

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute
OR
Philosophical Society of Great Britain

VOL. LXXIV

1942



LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY
THE INSTITUTE, 1, CENTRAL BUILDINGS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

847TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM, 19, LIVINGSTONE HOUSE,
BROADWAY, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, APRIL 13TH, 1942.

THE REV. D. M. LLOYD-JONES, M.D., M.R.C.P., IN THE
CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

The CHAIRMAN then called on the Rev. J. Cochrane Conn, M.A., Ph.D., to read his paper, entitled "Psycho-Analysis" (being the Dr. A. T. Schofield Memorial Paper for 1942).

The meeting was later thrown open to discussion, in which the following took part. Mr. W. E. Leslie, Mr. F. C. Short, Rev. H. R. A. Philp, Mr. J. H. Goode, Dr. Lloyd-Jones, Mr. P. Ruoff, Group-Captain Wiseman.

Written communications were received from the Rev. Principal H. S. Curr and Mr. Douglas Dewar.

The following elections have been made:—J. R. W. Stott, Esq., an Associate; A. E. Coombe, Esq., an Associate.

A REVIEW OF PSYCHO-ANALYSIS IN ITS BEARINGS ON RELIGION.

By the REV. J. C. M. CONN, M.A., PH.D.

I DO not propose to give a detailed account of Psycho-analysis, for many are available. My object is rather to comment on some aspects of the contact between it and Religion.

The impact of Modern Psychology on Religion has been very great. This has been largely due to the work of Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), who has exercised a wider influence upon his generation than any other psychologist. Without Freud's work this whole field would still be uncultivated wilderness. His attempt to explore the unconscious realm of the human mind revolutionised psychological study, and gave to the world what is in truth a "New Psychology." His discoveries enabled him to penetrate the veil which protects us from the disturbing knowledge of our unconscious tendencies.

Psycho-analysis, which started as a therapeutic *method* of investigation for dealing with neuroses, came into existence in 1895, when Freud and Josef Breuer jointly published their "Studies in Hysteria." This is generally accepted as the first event in the history of Psycho-analysis.

Psycho-analysis seeks to understand the dynamic processes of the mind, the motivation, purposes and tendencies, that produce a particular mental attitude or reaction. By means of this *method* Freud studied repressed experiences (emotions), which he called "complexes", buried in the unconscious mind of neurotic patients. Freud demonstrated that psycho-analysis is not abstract and remote from ordinary life. The implications of the Freudian doctrines have not escaped the attention of students in many fields. Making its first big stride forward at the close of the First World War, it has to-day affected almost every branch of knowledge that deals with the life and works of man, including art, literature, social science, psychiatry, æsthetics, ethics and religion.

It was not long before there were three masters in the field—Freud, Jung and Adler. Each, confronted by the same facts, made the facts fit his own widely divergent concepts. Each held contrary views on the basic principles of human motivation. Freud regarded the basic impulse of life as that of sex, Jung as that of self-preservation or the will to live, and Adler as the will to power. Adler joined the Freudian circle in 1900, and seceded from it after ten years. He ascribes—in his *Individual Psychology*,—only a minor rôle to the sex factor. He contends that sexuality is a manifestation or a symbol—the desire for power. His theory is the simplest of the three.

There are many other serious divergencies, yet all three leaders of the principal Schools claim remarkable successes to their credit in the sphere of treatment. One has to marvel at the air of complete certainty with which the divergent views are expounded.

"The divergence of opinion," writes Prof. Flügel, "is fundamental, and is too great to permit of the use of a common name." We are told that it is a misunderstanding to define psycho-analysis as a hydra-headed monster, or to say that the psycho-analytical garrison is divided into a large number of discordant bands, for Freud reserved the terms "psycho-analysis" and "psycho-analytic" for his own School, which is by no means discordant. Since he is the originator of psycho-analysis he is, I suppose,

entitled to do this; and the "discordant bands" have no claim to the title. Psycho-analysts *in the strict sense* are those Freudians whose names appear in the List of Members and Associate-Members of the International Psycho-Analytical Association. This Association held its first meeting in 1908.

It has to be admitted that among psycho-analysts of the dominant section, represented by Freud and his disciples, the scope of agreement is surprising, if not impressive. For the most part Freud's followers have remained very faithful to him. Nearly all of them accept the doctrine of the "Oedipus Complex"* from which Freud professes to derive religion. Practically all of them grant the existence, and agree about the meaning and significance of certain symbols.

In relation to the Christian religion the psycho-analysts are by no means unanimous. Some of them by their writings are causing Christians considerable perplexity and misgiving. Directly, or by implication, they challenge the Christian faith and conduct, and make their "New Psychology" a substitute for religion. Others take little interest in religion; treating it with indifference or contempt.

Some Freudians deny that psycho-analysis is out to *attack* religion. They admit that there is a definite strain of bitterness in Freud's *The Future of an Illusion*, which is generally regarded as fairly representative of the psycho-analytical attitude to religion. But they maintain that the characteristic psycho-analytical attitude towards religion is not one of attack, but one characterised solely by an attempt to formulate a Psychology of Religion. "Psycho-analysis is a method of investigation, an impartial instrument."† In one place Freud does say that religion is "a narcotic." It is also true that he classes it as an "illusion," but he takes pains to define what he means by "an illusion." "An illusion," he says, "is not the same as an error, it is indeed not necessarily an error." He also says: "We call a belief an illusion when wish-fulfilment is a prominent factor in its motivation, while disregarding its relations to reality."‡

* The desire, usually unconscious, of the son to possess the mother, and to be hostile to the father, or destroy him; an excessive erotic attachment of the son to the mother and an aversion from the father as his rival for the mother. The concept is Jungian. It is used, if at all, by Freudians purely in a *descriptive* sense, in such a phase as "castration complex." The term "situation" is preferred.

† *The Future of an Illusion*, p. 64.

‡ *Ibid*, pp. 53 and 54.

Of course, the arguments used to show that religious beliefs are illusory could with equal cogency lead to the conclusion that psycho-analysis, and for that matter all science, is illusory. What Prof. F. H. Bradley says is true: "There is nothing more real than what comes in religion. The man who demands a reality more solid than that of the religious consciousness knows not what he seeks."*

One aspect of psycho-analysis is destructive and subversive of much that is dear to Christians. Another is constructive, illuminating and valuable, shedding light on the basic facts and experiences of the religious life. At one time psycho-analysis seems to be opening up to the Christian minister possibilities hitherto undreamed of in pastoral work and in the understanding and training of the soul. At another it seems to drive the last nail into the coffin of Christianity.

The importance of the contribution which psycho-analysis has to make in the sphere of religion should not be underestimated. It reinforces some of the main principles for which the Christian has to contend. In various ways it justifies and confirms the Faith. It renders service in describing the way in which the mind works in relation to religion. It gives an account of religious dogma (belief), religious feeling, and religious rites (ways of behaving), and is thus of value in the exercise of the teaching office of the Church. It has to do with the mental origins of the religious mode of adjustment, as it is found in the average religious individual (though the actual *beginning* of religion in the soul is beyond its ken). It is also helpful in dealing with the origin of the individual differences in the religious adjustment; why, even under the same social influences, one person is strongly religious and another irreligious, and why one finds his spiritual home in one form of religion, while another finds it in another. It helps in the understanding of some religious difficulties: some of these are not really religious, but psychopathic; like religious doubt due to "anxiety," and loss of the sense of the value of prayer produced by "apathy." It throws some light on the mystery of the Atonement. The psycho-analytical concept of "ambivalence" (the co-existence of opposed feelings: e.g. when a boy's feeling towards his father is a mixture of love and hate), helps us to understand certain aspects of temptation

* Quoted by W. R. Inge, *The Fall of the Idols*, 1940, p. 299.

and of forgiveness. It points out, for instance, that to disown "guilt," and then to project it on others, or on the world, is not forgiveness. Nothing reduces mental tension like Christian forgiveness. Psycho-analysis helps us to analyse and understand the conditions of the conversion-process, but does not, and cannot explain all of the factors and forces involved. It can tell us nothing about the operation of the Spirit of God, which we know to be among the factors which produce the change: "By grace were ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." Personality and character is changed by conversion to a greater extent than by psycho-analysis. The psycho-analytical mechanism of "identification" helps us to understand how union with Christ is achieved. The concepts of "repression" and "the unconscious," aid us in the understanding of what is meant by "putting off" the "old man," the "first man," the "natural man," and "putting on" the "new man," whom Christians hold is dominated by the Spirit.

Recent developments of psycho-analytical theory are profound and far-reaching. There is, for example, Freud's division of the fundamental human instincts into two groups—the "life instincts" (libido), and the "death instincts" or destructive instincts directed outwards against others. In "The Ego and the Id," the libido is broadly conceived by Freud as representing all the urges in human nature which bring human beings together, in contrast to the aggressive instincts which drive human beings apart. There is a close correspondence here with religious ideas about God and the devil as universal beings with conflicting aims.

Another recent feature of psycho-analytical theory is the conception of "restitution," for which Melanie Klein is responsible. This concept is based upon the observation of a deep-seated tendency in human nature to attempt to restore what the aggressive impulses threaten to destroy. The idea of "restitution" has a bearing on the doctrine of salvation. Let Freud speak of the "phantasy of salvation" ("Moses and Monotheism," p. 139), we know that religious salvation is greater than psychological adjustment, call it "restitution," or "integration": it is redemptive, affording positive and permanent relief.

The psycho-analysts do not deny that religion is a factor of primary importance in the building up of a sane and integrated personality. Many of them acknowledge the power of religious faith in dealing with sick souls. As regards the question of

religion and neurosis Freud* says: "The true believer is in a high degree protected against the danger of certain neurotic afflictions: by accepting the universal neurosis, he is spared the task of forming a personal neurosis." Freud's general attitude appears to be fairly well summarised in the sentence: "Religion has performed great services for human culture. It has contributed much toward restraining the asocial instincts, but still not enough."† In "Moses and Monotheism" Freud attributes the beneficial results to a false and evil cause—to a neurosis. He holds that an obsessive character appertains to religious phenomena (p. 163). Is it, one may ask, a neurosis (religion) that has helped mankind to overcome his fears? Is it a neurosis that is the greatest factor in social progress, as Benjamin Kidd declared religion to be?

Whatever motives psycho-analysts may regard as operative in the psychology of religion, the following sentence quoted from an article entitled, "The Individual and Society," by Ernest Jones‡—a psycho-analyst in the strict sense—may be taken as representative of the general attitude of psycho-analysts: "In the history of the world religion has proved perhaps the most powerful help to human weakness, of man's constant endeavour to cope with his own nature."

On the final page of his *Terry Lectures*, Jung § writes in similar terms: "The thing that cures a neurosis must be as convincing as the neurosis; and since the latter is only too real, the helpful experience must be of equal reality. It must be a very real illusion, if you want to put it pessimistically. But *is* the difference between a real illusion, and a healing religious experience? Nobody can know what the ultimate things are. We must, therefore, take them as we experience them. And if such experience helps to make your life healthier, more beautiful, more complete and more satisfactory to yourself, and to those you love, you may safely say, "This was the Grace of God." In a review of Jung's more recent book, "The Integration of the Personality,"|| the reviewer concludes: "Jung, apparently basing his views on a rather superficial understanding of the

* *The Future of an Illusion*, p. 77.

† *Ibid.*, p. 65.

‡ *The Sociological Review*, July, 1935, p. 255. This article is recommended as an illuminating exposition of the wider implications of psycho-analytical theory in its bearing on all social phenomena, including religion.

§ *The Psychology of Religion*, 1938, p. 114.

|| *British Journal Psychology*, 1941, p. 272.

potentialities, as against the actualities, of the Christian religion (especially of Protestantism), seems to dismiss the possibility of any help from that quarter," in the ordinary man's dealing with the disruptive functioning of the unconscious in the personality. Jung could give no definite religious guidance to his patients, for his own religion was of the most nebulous kind.

Dr. Hadfield is less suspicious of the truth of religion than is Jung: "I am convinced that the Christian religion is one of the most valuable and potent influences we possess for producing that harmony and peace of mind and that confidence of soul, which is needed to bring health and power to a large proportion of patients. In some cases I have attempted to cure nervous patients with suggestions of quietness and confidence, but without success, until I have linked those suggestions on to that faith in the power of God which is the substance of the Christian's confidence and hope."* If religion is the best and surest means of perfecting the good work begun by psycho-analysis (which is the view of Dr. Wm. Brown), it is likewise the best means, and sometimes the only means, of dealing with many of the psychological conditions precipitated by psycho-analysis.

It is the theory of "infantile sexuality" that is meant, when it is said that psycho-analysis has finally disposed of religion. According to Freud, psycho-analysis has "traced the origin of religion to the helplessness of childhood, and its content to the persistence of the wishes and needs of childhood into maturity." Freud now observes†: "The information about infantile sexuality was obtained from a study of men, and the theory deduced from it was concerned with male children. It was natural enough to expect a complete parallel between the two sexes: but this turned out not to hold. Further investigations and reflections revealed profound differences between the sexual development of men and women" We still await the evidence and the proof that the existence of the Oedipus Complex is quite general in infancy.

Freud denies the objective existence of God. The "idea of God" is simply an "image" which the mind of man has "projected" out of a sense of need—the need for protection—as a result of his tendency to personify his ideas. God is a "defence mechanism," a form of "infantilism," a "regression." But Christians do not invent a God simply because it is *pleasant* to

* *The Spirit*, edited by Streeter, p. 113f.

† *Autobiographical Study*, 1935, p. 65.

believe in such a Being. They know that God's love can be angry. An indulgent God is not the Bible conception of Him. The New Testament declares that judgment is God's alternative to salvation.

If God is a "mere phantasy," then it has to be admitted that belief in Him is keeping multitudes out of the psycho-analysts' consulting-rooms.

Sin is a purely religious concept. So it is not to be expected that the doctrine of sin should form part of any psychological theory; but the "sense of sin" in the individual mind is regarded as falling within the province of psychological study. The psycho-analyst regards the sense of sin, or "guilt" as he would prefer to call it, as a special form of "anxiety," experienced by the ego in the presence of a conflict between the aggressive id-impulses and the ego-ideal (super-ego)*—the anxiety experienced by the ego when the ego is condemned by the ego-ideal for entertaining aggressive id-impulses.

A certain class of "sins" is regarded by the psycho-analyst as psycho-pathological phenomena, for example the sexual perversions; but in one of his quite early writings, Freud ventured the statement that the neuroses were the *obverse* of the perversions; and the general psycho-analytical view of the neuroses is that they represent an attempt to deal with guilty impulses, in such a way as to ensure that the individual concerned shall atone for harbouring them by suffering: a view, incidentally, which involves attributing to the unconscious, highly moral as well as highly "immoral" elements. Freud states specifically in "The Ego and the Id," *à propos* of the super-ego, that if man is more immoral than he knows, he is also more moral than he knows.

Now, while psycho-analysis has helped us to see more clearly what the consciousness of sin involves, its view of sin itself cannot be accepted by the Christian, who holds that deliverance from sin is not achieved merely by the discovery and knowledge of the forces behind it. Aware of being responsible for their actions men want to know how to get rid of their sin, and so get right with God. The sinner who wants to be reconciled to God can get no help from the psycho-analyst. Where there is no belief in God there can be no adequate sense of sin in the

* "Super-ego"; the self-criticising part of the mind out of which develops the conscience. The super-ego, ego and id, are comparable to the New Testament trinity of spirit, psyche and flesh.

Christian sense. "In trying to extirpate shame," writes C. S. Lewis (*The Problem of Pain*, p. 33), "we have broken down one of the ramparts of the human spirit. I do not know that there is anything to be done but to set about rebuilding as soon as we can. The "frankness" of people sunk below shame is a very cheap frankness."

The psycho-analytical concept of "repression" has led to much misunderstanding; and yet it is, perhaps, Freud's most valuable contribution. Repression is an *unconscious* process which, although persisting in adult life once it has become established, is essentially a process initiated in early life. As a means of dealing with instinctive impulses it is the primitive alternative to the more mature method of self-control; and excessive repression in childhood is found actually to compromise the development of self control as the child grows up. The result of excessive repression in childhood is to produce a situation characterised by the co-existence in the unconscious of a harsh relentless super-ego, and a highly energised fund of primitive and rebellious id-impulses. The existence of such a situation renders the development of self-control more difficult, and throws the individual back on more primitive methods of dealing with instinctive impulses. With the object of avoiding such a situation, the psycho-analyst advocates a greater toleration of the child's instinctive satisfactions on the part of the adult: but this must not be taken as implying any depreciation of self-control in the adult. On the contrary, this attitude is adopted in the interests of the capacity for self-control.

It is frequently incorrectly stated that psycho-analysts believe that nervous breakdowns can be avoided by immediate gratification of the impulses. Actually, such gratification is often the *occasion* of nervous and mental breakdowns. Over-indulgence or undue repression is alike dangerous. In general, inability to tolerate the frustration of impulses is regarded as one of the prime characteristics of neurotic individuals. It is evidence of the dominance of the "pleasure-principle," by which it is natural that behaviour should be governed in early childhood, but which comes to be replaced by the "reality-principle," in so far as emotional maturity is attained. One of the effects of psycho-analytical treatment is to promote the substitution of the "reality-principle" for the "pleasure-principle," and thus to enhance the capacity of the individual to endure the frustration of his impulses. Most psycho-analysts would agree—in spite of

popular belief to the contrary—that indiscriminate and immediate satisfaction of the impulses would make social life impossible. They do not say that the super-ego should be abolished: it is necessary to have rules of conduct. In Freud's words: "Every culture must be built up on coercion and instinctual renunciation."* "Repress or satisfy" are the alternatives of the neurotic; but psycho-analysis fully recognises a third alternative, "self-control." Indeed, it might truthfully be said, that the psycho-analyst regards the capacity for conscious self-control, without resort to repression, as constituting his criterion of emotional maturity and successful adaptation to life.

GENERAL CRITICISMS.

Extravagant and fantastic claims have been put forward by the too ardent supporters of Freud. Their charges against religion need cause little apprehension, for they are derived from a partial and biased view of the facts as all Christians know them by personal experience.

It may be said that the psycho-analyst deals with his subject "in vitro," neglecting human life as a whole. We must take the whole range of experience into account: the emphasis is false: the proportion is mistaken. For instance, the problem of human suffering should not be, and cannot be, studied merely in relation to masochism. It must also be approached as a philosophic question. And what Scripture teaches cannot be discounted. Similarly, though many ideals contain high proportions of Id motivation, narcissian interests, and super-ego compulsions, it is ridiculous to claim that *all* ideals are so composed as to their total constitution.

The psycho-analytical method has inherent limitations. Description of a mental process is not explanation, and explanation in the religious sphere does not explain *away*. The facts and experiences of religion cannot be explained without reference to God as an operative Power in human life.

Many of the "conclusions" of the psycho-analysts are based on the minimum of observed fact, and are highly conjectural. There is too little exact observation, and too much inexact imagination. Until much more is established fact as the result of psycho-analysis becoming more truly scientific, we need not be dismayed at their speculations and conjectures regarding religious experience, and the reality of God the Father.

* *The Future of an Illusion*, p. 11.

Freud must *prove* his statement that "religious phenomena are to be understood only on the model of the neurotic symptoms of the individual."* One of the most frequently occurring words in the book quoted is "perhaps." "A hypothesis that would seem to be inevitable" (p. 196), is the nearest approach to proof.

Moreover, whatever justification there appears to be for the extension of the theory from the pathological to the normal—and the psycho-analysts claim to detect the same mental mechanisms at work in the "normal" as in the psycho-pathological—it is unscientific and unsound to argue and generalise from the abnormal to the normal, *without qualification*: "The normal mind is one thing," writes Dr. Wm. Brown, "the abnormal mind is another." It is equally unsound to over-emphasise the abnormal in the application of psycho-analytical findings to religious phenomena. Religion should be judged by its *final* stages, and at its highest and best, whatever its origin. To explain the beginnings of religion from "below," seeking to prove that it springs from lowly origins, is not to discredit it; value is independent of origin.

The psycho-analytical method of investigation is one thing, and the philosophy that permeates Freudian pan-sexual terminology quite another. Psycho-analysis has no right nor power to attempt the solution of questions that are the concern of philosophy and theology.

There is no reason why the Christian should be afraid of what psycho-analysis may do to religion. It is still very much in process of development as regards its most fundamental concepts. Already many of the earlier assumptions of the Freudian system have been discarded.

The psycho-analysts should try religion out, as well as analyse it. It is not New Testament Christianity that Freud writes about. It is everywhere patent that religion to him meant the practice of traditional Judaism. Freud is thinking only of the external (the ceremonial) elements of religion. He ignores the higher and inward elements that have their place in the Christian religion: e.g., disinterested altruism, charity, creative vision, adventure (often apparently irrational), and personal idealism. "Freud does not attempt to explain religion," writes Dr. Wm. Brown,† "but only that superstitious mixture of selfishness, credulity and cowardice, miscalled religion."

* *Moses and Monotheism*, 1939, p. 93.

† *Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 3rd Edition, p. 195.

DISCUSSION.

Rev. HORACE R. A. PHILP, M.B., Ch.B., said : I have not had the opportunity of seeing the proof of the paper, but I am glad to have had the opportunity of hearing it read, as Dr. Conn can speak with authority and not as the scribes.

What an influence Jews have had on the world for evil as well as good. Much of the sufferings of Europe to-day can be traced back to the effects of the teaching of the Spanish Jew, Simon Maimonides, 1135-1204, on Spinoza and other leaders of thought in Germany. Freud in another Jew, whose influence is far reaching.

I feel that it is not enough to consider the purely scientific aspect of this subject. There is an aftermath in a flood of popular literature, which is having a baneful effect on many young people. I read from a magazine article (published Nov. 1941), *The Faith of a Psychologist* : "Do I believe in God? Not as a Being to be placated and worshipped . . . The importance of Christ to my mind is not that he revealed God to man, but that he showed clearly what should be the right relation of man to man."

Such popular teaching is definitely anti-Christian, and is a pantheism closely related to spiritualism. Indeed there is need for more research to be done on the relationship of this type of psychology to spiritualism : *e.g.*, in the famous case of Miss Beauchamp, recorded by Morton Prince, there is evidence of contact with spiritualism.

Mr. E. J. G. TITTERINGTON said : I have no claim to speak as a psychologist, but I am gratified that this important subject has now been dealt with in a paper read before the Institute. I was particularly pleased to see Dr. Conn's remarks that "religious salvation is greater than psychological adjustment" (p. 120) ; "the sinner who wants to be reconciled to God can get no help from the psycho-analyst. Where there is no belief in God there can be no adequate sense of sin" (p. 123) ; and again, "description of a mental process is not explanation, and explanation in the religious sphere does not explain *away*" (p. 125).

The trouble is that the language of the new psychology has obtained a popular currency, and there is grave danger of overlooking this important fact. The human mind has always been eager to grasp at an explanation of sin that will rob it of its sinful-

ness, and the conceptions of "complexes" and "repressions" and the like, as popularly understood, seem to have provided a new machinery to this end—may we say, an "escapist" phenomenon?

It must be extraordinarily difficult to disentangle those elements inherent in human nature as it was created, and those resulting directly or indirectly from the Fall, especially since there has never been an opportunity of studying the psychology of what may perhaps be termed a perfectly normal individual, unvitiated by any such evil principle. May we regard the resolution of complexes, repressions, inhibitions and the rest as included in the promise, "Whomsoever the Son makes free, is free indeed"

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Rev. Principal H. S. CURR wrote: I have enjoyed the perusal of Dr. Conn's paper, not only on account of its clear exposition of psycho-analysis, but also its spirit of mingled sympathy and criticism, the latter being based on the principles of the New Testament. The paper makes it clear that there is a certain amount of truth in this new phase of psychological science, but the truth is interwoven with error.

Pursuing that line of thought, one wonders if it is possible to understand human personality exhaustively with the aid of such categories as these employed by Freud, Jung, and Adler. One obvious comment is that they fail to do justice to the essential dignity of human nature. After all has been said and done, man was made in the image of Almighty God (Genesis i, 26-27): And God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them." And again, Psalm viii, 3-4: "When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and stars which Thou hast ordained; what is man that Thou art mindful of him? and the son of man that Thou visitest him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour." In the same strain Shakespeare writes,

“ What a piece of work is a man ! how noble in reason ! how infinite in faculty ! in form and moving how express and admirable ! in action how like an angel ! in apprehension like a god ! ” (Hamlet. Act II, Sc. 2). Pascal was surely much nearer the root of the whole matter than the psycho-therapist school of psychologists when he described man as at once the glory and scandal of the universe.

I am at a loss to know as to whether the psycho-therapist regards the mind of man as suffering from aberration, or as to whether the troubles which he claims to diagnose so ingeniously are nothing more than the growing pains of human personality like the traditional awkwardness of adolescence, destined to disappear with development. From the standpoint of evolution, the latter theory is of course the true one. On the hypothesis of the historic orthodoxy of the Christian Church, man's condition is due to the fact of sin. His strange complexes are the wages of evil inherited from his ancestors as far as our first parents. If Freud and the others who take much the same view regard man's infirmity as a malady, then their contentions can be cited in support of the proposition that man is a fallen creature.

In one of his sermons the late Principal Alexander Whyte of Edinburgh quotes the words of Macbeth to his physician—

Canst thou minister to a mind diseased (Act V, Sc. 3).
He then refers to Charlotte Elliott's famous lines :

Just as I am—poor, wretched, blind ;
Sight, riches, *healing of the mind*,
Yea, all I need, in Thee to find,
O Lamb of God, I come.

Mr. W. E. LESLIE said : A practical example of Freudian explanation may give a clearer impression than argument. The following case is taken by Hollingworth (Abnormal Psychology 131) from Ernest Jones. A young man is afraid of heights, particularly if there is water below. If another male be present, he fears he will throw him (the patient) over. The Freudian explanation is that the patient desires a moral fall (incestuous desire for his mother) manifested as a fear of a physical fall. The water recalls pre-natal uterine experience. The feared male companion is his Father (his rival for the affections of his mother). But then it appears

that at the age of 3 the patient was held over a water butt with the threat that he would be dropped. At 7 a man held him head downwards over a high wall with a similar threat, and at 9 his Father forced him to walk round a platform at the top of a high tower in abject terror. The reader may accept whichever explanation he prefers.

Two points on the paper. Why is not Freud analysed to remove the pathological bitterness mentioned on page 118?. On page 120 union with Christ is surely something that is objective although we may experience the consequences of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS DEWAR wrote : Apart from the serious evil it has wrought, is Freudism worthy of serious attention? Biologists have little use for it. Prof. J. B. S. Haldane says (*Science and the Supernatural*, p. 63) : " I do not think that psycho-analysis can be described as scientific. Its methods are not those of science. If Freud be right, he reached correct conclusions by insight and imagination, literary rather than scientific methods."

Freud based his theory on his observation of a number of wealthy neurotics at Vienna. A theory of the human mind based on minds in a diseased state is of much the same value as one based on the conduct of the inmates of a mental hospital.

Most psychologists reject Freudism. Dr. Conn has recorded in *The Evangelical Quarterly* of April, 1939, the views of some of these : Thus, J. Drever writes : " Psycho-analytical theory (like behaviourism) is guilty of ignoring the principles of science by going far beyond the observed facts, and ignoring the limitations under which the facts have been observed," and A. Wohlgenuth writes : " Nowhere in the whole of Freud's writings is there a shred of proof, only assertions, assertions of having proved something before, but which was never done. . . . For psychologists, in general, psycho-analysis was still-born, and has ever been as dead as a door-nail."

I think nearly all well-educated laymen reject Freudism. Gerald Heard in *The Third Morality* suggests that the success of the Freudian hypothesis was due not to proof but to prejudice. It was, in his opinion, a desperate hope of saving materialism that led to its acceptance without proof. He shrewdly points out that shell-

shock does not fit in with the theory. "In war," he writes, "sex is free but safety is correspondingly scarce. War neurosis is due to fear, not to lust . . . the sub-conscious desire which could paralyse man's body or dement his mind was the passion for safety, not sex."

The Daily Telegraph calls Freud "the father of Psycho-analysis." He is merely the inventor of the name. He borrowed the idea from Breuer, elaborated and popularised it, and invented a jargon to describe what he imagined to be various human instincts and states of mind.

His theory that man is only an animal and all his ideals and aspirations are only perversions of sexual energy, and that society has forbidden the natural employment of this energy except under inadequately satisfying conditions, naturally made a wide appeal. Some publishers seized upon the theory as a means of producing best-sellers. "The craze" writes Canon Raven (*The Creator Spirit*, p. 139) "had all the qualities that make for a popular success. Its esoteric jargon, appealing to the priggishness of the half-educated; its claim to secret knowledge, flattering the vanity of its initiates. . . To the boy tempted by sex or the girl discontented at home comes the message that repression is disastrous. . . All the intimacies and decencies of life were convention and prudery; beneath the mask and even below the conscious level lay naked animalism and primitive lust."

To describe Freudism as a farrago of pernicious nonsense is perhaps to condemn it too severely, but it may fairly be described as a barrel of chaff in which lie two or three grains of wheat. It seems to me that Mr. Conn makes far too much of these few grains. The idea of a Christian deriving *any* benefit from Freudism is on a par with that of a skilled painter learning anything about painting from a man blind from birth.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

(1) (Reply to Dr. H. R. A. PHILP). Freudian pessimism is one of the modern fruits of the romantic naturalism and nihilism of Nietzschean thought. Freud was influenced by the mechanistic philosophy of the nineteenth century.

In the welter of literature that has appeared on "multiple personality," Morton Prince's presentation of the Beauchamp case is the most exact and helpful.

Freud's theory of the Co-Conscious has some bearing of "demoniac possession." The demon is held to be part of consciousness split off from the main stream.

Freud's theory of the unconscious closes the door to the possibility of superhuman influences through the unconscious. His theory is, I think, at least a little better than Spiritualism. Freud himself would deny any association with, or resemblance of, his teaching to Spiritualism. Indeed, he is as critical of Spiritualism as he is of religion in general. (See "The Future of an Illusion" p. 48.)

(2) (Reply to Mr. E. J. G. TITTERINGTON). Religion for Freud is but a phantasy escape from reality: we can say the same thing of his conception of complexes and repressions.

Freud seeks to explain human nature through its aberrations and abnormalities, and claims that the extension of the theory from the pathological to the normal is justified. But the theory of the ego has not gained much from the abundant pathological evidence supplied by Freud.

We do know what a normal man and a perfect life are. Jung speaks of Jesus as, "this apparently unique life" ("The Integration of the Personality," p. 297). No man has ever lived who was more completely conscious and sane.

Psychological bogies like inhibitions, frustrations, phobias, complexes, regressions, phantasies, defence-mechanisms and obsessions, can best be cast out of the mind by the religion of Jesus Christ. When the "transference-love" is turned over to Him He sets us free from the tyranny of self. Thus delivered by Him from the spell of self we share His own power and peace.

Religion can alter radically personalities in the direction of psychological maturity.

(3) (Reply to Rev. Principal H. S. CURR). Freud has done more for the advancement of our understanding of human nature than any other man. But his is a false philosophy of the nature of man. He holds no good opinion about human nature. Freud says: "The belief in the goodness of man's nature is one of those un-

fortunate illusions which in reality bring only disaster": a statement that does not conform to the Christian's experience of life. Surely Freud was unfortunate in his friends! The same criticism cannot be made against Jung, who writes: "It was a turning-point in the history of mankind when he recognised a redemptive principle in his concern for the future of the race."

For an adequate analysis of human personality, a set of categories more peculiarly subtle than the Freudian is required. Personality is a very illusive thing, and Freud's analysis is but half the story. His categories are purely naturalistic. He pretends to explain man in biological terms.

An essential part of the reality of man's make-up is omitted by Freud. The Christian conception of man is the only adequate one. For an excellent criticism of the Freudian doctrine of man, consult R. Niebuhr's "The Nature and the Destiny of Man," Vol. 1, 1941, p. 45 f., and 253-4.

Psycho-analysis gives a fresh insight into the story of the Fall, but does not answer the question *why* "all have sinned": it only acquaints man with what he already knows—that he is a fallen creature. For all we know complexes are peculiar to man, and are associated with his fallen nature.

Psycho-analysis is a system of palliatives: it cannot solve the problem of sin.

(4) (Reply to W. E. LESLIE). The environment can cause well-grounded fears. Why must we assume then that an "anxiety" is not concerned with outer situations—as in the case of the young man afraid of heights?

I did not employ the phrase "pathological bitterness." But there are statements in Freud's writings that deserve to be called, "a strain of bitterness."

One should bear in mind the isolation, the ridicule and the opposition, which Freud had to contend with from the first, not least from the Church. Until he was fifty he was personally despised, and his teaching was rejected.

Breuer, Freud, Janet, Jung and Adler—one and all are guilty of depreciatory and spiteful remarks about each other.

These personal antagonisms lend significance to the surprise Freud is reported to have expressed, that his antagonists had not

concentrated their attacks on the weakest point of psycho-analysis—namely the psycho-analysts.

The psycho-analysts do not appear to have any unusual power of control over themselves, and are indistinguishable from others making no such claim to self restraint. One would expect the analyst's attainment of "object-mindedness," or the "detached attitude" towards his patients, to cast out all ill-feeling and pettiness, at least between colleagues. Analysis is supposed to free the individual from the influence of mental mechanisms which are liable to become tyrannical and compulsive. And because treating patients lights up his own complexes, in spite of the fact that the analyst himself has been analysed, Freud's last recommendation (1937) was that, "the analyst should submit to being re-analysed every five years as a routine."

H. Crichton Miller, referring to junior colleagues who cherished resentment towards him, tells of one who, after a ten years' lapse, forgave him by reason of a Group Movement conversion. He deduces from this, "that the particular brand of religion referred to can achieve for some readjustments that cannot otherwise be attained" ("British Journal of Medical Psychology," Vol. 16, 1937, p. 166).

Christians know that conversion, by mitigating the frustrations which provoke "aggression," reduces the aggression (pugnacity).

Nevertheless, what so many Christian critics have to say about psycho-analysis, "scarcely lends itself to courteous statement" (Dean Inge).

Psycho-analysis helps us to understand *how* the grace of God saves, though it eliminates all reference to the Spirit of God, as among the factors which produce the change. Psycho-analysis may help us to understand the conditions of the process, and to distinguish between the normal and the psychopathic. The process of "identification" with an ideal (*i.e.*, Christ), was recognised by New Testament writers, and called "rebirth" (St. John iii, 3; 1 Cor, xii, 16; Col. iii, 11; Gal. iv, 19).

The psychological mechanism of such an "identification" is well known to psycho-analysis. P. Hopkins writes ("British Journal of Medical Psychology," Vol. 18, 1939, p. 217): "To some extent the series of progressive steps by which the great end of reconciliation,

and final union with the father-*imago* in the person of God, can be achieved seems to correspond with the progress of a neurotic patient."

According to Freud "identification" is a complicated process. He does not feel that he has fully understood it. (See "New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-analysis," pp. 85-87.)

That the childhood formation of the "super-ego" and adult "conversion" are to some extent analogous, can hardly be denied. Psycho-analytic terminology is different from, but is no more effective than, the language of scripture.

(5) (Reply to Mr. DOUGLAS DEWAR). Is Freudianism worthy of serious attention? What is Freud's own opinion about psycho-analysis? He says: "There was a time when people attacked analysis with the accusation that it was not to be taken seriously as a therapy. . . . I may say that I do not think our successes can compete with those of Lourdes. There are so many more people who believe in the miracle of the Blessed Virgin than in the existence of the unconscious" ("New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-analysis," p. 195). "If psycho-analysis had no therapeutic value it would not have been discovered from clinical material and would not have continued to develop for more than thirty years" (*ibid.*, p. 201). "There can no longer be any doubt that psycho-analysis will continue: it has proved its capacity to survive" ("An Autobiographical Study," 1935, p. 135).

The attitude of academic psychologists is perhaps best stated by Spearman ("Psychology Down the Ages," Vol. 1, pp. 360-1): "It would appear that the great majority of competent psychologists have resolutely rejected or even ignored it. But practising psychiatrists on the other hand, seem to be turning towards it in increasing numbers. The most judicial attitude of experts towards it is that of Bernard Hart which he calls a 'benevolent scepticism.' The attitude of the plain man towards the doctrine may be expressed in the well-known lines of Pope: 'It is a monster of so frightful mien.'"

As regards the criticism that psycho-analysis is not scientific. Psycho-analysis rarely, if ever, uses such methods as correlation co-efficients, standard deviations, and calculated averages. But certain psycho-analysts, among them Franz Alexander and his

colleagues in Chicago, are beginning to pay attention to the planning of controlled and systematic investigations of particular problems.

The charge against psycho-analysis that it is unscientific is considered by Freudians to be extremely unfair; for if patient observation, careful analysis and rigorous logical procedure are criteria of scientific method, the psycho-analytic mode of investigation would seem to have, it is claimed, the necessary qualifications. Furthermore, if the customary experimental and mathematical methods of the psychological laboratory, borrowed as they are from physical science, are to be regarded as providing the only legitimate path of approach for the study of mental processes, it will be a long time, so it is asserted, before we know much that is valuable about human nature.

Freud's complaint against his opponents is that "they tend to regard psycho-analysis as a product of my imagination, and refuse to believe in the long, patient, unbiased work which has gone to its making." ("An Autobiographical Study.")

To the psycho-analyst the specially coined terms he invents and employs are not incomprehensible jargon. Psycho-analytical terms have a very definite meaning, and are used in a very specific scientific sense. At the same time, the lay-reader who complains about the "esoteric jargon," may be excused for wondering why the "oral œdipus-situation" cannot be called simply the "mouth-phase of development."

Psycho-analysis suffers from and deplores the popular misapplication of its precise terms by those who are ill-informed on the subject. When psycho-analysts express themselves in terms of common speech—and more and more they are doing so—there will be fewer misapprehensions and popular misinterpretations of what psycho-analysis really is, and less occasion to go to the many self-styled followers of Freud, and to the daily Press, and popular magazine articles for authoritative statements and enlightenment.

It is unfortunate for Freud that his theories have attracted so many charlatans, who have often obscured any merits his psychology possesses. Psycho-analysis has been too much in the public eye for its own good and for the public's good.

By way of contrast to Heard's statement about "saving materialism," I should support this quotation from an essay by C. S. Lewis

("Essays and Studies," by Members of the English Association, Vol. XXVII, 1941: 'Psycho-analysis and Literary Criticism,' p. 20): "Psycho-analysis heals some of the wounds made by materialism. For the general effect of materialism is to give you, where you expected an indefinite depth of reality, a flat wall only a few inches away. Psycho-analysis offers you some kind of depth back again—lots of things hidden behind the wall. Hence those who have once tasted it, feel that they are being robbed of something if we try to take it from them."

Early in his career Freud was accused of plagiarism in relation to Janet's theories, Charcot's investigations upon hysteria, and likewise Breuer's.

Freud takes little credit for his part in "Studies in Hysteria": he gave nearly all to Breuer. But Freud claimed that "it would have been difficult to guess from the book what an importance sexuality has in the ætiology of the neuroses" ("An Autobiographical Study," p. 39); and that "in deriving hysteria from sexuality I was going back to the very beginnings of medicine, and was following up a thought of Plato's" (*ibid*, p. 42).

A quite new understanding of the neuroses was given a new name—psycho-analysis—by Freud in 1896. He is the father of psycho-analysis as we know it to-day.

Freud was always ready to acknowledge his indebtedness to others, but the truth is that he was a man of remarkable independence of judgment, and an original authority on mind. And his contribution to the study of mind is a great advance in the subject.

I claim that psycho-analysis can be a valuable ally to, though not a substitute for, religion. Let me quote from the letter of a private correspondent (H.I.C.): "Many deeply religiously-minded people to-day are finding new life and religious liberty as a result of psycho-analytic treatment. Religious folk and neurotics are very far from being mutually exclusive: and as far as the Jungian school is concerned, it is more often than not men and women of sincere religious convictions who visit the consulting-room, because they have the courage to face the fact that their religion and their life are much at variance. May I add that many of us have found in the consulting-room a way to new freedom and power in our religious life."

Religion is not just a form of psycho-therapy. At the same time spiritual healing is a reality, and there is a vast field open for its application. Much of our Lord's Ministry was devoted to the healing of the sick, and He commissioned His disciples and His Church to continue that ministry. Christians may learn something even from Freud's errors.

SUBSEQUENTLY RECEIVED.

Group-Captain P. J. WISEMAN wrote: Sigmund Freud needs to be analysed. Shortly before he died he published a book entitled "Moses and Monotheism"; he says that it is a "an application of psycho-analysis" and "based on psychological probabilities." If anyone is inclined to regard Freud as an unbiased investigator, this perverse book is a sufficient illustration of his methods. The point of view taken in this analysis of Moses is stated on p. 194 as "we can only regret it if certain experiences of life and observations of nature have made it impossible to accept the hypothesis of such a Supreme Being," "Jahve was certainly a volcano god." Freud considers belief in God a delusion.

This standpoint was the basis of his work as a psycho-analyst as may be seen from his reference to his book "Totem and Taboo," written in 1912. He says "From then on I have never doubted that religious phenonema are to be understood only on the model of the neurotic symptoms of the individual." He applies his methods to the person of Moses and the tortuous precesses by which he comes to the conclusion that he was an Egyptian and not a Jew have scarcely convinced anyone.

There is a tendency in some quarters to make psycho-analysis a substitute for the gospel of our Lord and Saviour. Freud's viewpoint needs to be kept in mind by those tempted to follow him. For instance, he says "Once a year, however, the whole clan assembled for a feast at which the otherwise revered totem was torn to pieces and eaten. No one was permitted to abstain from this feast; it was the solemn repetition of the father-murder, in which social order, moral laws and religion have their beginnings. The correspondence of the totem feast (according to Robertson Smith's description) with the Christian Communion has struck many authors

before me. I still adhere to this sequence of thought. I have often been vehemently reproached for not changing my opinions in later editions of my book, since more recent ethnologists have without exception discarded Robertson Smith's theories and have in part replaced them by others which differ extensively."

A Christian psychology cannot be based on Freud!