

This article by Leanne Payne and Kevin Perrotta first appeared in *Pastoral Renewal* in 1988. At that time the authors were deeply concerned with the growing impact of Jungian thought on the Episcopal and Roman Catholic renewal movements of the 60's, 70's and 80's. Since then, in many Christian circles, Jungian spirituality, disguised as Christian, has penetrated or even replaced Christian spirituality. This introduction of the obscene into the holy was successfully set into a psychological framework by which Christian spirituality was emptied of objective truth and reality, and in this way the truly great renewal going on in the church was tragically and prematurely halted in many places. Now, many Evangelicals in need of genuine spiritual awakening are faced with the same temptation to "rediscover" the "authenticity" of their faith through dangerous and very subtle mixture of Jungian psychology and Christian spirituality. In this they stand to lose all the goodness and power of Christian language and imagery, and with it the very veracity of the Gospel message.

Reprinted from
April & May 1988 editions
Pastoral Renewal, Ann Arbor, MI.

The Unconscious Confusions Of Christian Jungianism

Part 1

By Leanne Payne and Kevin Perrotta

Christians' uses of C.G. Jung offer cause for serious pastoral concern

Carl Gustav Jung, pioneer Swiss depth psychologist, one-time friend of Sigmund Freud, died in 1961, but his ideas march on. Today the largest audience for Jungianism is found among Christians, especially Roman Catholics and Episcopalians.

With Jungian retreats and conference speakers, books and magazine articles, and even a monastery, the question arises whether Christian Jungianism offers an authentic enrichment of Christians' understanding of human psychology and spiritual life.

Jung himself is not an easy thinker to discuss briefly. His collected works run to 18 volumes, and his ideas are often difficult to pin down.

Christian Jungianism is likewise difficult to summarize. Books and articles are numerous. (A single Catholic book publisher, Paulist Press, lists 17 books in its catalogue under the heading "Jungian spirituality.") And Christians make use of Jung's thought in different ways and to different degrees.

Thus it would be impossible in a single article to assess either Jung's thought or all the uses to which Christians have been putting him. But in the present article we would like to voice our concern about certain recurrent themes in Christian Jungianism.

Looking Inward

The first problem that we observe in Christian Jungianism is a tendency toward self-absorption.

The unconscious is a major focus of Jung's own thought. Jung saw the unconscious mainly as a storehouse of living, healing symbols. The bulk of the unconscious, in Jung's view, consists not of the individual's memories and desires but of instincts and images shared by the whole human race. In Jung's view the path to wholeness lies in raising these hidden contents to consciousness.

Consequently Jung advocated paying close attention to indicators of the unconscious, such as dreams and fantasies. "*Constant* observation pays the unconscious a tribute that more or less guarantees its cooperation," Jung wrote. "One of the most important tasks of psychic hygiene [is] to pay *continual* attention to the symptomatology of unconscious contents and processes."

Christian Jungians take up this task with religious conviction. Betsy Caprio and Thomas M. Hedberg, a Roman Catholic priest, write: "Jesus' saying 'let down your nets' can be heard as an invitation to go fishing in that deep sea to bring up the rich life that is there. The contents of the unconscious—like the fish and other creatures of the ocean—are plentiful, of wide variety, and life-sustaining."² Signs that "bubble up from the interior" include "moods, dreams, memories, prayer experiences, physical changes, unexpected behavior."

Dream exploration is particularly important. For Jungians, *all* dreams have psychological significance. As messages from the unconscious, "dreams never lie," writes Chester P. Michael, a Roman Catholic priest, and Marie C. Norrissey.⁴

"*Take your dreams seriously*," writes Episcopal priest Morton Kelsey.* "Dealing with a dream is like dealing with a living being. The more attention you give to your dreams, the more attention they will give to you" (emphasis his).⁵ "As a result of our *loving attention and faithfulness* to their images, dreams eventually lead us to a new center of personality" (emphasis ours).⁶

Jung claimed to discover unconscious structures in the human mind, giving rise to certain kinds of images. He called these archetypes. For example, he claimed that in every man there is a concealed feminine side (called the anima) and in every woman, a masculine side (called the animus). In every person there is a dark side (called the shadow) and an image of wholeness and completeness (called God). One of the reasons for paying attention to one's own unconscious is to bring such archetypal images into consciousness and integrate them into one's life.

Jung sometimes spoke about these inner aspects of the personality as though they were distinct entities, needing to be recognized and cared for.⁷ Following his lead, Caprio and Hedberg picture the varied unconscious aspects of the personality as an "infinite line-up of inner characters" awaiting their turn to come to consciousness and get expressed.⁸ The authors suggest treating these aspects of oneself like real people:

- Carrying on conversations with one's own moods (One might ask one's inner sense of clown-ness, "Are you about some part of me that won't admit I'm sad?" One might ask a desolate mood, "Where did you come from? What can I do for you?"⁹
- Dressing up and acting out one's inner characters¹⁰
- Composing their biographies¹¹
- Putting pictures of them on the wall¹²
- Praying for them.¹³

Merging Self and God

This implicit identification of God with natural dynamics within the self becomes explicit in the works of Christian Jungians. But the word "explicit" does not here imply "clear." Rather Christian Jungians often confusedly blur distinctions between self and God.

Jung himself claimed that the personality has a harmonizing center, which he called the "self," that

balances the demands of the conscious ego and the unconscious. He also claimed that among the mind's archetypal images is an image of wholeness, which he called the "God archetype"—the mind's picture of God. (Whether Jung believed in the existence of God outside the human mind is a question that need not concern us here.) Jung thought that the harmonizing center (the self) and the picture of wholeness (the God archetype) are very hard to tell apart. "The self," he wrote, meaning this harmonizing center, "is a God-image, or at least cannot be distinguished from one" (emphasis ours).²⁰

This merging of "self" and "God" in the psyche lends itself to the view that God dwells in the unconscious without any gracious, saving action. The unconscious *innately* carries divine wisdom and power. The mind has a "self-liberating power," Jung wrote. What Christians would attribute to God, Jung attributed to the unconscious, often using religious language. He spoke of the unconscious as the source of the "water of grace," and said that psychological growth depends on "the unconscious psyche or 'the grace of God'—names make no difference" (emphasis ours).²¹

Following this line of thought, Christian Jungians tend to blur the boundary between God and the self in various ways. For example:

- Sanford sees the archetype or image of wholeness in the unconscious as an imprint of God's will for the person. "The unconscious contains the image of the whole person we are to become, the 'person in the mind of God.' "Therefore the unconscious has the capacity to "realize the 'divine man' " in us."²²
- Exploring the theology of the 16th-century Spanish mystic John of the Cross, Russell Holmes, a Roman Catholic priest and Jungian analyst, writes, "The purpose of the contemplative prayer experience of St. John of the Cross is revealed as a journey within which the ego, armed with hope, in the process of self-knowledge, is to establish a relationship with the center of the soul, with God or the Self."²³
- Practicing the presence of God and practicing the presence of self become virtually indistinguishable. "To live a life of awareness of the inner home and the God center of that home," Caprio and Hedberg write, is what it means to "practice the presence of God."²⁴

A Good Inner Self?

Christian Jungians, then, tend to think that the individual's urge to self-realization and his harmonizing personal center contain and express God's purpose. This view entails the belief that the core of the human personality has somehow escaped the fall.

Christian Jungians do not deny the existence of evil in the human person. But they see evil as belonging only to the conscious ego. Or they think of it as consisting in the repression of parts of the personality, especially emotional and sexual energies—a splitting-off of good elements that need to be integrated.

But, in their view, the roots of the person are good, inasmuch as the fundamental drive to self-completion and the harmonizing core of the self are naturally able to carry out their functions of growth and reconciliation.

Beyond the evils of conscious egotism, Michael and Norrisey write, "A new center to our life must be found—one that can control both our unconscious as well as our conscious life, one that resides in the depths of our being.

...Sacred Scripture frequently speaks of the inner self as the 'heart' of man. . . . Only the inner self is the trustworthy controller of our whole nature. . . . We call it 'our conscience.' "²⁵

The error here is in thinking that the evil in fallen human nature is confined to one level, while in fact evil now infects human nature from top to bottom. Not only has our conscious reason been affected, but so have our aspirations to wholeness and the imaginative, intuitive, emotional, and

symbolic faculties arising from the unconscious. No natural drive to completeness or center of growth within the personality has been preserved from original sin.

The “heart,” the “controller of our whole nature,” is simply not “trustworthy.” Separated from God the human heart has lost the divine splendor and has become “deceitful above all things and desperately wicked” (Jer. 17:9). As Jesus taught, “Out of the heart come evil thoughts” (Matt. 15:19).

The Bible tells of many kinds of hearts, including hearts that are (using the *King James Version*) obstinate, proud, wicked, double, subtle, froward, haughty, cunning, spiteful, insolent, arrogant, boastful, bitter, stony, uncircumcised, foolish, darkened, covetous, impenitent, evil, whorish, deceitful, hard, scheming, and diabolical.

Therefore it is folly to identify God’s vision for human life with the drives and images of the unredeemed human heart. If, before the fall, in the state of pristine union with God, man could look into his heart and find there only the brightness of God reflected in the unflawed mirror that God had made him to be, then perhaps he would have done well simply to be true to the promptings of his heart. But no longer.

Fallen man needs the light of God’s truth in order to identify the good and judge the evil in his heart. He needs the redeeming presence of the incarnate Christ to transform his heart. And in order to abide in that truth and have that Truth abide in him, he needs to constantly renew his submission to Christ’s authority over him.

Under Which Authority?

It is at exactly this vital point that Christian Jungianism is confusing. By giving natural psychological drives and images a divine authority and infallibility, it deflects the word of God which comes to “discern the thoughts and intentions of the heart” (Heb. 4:12). The notion that fallen man is equipped with a natural drive and center already containing God’s purpose and wisdom implies a duty to obey the self, creating a crisis of loyalties when, as inevitably happens, the self’s inclinations run counter to the summons to take up the cross and follow Christ.

Michael and Norrisey cause this kind of confusion when, after writing at length about overcoming selfishness and growing in love, they counsel that “we must work hard to center our conscious and unconscious life around our inner person so that it may become the real king and center of our being. . . . Authenticity is present to the extent that our conscious life is in accord with our unconscious and hidden self.”²⁶

Even more confusing are Caprio’s and Hedberg’s statements that the ego must “surrender primacy” to God within, which is the same as what Jung called the Self. “Being ‘Self-centered’ means that a well-established ego has allowed itself to become the servant or handmaid of the higher life principle within, and that that Self or God or Universal Truth or Power of Love or the Force (or whatever other words best say it for anyone) is now in charge.”²⁷

Advice like this muddies the crucial issue of obedience to God’s will, and can be used as a ticket to act in a deeply selfish manner in the mistaken conviction that one is thereby carrying out God’s will.

Part 1: Notes

* We cite Morton Kelsey because he has perhaps been the most effective popularizer of C.G. Jung among Christians. While Kelsey cannot most precisely be described as a disciple of Jung, he employs Jungian thought extensively to develop a case for what he calls the “spiritual or psychoid” realm.

† Leanne Payne, *Real Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Works of C.S. Lewis, The Broken Image, Healing the Homosexual, Crisis in Masculinity* (Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, MI, 1979, 1981, 1984, 1985).

¹ Joseph Campbell (ed.), *The Portable Jung* (New York: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 159

² Betsy Caprio and Thomas M. Hedberg, S.D.B. *Coming Home: A Handbook for Exploring the Sanctuary Within* (New York: Paulist Press, 1986), p. 61

³ *Ibid.*, p. 111

⁴ Chester P. Michael and Marie C. Norrissey, *Arise: A Christian Psychology of Love* (Charlottesville, Virginia: The Open Door, 1981), p. 91

⁵ Morton Kelsey, *Dreams: A Way to Listen to God* (New York: Paulist Press, 1978), p. 46

⁶ Morton Kelsey, *Transcend: A Guide to the Spiritual Quest* (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1981), p. 21

⁷ C.G. Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1933), p. 235

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 162

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 123, 125

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 150

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 168

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 180f

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 170

¹⁴ Howard Clinebell, *Contemporary Growth Therapies* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981), p. 102

¹⁵ C.G. Jung, "Foreword," in Victor White, *O.P., God and the Unconscious* (Cleveland, Ohio: Meridian Books, 1961), p. 21

¹⁶ C.G. Jung, *Psychology and Alchemy*, Collected Works, Volume 12, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1968), p. 46

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 195

¹⁸ John A. Sanford, *Dreams: God's Forgotten Language* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1968; original German edition 1966), pp. 91, 90

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 66

The Unconscious Confusions Of Christian Jungianism

Part 2

A third troubling theme in the works of Christian Jungians is a tendency to **confuse Jung's goal of personal completeness with the Christian goal of holiness.**

In Jung's psychological model, growth involves reconciling opposites within oneself. The goal is to become a complete person in whom all contrary tendencies are harmonized. "Wholeness of personality is attained when the two parts of the psyche, the conscious and the unconscious, are joined together and stand in a living relation to one another. That then is the ideal of Jungian psychotherapy."¹

This goal is subtly but radically different from the Christian one. Both Jungianism and Christianity look for man to achieve peace and fulfillment. But for Jung this is a matter of bringing the potentialities within the person into consciousness and integrating them. For the Christian, peace fundamentally means peace with God; fulfillment means ultimately sharing in God's life, which involves transformation in love. The Christian goal necessitates the pruning of some natural potentials, taking up one's cross, dying to self (John 15:2; Luke 9:23).

Christian Jungianism's process of self-completion, orchestrated by the self's harmonizing inner center, works against dying to self and living to God. Betsy Caprio and Father Thomas M. Hedberg write that when we let the "inner wisdom" be in charge, "We can lay down the cross" and experience the various parts of the personality coming to consciousness and being expressed.²

Stirring Up Eros

Problems arise especially when the completion process involves—as it inevitably must—exploring and integrating the erotic side of the personality. Following the Jungian pattern may mean more than a healthy acceptance of one's sexual identity and a realistic recognition of sexual desires and temptations. It may lead to advice counter to Christian prudence and even moral norms.

In an ambiguously stated piece of advice, Father Chester P. Michael and Marie C. Norrisey recommend opposite-sex friendships to develop the erotic aspect of the personality, "despite the dangers." When the question of what celibate or unhappily married people should do if erotic friendships arise and "marriage is not possible or feasible," they do not close the door on sexual relations between people not married to each other. They write that "by prayer, grace, intelligence, intuition, and the experience of others, the proper wisdom to resolve each situation will be discovered." "Previous commitments, obligations, and responsibilities should be *honored as far as possible* (emphasis ours)." There must be regard for "laws, customs, danger of scandal, and any evils that might result," as well as what will do "the greatest amount of good ... for the most people and the least amount of harm to the fewest persons."³

Michael and Norrisey offer the same advice to homosexuals and refer them to Dignity, a Catholic gay lib organization, for help in discovering "how best to fulfill God's will in this situation."⁴

Jung's ideas have proven useful to Christian homosexual activists, who have argued that "coming out"—publicly declaring oneself to be "gay"—is an instance of integrating the darker and opposite-sex sides of the personality.⁵

The dangers of this approach are quite real. We ourselves know of Christian leaders who have

fallen into sexual immorality under the influence of Jungian ideas about the importance of expressing the erotic side of the personality.

Making Room for Evil

The goal of self-completion through the reconciliation of contraries is fundamentally objectionable because it involves the idea that **evil, rather than being rejected, must be integrated in the person**. This problem in Christian Jungianism deserves particular attention.

Jung wrote a great deal on the reconciliation of good and evil, but his views are difficult to determine conclusively. As Episcopal priest John Sanford, perhaps Jung's leading Christian disciple, admits: "Jung is sometimes frustratingly inconsistent in his arguments regarding evil and God. His inconsistency would not be so difficult if it were not that at each point of his inconsistency he is quite adamant about his position."⁶

By calling for the reconciliation of good and evil Jung sometimes seemed to mean that by bringing what is evil to consciousness it can be confronted, freed of that which makes it evil, and integrated in the light. Denying, repressing, "splitting off" the instinctual and symbolic aspects of the personality is, in Jung's view, exactly what makes them evil. This much of Jung's thinking has some validity.

But Jung also seemed to look forward to the actual union of good and evil in a higher synthesis in God. He wrote that people's ideas of good and evil are too narrow. At the highest level of completeness and consciousness what people now regard as good and evil will both find a place. The goal of life, then, appears not to be goodness but consciousness and completeness, integrating even evil.

With this view, it is not surprising that Jung sometimes depreciated moral norms as mere conventions blocking the road to individual completeness. For example, when one group asked him whether incest is acceptable, Jung noted modern man's desire to cast aside moral objections to such behavior and "find out for himself how things are." Jung continued:

"Though this desire open bar and bolt to the most dangerous possibilities, we cannot help seeing it as a courageous enterprise and giving it some measure of sympathy. It is no reckless adventure, but an effort inspired by deep spiritual distress to bring meaning once more into life on the basis of fresh and unprejudiced experience. Caution has its place, no doubt, but can we refuse our support to a serious venture which calls the whole of the personality into the field of action. If we oppose it, we are trying to suppress what is best in man—his daring and his aspiration.

And should we succeed, we should only have stood in the way of that invaluable experience which might have given a meaning to life. What would have happened if Paul had allowed himself to be talked out of his journey to Damascus?"⁷

Don't Always Do Good?

The confusion of Jung's own approach to the reconciliation of good and evil also appears in Christian Jungianism. Sanford intimates that what we call evil may later be included in a higher synthesis. Remarking on the way that evil in the world provokes people to moral growth, he asks: "Who knows, perhaps when the final curtain goes up at the end of the drama, we will discover there was a secret alliance between God and Satan all along, and that the goodness of God is far greater than the good and evil we human beings distinguish in this world."⁸

Sanford ranks the goal of consciousness and completeness over goodness. He even claims Jesus' support for this position: "Growth in consciousness is valued more highly by Jesus than conformity to 'goodness.'"⁹

By contrast, Sanford makes an attack on the apostle Paul because “Paul is almost always antagonistic to emotion. He tends to see anger, sexual desire, and erotic yearnings as evil. . . . [This] amounts to a rejection of the physical nature of mankind. In this way Paul falls into a psychological Gnosticism.”¹⁰

Sanford’s view of the reconciliation of good and evil is, like Jung’s, unclear. At points it seems that he is merely making a case for a realistic and positive assessment of man’s physical nature. Sanford does not tell people to sin. Indeed, in his book *Dreams* Sanford uses dream interpretation to help people own up to serious wrongdoing, such as abortion and adultery, and accept God’s forgiveness. But Sanford’s attack on the apostle Paul signals that he is setting himself in opposition to the Christian revelation regarding good and evil.

It is clear that Sanford’s view of the reconciliation of good and evil is at odds with the Christian view that one should always do good and avoid evil. Sanford criticizes this as unrealistic, impossible, and even dangerous:

“There is an inevitable dark side to our nature that refuses to be assimilated into our lofty ideals of goodness, morality, and ideal human behavior. Indeed, if we strive to be too good, we only engender the opposite reaction in the unconscious. If we try to live too much in the light, a corresponding amount of darkness accumulates within. If we go beyond the bounds of our natural capacity for love and kindness, we build up an opposing amount of anger and cruelty within us. Psychology warns us against trying to be better than we are, and urges us to strive not so much for a forced ‘goodness’ but for consciousness, and to live, not out of ideals we cannot keep, but from an inner Center which alone can keep the balance. The grounds for the moral life are thus shifted from a striving for the highest moral ideals (though moral ideals are also important) to a striving for self-knowledge, in the belief that man’s moral values and ideals are only effective within the scope of his Consciousness.”¹¹

This view establishes Sanford as less hopeful regarding human nature than St. Paul, whom he criticizes, inasmuch as Paul has greater confidence in the possibility of man cooperating with the power of the Spirit to lead a life of goodness far beyond “the bounds of our natural capacity for love and kindness.”

Sanford explicitly rejects the view that Christians should strive to overcome the flesh. His criticism of Romans 7:14 - 26 is that Paul “concedes that there is another power within him that causes him to act contrary to his best intentions. . . . Unfortunately, Paul refuses to accept this contrary tendency as a part of himself. He declares that it is not, after all, his self that acts this way, but ‘sin which lives in me.’ This amounts to a refusal on Paul’s part to accept the Shadow as an inevitable and *legitimate* part of his own nature; it leaves as the only possible solution an attempt to find some way to cut the Shadow off from oneself. . . . This does not solve the problem, but only drives it deeper underground” (emphasis ours).¹²

Adventures in Evil

Predictably Sanford’s approach creates confusion about the importance of moral standards. He does not deny that there are moral norms: “Paul is right that to act out all our impulses, to give complete license to our emotions and desires, can be destructive. It is not a matter of allowing ourselves to commit all kinds of lawless actions.”¹³ But Sanford depreciates morality as artificially restricting the individual:

“Paul’s ethic takes away man’s freedom. When we are told to conform to a standard of goodness imposed upon us by collective authority, and to repress everything from our unconscious that contradicts this, we have lost our freedom; we are no longer expected to be conscious people, responsible for ourselves.”¹⁴

This position leads on to moral compromise: “Paul admonishes us ‘never get tired of doing good.’ He would not have to say that if it were not easy to become tired of just that. There is a part of us that refuses a one-sided identification with what Paul conceived to be goodness. An attempt to one-sidedly live up to Paul’s ego ideals only reinforces and intensifies the split within us and so divides us that our Shadow becomes an enemy.”¹⁵

In this regard Sanford dismisses Paul’s teaching on sex as gnostic because he teaches that “it is never permissible except in the strict confines of marriage.”¹⁶ He takes Paul to task for calling church leaders to lead an exemplary life (I Tim. 3:2-7), an attempt which, he says, “will not produce an authentic human being, but only a man who strikes a pose.”¹⁷

As an “interesting contrast” to Paul’s approach, Sanford quotes a Sioux “holy man” named Lame Deer: “Sinning makes the world go round. You can’t be so stuck up, so inhuman that you want to be pure, your soul wrapped up in a plastic bag, all the time. You have to be God and the devil, both of them.”¹⁸

In practice, this Christian Jungian approach is gravely misleading, an invitation to adventuring in wrongdoing. Sanford writes: “If we only play it safe in life, we never come to know who we are; life must be thoroughly lived if we are to become whole people, and it is better to be forgiven than to be self-righteous.”¹⁹ Perhaps angels could read such an assertion with merely dispassionate theological curiosity. But to at least some flesh-and-blood human beings it will sound like a clergyman’s authoritative permission to sin now, learn from the experience, and get things straightened out later.

Real Pastoral Problems

If space permitted we could explore Jungianism’s tendency to empty out the objective character of any religion it interacts with, including Christianity. Jungianism treats supernatural and spiritual realities as psychological realities. Creeds and confessions are regarded as projections of the psyche. Christianity is then valued not for the truths it reveals about man and God, but for its usefulness in mapping and exploring the unconscious. Consequently, Scripture is interpreted subjectively. Christ loses his uniqueness as incarnate Word and mediator between God and man.

We could also discuss the way in which Jungianism, by pushing God beyond the range of human knowledge and beyond good and evil, establishes a god who is both good and evil, a mere projection of the human mind, under whose image evil spiritual forces come to domineer over human lives. The repudiation of Yahweh invites the return of Baal. The abandonment of the search for holiness and transformation in the Spirit leaves the way open for spirits of sexual bondage, phallic demons.

Lacking the space to develop these concerns here, we merely mention them as warnings. Our central concern in the present article has not been with Jung himself but with his Christian followers.

In the present article, likewise, we are not able to consider the concerns which Christian Jungians are attempting to address or to suggest ourselves a more authentic Christian response. Jung is attractive to many Christians because he takes seriously the deepest levels of the human psyche. He appreciates the importance of the symbolic and imaginative dimensions of the personality. In a time when the church often reflects the rational and technological qualities of modern society, Jung announces a rediscovery of the soul, of the heart, which has been very welcome to many Christians.

Unfortunately, however, Jung offers a distorted picture, one shaped by his own encounters with evil in the unconscious realm, as he acknowledged at the end of his life in *Memories, Dreams, and Reflections*.²⁰ There he vividly described life-shaping childhood visions of a terrifying, underground phallic god and of a disgusting god defecating on Basel cathedral—revelations, as he saw them, of the dark side of divinity that Christianity had repressed.

Our goal in this article has been limited to pointing out themes in the works of Christian Jungians that have a harmful, practical effect on those who make use of them. These problems are real pastoral problems, because they appear not mainly in scholarly books written for academic audiences but in popular-level books, conferences, and retreats. While these themes are not equally present in the works of all Christian Jungians, they are often serious enough to disqualify the works as guides to Christian living. Dealing with these problems should be the concern of all who have leadership in churches, fellowships, and organizations where Christians are using the thought of C.G.Jung.

Part 2: Notes

1 William A. Johnson, *The Search for Transcendence: A Theological Analysis of Nontheological Attempts to Define Transcendence* (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1974), p. 133

2 Betsy Caprio and Thomas M. Hedberg, S.D.B., *Coming Home: A Handbook for Exploring the Sanctuary Within* (New York: Paulist Press, 1986), p. 203

3 *Ibid.*, p. 133

4 *Ibid.*, p. 134

5 Commission on Social Justice, Archdiocese of San Francisco, *Homosexuality and Social Justice: Report of the Task Force on Gay/Lesbian Issues*, 1982, page 82

6 John A. Sanford, *Evil: The Shadow Side of Reality* (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1981), p. 146

7 C.G. Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1933), p. 239

8 John A. Sanford, *Dreams, God's Forgotten Language* (Philadelphia: JB.Lippincott, 1968), p. 210

9 John A. Sanford, *Evil*, p. 83

10 *Ibid.*, pp. 72f

11 *Ibid.*, p. 23

12 *Ibid.*, p. 70

13 *Ibid.*, p. 72

14 *Ibid.*, p. 83

15 *Ibid.*, p.72

16 *Ibid.*, p.73

17 *Ibid.*, p.73

18 *Ibid.*, p.74

19 *Ibid.*, p.80

20 C.G. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, and Reflections* (New York: Random House, 1973), pp. 11-15, 36-56