

Jung and Christianity: An Interpersonal Perspective

By Robert T. Sears, S.J.

We have only to look at our spirituality today to see how much of Jung's agenda we have taken over. Dream and fantasy workshops, a growing awareness of ecology and care for the Earth, a recognition of our shadow and neglected side are just a few. I believe Jung is speaking a very important word to our one-sided religion and culture, and yet this word needs to be put in a different context — one that is interpersonal, in contrast to the intrapersonal focus of Jung himself. Jung interpreted "faith" as an intellectual adherence to dogmas without religious experience. He sought experience of God in a way that left "faith" in the actual existence of God open to question. An interpersonal view of faith was beyond his "scientific" interest. He retrieved the "whole individuated person," but in the process lost, I will argue, a mature interpersonality.

In recent times several attempts have been made to put Jung's contribution to Christianity, healing, and spiritual direction into right perspective.¹ With the wide use of Jung's thinking in healing ministries and spiritual direction, it seems important to present a critique of his position, especially with respect to implications for the healing ministry. Jung was always concerned with the religious implications of his perspective. He had six theologians on his mother's side of the family, with a bishop grandfather, and two uncles, besides his father, who were ministers on his father's side. Jung was steeped in religion, and his concern, as Murray Stein has well argued, was to treat not just individuals, but the whole Christian tradition as well.² He felt that the religious neurosis of his father (his inability to move beyond dogmas to experience and, hence, his suppressed doubts) was not peculiar to him, but expressed the one-sidedness of his tradition. The church, he felt, had excluded nature, as seen in its abstract art and architecture; had repressed animals, as seen in their extinction; had neglected its own inferior and dark side — sexuality, hostility — and its creative fantasy because of intellectual dogma.³ It had cut itself off from primitive roots and mythology and had lost its inferiority and soul. It sought an idealistic perfection rather than a realistic wholeness, and the neglected side was causing alienation, wars, division between the sexes,

and separation from God.

We have only to look at our spirituality today to see how much of Jung's agenda we have taken over. Dream and fantasy workshops, a growing awareness of ecology and care for the Earth, a recognition of our shadow and neglected side and the need for recreation to offset the one-sided workaholicism of both culture and religion; a recognition of the feminine in men, and, one hopes, a recognition that women do not have to identify with their masculine side but to integrate its virtues in their own way. Certainly, more could be done to enhance each of these directions.

The concern of this article, however, is to highlight what can well be lost in the way Jung and many of his followers view the Christian tradition to meet this agenda. Jung interpreted "faith," as lived by his father, as an intellectual adherence to dogmas without religious experience.⁴ He sought experience of God in a way that left "faith" in the actual existence of God open to Question.⁵ An interpersonal view of faith was beyond his "scientific" interest. He retrieved the "whole individuated person," but in the process lost, I will argue, a mature interpersonality. As a result, his reinterpretation of Christian "dogmas" in experiential terms distorted their interpersonal nature and made the church a way station on the road to individuation rather than making individuation a step toward mature spiritual community. It is

this ultimate horizon of understanding that concerns me in this article, not his agenda for healing the church, an agenda that seems to me a real need. How one interprets this agenda and meets it is at issue.

My points, then, are two: (1) I believe Jung is speaking a very important word to our one-sided religion and culture, a word that needs to be heard, and yet (2) this word needs to be put in a different context — one that is *interpersonal*, in contrast to the *intrapersonal* focus of Jung himself. In this article I focus on the second point. I will first highlight Jung's neglect of the interpersonal, then place his contribution in an overall view of human interpersonal growth, and finally indicate what implications this changed perspective would have on healing and Christian spiritual growth.

I. Jung's Neglect of the Interpersonal

Jung was clearly interested in human interaction, as his *Psychological Types* (1923) documents at length and his analysis of how the projection of shadow and anima/animus corrupts human communication develops further. Yet he focused on withdrawing "projections" between individuals (such as those he discovered in his relationship with Freud) or owning one's own religious experience "projected" onto institutional religion. Analysis frees the individual to full self-expression. Society and the church are the womb of this new birth but not its ultimate goal. This can be seen in Jung's view of faith, his treatment of projection, and his view of God.

A. Jung's view of faith. For Jung, as for many moderns, "faith" is adherence to cultural or religious dogmas without full experience or understanding. When asked whether he believed in God, Jung answered: "I do not believe. I know." Very early he determined not to adhere blindly to dogmas, as he felt his father had done to the detriment of his own life conviction. He would let his experience of "God" lead him, as untraditional as it seemed. He concluded early that "in religious matters, only experience counted."⁶ Jung was both a scientist and a convinced Kantian. Kant held that we cannot *know* the other, only the phenomenon of our own

experience. We must leave the ground of this experience to "belief that cannot be proved. A dream of his father that Jung had around 1950 (while struggling with his *Answer to Job*) brings his view into clear focus. After a scene where his father is a distinguished scholar explaining a fishskin-bound Bible to Jung and two other psychiatrists at breakneck speed in a way too erudite for their understanding, the scene changes to a large, circular second-story hall with a sultan's throne elevated in the center. His father points to a small door high up on the wall

Jung was both a scientist and a convinced Kantian. Kant held that we cannot know the other, only the phenomenon of our own experience.

and says: "Now I will lead you into the highest presence." He then kneels and touches his head to the ground. Jung follows suit, but does not go all the way to the floor. That door, he then realizes, leads to the chamber of Uriah, King David's betrayed general, whom Jung sees as a Christ-image. Jung acknowledged that he ought to have submitted to his fate, but "something in me was defiant and determined not to be a dumb fish... Man always has some mental reservation, even in the face of divine decrees. Otherwise, where would be his freedom? And what would be the use of that freedom if it could not threaten Him who threatens it?"⁷ In this view, to believe fully is to lose one's independence and freedom. "Faith" meant to Jung an unquestioning submission that would hinder individuation.

Jung's wariness of "faith" in this sense will always be needed if individual experience is to be taken seriously and social systems are to be challenged, yet there is an interpersonal aspect of faith that his view neglects. When Jesus asks his disciples, "Will you also go away?" (John 6:67) and Peter replies that "you have the words of eternal life and we have come to believe...", he is not asserting a dogma so much as a commitment to a relationship. Faith in this sense is a committed, loving relationship to another person, a basic trust that, in another's self-

revelation and faithfulness. God is communicated. Far from de-individualizing us, this interpersonal faith ultimately calls each of us, as it did Jesus' disciples, to full uniqueness at the same time that it builds a believing community." Jung was aware that his focus on individuation was to offset the rampant collectivism of his time (seen in Nazi Germany and communist Russia but also in the institutional church). He felt that this individuation was itself "one-sided," and took great care to carry out his responsibilities to the state and to religion by his military and political service through his writing.⁹ The individualism of our day¹⁰ is not what Jung meant by individuation that required sacrifice of egoism for the self. Yet even so, the self, for Jung, is not ultimately grounded in interpersonal faith but in one's own nuministic experience." Though he had his children belong to the church as a container for their initial growth (his mother took charge of this aspect),¹² he and Emma did not attend church. Not interpersonal faith but personal experience grounded his religion.

B. Freeing of projections. "Whatever is unconscious is projected," Jung affirmed, and unless such projections (shadow, anima/animus, savior) are brought to light, they will contaminate our relationships, whether personal or social. I (we) will fight the "enemy" outside if I (we) overlook the "shadow" within; I (we) will oppress the sexes if I (we) neglect the countersexual sides of ourselves; I (we) will carry out "holy wars" against those who attack my (our) "saving myth" rather than reverence the revelation of God in ourselves and others to help each other to saving wholeness.

Again, we have to agree with Jung's insights, but what will call us to commitment once the projections are released? What vision of "beloved community" (Josiah Rpyce, *The Problem of Christianity*, 1913) will be worth the sacrifice of our new-found autonomy once our religious and nationalistic "illusions" fall away? Without a divine Other to ground an interpersonal goal, we are left with individual motivation and self-interest (albeit a larger "self than narrow egoism), and experience is showing us this is not enough.

C. God within experience. Ultimately, our image of God is what calls us to growth or

stands in the way. As Jung saw it, the Christian God was one-sidedly "light" and masculine, so Christians projected their shadow on the "unsaved" outside and kept women in subservient positions. Individuals were not encouraged to trust their own experience and think for themselves, so the slavish following of "-isms" was an ever-present danger. "God" must be found in each one's experience, in one's

Jung's God-image individuates, that is becomes progressively more self-aware in the world, through interaction with humans. It includes a dark, destructive side that is revealed in the death of Jesus, and warns us against total trust.

darkness as well as light, in feminine receptiveness as well as masculine determination, if we are to creatively meet the challenges of our day. The trinitarian God expresses full consciousness: *the* Self (Father) expressing itself (Son) and releasing energy through explicit self-acceptance (Holy Spirit). But consciousness leaves out the unconscious (darkness, evil, the feminine). God must be Quaternity — Trinity plus that dark side — if our God-image is to lead us to full individuation."

Here we glimpse the confusing subtleties in Jung's position. He claims to deal with God-images, yet critiques church dogmas (which claim to express truths, not images) on the basis of their symbolism for individuation. Jung's God-experience is open-ended, a personalized contact with a common "ground of being" out of which we individually emerge, an "archetype" (a basic structure of the psyche). Jung is not an atheist, nor even an agnostic. He really says nothing about the ultimate in reality but only that in the psyche. Yet that very neglect of an ultimate statement (if in fact it is possible) leaves the individual adrift in a sea of emerging consciousness with no clear affirmation of who God ultimately is. That vacuum will be filled with implied ultimate metaphors for God, and ultimate values springing from that commitment.¹⁴

Jung himself seems to take this step when he describes (in his *Answer to Job*, 1952) the changing human conceptions of God as changes in God's self-consciousness. Jung's God-image individuates, that is becomes progressively more self-aware in the world, through interaction with humans. It includes a dark, destructive side that is revealed in the death of Jesus, and warns us against total trust (as we saw above).¹⁵ To submit totally to such a God is to gain power but lose one's distinctiveness. Such an image is not a loving, personal presence that

The Spirit given through Jesus' death/resurrection brought to life a community of believers at Pentecost; gave each a different manifestation of the Spirit for the building of the community, and opened people to Jesus as Lord and the Father as Abba.

calls us into a committed world of self-giving love (as David Hassel argues is necessary).¹⁶ Such a God is united to our experience, Jung's main concern, but does not embody a transcendent goal of perfect, self-giving Love that calls us into union with Christ and loving community. How can we take seriously Jung's concern to relate God to our experience of darkness, yet maintain an ultimate faith in God's perfect, self-giving love? An interpersonal perspective offers hope for that integration.

n. An Interpersonal View of Human Growth and Trinitarian Love

Jung focused on emerging individuating consciousness and understood God as its ultimate goal. If we attend to God's self-communication through Jesus and the Spirit as leading to individuated, self-giving love, what view of human development and God would emerge and how would Jung's contribution fit?

First, Christian faith must begin with the personal God that Jesus reveals in his words and actions.¹⁷ Jesus lived and preached God's kingdom by healing and reaching out to the poor. The Spirit at work in him went to the disciples at Pentecost to build them into a com-

munity of service. Authentic Christian tradition came to see Jesus and the Spirit as equally divine, a factor that grounds seeing God as a community of self-giving love." Recent theology has focused on Jesus' cross and resurrection as the privileged way to understand God (very different from the approach to God in Jung's day). Viewing the Father through the Son (John 14:9), we see beyond Jesus' cross to the Father who surrenders his Son out of Love (John 3:16). The Son's faithful commitment leads him to surrender himself in response, and their joint self-giving "sends" their Spirit of self-giving love to our world to empower other believers.

Second, this power of self-giving love is made available to us through the gift of the Spirit in Jesus' resurrection. Jesus' resurrection brings human nature into union with God. It is the beginning of a "new creation" at work *in* the world (since Jesus is now Lord of the world), and because it partakes of God's life, the Spirit of Jesus pervades all space and time. It brings Jesus' ancestors, and all our ancestors, into union with God, as it does future generations, and calls from the depths of all people whether or not they are conscious believers. Hence, the experience that Jung appeals to actually is an experience transformed by the Resurrection of Jesus, even though Jung does not understand it in that light. If he did, what new perspective would emerge in consciousness?

Third, the new perspective would be fundamentally interpersonal. The Spirit given through Jesus' death/resurrection brought to life a community of believers at Pentecost (Acts 2); gave each a different manifestation of the Spirit for the building of the community (1 Cor. 12:7), and opened people to Jesus as Lord (1 Cor. 12:3) and the Father as Abba (Gal. 4:6; Rom. 8:15). In every case the gift is interpersonal, yet implies an individual freedom to develop one's unique giftedness. Elsewhere I have argued¹⁹ that this goal of creative individual relationship (which I have called *communitarian* and *mission faith*) is reached through several stages corresponding to stages of Judeo-Christian history: trust (corresponding to Yahwist theology); familial faith (corresponding to the law stage of the Elohist and Deuteronomist); individuating faith (which we see emerging in Ezekiel 18 and

Job during the Exile and after); communitarian faith (which first emerges with Jesus' forgiveness of enemies and sinners, forming a compassionate individuated community), and mission faith (which we see at Pentecost and beyond).

This interpersonal perspective does not invalidate Jung's insights. Rather, it reinterprets them from a higher viewpoint, for the above stages are cumulative and cyclical. Cumulatively, each higher stage builds on the preceding and raises it to a new level. Familial faith presupposes and deepens trust, and individuating faith presupposes familial relationships that have contributed to one's unfolding, yet rediscovers them in an individuated way in communitarian faith. Thus communitarian faith increases with the increasing individuation of those united, and their union, in turn, actually increases the uniqueness of each involved. Jung's focus was on individuation, and he saw community, in this perspective, as familial, since it was pre-individuated, a container for later individuation. The Spirit moves us toward a further form of community that individuates its members by developing each one's unique gifts (1 Cor. 12:7) and leads to an overflow of communal life in mission, as we see in the early community in Acts.

III. Jungian Insights Re-Visioned from an Interpersonal Perspective

Jung appeals to experience and uses concepts such as archetype, etc., to organize that experience. Hence, there would seem to be nothing in his view to oppose a restructuring of his data, as long as it took seriously his concerns. Let us look at several of his concepts and concerns from the point of view of the interpersonal resurrection-Spirit as the ground of our experience.

A. *The Shadow in Humans and God.* Jung was concerned that the perfectionism of Christianity led to its overlooking its dark side. We necessarily create outer enemies if we are not reconciled to the inferior sides of ourselves. *We* seek world peace but will never achieve it until we recognize and reconcile our inner aggression and suspicion. "We are the source of all evil," Jung commented in a BBC interview,

"and we are pitifully unaware of it." Since we see ourselves in light of our God-images, Jung concluded that a root cause of our blindness was our one-sidedly good image of God. According to Jung, since a trinitarian God is all good, we are led to constellate an outer enemy to be fought (as we see happening in the Book of Revelation) rather than focus on our inner dark side to be understood and integrated. For Jung, God must be at the root of *good* and evil if there is one source of all. If God also has a questionable side, then we are freed to admit our own darkness, to look honestly at all our experience, bring it to light, and work toward an integration of the opposites.

This placing of evil in God has led opponents of Jung's view to various rebuttals. Even such a staunch Jungian as John Sanford called Jung "frustratingly inconsistent" in his treatment of evil, and "adamant in his affirmations."²⁰ Jung affirmed the Self as uniting opposites in an all-encompassing wholeness, yet states that evil destroys wholeness. Either there is a larger wholeness that includes evil, or there is no ultimate wholeness. Jung seems to imply the first, for in one place²¹ he speaks of God as Love in that God unites opposites, without saying that the opposite of God is hate. Yet other passages affirm evil in God. In any case, Jung misinterpreted the classical definition of evil. He continually argued that to define evil as the "privation of good" slighted its terrifying power, as though it lacked being. In fact, Augustine and Aquinas defined evil as "the privation of good *that ought to be there*" ("*privatio boni debiti*"), such as a fallen angel. In no sense does the angel become less powerful; it only becomes distorted in its power. The corruption of the best is the worst. And further, as Robert Doran pointed out, to put evil in God makes it impossible to trust God unconditionally.²² Jung's own dream in which he did not bow fully indicates his need to keep his autonomy, but also shows a lack of total trust in God, as though God would take away his freedom. Augustine and Aquinas both argued, in contrast, that the touch of God is what frees us. Only God can free us to open to the ultimate good. Such faith liberates rather than enslaves. In preventing a total trust in God, Jung's view would block the loving integration that alone

can bring wholeness.

Let us concede that Jung's argument is faulty philosophically and theologically. The fact remains that we often do shy away from full surrender to God. Do we not feel that God will take away what we want to keep, will tell us to "sell all" when we are not ready? To see God is to die, the Old Testament said, so Moses could only see God's backside. How can we take Jung's observation seriously and still be true to the Christian tradition? I believe the approach to God by way of Jesus' death/resurrection shows a way. The death of Jesus is not just an unfortunate result of sin. Jesus freely gives his life, and this self-gift unto death must reveal an essential aspect of God if we see God in Jesus (John 14:9). God's Spirit in us *does* put to death what is partial and self-enclosed, and that opposition to all that is limited must *feel* like an enemy till we can see it as a bridge to self-giving love. The shadow in its deepest root need not be seen as an unalterable evil. Psychologically, it is an undeveloped aspect of the individual or social personality turned sour because it has been repressed, but it is repressed because we do not open our weaknesses and perverted choices to compassionate love. In freely surrendering his life to God's love amidst human evil and rejection, Jesus shows us how weakness and even death are a bridge to greater love. From a limited perspective, the shadow opposes our autonomy and appears to be totally evil, but transformed by the Spirit it reveals God's ever-greater, self-giving love (Romans 7). Death and darkness *is* in God, but is transformed in God (and in us through God's Spirit) to self-giving love.

B. *Masculine and Feminine in Humans and God.* Jung introduced femininity into God to avoid a one-sided patriarchal image that would not lead humans to wholeness. His culminating work *Mysterium Coniunctionis* (the alchemical sacred marriage) shows the importance he gave this union of opposites in God, and his analysis of the anima/animus in men and women showed how important it was for individuals to contact the opposites in themselves. Yet even in this area of profound interpersonal importance, Jung's focus was on the sexual opposites in each individual and in the single God-image. I

believe Jung is correct in showing that true inner freedom in relationships presupposes coming to clarity about the femininity in men and the masculinity in women, but is the goal of human development an androgynous individual? I think not! An interpersonal view of God, and male-female relations in God, can integrate both male and female aspects of God in a community of self-giving love as well as develop the full human potential of each person.²³ Jesus' death/resurrection reveals a God as free, covenanted, self-giving love. Full human healing would come when each could freely surrender her/his life for the other in a similarly individuated way. Such a Spirit-empowered self-giving would give rise to complementarity and creativity rather than competition and enmity out of sexual differences. In social structures, it would release other-empowering community rather than domination.

For Christians, Jesus is the key both to individuation and to the reconciling love so needed in our world. For Jung, the historical Jesus soon was lost in the myth of Christ.

C. *The Ground of Ultimate Meaning.*

Perhaps the central concern of Jung was to help clients contact a ground of ultimate meaning in their own experience, since the church seemed to be hopelessly one-sided and most of his clients had lost faith in its teachings. He first sought for his own grounding myth, which was, as Barbara Hannah expressed it, to bring nature to consciousness and hence to be part of the completion of Creation.²⁴ He found the link to this ground in myths and neglected products of the human spirit such as alchemy. So important did these sources become to him that Jung reinterpreted basic Christian dogmas (such as the Trinity, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Ignatian Spiritual Exercises, etc.) in light of world mythology and spirituality to show their grounding in common human experience and thus make them again acceptable to people today. He was opposed to a slavish imitation of Jesus that alienated people from their own im-

ages and unique selves. Analysis sought to reconnect persons with their unique senses of meaning through dreams, projections, etc., and so to carry out in their lives their own uniqueness as Jesus did in his life. Jung found that myths often revealed to people their deep meanings that had been eclipsed by overly conscious modern lives. When one finds a personal "myth" (or life meaning), paradoxically one gains the freedom to create something that has meaning for others. Jung's discoveries were important contributions to his time, and continue to be in our day. In touching the wisdom deep inside his own experience, he could lead others to renewed life.

Yet these myths and archetypes are themselves no more developed than the times out of which they emerged. Christianity completes these underlying myths (as the Old Testament transformed sacred meals, etc., to historical Passover meals, and these, in turn, were given a christological meaning in the New Testament). Through Jesus they are redirected to interpersonal, committed love. "Yahweh, not Baal or Astarte, becomes the source of life, and Christians see this life in Jesus. The sacred Rock and Foundation is Yahweh, then Christ. Each sacred image is regrounded historically in Yahweh in Israel and mediated through Christ in Christianity. What Jung has done is to retrieve neglected aspects of the background of Israel and Christianity by providing a sympathetic analysis of ancient pagan mythology. But he has reinterpreted Christianity in light of that mythology rather than reinterpreting that basis in light of Christ. I believe we can use his analysis of archetypes and mythology to open our dreams and images to their broadest meanings if we carry those meanings through to their fulfillment in Christ. If we are consistent with our Christian faith, the very ground of our experience is the Resurrection-Spirit of Christ. So we are not falsifying our dreams and images by rooting them in Jesus; we are bringing to completion what nature has left incomplete.

IV. Union with Jesus in the Church as Fulfillment of Our Individuated Selves

If Jung had an inadequate ultimate grounding, why is it that so many Christians look to him for guidance? Can he be trusted? What is his

contribution to an adequate Christian perspective? I have studied and taught Jung and theology for about ten years now, and I continue to find new insights in Jung. I would explain that through the following points:

A. *Every psychology, Jung said, is a personal confession.* We see what we are ready to see, and one who has confronted his or her own experience more fully can point out things to others that they would not otherwise see, whether or not those people "believe" in the same way as oneself.²⁵

B. *Jung's "conversion" and self-awareness are expressed in his individuation process.* Through it he uncovered the neglected aspects of his inner life, aspects that he saw had been neglected by the dogmatism of the Christianity he experienced through his father and his clients. These neglected aspects (nature, animality, femininity, dreams and fantasy, the inferior side and the shadow) lay deep in the human unconscious, and were acted out in negative, primitive ways because they were neglected. Every human is a product of cumulative levels of evolution, and so whatever is neglected remains active, though it is suppressed. In "reworking" the Christian dogmas, Jung retrieved these neglected aspects and so opened us to take seriously *all of Creation*.

C *One can be a "believing" Christian without being aware of those neglected dimensions, but then one's Christianity will be distorted in many ways.* Without awareness of one's grounding in nature and animality, the Christian will repress these aspects in him or herself and will also dominate nature rather than partner it. Some have justified this domination from the Bible (Gen.-1:28, "fill the earth and *subdue* it") even though the text means quite something else.²⁶ If one is out of touch with one's inner femininity (or masculinity in women), one will dominate women and treat them as inferior and act out sexually, or attack men as enemies,²⁷ a clear distortion of Jesus' practice. The recent scandals of some televangelists provide ample evidence of this. If one neglects the shadow or inferior side, one will oppress the weak and create enemies outside rather than reach out in forgiving love as Jesus taught, as events in South Africa amply illustrate. In other words, the Christian who

seeks salvation in Jesus while avoiding self-awareness and conversion (since Jesus saves us as sinners) will interpret Jesus in light of his or her own distortions. Jung's focus on individual awareness is a much-needed corrective of that view. We will only understand Jesus if we become like him, and we will only become like him if we are deeply aware of our grounding in nature, animality, etc.; for that is how Jesus was.

D. While individuation is needed for an integral development of Christian spirituality, it is not enough.²⁹ We cannot substitute relation to Jesus for personal growth in self-awareness, but we also cannot substitute personal growth for relation to Jesus. Both are needed if the Spirit unites us interpersonally with Jesus and not just symbolically in ourselves. Jung reinterpreted the Ignatian Spiritual Exercises to mean total submission to God-within of the Self.²⁹ He rejected Ignatius' focus on Jesus' life as norm, saying it endangered the individual's unique way and personal imagery. Experience teaches us that slavish imitation of Jesus' life *can* very well submerge individual differences. However, free, mature relationships do not submerge individuality, but actually increase it. We come to a deeper sense of our own uniqueness through freeing dialogue with others, and this would certainly be the case with freeing dialogue with Jesus. Jesus himself reveals the perfection of individuation. He has assimilated his own shadow through forgiveness and taught us to "love our enemies" (Man. 5:44).³⁰ He was open to equalizing dialogue with women in a way unprecedented for his day, and he found his Father's love and direction *within* himself while remaining faithful to his tradition, at great cost of persecution from his religion and society. In relating to him out of an individuated self-awareness, we cannot help being challenged to a further growth toward illumination and wholeness.

E. Jesus calls us not just to wholeness, but to commitment to him and his mission of reconciliation. He calls us to intimate union with himself and to become a community of reconciling love in the image of the divine community of God. Jung's insights into collective structures can help us find the way to the goal

of forming individuated, creative community more clearly and avoid the projection of evil and dominating relationships on to others. But the Christian's center must remain the crucified and resurrected Christ, who integrates all things and all persons in submission to God (Col. 1:20). For Christians, Jesus is the key both to individuation and to the reconciling love so needed in our world. For Jung, the historical Jesus soon was lost in the myth of Christ.³¹ Jung saw us as called to live our lives with the same fidelity to the God within that Jesus lived, and said that we then would be gods in our day as only we could be. This development is not based in a personal relationship with Jesus but in a relationship with the incomprehensible ground of all being. Without denying our call to individuation, the biblical Christ calls each Christian to "follow him," and sends his followers "to all nations," to baptize all into trinitarian love and to live that love especially for the poor. We are, yes, to befriend the poverty within ourselves, but ultimately that we might reach out with God's own compassion to the poor of the world. It is through this creative self-gift in union with Christ that ultimate healing and wholeness comes to full expression.

Reference notes

1. See Murray Stein, *Jung's Treatment of Christianity: The Psychotherapy of a Religious Tradition* (Wilmette, IL: Chiron Pubs., 1985) and *Jung's Challenge to Contemporary Religion* (Wilmette, IL: Chiron Pubs., 1987), edited by Murray Stein and Robert L. Moore, which come from Jung's perspective; Don S. Browning, *Religious Thought and the Modern Psychologies: A Critical Conversation in the Theology of Culture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987); Wallace B. Clift, *Jung and Christianity: The Challenge of Reconciliation* (N.Y.: Crossroad, 1982); Robert Doran, "Jungian Psychology and Christian Spirituality," I, II, III, (*Review for Religious* 38 [1979]: 4, 5, 6; Christopher Bryant, *Jung and the Christian Way* (New York: Seabury Press, 1983), and Robert T. Sears, "Individuation and Spiritual Growth," *New Catholic World* (March/April 1984), which are open to Jung yet critical.
2. See Stein, *Jung's Treatment of Christianity*.
3. See Barbara Hannah, *Jung: His Life and Work, a Biographical Memoir* (N.Y.: C. P. Putnam's Sons, 1976) pp. 149f.
4. See C.G. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, pp. 52ff.
5. See Bryant, *Jung and the Christian Way*, pp. 6-10. Jung was under attack also from scientists who accused him of mysticism. He defended his empiricism and always held that faith in God's existence was beyond the scope of science. However, he also implied that faith was unnecessary for one who "knew" from experience.
6. See Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, p. 98.
7. *Ibid.*, pp. 217-20

8. See David Hassel, *Searching the Limits of Love: An Approach to the Secular Transcendent: God* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1985) for an analysis of how committed relationships require a personal "unchosen absolute."

9. See Hannah, *Jung: His Life and Work*, pp. 289-90.

10. See Robert Bellah, *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life* (1985) for an analysis of how pervasive such erosion of the fabric of social commitment is.

11. Jung wrote in a 1950 letter in reference to a writer who considered the God-image as the door through which one finds God: "I can only concur with this view, but with the best will in the world I cannot maintain that this is a verifiable assertion, which is what science is about. It is a subjective assertion which has no place in science" (quoted in Bryant, *Jung and the Christian Way*, p. 8). As Bryant comments, if God exists, he is concerned not only for me but for all, and it is not just my experience that counts, but the possibility that God already has revealed himself through another (as Christians hold) or in many thousand ways. Bryant puts it well: "I believe that Jung is destined to play an important part in the revival of Christian faith among educated men and women of the West, but his role will be more that of a John the Baptist who prepared the way for the coming of Christ than that of one of Christ's apostles" (Ibid., p. 9).

12. See Hannah, *Jung: His Life and Work*, pp. 156-57.

13. See C. G. Jung, *A Psychological Approach to the Trinity, Collected Works*, vol. 11.

14. See Browning, *Religious Thought and Modern Psychologies*, for an extensive analysis of the implied ultimate metaphors of several therapists, with a separate chapter devoted to Jung.

15. From Ivan Boszormenyi-Nagy's view of family dynamics, it would seem that Jung was parentified by his inability to trust his father's religious sense (see Boszormenyi-Nagy and Geraldine M. Spark, *Invisible Loyalties* [New York: Harper & Row, 1973], pp. 151-66). Jung had to father his own father (and his father's religious tradition), and this inability to receive fathering seems to have carried over to his relationship to God. Ultimately it was his God-experience that he trusted, but this left his consciousness, not a transcendent Other's, as the focal point.

16. Hassel, *Searching the Limits of Love*.

17. Robert Doran makes this point in the second of his series of articles on "Jungian Psychology and Christian Spirituality," p. 743. In a dream, he was descending to a basement to look at images. On the way down he met Bernard J.F. Lonergan (a well-known theologian he was working with), who said, "I will show you some images." He took Doran to the upper story, where they sat down to watch images on a screen. What Doran concluded was that the symbolic products of the unconscious do not interpret themselves, but need to be looked at from an authentic theological framework. As I would put it, the higher level of consciousness (God's Spirit in us) includes the lower, but cannot be concluded to simply on the basis of the lower. Intelligence includes sense, but animals cannot think. So also God's Spirit in us includes human life (Jesus became human, and in his Spirit we can be divinized), but human experience cannot grasp the divine without revelation.

18. See Robert Sears, "Trinitarian Love as Ground of the Church" *Theological Studies* 37 (1976): 652-79. More recently, see Leonardo Boff, *Trinity and Society* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1988).

19. See Sears, "Trinitarian Love," pp. 652-79, and my article "Healing and Family Spiritual/Emotional Systems," *Journal of Christian Healing* 5:1 (1983): 10-23.

20. See John A. Sanford, *Evil: the Shadow Side of Reality* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), p. 146

21. See *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, chap. 12, sec. 3.

22. See Doran, "Jungian Psychology and Christian Spirituality," III, which was reprinted in the *Journal of Christian Healing* 4:1 (1982).

23. See Leonardo Boff, *Trinity and Society*, where he shows masculine and feminine aspects in each person of the Trinity (the Father "begetting" the Son and in the Son Creation, the Son showing feminine tenderness and care for relationships while explicitly divinizing maleness, and the Spirit explicitly divinizing femaleness in Mary and the church while revealing implicit masculine traits). See also his *Maternal face of God* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), where he develops the feminine aspect of God more thoroughly.

24. During his trip to Africa, Jung had a deep experience on the Athi Plains near Nairobi. He felt in the stillness "the eternal beginning" of "the world as it has always been." He felt then that human consciousness was "indispensable for the completion of creation." As the alchemists put it: "What nature leaves imperfect, the [alchemical] art perfects" (Hannah, *Jung: His Life and Work*, pp. 171-72). Consciousness is to bring creation to its full maturity, much as the Pueblo Indian helped the sun cross the sky, so doing a service for all people (Ibid., p. 160).

25. This focus on persona experience and "conversion" now is seen as central to theological method (see Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* [New York: Herder & Herder, 1972]). With research changing "facts" from day to day, what remains constant is the perspective the researcher brings to his or her work. The subject's self-awareness (intellectual, moral, religious and psychic (Doran's contribution) conversion) is the constant source of validity in the evaluation of the data. Jung's view of individuation serves a similar function in his psychology.

26. See Wesley Granberg-Michaelson, *A Worldly Spirituality* (New York: Harper & Row, 1984), chap. 4, for a fine analysis of the implications of that text for ecology. What the passage means is to be God's caretaker for the Earth. Our own lack of love for nature in ourselves alienates us from our roots in nature.

27. See my article "Trinitarian Love and Male-Female Community," *Journal of Christian Healing* 6:1 (1984): 32-39, where I argue that equal complementarity is needed to bring out the full image of God.

28. I use "integral" here to imply a deepening through such stages as purgative, illuminative, and unitive spirituality. Others might distinguish "justification" from "integral salvation or sanctification." There is an initial conversion to faith in Jesus, but that can coexist with a narrow dogmatism or religious prejudices "Integral" implies a total assimilation to Jesus' mind, heart, and will (in union with God), and we cannot attain that goal unless we are aware of ourselves and have these aspects conveyed by Jesus' Spirit. Thus, I understand the "illuminative" way to involve individuation.

29. See C. G. Jung, "Transformation Symbols in the Mass," *Collected Works*, no. 391. Notes on his lectures on the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius of Loyola are in *Modern Psychology*, 2d edition (1959), vol. 4. Jung says in Lecture VIII, p. 214: "If you translate this ('man is created to praise God') in psychological language it means that Ignatius recommended an unconditional submission to the unconscious mind." In Lecture IX, p. 171, Jung criticizes Ignatius' vision of Jesus at La Storta of God, saying, "I will be favourable to you in Rome," as "not authentic." "It is in accordance with dogmatic expectation....He must have learned how to project his own thoughts." On the other hand, "visions" of the snake or luminosity are unconscious products, and authentic. Jung uses his psychology to evaluate Ignatius' religious visions exactly the reverse of how Ignatius would evaluate them.

30. Whether Jesus had a shadow side or only the potential for one is open to question. He did show the typical Jewish prejudice against the Syro-Phoenician woman (Mark 7:24-30), but transcended it by seeing her faith. His view of God included all, and his human limits were quickly transformed by it.

31. See Jung, *Answer to Job*, sect. VII.