholarship does not "explain

away" Nazi evil; it explains how that evil came to be and how it operated. Such explanation is not a reduction of moral horror but a precondition for preventing its repetition.

6.1 Economic Conditions

The Nazi rise to power occurred in the context of devastating economic crisis. The hyperinflation of the early 1920s, followed by the Great Depression's impact on Germany, created conditions of material desperation and status anxiety that extremist movements exploited. Understanding these economic dynamics does not excuse those who embraced Nazism, but it illuminates why such an ideology found purchase when it did. If we attribute Nazi success to demonic intervention, we lose this insight--and we lose the ability to recognize similar economic danger signs in our own time.

6.2 Political Structures

The Weimar Republic's constitutional structure--particularly its use of emergency powers and its vulnerability to coalition politics--created pathways through which an extremist party could achieve power legally. The failure of mainstream political actors to form effective coalitions against the Nazi threat, the miscalculation of conservative elites who thought they could "control" Hitler, the fragmentation of the left--these political factors are comprehensible, analyzable, and therefore potentially avoidable. Demonic explanation renders them irrelevant, treating Hitler's chancellorship as a supernatural fait accompli rather than a political outcome that different choices might have prevented.

6.3 Psychological Mechanisms

How did ordinary people come to participate in genocide? The psychological research on this question--from Milgram's obedience studies to Zimbardo's prison experiment to Browning's study of "ordinary men" in police battalions--reveals mechanisms of conformity, authority, and moral disengagement that operate in predictable ways. These mechanisms are not unique to Germans of the 1930s and 1940s; they are features of human psychology that can be activated under certain conditions. Understanding them allows us to design institutions and cultivate dispositions that resist such activation. If we attribute Nazi crimes to demonic possession of perpetrators, we abandon this psychological insight and the preventive possibilities it opens.

6.4 Ideological Development

Nazi ideology did not spring fully formed from Hitler's demonic imagination. It drew on existing traditions of antisemitism, social Darwinism, racial pseudo-science, and nationalist mythology that had developed over decades. These ideological streams can be traced, their logic analyzed, their rhetorical strategies identified. Such analysis allows us to recognize when similar ideological formations emerge in our own context--to identify the warning signs of genocidal thinking before it achieves state power. Demonic explanation, by contrast, treats Nazi ideology as a mysterious irruption rather than a comprehensible (if horrifying) development.

7. The Structure of Explanatory Surrender

The parallel between demonic illness and demonic history reveals a common structure: explanatory surrender. In both cases, we encounter phenomena that challenge our understanding--suffering that seems disproportionate, evil that seems unmotivated, outcomes that seem impossible. In both cases, the demonic offers a satisfying closure: the phenomenon is explained by reference to an agent whose purposes are opaque but whose power is real. And in both cases, this satisfaction comes at the cost of inquiry, understanding, and ultimately prevention.

The structure of explanatory surrender can be analyzed as follows. First, we encounter a phenomenon that exceeds our current understanding. Second, this gap in understanding creates cognitive and emotional discomfort--we want explanations, and the absence of satisfying ones is distressing. Third, the demonic offers an explanation that, while not empirically substantiated, provides narrative coherence and moral framework. Fourth, the acceptance of this explanation relieves the discomfort. Fifth--and this is the crucial step--the relief of discomfort removes the motivation to inquire further. We have our explanation; the question is closed.

This structure reveals why demonic explanation is not merely wrong but pernicious. It does not simply offer an incorrect answer; it abolishes the question. It does not merely fail to advance understanding; it actively prevents understanding from being sought. The satisfaction it provides is precisely the measure of its danger, for that satisfaction is the mechanism by which inquiry is terminated.

8. The Moral Dimension: Responsibility and Prevention

The argument thus far has been primarily epistemological: demonic explanation terminates

inquiry and thereby prevents understanding. But there is also a moral dimension to this critique. The termination of inquiry is not merely an intellectual failure; it is a failure of responsibility.

We have responsibilities toward the suffering--responsibilities to understand the causes of their suffering, to develop treatments and preventions, to alleviate what can be alleviated. These responsibilities are not discharged by attributing suffering to demonic agency. On the contrary: such attribution constitutes an abandonment of responsibility, a declaration that the suffering lies beyond our obligation to address through natural means.

Similarly, we have responsibilities toward future generations--responsibilities to understand the conditions that produce atrocity so that we can prevent its recurrence. The study of Nazism is not merely academic; it is a moral imperative. We owe it to the victims of the Holocaust and to potential victims of future genocides to understand how such things happen. Demonic explanation betrays this obligation by declaring that such understanding is impossible or unnecessary.

The moral force of this argument can be stated simply: we do not have the right to stop trying to understand. The suffering of the ill, the horror of historical atrocity--these demand our best efforts at comprehension, precisely because comprehension is the precondition of response. To accept explanations that terminate such efforts is to fail those who suffer and those who may yet be protected from suffering.

9. The Phenomenology of Evil and the Limits of Explanation

A sophisticated defender of demonic explanation might offer the following response: "You misunderstand the function of such explanation. We do not claim that social, economic, and psychological analysis is impossible or unnecessary. We claim that such analysis, however complete, leaves a remainder--an aspect of evil or suffering that exceeds naturalistic explanation. The demonic names this remainder."

This argument has a certain phenomenological plausibility. When we confront the Holocaust, even after understanding all the historical factors that contributed to it, something remains that resists comprehension--a quality of excess that makes us reach for language beyond the ordinary. Similarly, certain experiences of illness--the relentlessness of chronic pain, the apparent malevolence of certain disease progressions--seem to exceed what a purely mechanical account can capture.

I want to take this argument seriously before rejecting it. The phenomenology of evil and suffering does include an element of excess, a sense that what we confront is "more" than our categories can contain. But I would argue that this phenomenology does not justify demonic explanation; rather, it reflects the limits of our current understanding and the depth of our emotional response.

The sense that evil exceeds explanation is real, but it is a feature of our relationship to evil, not a feature of evil itself. The Holocaust is horrifying precisely because we can understand how it happened--because ordinary psychological and social mechanisms produced such extraordinary results. The horror lies not in inexplicability but in the recognition that human beings, under certain conditions, are capable of such things. To invoke the demonic is to distance ourselves from this recognition, to place evil outside the human and thereby to exempt we from the terrible knowledge of what humans can become.

10. Illness, Agency, and the Problem of Submission

Return now to the case of illness. The demonic framework, as we have seen, provides narrative coherence, moral framework, community support, and explanation for treatment failure. But it does something else as well: it transforms the patient's relationship to disease from one of resistance to one of submission.

This may seem counterintuitive. Does not the demonic framework cast the patient as a warrior against dark forces? Is not spiritual combat a form of resistance? The appearance of resistance, however, masks a deeper submission. When we accept that illness is fundamentally demonic, we submit to the idea that the natural causes of illness are either nonexistent or secondary. We submit to the idea that medical intervention addresses only symptoms while the true battle is spiritual. We submit to the idea that prevention through natural means--through changes in behavior, environment, or social conditions--is beside the point.

This submission has practical consequences. The patient who understands their chronic illness as demonic attack may continue with spiritual interventions even when medical alternatives exist. The community that attributes disease outbreaks to spiritual causes may neglect public health measures. The researcher who encounters mysterious conditions may be less motivated to persist in investigation if

the surrounding culture treats such mysteries as fundamentally supernatural.

More subtly, the demonic framework can induce a kind of fatalism even among those who do not explicitly endorse it. When a disease is spoken of in demonic terms--as "attacking," "invading," possessing a kind of malevolent intentionality--the implicit message is that we face an adversary that operates by its own rules, that cannot be fully understood or predicted, that may be resisted but perhaps not defeated through human effort alone. This framing, even when not explicitly supernatural, imports the structure of demonic explanation and its attendant surrender.

11. The Responsibility to Fight: An Ethic of Inquiry

Against explanatory surrender, I want to propose an ethic of inquiry--a stance toward suffering and evil that refuses premature closure and insists on the possibility and necessity of understanding. This ethic does not promise that all mysteries will be solved or that all suffering will be prevented. It does not claim that human effort is omnipotent. What it claims is more modest but no less important: we must try.

The ethic of inquiry rests on several commitments. First, the commitment to naturalism as a methodological principle: we approach phenomena as if they have natural causes, knowing that this approach has been spectacularly successful in expanding our understanding and our capacities. Second, the commitment to persistence: we do not abandon inquiry when it becomes difficult, when the mystery resists our efforts, when we are tempted by the satisfaction of supernatural explanation. Third, the commitment to humility: we acknowledge our current ignorance without treating it as permanent or as evidence of supernatural causation.

This ethic applies to both cases we have considered. In the case of illness, it demands that we continue to investigate causes, develop treatments, and pursue prevention even when diseases are mysterious and treatment is difficult. In the case of historical atrocity, it demands that we continue to analyze the conditions that produce such horrors, to understand the mechanisms by which ordinary people become perpetrators, to develop institutional and educational safeguards against recurrence.

The ethic of inquiry is not easy. It denies us the comfort of demonic explanation, the satisfaction of narrative closure, the relief of declared impotence. It demands that we live with uncertainty, that we persist in effort without guarantee of success, that we resist the temptation to give up and call our surrender wisdom. But this difficulty is itself a measure of its importance. The stakes--human suffering, preventable death, the recurrence of atrocity--are too high to permit ourselves the luxury of explanatory surrender.

12. Medicine as Moral Practice

The argument of this essay has implications for how we understand the practice of medicine. If we reject demonic explanation of illness, we commit ourselves to viewing medicine as a fundamentally moral practice--not in the sense that it involves ethical dilemmas (though it does) but in the sense that it embodies a stance of responsibility toward suffering.

The physician who approaches disease as having natural causes amenable to investigation and intervention is making a moral commitment: a commitment to the possibility of help, to the value of inquiry, to the refusal of surrender. Every research program that seeks to understand a mysterious disease, every clinical effort to treat what was previously untreatable, every public health initiative that addresses environmental or social determinants of health--these are expressions of the ethic of inquiry applied to human suffering.

This understanding of medicine has practical implications. It suggests that the medicalization of conditions previously understood in supernatural terms is not merely scientific progress but moral progress--an expansion of the sphere in which human effort can make a difference. It suggests that research funding for mysterious diseases is not merely a scientific priority but a moral imperative. It suggests that explanatory humility ("we do not yet understand") is preferable to explanatory surrender ("this cannot be understood").

It also suggests a critique of certain tendencies within contemporary medicine. When biomedical practitioners too quickly declare conditions "psychosomatic" or "functional"--not in the sense of identifying psychological mechanisms but in the sense of dismissing symptoms as unreal or unmeasurable--they may be engaging in their own form of explanatory surrender. The ethic of inquiry demands that we persist in seeking understanding even when our current diagnostic categories fail.

13. History as Moral Practice

Similarly, the argument has implications for how we understand the study of history, particularly the history of atrocity. If we reject demonic explanation

of Nazism, we commit ourselves to historical inquiry as a moral practice--an effort to understand the past in order to prevent the recurrence of its horrors.

This is not the only possible understanding of historical study. One might pursue history as pure scholarship, as an exercise in understanding the past for its own sake without concern for contemporary application. But in the case of atrocity, such detachment is difficult to justify. The victims of the Holocaust, and the potential victims of future genocides, have a claim on our efforts to understand. Historical inquiry that illuminates the mechanisms of mass violence is not merely interesting; it is obligatory.

This understanding generates specific obligations. We must continue to study the social and psychological conditions that enable genocide. We must attend to warning signs in our own societies--the rise of authoritarian movements, the scapegoating of minorities, the normalization of political violence. We must develop educational programs that communicate not merely the horror of the Holocaust but the mechanisms by which it occurred--so that citizens can recognize and resist such mechanisms when they emerge.

The alternative--to treat Nazism as an inexplicable eruption of supernatural evil--abandons these obligations. It provides the comfort of distance ("that could never happen here, because it was demonic and we are not subject to demons") at the cost of vigilance. It provides the satisfaction of moral condemnation ("Hitler was evil incarnate") at the cost of understanding. It provides the relief of closure at the cost of the ongoing effort that prevention requires.

14. The Theological Question

A theological reader might object that this essay has simply assumed a naturalistic worldview and dismissed supernatural explanation without adequate engagement with religious tradition. Does not the Bible speak of evil spirits? Does not Christian tradition include exorcism? Does not Jewish tradition acknowledge the yetzer ha-ra, the evil inclination, and various demonic figures? Is not the rejection of demonic explanation itself a theological position--one that secular modernity assumes but does not argue for?

This objection deserves serious response. I am not arguing that religious belief is incompatible with the ethic of inquiry I have proposed. What I am arguing is that explanatory use of the demonic--using demonic categories to account for specific phenomena in ways that terminate natural inquiry--is incompatible with our responsibilities toward the suffering and toward future generations.

Religious traditions have resources for making this distinction. The Jewish tradition's emphasis on pikuach nefesh--the obligation to preserve life that overrides almost all other commandments--suggests that we must pursue every natural means of healing, regardless of beliefs about ultimate causation. The Christian tradition's affirmation of medicine as a legitimate vocation, and its historical role in establishing hospitals, suggests similar commitments. The theological concept of "secondary causation"--the idea that God works through natural causes rather than constantly intervening supernaturally--provides a framework in which religious belief and natural inquiry coexist.

What I am rejecting is not religious belief as such but a specific use of religious categories--the use that terminates inquiry, that declares phenomena beyond natural understanding, that provides satisfaction at the cost of responsibility. A sophisticated theology can acknowledge the reality of evil, even use the language of the demonic, while insisting that we have obligations to understand and combat evil through every means available to us, including the methods of science, social analysis, and historical inquiry.

15. Living with Mystery

The ethic of inquiry I have proposed does not eliminate mystery; it changes our relationship to it. Instead of resolving mystery through supernatural explanation, we live with it as a spur to continued effort. Instead of the false closure of the demonic, we accept the genuine openness of ongoing investigation.

This is not easy. The human mind craves closure, and the absence of satisfying explanation is genuinely distressing. Patients with mysterious illnesses suffer not only from their symptoms but from the uncertainty of not knowing what is wrong with them. Those who confront historical atrocity suffer not only from the horror of what occurred but from the difficulty of understanding how it could occur. The demonic offers relief from these secondary sufferings--relief that the ethic of inquiry denies.

But the relief offered by demonic explanation is false-not because there are no demons (a metaphysical question I do not presume to settle) but because such explanation does not actually help. It does not cure the patient, does not prevent the disease, does not protect against future atrocity. It provides psychological comfort at the cost of practical efficacy. And practical efficacy is what the suffering requires of us.

Living with mystery, by contrast, keeps open the possibility of genuine help. The disease we do not yet

understand may be understood tomorrow, if we persist in inquiry. The social conditions that produce atrocity may be recognized and resisted, if we continue to analyze them. Mystery is not a wall but an invitation--an invitation to the hard work of understanding that the demonic allows us to avoid.

16. Conclusion: The Refusal to Surrender

This essay has argued against the conceptualization of illness as demonic and against the invocation of the demonic to explain historical atrocity. The argument has been twofold: epistemological (demonic explanation terminates inquiry and prevents understanding) and moral (we have responsibilities to the suffering and to future generations that such termination betrays).

The parallel between illness and historical evil has been central to the argument. In both cases, we encounter phenomena that challenge our understanding and provoke our moral emotions. In both cases, the demonic offers an explanation that satisfies by closing off inquiry. In both cases, this closure has practical consequences: the perpetuation of suffering that might be alleviated, the recurrence of horror that might be prevented.

What I have proposed in place of demonic explanation is an ethic of inquiry--a commitment to understanding that refuses premature closure, persists in the face of difficulty, and maintains humility about current ignorance without treating that ignorance as evidence of supernatural causation. This ethic is demanding; it denies us the comfort of explanatory surrender. But it is also hopeful, for it affirms the possibility that human effort can make a difference--that diseases can be cured, that atrocities can be prevented, that understanding is possible and worthwhile.

We must not surrender. Not to illness conceived as demonic attack, not to historical evil conceived as supernatural irruption, not to the temptation to stop trying to understand because understanding is difficult and uncertain. The suffering of the ill and the memory of the murdered demand better of us. They demand our best efforts at comprehension, our persistence in inquiry, our refusal to accept the comfortable closure that demonic explanation provides.

This is not mere optimism about the power of human knowledge. It is a moral stance: the recognition that surrender is itself a choice, and that we do not have the right to make it. The mysteries remain--of illness, of evil, of human nature in its capacity for both destruction and healing. But mysteries are invitations, not verdicts. They call us to continued effort, not to the abandonment of effort. They require of us not the satisfaction of false closure but the harder and more honest work of living with questions while we seek answers.

In the end, the refusal of demonic explanation is an affirmation of human responsibility. We are responsible for understanding what we can, for fighting what we can fight, for preventing what we can prevent. This responsibility is not diminished by the difficulty of the task or the limits of our current knowledge. It is precisely in the face of mystery that responsibility asserts itself most strongly--the responsibility not to surrender, not to stop trying, not to trade genuine effort for the false comfort of the demonic.

Addendum

1. The Demonic as Reflection of the Inner Self

Above we argued against demonic explanations of illness and historical atrocity on the grounds that such explanations terminate inquiry and relieve us of responsibility. But there is a deeper theological argument to be made--one that does not simply reject demonic language but reinterprets it. Drawing on resources from Jewish mystical tradition, particularly the Kabbalistic understanding of evil and the Hasidic psychology of the yetzer hara, this addendum proposes that what we call "the demonic" is not an external supernatural force but a projection of our own inner

life--a mirror in which we see, but fail to recognize, ourselves.

This reframing does not merely add another argument against demonic explanation; it transforms our understanding of what such explanations represent. If the demonic is a projection of the inner self, then the invocation of demons is not simply an intellectual error but a form of psychological avoidance--a refusal to confront what we ourselves contain. The stakes of such avoidance are immense, for we cannot transform what we refuse to acknowledge.

1.1 Evil as Inner Inclination

Jewish tradition offers a distinctive understanding of evil through the concept of the yetzer hara--the "evil inclination." Unlike demonic frameworks that locate evil in external supernatural agents, the yetzer hara is understood as an internal dimension of human nature, present from birth and active throughout life. The Talmud (Sukkah 52a) teaches that the yetzer hara grows stronger each day, seeking to overpower the person--but it is our own inclination, not an alien invader.

This internalization of evil has profound implications. If evil is a dimension of us, then combating evil requires self-knowledge rather than exorcism. The battlefield is not "out there" in the cosmic struggle between divine and demonic forces; it is "in here," in the depths of our own psyche. The Talmud's teaching that "the greater the person, the greater their yetzer" (Sukkah 52a) underscores this point: the capacity for evil scales with the capacity for good, because both emerge from the same source--the complexity and intensity of the human soul.

Crucially, the rabbinic tradition does not advocate for the elimination of the yetzer hara but for its transformation and channeling. The midrash famously teaches: "Were it not for the yetzer hara, a person would not build a house, marry, have children, or engage in business" (Bereshit Rabbah 9:7). The energy of the yetzer--desire, ambition, passion--is necessary for life. The task is not to destroy this energy but to direct it toward holy ends.

1.2 The Ontology of Concealment

Kabbalistic tradition elaborates this psychology into a cosmic ontology through the concepts of kelipot (shells or husks) and sitra achra (the "other side"). These terms are often translated as references to demonic realms, but a careful reading reveals something more subtle. The kelipot are not independent evil beings but concealments--layers of opacity that hide the divine light present in all creation. Evil, in this framework, is not a positive force but a privation--the absence or concealment of good rather than a substance in its own right.

The Tanya (Likutei Amarim, chapters 6-7) explains that the sitra achra comprises everything that does not openly surrender to the divine--including, significantly, the sense of independent selfhood that characterizes human experience in this world. When I experience myself as a separate, autonomous being rather than as a vessel for divine presence, I am, in Kabbalistic terms, operating within the realm of kelipah. The "demonic" is not an external adversary but the structure of ordinary consciousness--the illusion of separate selfhood that prevents us from recognizing our true nature as expressions of divine unity.

This understanding transforms the meaning of spiritual combat. We are not fighting external demons; we are wrestling with our own tendency toward self-enclosure--our resistance to recognizing our dependence on and connection to the divine source. The "shells" are not foreign impositions but the hardened boundaries of ego that we ourselves construct and maintain.

1.3 The Origin of Apparent Evil

The Lurianic Kabbalah provides a cosmogonic framework that illuminates the origin of the kelipot. According to the Arizal (Rabbi Isaac Luria), creation began with tzimtzum--divine self-contraction. God "withdrew" to create space for the world, and into this space divine light was channeled through vessels (kelim). But the vessels of the primordial World of Chaos (Olam ha-Tohu) could not contain the intensity of the light poured into them, and they shattered (shevirat ha-kelim). The sparks of divine light fell into the realm of the kelipot, becoming trapped in shells of concealment.

This narrative is not merely mythological; it is a phenomenology of consciousness. The "shattering" describes the fragmentation of unified awareness into the multiplicity of separate objects and subjects that characterizes ordinary experience. The "shells" are the conceptual and perceptual boundaries by which we carve up the seamless fabric of reality into discrete entities--including, crucially, the boundary between "self" and "world" that constitutes egoic consciousness. Evil, on this reading, is not a demonic invasion but a structural feature of finite consciousness--the inevitable consequence of being a bounded perspective within an infinite whole.

The task of tikkun (repair) is to release the trapped sparks by recognizing the divine light concealed within all things--including within our own "evil" inclinations. This is not a battle against external demons but a process of integration--gathering the scattered fragments of consciousness into renewed wholeness. The "demonic" is not defeated but redeemed, transformed from concealment into revelation.

1.4 Jung Meets the Rabbis

The convergence between Jewish mystical psychology and Carl Jung's concept of the "Shadow" is striking. For Jung, the Shadow is the unconscious repository of everything the conscious ego finds unacceptable--repressed desires, denied impulses, disowned aspects of self. The Shadow is not evil in itself; it becomes destructive only when it remains unconscious and is therefore projected outward onto others or onto imagined external forces.

The yetzer hara functions similarly. It is not an alien intruder but a dimension of our own psyche--the energies of desire, aggression, and self-assertion that civilization requires us to regulate but cannot eliminate. When these energies are acknowledged and integrated, they become sources of creativity and vitality. When they are denied and projected, they return as "demons"--external threats that we must battle without recognizing that we are fighting ourselves.

The Talmudic stories of great rabbis struggling with their yetzer illustrate this dynamic vividly. Rabbi Akiva, who mocked sinners, was tested by Satan appearing as a beautiful woman--teaching him not to underestimate the power of his own inclinations. Rav Amram the Pious, overcome by desire, cried out "Fire in the house of Amram!"--publicly acknowledging his inner struggle rather than projecting it outward. The message is consistent: the adversary is within, and victory requires self-confrontation rather than demon-hunting.

Jung himself noted the parallel: "Were it not for the yetzer hara, people would not build houses, take wives, have children, or engage in business"--this rabbinic teaching anticipates Jung's insistence that the Shadow contains not only darkness but essential life energy. To repress the Shadow entirely is to cut ourselves off from our own vitality. The path to wholeness lies not in shadow-elimination but in shadow-integration.

1.5 Projection as Spiritual Mechanism

The Jewish concept of the ayin hara (evil eye) provides another lens through which to understand the demonic as projection. The tradition warns against gazing enviously at another's possessions or good fortune, lest one cause harm through the "evil eye." But what is the mechanism of this harm? A psychological reading suggests that the ayin hara describes not magical causation but the toxic effects of projected envy--both on the one who envies (who poisons their own consciousness with resentment) and on social relationships (which are corroded by unexpressed hostility).

The ayin hara is thus a form of psychological projection: inner states of envy, resentment, and hostility are experienced as emanating outward toward their objects, causing harm through a kind of malevolent radiation. But the real harm is internal--the corrosion of one's own soul through the cultivation of negative emotions. The tradition's emphasis on not "counting" people, not drawing excessive attention to good fortune, not gloating over success--these are strategies for managing projection, for containing the tendency to externalize inner states in ways that damage both self and other.

1.6 Divine Presence in the Depths

The Kabbalistic teaching of the Shekhinah's exile adds another dimension to this analysis. The Shekhinah--the feminine aspect of divine presence--is understood to have descended into the realm of the kelipot, dwelling among the shells and sparks of the broken world. This means that divine presence is found not only in obvious holiness but precisely in the depths of apparent darkness--including the darkness of our own inner life.

As I have argued elsewhere, this theology has profound implications for understanding suffering and healing. The primordial wound of tzimtzum inaugurates creation through divine self-limitation, birthing both world and evil through an originary incision in the Infinite. The Shekhinah, as the feminine hypostasis of this wound, descends into material exile where her pain becomes the site of redemptive encounter. We can extend this analysis to the "demonic": what we experience as demonic attack may be the Shekhinah in exile--divine presence concealed within the very aspects of ourselves that we most fear and reject.

This reframing does not romanticize suffering or evil. It suggests, rather, that the path through darkness lies not in flight or combat but in recognition--the recognition that what we encounter as alien and threatening is, at its core, an exiled aspect of our own wholeness calling for redemption. The demon, on

this reading, is a disguised divine spark waiting to be recognized and reintegrated.

1.7 Implications for Illness and Historical Atrocity

These theological reflections have direct bearing on the main argument of this essay. If the "demonic" is a projection of our own inner life, then demonic explanations of illness and historical atrocity are forms of psychological avoidance--strategies for refusing to confront what we ourselves contain.

When we attribute illness to demonic attack, we may be projecting our own resistance to vulnerability, our fear of bodily fragility, our anger at the limitations of finite existence. The "demon" of disease is the embodiment of our refusal to accept our mortality--a refusal that, by preventing us from facing what is actually happening, impedes both medical treatment and psychological integration. The task is not to battle the demon but to withdraw the projection--to recognize that what we fear "out there" is actually "in here," a dimension of our own experience that requires acknowledgment and care.

Similarly, when we attribute historical atrocity to demonic forces, we may be projecting our own capacity for evil--the yetzer hara that dwells in every human heart, including our own. Hitler becomes a demon because we cannot bear to recognize that the same inclinations that drove him--resentment, scapegoating, the desire for power, the capacity for cruelty--exist within ourselves. By making Nazism supernatural, we exempt ourselves from the terrible knowledge that "ordinary men" (to use Christopher Browning's phrase) committed these atrocities--and that under different circumstances, we might have been among them.

This is not a comfortable realization. It is far easier to fight demons than to confront our own capacity for evil. But the tradition insists that wholeness requires such confrontation. The path of tikkun runs through the kelipot, not around them. We cannot redeem what we refuse to acknowledge.

1.8 Healing Through Integration

The understanding of the demonic as projection has important implications for therapeutic practice. If what we call "demonic" is actually an externalization of inner experience, then the therapeutic task is not exorcism but integration--helping patients withdraw their projections and recognize the displaced aspects of themselves that have taken on monstrous form.

This approach aligns with the hermeneutic medicine I have developed elsewhere, which treats the patient as a "sacred text" requiring interpretation rather than merely technical intervention. The patient's experience of illness as demonic attack is not dismissed as superstition but read as a symbolic expression of inner reality. What aspects of the patient's psyche have been projected onto the disease? What fears, angers, or unacknowledged aspects of self-have taken on the form of an external adversary?

The therapeutic space becomes, in this framework, a site of tikkun--a place where scattered fragments of self can be gathered and reintegrated. The healer's role is not to wage war against demons but to create the conditions in which the patient can recognize and reclaim what has been projected. This is delicate work, requiring the creation of what I have called a "sacred space" in which such recognition becomes possible--a container strong enough to hold the terror of self-confrontation.

1.9 Collective Shadow Work

The implications extend beyond individual therapy to collective life. If the demonization of historical atrocity is a form of collective shadow projection, then preventing future atrocity requires collective shadow work--the difficult process by which societies confront their own capacity for evil rather than projecting it onto scapegoats or supernatural adversaries.

Germany's post-war Vergangenheitsbewaltigung (coming to terms with the past) represents one attempt at such collective work. Rather than treating Nazism as a demonic aberration from which "real" Germany was exempt, the process required acknowledging that ordinary Germans--not demons, not monsters--participated in and enabled the Holocaust. This acknowledgment is painful but necessary, for only by recognizing the capacity for such evil within the collective can the collective develop the vigilance and institutional safeguards needed to prevent recurrence.

Societies that refuse such shadow work--that insist on treating past atrocities as the work of demonic others rather than recognizing their own complicity--remain vulnerable to repetition. The projection provides psychological comfort but forecloses genuine reckoning. And without genuine reckoning, the conditions that enabled atrocity to remain unaddressed, ready to produce new horrors under new circumstances.

1.10 The Courage to Face the Mirror

The theological traditions we have examined converge on a profound insight: what we call "the demonic" is, at its core, a reflection of our own inner life--a projection of the yetzer hara, the Shadow, the exiled aspects of self that we cannot bear to acknowledge. This insight does not diminish the reality of evil or the seriousness of suffering; rather, it locates the source of evil and the possibility of healing in the one place where we can actually do something: within ourselves.

The demonic, understood this way, is not an adversary to be defeated but a mirror to be faced. What we see in that mirror is frightening: our own capacity for cruelty, our own resistance to vulnerability, our own complicity in structures of harm. But the tradition insists that such confrontation is the path to wholeness. The sparks of divine light are trapped in the kelipot; they cannot be released without engaging the shells that contain them. The Shekhinah dwells in exile; she cannot be redeemed without descending to meet her.

This is why we must not surrender to demonic explanations--not only because they terminate inquiry, not only because they relieve us of responsibility, but because they represent a refusal to look in the mirror. The demon we project outward is the self we refuse to see. And until we see that self--until we acknowledge the yetzer hara within us, integrate our Shadow, release the Shekhinah from her exile in our depths--we cannot become whole, and we cannot prevent the evils that fragmented consciousness perpetuates.

The courage to face the mirror is the beginning of tikkun. It is also the beginning of genuine responsibility--responsibility not merely for our actions but for our inner life, for the projections we cast and the shadows we refuse to see. In this responsibility lies the possibility of healing, both individual and collective. The path runs not around the darkness but through it--and the light we seek is waiting to be recognized in the very depths we fear to face.

17. References

1. Browning, Christopher R. Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland. New York: HarperCollins, 1992.
2. Jung, Carl G. Aion: Research into the Phenomenology of the Self. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959.
3. Scholem, Gershom. Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism. New York: Schocken Books, 1941.
4. Schneur Zalman of Liadi. Tanya (Likutei Amarim). Brooklyn: Kehot Publication Society, 1984.
5. Talmud Bavli, Tractate Sukkah. Standard Vilna edition.
6. Ungar-Sargon, Julian. "From Midrashic Exile Through to Embodied Theology." Theological Essays. www.jyungar.com.
7. Ungar-Sargon, Julian. "Sukkah 52: Yetzer Hara--A Moral Model vs Illness Model." Daf Ditty. www.jyungar.com-daf ditty
8. Ungar-Sargon, Julian. "Ayin Hara." Deep Dive Ditty. www.jyungar.com-theological essay
9. Vital, Hayyim. Etz Hayyim. Jerusalem: Yeshivat ha-Hayyim ve-ha-Shalom, 1988.
10. Wolfson, Elliot R. Language, Eros, Being: Kabbalistic Hermeneutics and Poetic Imagination. New York: Fordham University Press, 2005.
11. Bibliography
12. Arendt, Hannah. Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil. New York: Viking Press, 1963.
13. Browning, Christopher R. Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland. New York: HarperCollins, 1992.
14. Canguilhem, Georges. The Normal and the Pathological. Trans. Carolyn R. Fawcett. New York: Zone Books, 1991.
15. Cuneo, Michael W. American Exorcism: Expelling Demons in the Land of Plenty. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
16. Foucault, Michel. The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception. Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.
17. Friedlander, Saul. Nazi Germany and the Jews. 2 vols. New York: HarperCollins, 1997-2007.
18. Goldberg, Carl. Speaking with the Devil: Exploring Senseless Acts of Evil. New York: Penguin, 1996.
19. Hauerwas, Stanley. Naming the Silences: God, Medicine, and the Problem of Suffering. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
20. Kershaw, Ian. Hitler. 2 vols. New York: W. W. Norton, 1998-2000.
21. Kleinman, Arthur. The Illness Narratives: Suffering, Healing, and the Human Condition. New York: Basic Books, 1988.
22. Milgram, Stanley. Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
23. Neiman, Susan. Evil in Modern Thought: An Alternative History of Philosophy. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.
24. Pagels, Elaine. The Origin of Satan: How Christians Demonized Jews, Pagans, and Heretics. New York: Vintage Books, 1996.

25. Sontag, Susan. Illness as Metaphor and AIDS and Its Metaphors. New York: Picador, 2001.
26. Zimbardo, Philip. The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil. New York: Random House, 2007.