

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor, BLACKFRIARS

Sir,—In your February number you printed an article by Mr Eversley Belfield on *Catholics and Adult Education*, proposing the foundation of a residential Catholic Adult Education College, a thing very much to be desired. However such a project has been under way for four and a half years, and has indeed been mentioned in BLACKFRIARS, and elsewhere in the Catholic press, a number of times throughout that period. The *Association for Catholic People's Colleges* was founded at Oxford in 1945 on the Feast of the Assumption. It has held since then a number of 'weeks' at places which it has hired, at Oxford, Birmingham, Hawkesyard and Cambridge; and local 'days' and courses have been held at Oxford, Bolton and Taunton. This year the 'week' is to be at Stonyhurst, August 12th to 19th.

The Association has gone some way with its principal object of bringing a permanent residential college, or colleges, into existence. A board of Governors was formed a year and a half ago with the approval of Cardinal Griffin, when it was hoped at one time that the college would be able to start in a big house in Staffordshire, and the Archbishop of Birmingham appointed Dr Davis of Oscott as his representative on the Board of Governors. This project itself has had to be abandoned, but efforts are now being made to bring a college, or colleges, into existence elsewhere. The address of the fund which is being collected for this purpose is The Catholic People's College Fund, The Midland Bank, Pall Mall, London, S.W.1.

The Association issues a small folder which describes itself more fully than this letter; it is available free to all enquirers. A fuller account of the aims which it exists to propagate are contained in *Towards a Catholic People's College*, by R. F. Trevett (Sheed and Ward, 1s. 6d.). All Mr Belfield's points are dealt with and developed in this book.

Yours etc.

JOHN M. TODD,

Hon. Sec. Association for Catholic People's Colleges
21 Linkmead, Stratton-on-the-Fosse, near Bath.

To the Editor, BLACKFRIARS

Sir,—It is gratifying indeed that my five-year-old essay on 'Psychotherapy and Ethics' should prompt so authoritative an article as that by Dr Charles Burns in your March issue. I fear however that those of your readers who are unable to obey his behest to read my essay may be led to suppose that there is disagreement between us where I think none exists. Its purpose was in fact to answer the question 'Is the

therapist a moralist?' with as emphatic a 'No' as does Dr Burns himself. I too hold it to be inadvisable (I should prefer to say 'disastrous') 'that the therapist should become involved in the role of spiritual adviser' and that 'it is not his job to suggest beliefs or values'. Indeed I went further than Dr Burns seems prepared to go when I maintained that the unconscious influence of the analyst is still more pernicious—even therapeutically—than conscious influence. I would far sooner see a Catholic analysant with a Communist analyst who was conscious of his own beliefs, values, limitations and motivations than with a Catholic analyst who was not.

I am all with Dr Burns in requiring a separation of *roles*. What I question is a separation of *fields*. But neither, it seems, does Dr Burns suppose that the 'instinctive and emotional' can be immunised from the 'moral and spiritual', and treated as a thing apart.

Where then are the supposed differences between us? Only, I would hazard (if we *must* have a quarrel), about the extent to which the 'instinctive and emotional' and the 'moral and spiritual' are in fact inseparable, and whether they should or should not be separated. I have never of course contended that Jung was a 'protagonist of the Catholic religion', but the five years which have elapsed since my article was written have confirmed me in my conviction that Jung has proved up to the hilt that his collective archetypes are precisely (as he claims) the psychological counterpart of biological instinct, that religion, in some form or another (conscious or unconscious) is the regular psychological instrument for the assimilation and organisation of instinctive, emotional and other experience, and that it can be as little neglected in the treatment of psychoneurosis as can the digestive and excretory organs in the treatment of dyspepsia. (It should be needless to add that, no more than Jung, do I hold religion to be *nothing but* a psychological digestive system!) It is difficult therefore for me to view Jung's psychology as a sort of post-graduate course to Freud's for a few chosen souls, or religious concerns as an optional superaddition to the equipment of a non-existent abstraction (an invention of certain theologians, I must with shame confess) called the 'natural man'. For 'religious' forces too are (though perhaps unconsciously and deleteriously) 'operative in the field of personal relationships: in the family, in work and leisure'; when 'we are dealing with loves and hates, with jealousy and guilt, with inferiority and self-assertion'. These conclusions of empirical psychology I find amply confirmed (by each from their different standpoints) by theology, history and anthropology. I believe that a psychotherapy which, in its endeavour to become 'integrated' into respectable medicine, would exclude *a priori* man's innate 'religious' forces is as doomed—*mortua et mortifera*—as is a religion

which has become severed from its instinctual and emotional roots. This inextricable connection between the 'moral and spiritual' and the 'instinctive and emotional' I find hardly less emphasised (however disguised and unwillingly) by Freud than by Jung: notably in the whole development of his psychoanalysis 'Beyond the Pleasure-Principle' to increasing emphasis on the function of the 'super-ego' in mental health and sickness, in his own seemingly compulsive interest in essentially 'religious' questions, in his fashioning and re-fashioning of myth—of Œdipus, of the primaeval horde, or Eros and Thanatos, of the Akhnatonite Moses. Perhaps Freud himself never faced the full psychological implications of his own mythologizing, but I would suggest that we rob him of much of his real greatness if we ignore his highly 'unscientific' phantasies, and see him as nothing but the founder of a purely rational 'medical psychology'.

Jung's concern with alchemy and yoga is certainly disconcerting on first inspection, but it is important to understand what he is about. He does not urge us to undertake these procedures of other times and climes: on the contrary he warns us sternly against deliberately attempting anything of the sort. But he does claim to find in them an ancient wisdom concerning psychological processes, and nature's own resources for healing and integration, which at once confirm, illuminate and supplement modern psychology. This claim is of course open to discussion and dispute; in any case it involves a highly specialised line of research which few busy practitioners can be expected to undertake. But the claim should not be without interest to Dr Burns. For if alchemy and yoga have anything to teach us, it is undoubtedly concerning the impossibility of detaching ourselves from those 'simpler problems of the individual' of which he speaks, concerning the radically instinctual, physiological, even biological, character of psychological processes, and concerning the ineluctable necessity of beginning with the 'dung at our feet' (the very *materia prima* of the alchemists) if 'health and holiness' are to grow.

This brief letter is necessarily restricted to unsubstantiated assertions: their verification must be sought in the appropriate literature, or better still in the manifestations of the human psyche itself. But believing as I do with Dr Burns that 'the reconciliation and synthesis of religion and psychology is of far greater importance than that between "religion and science" which agitated a previous generation', it seems well that the points at issue should not be misconstrued at the outset, or these deep waters muddied up with non-existent differences. I could wish he had defined our supposed differences a little more closely: there seems to be no disagreement between us that the dilemma 'between sex and science with Freud and religion and alchemy with Jung' is quite

illusory. I for my part do not of course advocate a deep analysis of moral and religious factors for any and every mental disturbance, any more than a major surgical operation for every occurrence of indigestion. I am still uncertain just where we disagree, but hope that in this letter I have stuck my neck out conspicuously and provocatively enough to ensure a riposte which will leave no doubt.

Yours, etc.

VICTOR WHITE, O.P.

To the Editor, BLACKFRIARS

Sir,—It is equally gratifying to me to find that there is no obvious cleavage of opinion between Fr White and myself. My first reaction in fact to his reply was to cry 'touché' and leave it at that, but it might be ungenerous not to take up his challenge.

I did agree in my remarks, that the character and belief of the therapist must influence the patient unconsciously, although the extent and nature of this kind of influence must be conjectural, while the effect of direct advice and suggestion of values is more obvious, and is not, to my mind, the job of the therapist.

Now, while beyond the field of the 'instinctive and emotional' extends the landscape of the 'moral and spiritual' to beyond human sight, the therapist for the most part is concerned just with the field which he is hoeing and digging, preparing it, one hopes, to grow a harvest and fit in with the rest of the land. So I still say that in practice we do separate the one from the other.

Having said this, I do admit that the 'emotional' and the 'moral' are in a sense identified; because of love, hate and guilt, etc. If I seem to avoid the term 'moral' it is because it implies a definite set of ethics and values, and suggests that these are to be imposed on the patient.

Also I think it is stretching concepts a bit far to claim that all psychoneurosis, including presumably nervous dyspepsia, has to be considered in a religious framework (except in the obvious sense that everything is a part of the whole). I doubt whether Jung would maintain that the collective unconscious has to be tapped or mobilised in every case and at every stage of life.

I do heartily welcome the corrective applied by Fr White to the summary dismissal of Freud's 'metapsychology' (or his preoccupation with religious issues without being really aware of what he was doing). It is through this aspect that a synthesis may one day be found between the schools.

I fear that my riposte will leave lots of doubt, and I may be quite off the track, but here I retire.

Yours, etc.

C. BURNS.