

The Goodness Paradox How Evolution Made Us Both M Workbook

The goodness paradox: how evolution made us both moral and capable of evil

Introduction: The Paradox at the Heart of Humanity

Human beings are uniquely positioned in the animal kingdom as creatures capable of profound kindness and compassion, yet also capable of immense cruelty and violence. This apparent contradiction, often termed the "goodness paradox," lies at the core of understanding human nature. How did evolution, a process driven by survival and reproduction, endow us with such dual capacities? This article explores the roots of the goodness paradox, examining how evolutionary pressures shaped our moral capacities and our darker tendencies, and why understanding this paradox is essential for fostering a more compassionate and aware society.

The Evolutionary Origins of Human Morality

Natural Selection and Cooperative Behavior

Evolution, through natural selection, favored traits that increased reproductive success. For humans, cooperation and social bonding proved advantageous in navigating complex environments. Early humans who collaborated could hunt larger prey, defend against predators, and share resources more effectively.

- Group living increased survival odds.
- Altruistic behaviors promoted group cohesion.
- Reciprocity and fairness fostered trust among members.

Over time, these behaviors became embedded in our social fabric, laying the groundwork for moral systems.

The Role of Kin Selection and Reciprocal Altruism

Two key evolutionary mechanisms underpin human morality:

- **Kin selection:** Favoring relatives to ensure the propagation of shared genes.

- **Reciprocal altruism:** Helping non-relatives with the expectation of future reciprocity.

These mechanisms reinforced prosocial behaviors that, while beneficial for individual and group survival, also created an environment where cooperation could flourish despite the potential for exploitation.

The Emergence of Moral Norms and Empathy

As humans developed larger brains and complex social structures, empathy became a crucial trait. The ability to understand and share the feelings of others fostered moral norms:

- Empathy encouraged prosocial actions.
- Shared moral codes reduced conflict.
- Culture transmitted norms that promoted altruism.

Moral development thus became intertwined with our biological evolution, shaping the social behaviors that define us today.

The Dark Side: Evolutionary Roots of Violence and Self-Interest

The Evolution of Aggression and Competition

While cooperation was vital, humans also evolved competitive and aggressive traits. Evolutionary pressures favored individuals who could defend resources, rival competitors, or assert dominance.

- Intraspecific competition increased access to mates and resources.
- Violence could secure status and reproductive advantage.
- Aggressive instincts were vital in hostile environments.

These tendencies, while advantageous in certain contexts, could manifest as violence and cruelty when unchecked.

The Evolution of Self-Interest and the "Dark Side"

Human self-interest often conflicts with altruism. Evolution favored traits like greed, deception, and manipulation because they could enhance individual survival and reproductive success.

- Deception and lying can create advantageous situations.

- Greed motivates resource accumulation, improving survival prospects.
- Power-seeking behaviors enhance status and reproductive opportunities.

The capacity for selfishness and cruelty is embedded in our evolutionary history, contributing to the "dark side" of human nature.

The Balancing Act: Why We Are Both Moral and Immoral

Dual Evolutionary Pathways

The coexistence of morality and immorality is not accidental but results from dual evolutionary pathways:

- **Prosocial pathway:** Promoting cooperation, empathy, and moral norms.
- **Selfish pathway:** Favoring individual advantage, dominance, and exploitation.

These pathways continually interact, creating a dynamic tension that shapes human behavior.

The Role of Culture and Society

Culture acts as a mediating force, shaping and constraining our innate tendencies:

- Legal systems and social norms suppress harmful impulses.
- Education fosters empathy and moral reasoning.
- Cultural narratives reinforce prosocial behaviors.

Yet, cultural influences can also be manipulated to justify cruelty or selfishness, illustrating the complex interplay between biology and environment.

The Goodness Paradox in Modern Humanity

Empirical Evidence of the Paradox

Research demonstrates that humans are capable of extraordinary acts of kindness alongside acts of barbarism:

- Examples of altruism, such as rescue efforts and charitable acts.
- Instances of genocide, warfare, and systemic cruelty.

Psychologists and anthropologists have studied these behaviors to understand how the same species can embody both extremes.

Psychological and Biological Factors

Several factors influence the expression of the goodness paradox:

- Neurobiological mechanisms, such as the reward system activated by altruism.
- Situational influences, including group dynamics and authority figures.
- Individual differences in temperament, upbringing, and values.

Understanding these factors helps explain why humans can oscillate between moral high ground and moral failure.

Implications for Humanity and Society

Addressing the Paradox: Promoting the Good

By recognizing the evolutionary roots of both our moral and immoral tendencies, societies can foster environments that encourage prosocial behavior:

- Implementing educational programs that cultivate empathy.
- Developing institutions that promote justice and fairness.
- Encouraging self-awareness and moral reflection.

Such initiatives can help tilt the balance towards kindness and cooperation.

Understanding Our Limitations and Potentials

Awareness of the goodness paradox emphasizes that human nature is complex. We must accept our capacity for both good and evil and work consciously to nurture the former:

- Recognize the influence of evolutionary predispositions.
- Build social structures that mitigate destructive tendencies.
- Foster individual responsibility and moral growth.

This understanding fosters humility and hope in our ongoing moral evolution.

Conclusion: Embracing the Paradox for a Better Future

The goodness paradox underscores the duality inherent in human nature, rooted in our evolutionary history. Recognizing that we are both capable of kindness and cruelty allows us to approach our moral development with honesty and compassion. By understanding the biological and cultural forces that shape us, we can create a society that amplifies our capacity for goodness while minimizing our darker impulses. Embracing this paradox not only deepens our understanding of ourselves but also empowers us to build a more just, compassionate, and resilient future.

The Goodness Paradox: How Evolution Made Us Both Murderers and Saints

The human condition is a fascinating amalgamation of kindness and cruelty, morality and brutality. At the heart of this paradox lies an intriguing question: How did evolution shape us to be both capable of horrific violence and profound goodness? The book "The Goodness Paradox: How We Evolutionarily Became Both Murderers and Saints" by Harvard primatologist and evolutionary psychologist Richard Wrangham offers compelling insights into this duality. This review aims to explore the core ideas of the book, dissecting how evolutionary forces have crafted the complex moral landscape that defines humanity today.

Understanding the Paradox: Murderers and Saints

The paradox posited by Wrangham revolves around two seemingly contradictory traits:

- Innate violence: Humans are capable of extreme violence, murder, and brutality.
- Innate prosociality: Simultaneously, humans exhibit extraordinary levels of cooperation, altruism, and moral behavior.

How can these coexist? Wrangham suggests that the roots of both behaviors are deeply embedded in our evolutionary history, shaped by different social pressures and survival strategies.

The Evolutionary Roots of Human Aggression

1. The Role of Predation and Competition

Historically, early humans faced intense competition for resources, mates, and survival opportunities. This competition fostered aggressive behaviors as adaptive strategies:

- Intra-group violence: Competition within groups could lead to conflict, dominance hierarchies, and even lethal confrontations.

- Inter-group violence: Warfare between groups or tribes often determined access to resources, territory, and reproductive success.

Wrangham emphasizes that some level of violence was evolutionarily advantageous, enabling early humans to defend their resources and secure reproductive opportunities.

2. Biological Foundations of Aggression

Research indicates that aggression has biological underpinnings:

- Elevated levels of testosterone correlate with increased aggression.
- Neural circuits involving the amygdala and limbic system facilitate responses to threats.
- Evolution favored those with aggressive tendencies in certain contexts, especially during times of resource scarcity or territorial disputes.

The Emergence of Prosocial Behavior: Cooperation and Morality

While aggression had its evolutionary benefits, humans also developed remarkable prosocial traits:

1. The Importance of Cooperation

Humans are uniquely cooperative compared to other primates. Cooperation enhances:

- Collective hunting and resource sharing.
- Defense against predators and rival groups.
- Child-rearing and knowledge transfer.

This cooperation is rooted in our capacity for theory of mind, empathy, and reciprocal altruism.

2. The Evolution of Morality

Wrangham discusses how moral systems and social norms evolved to promote group cohesion:

- Moral codes discourage violence within the group.
- Punishments and social sanctions maintain prosocial behavior.
- Empathy and guilt regulate individual actions.

This moral framework enhances group survival by fostering trust and reducing destructive conflicts.

The Duality: Two Evolutionary Pathways

Wrangham argues that human evolution created two overlapping but distinct behavioral pathways:

- The "Lethal" Pathway: Driven by competition, dominance, and aggression?leading to violence and murder.
- The "Loving" Pathway: Driven by cooperation, empathy, and moral considerations?leading to prosocial acts and altruism.

This duality is not accidental but a product of different evolutionary pressures that shaped our neural and social architecture.

The Role of Self-Control and Cultural Evolution

The coexistence of these pathways raises the question: Why don't humans universally behave violently? The answer lies in cultural evolution and the development of self-control mechanisms.

- Social norms and laws: Cultures have developed rules that suppress violent impulses and promote cooperation.
- Education and moral socialization: From childhood, individuals learn empathy, fairness, and social responsibility.
- Institutional structures: Governments, legal systems, and religious institutions serve to restrain violent tendencies.

Wrangham emphasizes that culture and social institutions are crucial in shaping human behavior, often overriding innate tendencies.

The Goodness Paradox in Practice

Wrangham's analysis sheds light on real-world phenomena:

- Historical and contemporary violence: Despite our capacity for goodness, humans continue to wage wars, commit atrocities, and engage in violent crimes.
- Acts of extraordinary kindness: From humanitarian efforts to self-sacrifice, humans also demonstrate profound altruism.
- Group dynamics: Cooperation within groups and hostility towards outsiders reflect the same dual evolutionary heritage.

This paradox explains why societies have both mechanisms of violence and institutions of compassion.

Implications for Modern Society

Understanding the dual nature of human evolution has profound implications:

- Policy and justice: Recognizing innate tendencies toward violence can inform criminal justice and conflict resolution strategies.
- Education: Promoting empathy and moral reasoning can harness our prosocial pathways.
- Conflict prevention: Addressing resource scarcity, social inequality, and cultural conflicts can reduce triggers of violence.

Wrangham advocates for an integrated approach that acknowledges our biological predispositions while actively cultivating prosocial behaviors.

Conclusion: Embracing Our Dual Heritage

"The Goodness Paradox" offers a nuanced perspective on human nature. It challenges simplistic notions of humans as inherently good or evil, instead presenting us as complex creatures shaped by millions of years of evolution. Our capacity for violence and kindness is deeply intertwined, reflecting adaptive strategies that have helped humans survive and flourish.

By understanding the evolutionary origins of both our aggressive and altruistic tendencies, we can better navigate the moral and social challenges of our time. We are, in essence, a product of dual pathways?murderers and saints?whose coexistence is a testament to the intricate tapestry of human evolution.

This recognition invites us to consciously cultivate the "loving" pathway through cultural, social, and individual efforts, ensuring that our innate capacity for goodness continues to flourish in an often violent world.

Question What is the core idea behind 'The Goodness Paradox' regarding human evolution? The core idea is that human evolution has shaped us to be both inherently cooperative and capable of violence, with our moral instincts promoting prosocial behavior while our capacity for aggression allows us to defend and compete, creating a paradoxical nature. How does the book explain the dual nature of human morality and aggression? The book explains that evolution selected for prosocial traits like empathy and trust to foster cooperation, while also maintaining aggressive instincts that can be unleashed in conflicts, resulting in humans being both 'good' and 'bad' depending on circumstances. In what ways does understanding the goodness paradox help us

address modern social issues? Understanding the paradox highlights the importance of managing our innate tendencies, promoting prosocial behavior through social norms and institutions, and recognizing the potential for violence, which can inform policies to foster peace and cooperation. What role does social hierarchy and dominance play in the development of human aggression according to the book? The book suggests that social hierarchies and the desire for dominance have historically triggered aggressive behaviors, but human societies have also developed norms and institutions that suppress violence to maintain social order. How does 'The Goodness Paradox' relate human evolution to contemporary behavioral tendencies? It relates by proposing that our evolutionary history endowed us with both cooperative instincts and aggressive drives, which continue to influence our behavior today? explaining why humans can be remarkably altruistic yet also capable of great violence. What implications does the paradox have for understanding human nature in the context of violence and kindness? The paradox implies that human nature is fundamentally complex; recognizing this duality helps us understand that our capacity for both kindness and violence is rooted in our evolutionary past, guiding efforts to nurture the positive aspects while controlling the negative.

Related keywords: evolution, human nature, morality, altruism, self-interest, social behavior, evolutionary psychology, cooperation, selfishness, moral development

cut both ways

Understanding the Expression Cut Both Ways: Meaning, Usage, and Context

The phrase **cut both ways** is a common idiom in the English language that conveys the idea of a situation or action having two contrasting or opposing effects. It emphasizes that something can benefit one party while simultaneously disadvantaging another, highlighting the dual nature of certain circumstances or decisions. Recognizing the nuances of this expression can enrich your vocabulary and improve your understanding of complex social, political, and personal contexts.

Origins and Historical Context of Cut Both Ways

Historical Roots of the Phrase

While the exact origin of **cut both ways** is difficult to pinpoint, it is believed to have emerged in the early 20th century, possibly rooted in the metaphor of a sword or blade that can cut in multiple directions. This imagery underscores the idea of duality ? that a single action or decision can have two different outcomes.

Evolution of Usage Over Time

Initially, **cut both ways** was used primarily in legal or political contexts to describe policies or laws that could result in both positive and negative consequences. Over time, it has broadened to encompass personal relationships, business decisions, and societal issues, reflecting the universal nature of situations with dual effects.

Meaning and Interpretation of Cut Both Ways

Literal and Figurative Meanings

- **Literal:** A physical object, like a sword or blade, that can cut in two different directions, causing harm or benefit depending on how it is used.
- **Figurative:** An abstract concept describing situations, actions, or policies that have both advantageous and disadvantageous outcomes simultaneously.

Common Contexts Where the Phrase Applies

- **Legal and Political Decisions:** Policies that benefit certain groups but disadvantage others.
- **Personal Relationships:** Actions that can strengthen one relationship but strain another.
- **Business Strategies:** Marketing campaigns that attract new customers but may alienate existing ones.
- **Societal Issues:** Legislation or social movements that promote progress but may also incite controversy.

Examples of Cut Both Ways in Daily Life

Legal and Political Examples

- Tax reforms designed to stimulate economic growth may also widen income inequality, **cutting both ways**.
- Implementing stricter environmental regulations can protect natural resources but may hinder industrial growth.

Personal and Social Examples

- Sharing personal information online can foster closer connections but also risk privacy

breaches.

- Deciding to move to a new city may open up new opportunities but also lead to feelings of loneliness or disconnection from friends and family.

Business and Marketing Examples

- Offering discounts may attract new customers but reduce profit margins.
- Innovating a product can boost sales but might alienate loyal customers resistant to change.

Strategies for Navigating Situations When Things Cut Both Ways

Assessing Risks and Benefits

Before making decisions in scenarios where outcomes can go either way, it is essential to conduct a thorough analysis of potential risks and benefits. Consider:

- Who benefits, and who might be disadvantaged?
- What are the short-term versus long-term consequences?
- Are there ways to mitigate negative effects?

Balancing Competing Interests

Effective decision-making often involves balancing conflicting interests. Techniques include:

- Engaging stakeholders to understand different perspectives.
- Seeking compromise solutions that minimize adverse effects.
- Prioritizing transparency and open communication.

Implementing Flexible Strategies

When outcomes are uncertain, adopting flexible or adaptive strategies can help manage unforeseen consequences. This involves:

- Monitoring results closely after implementation.
- Being prepared to adjust course as needed.
- Maintaining contingency plans for various scenarios.

The Significance of Cut Both Ways in Modern Discourse

In Politics and Policy-Making

Understanding that many policies **cut both ways** is crucial for informed debate. Policymakers must weigh the positives against the negatives to craft balanced legislation.

In Business and Economics

Businesses often face decisions where strategies designed for growth may have unintended side effects, such as environmental impact or social backlash. Recognizing the dual nature of these actions helps in creating sustainable practices.

In Personal Development and Relationships

Personal choices frequently involve trade-offs. Recognizing that actions can have both beneficial and adverse effects enables individuals to make more thoughtful decisions that align with their values and goals.

SEO Optimization Tips for Using Cut Both Ways

Keywords and Phrases to Incorporate

- Meaning of **cut both ways**
- Examples of **cut both ways**
- Situations where **cut both ways** applies
- Understanding dual effects in decision-making
- Implications of **cut both ways** in politics/business

Meta Description Suggestions

- Discover the meaning of **cut both ways** and how this idiom applies to various contexts like politics, business, and personal life. Learn strategies to navigate dual-effect situations effectively.
- Explore the origins, usage, and examples of **cut both ways**. Understand how to assess situations with dual outcomes for better decision-making.

Content Optimization Strategies

- Use the keyword **cut both ways** naturally throughout the article.
- Include related terms like "dual effects," "trade-offs," "pros and cons," and "dual outcomes."
- Optimize images with descriptive alt text related to the idiom.
- Ensure the content provides genuine value, answering common questions and offering practical insights.

Conclusion: Embracing the Dual Nature of Decisions

The idiom **cut both ways** encapsulates the complex reality that many situations involve simultaneous benefits and drawbacks. Whether in politics, business, or personal life, recognizing this duality allows for more nuanced analysis and better decision-making. By assessing risks, balancing interests, and remaining adaptable, individuals and organizations can navigate situations where outcomes **cut both ways** with greater confidence and wisdom.

Understanding the full implications of actions that **cut both ways** empowers us to make more informed choices, fostering resilience and sustainability in an increasingly complex world.

Cut Both Ways: An In-Depth Analysis of a Phrase with Multifaceted Implications

The phrase "cut both ways" is a compelling idiomatic expression rooted in the complexities of language, perception, and consequence. Used widely across contexts—from everyday conversations to political discourse—it encapsulates the idea that actions, decisions, or situations often have dual or even contradictory effects. This article delves into the origins, interpretations, and broader implications of the phrase, exploring how "cutting both ways" embodies the nuanced nature of cause and effect, and why understanding its layered meaning is essential in analyzing human behavior and societal dynamics.

Origins and Etymology of "Cut Both Ways"

Historical Roots

The phrase "cut both ways" traces back to the realm of fencing, swordsmanship, and combat training, where literal cutting instruments and techniques exemplify the dual-edged nature of blades. In the literal sense, a sword or blade that "cuts both ways" is capable of delivering harm or benefit to either side, emphasizing the inherent symmetry and potential for collateral damage. This metaphorical extension into language and idioms gained popularity in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

In the early literature and speeches, "cut both ways" appeared as a way to describe situations where an action or policy had both positive and negative consequences. Its figurative use became more widespread throughout the 20th century, especially in political and social commentary.

Evolution of Usage

Initially, the phrase was primarily used in contexts involving physical danger or conflict, such as fencing or military strategy. Over time, it transitioned into a broader idiomatic expression, applicable to ethical dilemmas, policy decisions, and personal choices. Today, "cut both ways" is ubiquitous in media, literature, and everyday speech, often serving as a shorthand for complex situations where unintended or conflicting outcomes are involved.

Interpreting "Cut Both Ways": Multiple Perspectives

Dual Outcomes in Decision-Making

One of the most common interpretations of "cut both ways" pertains to decision-making processes. When individuals or organizations face choices, every option often carries both advantages and disadvantages.

Example:

A company implementing a new technology might gain efficiency but at the cost of employee layoffs. Here, the decision "cuts both ways"—beneficial for productivity but harmful to staff morale and job security.

Key points:

- Recognizing dual outcomes helps in evaluating trade-offs.
- It fosters a nuanced understanding that no decision is entirely good or bad.
- Anticipating both sides can lead to more balanced and ethical choices.

Political and Policy Implications

In political discourse, policies are frequently described as "cutting both ways." For instance, a law intended to reduce crime might also infringe on civil liberties, embodying the phrase's essence.

Case Study:

The implementation of surveillance laws post-9/11 aimed to enhance national security but also raised concerns about privacy erosion. Such policies "cut both ways"—they potentially save lives but threaten individual freedoms.

Implications:

- Policymakers must weigh competing interests.
- Public debates often revolve around the "both ways" nature of legislation.
- The phrase underscores the importance of comprehensive impact assessments.

Personal and Ethical Dilemmas

On a personal level, individuals encounter situations where their actions or beliefs have conflicting effects.

Example:

An activist might believe that protesting is necessary for change but also recognize that protests can sometimes lead to social unrest or alienate moderates.

Moral considerations:

- The phrase highlights the complexity of moral choices.
- It encourages reflection on unintended consequences.
- Recognizing "both ways" outcomes fosters empathy and critical thinking.

Broader Societal and Cultural Dimensions

Economic Contexts

Economics often involves decisions that "cut both ways." For example, globalization can boost economic growth but also lead to job displacement in certain sectors.

Analysis:

Global trade agreements can increase consumer choices and lower prices but may weaken domestic industries and widen income inequality.

Implications:

- Policymakers must find a balance that maximizes benefits while mitigating harms.
- The phrase encourages a holistic view of economic policies.

Environmental Considerations

Environmental policies frequently embody the "cut both ways" principle. For instance, renewable energy projects like hydroelectric dams generate clean power but can disrupt ecosystems and displace communities.

Case Study:

The construction of the Three Gorges Dam in China provided renewable energy and flood control but also caused ecological and social upheavals.

Lessons:

- Sustainable development requires acknowledging and managing conflicting impacts.
- The phrase reminds us of the importance of integrated environmental assessments.

Technological Advances

Technological innovations often bring transformative benefits but also pose risks and ethical dilemmas.

Example:

Artificial intelligence improves productivity but raises concerns about job displacement and privacy violations.

Reflection:

The rapid pace of technological change underscores the need for proactive regulation and ethical considerations, recognizing that progress "cuts both ways."

Analyzing the Phrase in Modern Contexts

Media and Public Discourse

In contemporary media, "cut both ways" is frequently invoked to describe complex issues, especially in polarizing debates.

Example:

Discussions about social media regulation often highlight that while platforms enable free expression, they also facilitate misinformation.

Significance:

The phrase aids in framing nuanced narratives that avoid oversimplification, fostering informed public debates.

Legal and Judicial Settings

In legal contexts, laws and rulings may "cut both ways," impacting different groups disparately.

Example:

A Supreme Court decision expanding free speech rights might also limit regulatory power over harmful content, illustrating conflicting effects within the legal system.

Implication:

Judicial decisions often exemplify the "both ways" nature of law, emphasizing the importance of balancing rights and responsibilities.

Business Strategies and Ethics

Corporate decisions, such as adopting sustainable practices, can have both positive brand impacts and increased costs.

Example:

A company going green may appeal to eco-conscious consumers but face higher operational expenses.

Takeaway:

Understanding "cut both ways" effects enables businesses to craft strategies that consider long-term sustainability versus short-term gains.

Conclusion: Embracing the Dual Nature of Outcomes

The phrase "cut both ways" encapsulates the inherent complexity and duality in human decisions, societal developments, and natural phenomena. Recognizing that actions often produce both beneficial and adverse effects fosters a more sophisticated approach to analysis, policy-making, and personal choices. It urges caution against oversimplification and advocates for comprehensive evaluation of consequences.

In a world characterized by interconnected systems and unpredictable variables, embracing the "cut both ways" perspective enhances our capacity for critical thinking, ethical judgment, and adaptive strategies. Whether in politics, economics, technology, or daily life, understanding that every "cut" can be both a gain and a loss reminds us of the nuanced tapestry of cause and effect that shapes our reality. Ultimately, this awareness equips us to navigate complexity with wisdom and foresight, recognizing that in many situations, there is no clear-cut outcome?only the delicate balance of "cutting both ways."

Question What does the phrase 'cut both ways' mean in everyday language? It means that a situation or action can have both positive and negative consequences or effects, often implying that something can be beneficial for one person but harmful to another. How is the expression 'cut both ways' used in legal or political contexts? In legal or political discussions, 'cut both ways' refers to policies or decisions that can have mixed impacts, benefiting some groups while disadvantaging others, highlighting the complexity of certain issues. Can 'cut both ways' be applied to personal relationships? Yes, it can describe situations where one's actions can have both positive and negative effects on others, such as offering help that might inadvertently cause harm or misunderstandings. Is 'cut both ways' a common phrase in literature or media? Yes, it is frequently used in literature, movies, and media to illustrate dilemmas or situations with dual outcomes, emphasizing the nuanced nature of decisions or circumstances. Are there similar idioms to 'cut both ways'? Yes, idioms like 'double-edged sword' or 'two sides of the same coin' convey similar meanings of situations having both positive and negative aspects. How should one interpret 'cut both ways' when analyzing a complex issue? It suggests that the issue has multiple facets with potential benefits and drawbacks, encouraging a balanced and nuanced understanding rather than a one-sided view.

Related keywords: double-edged sword, dual effect, two-sided, mixed blessing, reciprocal, two-way street, conflicting interests, ambivalent, paradox, yin and yang

Read the full article online: [CUT BOTH WAYS](#)