

A meditation on the inevitable passage from moral/ethical to sacred/metaphysical.
SITUATION: Availability of yellow fever control-technology and of governmental authority/power to use it without the consent of the governed.

1. Eliminating yellow fever is a general and specific good.
2. Coercing the recalcitrant people into cooperation with the government for this is an evil, since coercion is generally or specifically evil.
3. Therefore, let's use only persuasion and accept a percentage of yellow fever minus coercion. This is not "best," but it is the "best good" possible here.
4. What, then, is the acceptable percentage differential between elimination and reduction--both specifically (in this situation), and generally (on the larger map of the disease in the area and world)?
5. Contrariwise, what would be an acceptable level of coercion?
6. If coercion is not ruled out as inherently evil, how engage the people affected in designing a program of persuasion + coercion?
 - a. Work with existing power-persons?
 - b. Discover "the natural leaders," only some of whom are now in power; and then work with this group?
 - c. Use communication technology for blanketing the people with propaganda, then work with the leaders who emerge resultantly?
 - d. Other?
7. Contrariwise, take another look at step #1? Is yellow fever in any sense(s) a relative good, i.e. to some extent better [in any percentage] than its eradication? Certainly not medically, in terms of public health. What then? In terms of ecology and/or theology? Which versions of Christian theology would sanction (a) eradication, (b) some persuasion + coercion program, (c) neither persuasion nor coercion? Why? Which version of Christian theology would here be the most pro-human (and why do you think so)?
8. Or should we be uncritical of step #1 and substitute "good" for "evil" in step #2, which then could lead to immediate planning/action (as it would in the cases of plant- or animal-diseases)? Attendant considerations to this question:
 - a. But how much government coercion in other matters is already laid on the people, and how conscious of that as burden are they? as injustice unavoidable? as injustice from which liberation is (1) thinkable or even (2) in sight?
 - b. Would this additional coercion sink their spirit and those other improvement-projects?
 - c. Would this additional coercion sink their way of life, subverting their "consciousness" (world-view [world-picture and world-story])?
 - d. Is their way of life so "sacred" to those who must make the political decision in the larger society that 8c, even as possibility, makes eradication unthankable? To put it another way, is their freedom from yellow fever a negotiable and their life-style not? or the reverse? or are both negotiable in the interest of some third value? Is there anything "human" that is uncritically worthy of preservation per se?
9. Metaphysics-theology becomes, at 8d, unavoidable: how humanize the question of the sacred? by divinizing the secular components? by....? by archaizing? by futurizing? by...? Use the rest of this page and the overpage for scenarioing three ways: