ILLUSION OR ILLUMINATION: A STUDY OF THE RELIGIOUS PROCESS.*

By W. J. T. KIMBER, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., D.P.M.

THERE are few, I suppose, who would disagree with the view that we are passing through a period of social and cultural disintegration.

The claims of society are disregarded by a large number of its members, and customs hallowed by age-long observance are passing rapidly into disuse. Almost daily, science throws increasing light on fresh problems of the hour, while religion is eclipsed and increasingly disregarded, so much so that we see it stated that the loss of Christian faith and philosophy is due to a conviction that science has replaced it.

Science, or reason, it is claimed on the other hand, cannot walk by its own light, but needs some principle of interpretation beyond itself (1).

That the present position is far from satisfactory is generally agreed. We are faced with a disturbing increase in the amount of juvenile delinquency and of crime generally, and this is held by many to be due in part at least to a lack of spiritual understanding and religious training. We seem to have lost something of value or something possibly even essential, if we are to progress as a world civilization.

Here then is a situation provocative of thought. It seems to be a matter of moment, a matter of urgency, and although I am but poorly qualified to deal with it, there is here a challenge which as psychiatrists, I feel we cannot properly avoid.

"Religious doctrines" (I am quoting Freud) (2) "cannot be proved or refuted, but are so improbable so incompatible with all we have discovered about the reality of the world as to be almost delusions." He passes on to explain that religion has lost the influence it once had, "not because it promises less, but because its promises are less credible," and he concludes that even the fundamental assumptions of religion are being discredited.

Though such an opinion as this may not be acceptable without modification by psychologists to-day, it does represent still the general attitude of many of those of the lay public who think at all about such things, and it encourages a complete disregard of the subject by many others.

Emil Brunner in the Gifford Lecture of 1947 throws some further light on the reasons for the development of somewhat similar opinions when he says "The detachment of culture from Christianity produced the fatally erroneous belief that culture or creativity needs no subordination to a higher unit, but

* Presidential Address to the Section of Psychiatry, Royal Society of Medicine, delivered 8 November, 1949.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

can live on its own resources. The vehemence with which the so-called Christian tutelage of culture is rejected is not incomprehensible, considering how intolerably in past centuries Christianity has fettered culture. The narrow borderlines in which Church dogma kept scientific endeavour hampered scientific development for centuries" (3).

Jung also has warned us of the danger of reaction here, though he states the problem rather differently, as follows: "If we are conscious of the spirit of the age, we should know why we are so inclined to account for things on physical grounds; we should know that up till now, too much was accounted for in terms of the spirit. This realization would make us critical of our bias."

Our present attempts to give physical explanation, he likens to a development of consciousness on the horizontal plane, as opposed to and in consequence of the "exclusively vertical perspective of the Gothic age."

Looking about us on the horizontal plane at our fellow men and women we shall certainly discover a reality and will inevitably give it a material interpretation, but may we not glance upwards and by interrupting our world-fast inspection shall we not gain a clearer vision of reality, in appreciating a greater unity?

Some comprehension of this greater unity is only to be gained by relating the vertical with the horizontal aspect, by relating material objectivity with that something more which we may call spiritual reality, and as the Russian philosopher Berdyaev has pointed out, the present day materialistic domination of life is due to "a divorce between spirituality and the complete life" (4.)

As professed healers of the mentally sick, do we not owe a duty to our patients to consider the "complete life"? Because of their unfamiliarity and the impossibility of measuring up by a scientific yardstick, the spiritual aspects of life expressed in religious concepts and dogmas, we as psychiatrists are not justified in disregarding or underestimating their importance.

The Churches in our Western Culture at any rate, are the organizations concerned with the presentation of the spiritual to man. To-day the credit of the Churches probably stands in the popular estimation on an even lower level than that of "religion" itself. It will help if we give some thought as to the reasons for this, for we shall thus better understand the difficulties which the Churches—or in fact any other form of organized religion—have to meet. We shall find that indeed the Church is open to the same criticism and for the same reasons as we have heard applied to the scientific world.

The task of the Church is to relate spiritual truth from "above"— to continue using spatial metaphors—to the horizontal vision of the ordinary man engaged in daily conflict with the realities of a material universe. For this purpose various techniques are employed, and in the words of Berdyaev there is consequently and necessarily an "objectification of spirit."

"The wind bloweth where it listeth"—so is everyone that is born of the Spirit —but as soon as the spirit is objectified in church organization, as symbol or ritual, it is no longer free, it is limited, restricted and controlled by the fetters of dogma and tradition.

This limiting factor, which characterizes objectification of spirit in religion, was clearly apprehended by Jung, and is referred to by him as the "walls

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

erected in primeval times" (5), from behind which it is stated a religious tyranny can never again be exercised over mankind. They serve, however, we must remember, a beneficent purpose, being the means by which the unlimited and uncontrolled spirit was made available to materialistically-minded man, who, according to his individual capacity, could receive more or less of the things of the spirit. It would seem from the signs of present social unrest, that further training is needed before man for the most part will learn to become sufficiently responsible to use even the limited degrees of freedom which is being thrust upon him. "But to train a people in the way of democracy after centuries of despotism is a hard undertaking," writes Dr. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham, and continues: "There must be something in the nature of religious dedication before it comes to pass that a man, conscious of more than ordinary ability, will put aside ambition to rule others and place his gifts at the service of his fellow-men. . . . The danger to democracy is that men who achieve leadership should be so fearful of revolution, so obsessed by the need for order, that they suppress freedom. Tyranny is the more dangerous in proportion as the motives which lead to it have justification" (6).

It is not surprising, therefore, that organized religion should have found it necessary to limit freedom and so objectify spirit in the way that it has done. It shows to what extent the position has been misunderstood since scientific criticism of religion has for the most part been levelled at it on these grounds.

The limiting factor in the spiritual field manifests itself in the formulation of differing creeds, particular rituals or peculiar symbols. Differences in formulation appear since man familiarizes himself with one known way in his insecurity and is only too ready to affirm that this is the only way, hence different religions and differing sects appear and multiply. To how great an extent the adoption of a particular religious outlook is influenced by the psychological make-up has been pointed out by David Yellowlees (7) and other writers.

In the scientific sphere the limiting factor appears as a narrow specialism, carried on with little or no regard to work being done in other fields. Whitehead terms this the "dogmatic fallacy." The error, he states, "consists in the persuasion that we are capable of producing notions, which are adequately defined in respect to the complexity of their relationship required for their illustration in the real world." "Our right understanding of the methods of intellectual progress depends on keeping in mind this characteristic of our thoughts. The notions employed in every systematic topic require enlightenment from the perspective of every standpoint. They must be criticized from the standpoint of their own internal consistency within the topic and from the standpoint of other topics of analogous generality, and from the standpoint of so-called philosophic topics of a wider range."

"During the medieval epoch in Europe," he adds, "the theologians were the chief sinners in respect to dogmatic finality. During the last three centuries their bad pre-eminence in this habit passed to the men of science" (8).

The work of Carl Jung demonstrates very clearly that his technique at least has not suffered from this defect and from a study of this we may hope to gain some deeper insight into these problems. His appreciation of the comprehensiveness of the factors involved in the integration of personality remind

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

us of the humility with which any worker in this field should approach his task. For the achievement of personality he writes: "A whole human life-span in all its biological, social and spiritual aspects is needed. . . . Personality is an act of the greatest courage in the face of life, and means *unconditional* affirmation of *all* that constitutes the individual. . . ." (9). There is no limiting factor operative here.

We cannot hope to reach any indication much less understanding of the reality or otherwise of the spiritual factors influencing behaviour unless we take pains to consider what we may loosely term religion and to distinguish between, on the one hand, the essential elements of it—that spiritual apprehension of truth which "makes one free," and on the other, those accretions, those objectifications which bind, confine and may ultimately lead to religious antagonisms and isolation.

William James, you will remember, designates as "over-beliefs" the various different interpretations of religion, while contending that some sort of "over-belief" is a practical necessity for the individual (10). The over-belief is capable of almost indefinite variation and adaptation to the needs of the individual and of the age. Over-beliefs thus became dated, and so out of date. As new needs arise they fail to supply that satisfaction which a former generation sought and found in them. Their very vitality, their capacity to linger on, seems to be due not to their transient characteristics, but to some intrinsic and essential quality derived from their timeless and spiritual origin.

We can see that much of the criticism to which religion is subjected to-day arises from a failure to recognize the difference between the transient, finite nature of the over-beliefs and the eternal and infinite character of spiritual creativity. It is clear, however, from what has been said that over-beliefs are humanly constructed and adapted structures, the response to man's immediate needs and insecurities, and although this has not always been recognized by religious leaders, their "human, all too human" origin has been conclusively demonstrated by anthropologists and psychologists. It would, indeed, be no exaggeration to say that credibility in accepting many over-beliefs is by any modern standards simply incredible.

If we remain unaware of the limiting factor and fail to penetrate beyond it, when considering any ideas, it is astonishing how restricting and stultifying its effects may be. We must at all costs strive to avoid this and take the greatest care to relate our ideas in any one field to those of seekers in others. Reality is reality for a subject, an individual. For most people to-day even scientific reality is not *adequately* related to the experiences of their daily lives, it is accepted as something of a mystery, a magic. So it is also with religion. Science, however, is applied, it works to an extent that is not true of religion, because religion is still hampered by the limiting factor from which science has broken free. There is a need, it would seem, for the application of religion to our daily problems, but we have yet to exorcise the limiting factor. It is the beam which we have not cast out from our eyes; it not only clouds our vision and distorts our reason, but makes us emotionally inaccessible and intolerant; it limits our power of co-operation and practical ability. It is, perhaps, the very Devil.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

While it would be difficult and, I think, not very fruitful for our present purpose to try and determine the line dividing belief and the over-beliefs, we must give some consideration to the basic characteristics of belief.

A study of the beginnings of religion and its early development throws much light on this. From the earliest days man has used religion to provide for his really vital needs and to acquire for himself that security which in his weakness he so earnestly desired. The deep feelings associated with these needs have been constantly expressed from primitive times till the present day, in the form of myth and ritual. Even in their primitive form, these show recurring themes expressive of the turning of the individual to the non-material and the development of some sort of spiritual relationship with what appeared to be "beyond." Professor E. O. James, writing of these primitive religious cults says, "If at this stage ritual dominates the situation this is only because the deepest emotions of the human heart, and the most profound convictions of the mind find expression in actions before they are given utterances in words and elaborated in systematized theologies and philosophies, aetiological mythologies, spiritualized worship and ethical rules of conduct" (11).

This being so we shall feel no surprise at finding ritual ceremonial expressive of this primitive need for spiritual relationship perpetuated and conserved, or reappearing with but little modification as forms of worship in the higher religions at the present time.

The breaking of bread and participation in a communal meal is an instance of such a perpetuated ritual. In this connection we may note how the basic spiritual symbolism of communion with the diety has in the Christian worship become associated with the teaching that it was so ordained by Christ. Recently this assumption has been challenged by Dr. Barnes (12), but whether this is historically correct or not, its acceptance may be looked upon as a matter of concern as regards the over-belief and not as invalidating the spiritual value of the ritual, which long antedated its sanction—if so it was—by Christ.

Psychology has dealt with these human expressions or symbolization of the spiritual and has concluded that they are subject to human and natural laws of development. It would indeed be strange if this were not so. The spiritual itself, however, is a category beyond the assessment of psychology, and conclusions about the material representation of the spiritual are in no sense valid in regard to the actual nature of the spiritual itself.

A study of comparative religion has made it clear that many of the rites of the Christian Church have a close counterpart in those of earlier religious rituals. Many Christians who believed that their own practice rested on a divinely ordained origin, in an historical setting, the teaching indeed of the over-belief, were perplexed and despondent in consequence.

It would seem, however, that what at one time was regarded as merely primitive superstition has had in fact the elements of the spiritual within it.

Those, for instance, who accept the gospel narrative, may thus regard the value of the communion rite as enhanced by its antiquity and by the fact—if the gospel record is acceptable as historically accurate—that its value as a sacrament was appreciated and used by Christ as a vehicle of continuing spiritual relationship.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This takes us on to a consideration of what characterizes the expression of the spiritual which is common to all the higher religions, and of which we can find traces even in more primitive forms. What evidence is there of such universal spiritual reality?

If we want to be sure about the existence of anything in the material world, we can go and see it for ourselves, but it is otherwise, Freud suggests, as regards spiritual realities. We are required to take them on trust. Such an accusation, however, can hardly be sustained, since many people, at different times, with differing religious convictions have sought and obtained a first-hand experience of what they felt assured was spiritual reality. They have had to undertake however, without exception, an arduous, sometime dangerous spiritual journey in order to do so. They have only gained the experience at a price.

These are the mystics who, in all lands and throughout all time, in humility and self-abandonment, poor in spirit, have sought and found this spiritual reality, which they have recognized as something transcending self, that something which they have often called God. They have been and seen and have attempted to pass on to us something, but admittedly and very definitely proclaimed by them to be, not more than a mere shadow of the actual experience.

The mystics have done much to illuminate and cleanse the religion of their day by setting out in terms appropriate to their time and culture something of the ultimately inexpressible and incomprehensible nature of their individual mystical experience.

There exists a tendency to some confusion between mysticism and magic, and while we need not now enlarge on the nature of the differences we do well to remember the essential difference. This is put tritely and pertinently by Evelyn Underhill: "The fundamental difference between the two is this: magic wants to get, mysticism wants to give" (13).

We may be inclined to dismiss mysticism as something if not definitely morbid, at least as so trivial as to be beneath serious consideration. We are indeed likely to do so unless we distinguish between its essential nature and its accidental and consequential trappings. Words are admittedly an inadequate means for giving expression to the mystical experiences, and symbolism is varied in attempts the more adequately to express them. The greatest mystics are unanimous in emphasizing the inadequacy of expressing the "Ineffable Reality," they make a clear distinction between the two. The expression is consequential, but not essential to the experience itself. The path of the mystic is not an easy one. It entails an autognosis—self-analysis—which may well result in much personality disturbance. Morbid reactions and neurotic manifestations may be observed. It is doubtful, however, if we are justified in regarding as really pathological, these non-essential manifestations of the individual's struggle to attain relationship with the Absolute or at least no more so than the pain and physical disorders, which so often have been the lot of explorers, exposed to risks of climate and country in expeditions of discovery in new lands.

We must here attempt some further definition of mysticism and give some consideration to the mystical process or behaviour pattern. Evelyn Underhill (14) has defined mysticism as "the name of that *organic process* which involves

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the perfect consummation of the Love of God, or it is the *art* of his conscious relation with the Absolute.'' Passing over William James' four marks of the mystic state (15) as unsatisfactory, she substitutes for these four tests which I give in a somewhat abbreviated form as follows :

1. Mysticism is active and practical. It is an organic life process involving the whole self, not merely an intellectual opinion.

2. Its aims are transcendental and spiritual, and it is not concerned with action in the visible universe. It does not imply neglect of duty to others, but it implies a constant setting of the heart on the One.

3. The One is never merely an object of exploration, but exists as Reality, but is also a living personal Object of Love.

4. Living Union with the One—the mystic aim—is a form of enhanced life, it entails intellectual realization and emotional longings, but requires through an arduous psychological and spiritual process—the Mystic Way—the liberation of a latent consciousness resulting ultimately in the attainment of the Unitive State.

We should note here that although mysticism is concerned with a fuller understanding of the One, in order through greater love to be as it were burnt up and consumed in the unitive existence with the Absolute, its active and practical side is emphasized, while its organic activity is regarded as essential.

"All mystics speak the same language, for they all come from the same country" says St. Martin. There is a unanimity amongst them as to their mystical experiences, which confirms belief in the reality of the states to which they testify, and as to the conclusions they have reached as to the origin of such experience. It is in this way that the mystical experience differs from the morbid intellectual and emotional activities of the neurotic or psychotic subject. We find, moreover, that their spiritual experiences have not diminished the capacity of the mystics in the practical aspects of life. Many of them have exercised a profound influence for good on their generation, while a few were efficient administrators and conducted their affairs with a soundness of judgment and a clearness of vision which are the very antithesis of morbidity.

The mystic way of life has then a dual aspect, comprising both an effective relationship with transcendent reality, and also with the needs of the material world which involves communion and love for one's fellows and consequently a desire to bring them to at least some realization of the richness and splendour of the mystic way. Not all mystics, of course, have shown to the full these dual characteristics. Some have been introverts and recluses, who have to a very limited extent been able to communicate with their fellow men. It is clear, however, that the mystic life is in no way a hindrance, but rather a help to a fuller community relationship. It is essentially a beneficent rather than a malignant influence, it brings together rather than isolates.

Although it is pre-eminently through the mystics that spiritual insight of divine revelation has come, there are two other classes of individuals to whose behaviour patterns we must also give some attention, since it is, I believe, more fruitful to study living reacting individuals, since on such lines we are

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

more likely to get an appreciation of the dynamic force which religion claims to be, than we are by attempting a critical analysis of its dogmas which are but reflections of living thoughts and feelings. It was by such means that Freud developed the dynamic concepts of psychoanalysis, which have proved so fruitful in making clear to us psychopathology to-day.

We must then consider the rôles of the prophet and the priest in the course of religious development.

The Hebrew race has produced a series of prophets with spiritual insight and an appreciation of spiritual values and reality the like of which have been seen in no other race. The Hebrew prophets spoke as God, they spoke for God and told forth what they felt, and asserted to be the opinions and intentions of Jehovah. They were men of their age and had a very definite and usually a very specific message for their time and place.

Their message, being founded on lasting values, was found to have a more general and even timeless application. Judged by present day standards many of their ideas were primitive, but they persist and influence and indeed enrich our concepts even to-day. As Abraham quoted by Elmslie (16) says: "It is primitive to think of God as close at hand, speaking to Moses face to face as a man to his fellow; it is primitive to place God in a local heaven above the earth, for science has left us no room for any divine seat in the skies. Yet these two primitive ideas in interaction gave us in Judaism, on the one hand, the immanent God, and on the other the transcendent."

The great prophets, each in turn, as Elmslie has demonstrated, set out in their day for the first time "one cardinal principle of belief concerning Supernatural Reality and the consequent nature of human duty." They were, in fact, true mystics exemplifying the dual characteristics of the spiritual and material aspects of life, but for the most part they stressed a special aspect of this relationship, Amos with mercy, Hosea with love, Isaiah with the eternal in the temporal, and so on.

The priest also is concerned with both the spiritual and the physical world. He is essentially the intermediary between God and man, but his particular concern is with the average man who is not specially endowed with spiritual insight. By his teaching and ministrations, largely symbolic in character, he attempts to bridge the gap between the spiritual and the material. He uses ritual and sacramental actions as a sign but also as a means for doing this. He speaks with and is endowed with authority, but is himself under a pledge to carry out his duties in accordance with carefully prescribed rules. He may be spiritually-minded and have considerable mystical insight, but being controlled and directed he is denied that freedom which is the privilege of the true mystic.

He is essentially a conservator and preserves forms and traditions which at one time were newly discovered and vital expressions of immediate spiritual life. In course of time, however, all such tend to lose their freshness and their value as a source of power and inspiration. When this happens a feeling of insecurity results and additional means are sought to bolster up a ritual which has lost its vital force and immediate appeal.

In consequence of this, myths and rituals which originally had a deeply

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

spiritual significance and application become contaminated and debased, so that thinking people may discard them.

When a rite from whatever cause loses its spiritual significance, but its use is persisted in, it becomes little more than a magic formula for compelling the god to accede to the demands of the worshipper. It is a regressive phenomenon partaking of the nature of the primitive magic of the witch doctor. It then loses not only its spiritual, but even its ethical value. Opponents of religion have with justification pointed this out, but they have gone further and have found in these imperfections and perversions a warrant for wholesale condemnation of religious practices.

These, however, are not the only difficulties with which the priest has to contend. He has to relate God to men, but to men in very different stages of spiritual, intellectual and emotional maturity. Attempts to meet these differing needs are the occasion of still further aspersions on the bona-fides of the Church. What is acceptable and intelligible and emotionally satisfying only in a symbolic form to one cultural group, appears to another section to be mere superstition, spiritually undesirable or even misleading.

These difficulties are not only not considered by the critics, but are often quite unrealized by the faithful themselves, who being unaware of the baneful effects of the "limiting factor" condemn those who do not conform to their own narrow tenets.

Most of us, as regards the spiritual life, are like the infant, ignorant and ineffective. It is, Adler claims, to the urge for superiority, to a wish fulfilment, that our material progress is due, and so it is on the spiritual plane. We wish to be better, we seek peace and security, but in doing so face the spiritual paradox that this entails sacrifice of the self. A desire to do the will of God, because it is pleasing so to do, and for love of him, replaces the self-seeking impulses.

The primitive acquisitive urge for love and security on a crude wish fulfilment level, is transmuted into the mystical desire to give oneself in love and self-abandonment to the Divine and thus directed in its highest forms issues as an increasing awareness of social claims and a feeling of responsibility for others.

This is not a specifically Christian doctrine but is common to all the higher religions. "Hear, Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is One," but also "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

The Gita teaches the Hindu the complementary nature of devotion, knowledge and action. "By meditation some perceive . . . others by the path of knowledge, and still others by the path of works" (17).

The immanent in relation to the transcendent, the self (individual) as a manifestation of the Self (absolute), the soul in association with God, seeks expression in a practical way, in a material universe of other human beings, as part of the process of its spiritual fulfilment. Thus religion in seeking as an ultimate aim, relationship of the individual with God, has an intermediate effect of the greatest practical importance, in stimulating a better, that is a more considerate, relationship of one man with another. It seems to involve a process, a kind of background adjusting mechanism, which is of the greatest

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

practical value to mankind and can therefore in no sense be regarded as an illusory phenomenon.

"The way" is hard and we must not be surprised to find many examples of failure amongst those endeavouring to follow it, but it would be illogical to regard these as characteristic of the religious life. We may find the fear of being challenged on points of doctrine issuing in heresy hunting in extreme forms, the need to find scapegoats for guilt feelings, may show itself in unrestrained persecution. We may see excessive puritanism, over-compensating for a covert worldliness, and other such examples of failure to maintain an exacting standard of conduct, but we are no more justified in making a judgment on religion, on such grounds than we should be in assessing the worth of chemistry on the efforts of a class of children in a school laboratory.

Is it possible to describe in psychological terms these processes which we have so far termed spiritual or religious? They appear to be effective in making man better able to grapple with the varied problems of life, and we should therefore like to consider them from a psychological angle. It is undoubtedly to Jung that we shall turn for help here, for in the archetypes which he has made known to us, beyond the bounds of any individual experience, in the collective unconscious are to be found, in symbolic and primitive forms, evidence of those deepest and earliest feelings of man which seem to partake of the nature of the spiritual.

Freud has emphasized the universal tendency, particularly if early life has been a series of experiences of threats and frustrations, to regress and to secure early satisfaction and security in wish fulfilments. Jung has shown how this process may proceed still further back into the collective unconscious and final security can only be found in a retreat to the omnipotent father archetype, or even to the still more primitive mother symbol.

While it is true such a retreat may end in continued fantasy activity and permanent inhibition of personality development, the libido being morbidly sequestrated, a process termed by Jung "inversion," on the other hand, there may be a rejuvenation and re-animation of the inward-turned libido which issues in creative activities of many kinds. The latter is a wholly beneficent process, termed by Jung "introversion."

In mythology the inward turning of the libido is portrayed as the descent into the underworld, that is, it is concerned with the collective not the individual unconscious.

Listen to Mephistopheles instructing Faust as to how to find there the maternal archetype.

> "In solitude throne goddesses sublime,
> Round them no place is, and still less a time
> Only to speak of them the brain doth swim . .
> . . . . . .
> And round them float forms of all things that be
> They'll see thee not, for wraiths alone they see.
> Then pluck a heart up for the dangers great."
>
> and later . . . . . .
>
> "I wonder now if ever he'il come back."

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

That is, will there be merely an inversion of libido with a fantasy mother fixation and no possibility of return to the world of light and life, or will the descent result in an augmentation of libido and a return from the shadows to the world of men? Will the process be one of introversion, through which the psyche having tapped the archetypal source of power and wisdom, reinforced and spiritually reborn, returns to meet the problems of life with increased power and greater spiritual awareness?

"The essential problem of human consciousness hinges upon the basic condition that man has to adapt to two relatively incompatible psychical realities"—I am quoting Baynes (18). "The roots of his emotional life in the primordial or impersonal psyche, on the one hand, provide an access, so to say, to the eternal verities, while above in the running stream of time, the constantly changing flux of events and conditions makes a perpetual demand for adaptation and improvisation."

The weakness of the Christian religion, as compared with many Eastern cults, lies in its great reliance on faith and its very limited provision of instruction whereby its adherents can gain access to the eternal verities. This position is made still more difficult by the importance that has been placed on the time and place elements as regards the life of Christ—its historicity—whereas it is his spiritual essence which is of primary value, since this partakes of the eternal. Though the essential nature of the fact of the incarnation—the relation of the eternal to the temporal—may be admitted, no such essential qualities attach to the local and temporal details of such an event. The acceptance or repudiation as matters of belief of historical details are of the nature of an over-belief. Christianity would become much more credible, and therefore a much more effective force in men's lives, if such problems of time and place were left to be settled by critical historical methods.

The gospel story of the resurrection, historically considered, is one full of contradictions, uncertainties, and improbabilities to such an extent that for many people it is incredible, but, writes Dr. Barnes, "The resurrection is one of the great essential truths of Christianity. But it cannot be stated too often, or too emphatically, that this tenet of the Christian faith is quite independent of the question as to whether the body of Jesus was re-animated after his death. What matters is that Christians shall find a spiritual power in their lives, which they can rightly interpret as that of the Spirit of Jesus revealing, as in his teaching in Galilee, the wisdom and righteousness of God" (19).

Mythologically the story of the death and resurrection of Christ runs on more or less classical lines and as a symbolic presentation is of value as doctrine if recognised as such.

Spiritually Christ died and rose again and his spirit of love and self-sacrifice influenced his disciples and their adherents so that it was said with astonishment, "How these Christians love one another!" How powerful in the lives of these people was the effect of their introversion and how wide was their subsequent influence in the world.

It is by the process of introversion that heaven and earth have been united in an emotionally adequate and so satisfying and effective way.

We saw previously when considering the development of the myth from

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

primitive times how later additions, intended in the first instance as supports, led finally to a devaluation and devitalization of the living forceful myth. If doctrine based on the myth is to live again and have a value for a later more sophisticated generation, it must be purged of these later accretions.

The re-animated spirit or libido following introversion would then be free for creative work instead of being dissipated in argument and disputes over unessential details of historical accuracy.

It is not, however, possible to express such teaching in an emotionally acceptable way in scientific terminology nor even in the language of Western theology. Attempts to do so stultify themselves by producing monstrosities of bewildering and unconvincing verbiage. Eastern philosophies are more adequate, but symbolism and myth have always been the best media available for the purpose, though ambiguities and misinterpretations are then in the nature of things inevitable. Ultimately it must be recognized that one cannot explore "the unexplorable."

The very real advances science has made by providing man with such a wealth of mechanical contrivances for dominating the material universe, has indirectly also contributed to man's spiritual asthenia. He appears to be no longer subservient and inferior to nature and the gods of nature, but seems actually to be in control and dominant.

While on the material plane this is to a great extent true, there appears to have been no corresponding spiritual development. God appears to have gone the way of the old gods, but man alone is clearly unable to cope with the situation. He is full of pride in achievement, which according to the theologians, is the first of the deadly sins, and only, we are told, in a return to spiritual humility recognizing the omnipotence of the Spirit is there hope for him, that by a process of introversion, finding by way of the collective unconscious, some of the ancient God-given wisdom, he will ensure a return and rebirth in power, to control those material forces for constructive rather than destructive ends.

It is this element of power and forcefulness which Professor Toynbee emphasizes in his analysis of the growths of civilizations (20). He refers to the whole process as the Movement of Withdrawal and Return—an appropriate designation for such a creative process—and he quotes a graphically realistic description of this by Bergson as it is seen in the mystics (21).

"The soul of the great mystic does not come to a halt at the (mystical) ecstasy as though that were the end of the journey. The ecstasy may indeed be called a state of repose, but it is the repose of a locomotive standing in a station under steam pressure, with its movement continuing as a stationary throbbing, while it waits for the moment to make a new leap forward. . . . Henceforward the soul has a superabundance of life; it has an immense élan, it has an irresistible thrust which hurls it into vast enterprises."

Listen to the words of the Hebrew prophet, "I will go before thee and make the crooked places straight; I will break in pieces the gates of brass and cut in sunder the bars of iron; and I will give thee treasures of darkness and hidden riches of secret places, that thou mayest know that I, the Lord which call thee by thy name, am the God of Israel."

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This power and effectiveness is based on the mystic experience of love and sacrifice. "This monk can give lessons to lovers" was said of St. John of the Cross.

The mystic returns enlightened and invigorated to find in the world a love and intimacy with all creatures, and a power and effectiveness through which he can realize his *duty to man and God*.

In the Collective Unconscious we find something of a personal nature. The Unconscious personates, says Jung, and it is in this sense that we may hope to understand the personal nature of the Christian God, in no sense as a bodily restricted, anthropomorphic being, but yet the source of a directed spiritual force, the effects of which we may observe and analyse in an individual's conduct.

Seen in this way we may get some understanding of what is entailed in the God–man relationship. In religion it is this *relationship* which is vital. Belief on an intellectual and rational level apart from this is "nothing worth," but realization of the love of God "passeth all understanding."

One has to proceed along the way and learn step by step to love in this manner, just as the student of art or the sciences has to proceed along the accepted paths advancing little by little in his chosen field.

A lack of moral and religious upbringing has been held responsible for the great increase in crime, and particularly in juvenile delinquency. Is there justification for this?

One has to learn to love, and the broken home, the distracted mother, the care-ridden father, do not provide a suitable environment for learning this lesson.

Susan Isaacs noted as a fact of the deepest significance "the reality and power of the super-ego in the early years." This she held to be an innate attribute of the child's mind, but she stressed the need for relating this fantasy super-ego of the oral-sadistic pattern, with parents and other adults, who can control and direct to such an extent that the super-ego is not called upon to inflict severe self-punishment.

Where there is a satisfactory love relationship the parents are endowed by the child with ideal attributes which many fail to justify, but the child's rich fantasy life transcends their actual failings to a large extent and maintains intact the ideal controlling, supporting and directing parent figures.

Religious training in the early years again through fantasy and symbolism provides alternative or additional parent figures which because they are dependent for their formation on compensatory mechanisms, and are endowed with qualities lacking in the actual parents, may well prove fully satisfying. We may describe this happening in various ways, saying, for instance, that the primitive super-ego is projected in fantasy and a divine father figure formed, or that the individual ego is thus related to the archetype or alternatively that the intrinsic and spontaneous spirit imminent in the child self or soul is united with the transcendent SELF or deity.

However this may be verbalized, it seems to be an entirely beneficent activity, which gives to those children who have learnt to symbolize and so vitalize and perpetuate the relationship in the practice of religion an added

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

measure of comfort, support and confidence. It provides them with an additional measure of stability which enhances their capacity to meet the challenges and threats of life. They attain a greater measure of mental health.

Religious training should be related to the demands of the reality situation and it would appear to be desirable to relate this training, or at least to understand the relationship between religious development and the early social adaptations that a child is expected to make. There must be, I think, an appropriate advancing spiritual stage related to the oral, anal and phallic phases of child development. The solution of the Œdipus situation has surely a spiritual counterpart.

Progressive development of religious ideas during the latency period would, I believe, go far to equip the individual to meet the storms and stresses of puberty and adolescence. It is surely a lack of this preparation—religion as a background in life—which is a factor in bringing so many children in their later years to the Juvenile Courts and the Child Guidance Clinics.

The difficulties in the way of the child deprived of parents or in a " broken home " or similar situation, becomes at once apparent as adequate parent figures on which to develop a spiritual relationship for life are lacking, and though the need for religious guidance is greater under these circumstances, the opportunities for obtaining it are for many reasons less.

In the earlier stages of child development there is, of course, no possibilitiy of an intellectual approach, all is experienced as feeling, and the need for the mother to be the first love-object is one which in most cases is adequately met. Though this condition persists, at the same time also from about the end of the first year of life onwards the child develops an intellectual appreciation and awareness of others and of their claims.

Even for adults we have seen that the verbalized and intellectual expression of the mystical experience is well-nigh impossible, we should therefore be prepared to utilize the normal fantasy constructions of the child for helping to relate him not only to the material realities, but to the higher spiritual values which seem to be essential for the fuller life.

Persons and conditions to-day, as indeed has always been the case, do not offer to the child patterns of perfection, but the ancient wisdom has provided these—symbols of the divine and the eternal—in forms which childish fantasy can assimilate and manipulate. To-day, however, the traditional teachings have been so far discredited that neither in the home nor in the schools is there much chance that really living and vitalizing spiritual or religious training will influence the child consistently. Many of those who have had some religious instruction perceive the symbols only without apprehending the spirit behind them, and as such they soon prove to be meaningless and useless.

Too many children, as they reach adolescence, if any religion is left in them, retain it in an infantile form, which with an extension of secondary education and with a wider learning in science and history they are unable to reconcile with what they have been taught of the physical world. Their religion is a poor tenuous wraith of a thing, certainly utterly useless for " breaking in sunder bars of iron."

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

No wonder they jettison it as an encumbrance. They are without judgment or experience to guide them, whereas opportunities for action are multiplied, and adolescent drives, often artificially stimulated in numerous ways, produce only too often the kind of problems with which we are all familiar.

To a large extent I have referred to religion in a rather general way without specifically considering Christianity. I have dealt with the religious process as observed in different types of individuals, and have noted some of the consequences of the absence of such a process. I have been concerned with what is common to religions as they have developed, that is, with what may be called "natural religion." It is this type of religion which Kierkegaard has termed Religion A, and referred to as the "religiosity of immanence." To this extent, he maintained, truth could be realized by an individual's inwardly directed thought. It is essentially anthropocentric, God being recognized and approached through the individual personality. According to Kierkegaard, Religion A must pre-exist in an individual before the more fully developed Religion B which he equates with Christianity can be acceptable.

If this be so, we see here as in other developmental processes an ontogenetic repetition of religious phylogenesis. Furthermore, Kierkegaard allows that Christianity is too severe and demanding a religion for children. They require some modification of the full teaching. St. Paul, indeed, recognized this as a necessity for all converts, who at first must be fed with "milk and not with meat," but becoming more advanced spiritually need more sustaining truth for their satisfaction.

Progress as viewed by Kierkegaard comprises a series of choices of which the most vital one is the final "leap of faith" which he emphasizes must be always a solitary and individual undertaking, a definite personal choice.

This is the leap from the ascertainable immanent and natural religion, which is subject to rational laws and deductions, to the transcendent eternity. It involves leaving and renouncing everything temporal; here again we have a description of the withdrawal, but paradoxically, in so doing there is acquired —on the return—all the radiance and illumination of the eternal. This then is faith, which, having the quality of an absolute relationship cannot be taught or directly communicated by one person to another. Science stops short of this. Is it illusion or illumination?

As psychologists we may shrug our shoulders and leave the matter unresolved, but as psychiatrists, physicians of the sick, we must, I submit, go further. Medicine embraces art as well as science, and for many it has and still does partake of the spiritual in that their practice is the outward expression of this.

We would not judge medicine by the claims of the quack medicine vendors nor should we appraise religion by the less enlightened claims made on its behalf. Many outstanding figures in the religious life have shown a high degree of social adaptation and ability and have been realists in the material sense, and to suggest that the basis of such activities are to be found in illusory ideas seem to me impertinent and unrealistic. If from the evidence available we find a spiritual orientation is subjectively a factor of value in guiding the lives of our patients, it should surely be regarded as reality and endorsed as such.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

To sum up, we may think of man as at the same time within three fields or spheres of influence or relatedness, which together constitute his environment. From each of these the individual gains some protection or support in meeting the demands which life makes upon him, and he therefore needs to develop his ties with each of these throughout life.

This is, of course, particularly important in the earlier years and education for life, as opposed to training to earn a living, should be an aid to this end. Deprivation of an essential requirement so often demonstrates its functional value, and in the child deprived of any religious upbringing, lacking any cultural background, and without experience of a loving and integrated family life, we see, I think, the serious effects of such deprivation. Many such children are characteristically unstable, impulsive, rootless, and seem almost incapable of developing any lasting ties of affection.

I see the individual surrounded throughout life in a sphere of immediate personal experience, constituting the situation of the moment. This is built up of the present material or sensible factors constituting his world situation. Here also are stored past individual experiences, happy and invigorating memories, psychic traumata and a medley of experiences remembered, half-remembered and forgotten.

There is also, but concealed—only to become manifest under special circumstances—the material of the racial or collective unconscious, the archetypes, symbols of the earliest and most primitive human heritage.

These two spheres have received scientific recognition as the Conscious and the Unconscious.

But beyond this—what? There is no human beyond. Only in transcending humanity have some found evidence of the source of existence, the ultimate creative power, the Godhead.

This third sphere, the spiritual or transcendent, is not assessable by any scientific measure and has received as yet no scientific sanction. Claims that the power derived from such a source has dynamic effects on human conduct are impressive. The evidence cannot lightly be disregarded. The effects are of a kind which go beyond anything which is undoubtedly of human derivation. Since it is the opinion of many intelligent and unbiased persons that such forces are, as reality, daily influencing their lives, it would not be unreasonable to term them ultra-conscious.

Actions originating in the ultra-conscious are characteristically integrating and unifying. They are other-worldly to the extent that they are related rather to the eternal and the infinite, than to time and place. Religion teaches that such may characterize human as well as divine activity, and since we are not in a position to refute such a claim, we may gain further insight into human conduct if we accept the concept of the ultra-conscious as a working hypothesis.

Many of us will remember the opposition and the difficulties encountered in gaining acceptance for the Freudian unconscious, but its usefulness as a hypothesis has established it as scientifically acceptable.

The Ultra-conscious may be defined as that part of the mind comprising feelings, intuitions and apprehensions which receive spiritual influences from without. Here they are retained and integrated with other collective and

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

individual unconscious contents and forming a background directive issue in the drives of the individual life.

We understand conduct in relation to unconscious motivations in a way which renders it comprehensible. Similarly, I submit we can the better understand conduct if we can relate actions not only to the conscious and unconscious, but through these to the ultra-conscious factors, which under many conditions influence individual behaviour in an otherwise inexplicable way.

As long as we are under an obligation to repudiate spiritual or ultra-conscious influences, we are forced to explain much conduct of a high ethical order in a way which to many seems improbable if not absurd, but by recognizing the ultra-conscious to be as real as the conscious and unconscious, many of our difficulties are resolved.

As scientists we shall thus acquire a better understanding of those who, not concerning themselves, with scientific theory, have made the "leap of faith" and have through the process of introversion undergone the final change of conversion.

In this, as Kierkegaard states, is the Paradox which characterizes as does nothing else, spiritual conversion: "Whosoever shall lose his life for my sake, shall find it."

The truly spiritual man will meet all the tests. Dr. Torrie, speaking recently on "Mental Health in the Community" reminded us of the statement that "life is meeting," and that this requires us to discard the garments of office, status and position. The spiritual man has no need for such garments. He may use them in deference to convention and as an indication to others, but he is ready, indeed eager, to relinquish them, since in each and every individual he recognizes the spiritual of like nature with his own. Differences of culture, race or colour become then of little significance.

"We must look perhaps for the leader within," Dr. Torrie remarks. Unquestionably we must, and in so doing the spiritual man will find within himself, a reflection of the spiritual light in the ultra-conscious, from which he may acquire understanding and responsibility for his conduct and in self-sacrifice and humility in relation to God gain self-confidence and self-reliance in regard to his fellows. A paradox indeed.

Judged by strictly scientific and materialistic standards, that is from the rational conscious field alone the limiting factor, the things of the spiritual world can but appear as illusions, but seen from the viewpoint of those who have made the leap, that is, looked at from the ultra-conscious sphere, such things are indeed radiant with unfading illumination.

Does this appear to be an evasion of the issue? I hope not, but let me put it thus.

From a scientific viewpoint we must restrict ourselves to what can be observed and assessed in general terms. We introduce, wisely enough, a limiting factor and confine ourselves to the bounds of the conscious and unconscious. We thus reach certain conclusions, rationally deduced which are applicable within the specified limits.

As psychiatrists we deal not with the general, but with individual per-

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sonalities—a unique relationship. In this situation we become aware of something more, something which I have called the ultra-conscious. We then may realize as our own personal experience that the following words from Sir Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici* have to-day an immediate and vital meaning.

"There is surely a piece of Divinity in us, something that was before the Elements and owes no homage unto the Sun. Nature tells me I am the Image of God, as well as Scripture; he that understands not thus much, hath not his introduction or first lesson, and is yet to begin the Alphabet of Man."

References.

(1) Richardson, Alan (1947), *Christian Apologetics*, p. 231.
(2) Freud, Sigmund, *The Future of an Illusion*.
(3) Brunnel, Emil (1948), *Christianity and Civilization*, p. 153.
(4) Berdyaev, Nicolas (1939), *Spirit and Reality*, p. 178.
(5) Jung, Carl (1940–44), *Integration of the Personality*, p. 71.
(6) Barnes, Ernest W. (1949), *Religion and Turmoil*, p. 12.
(7) Yellowlees, David (1936), *Psychology's Defence of the Faith*, p. 122.
(8) Whitehead, Alfred N. (1933–47), *Adventures of Ideas*, p. 185.
(9) Jung, Carl, *Op. At.*, p. 286.
(10) James, William (1902), *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 505 in 1947 edition.
(11) James, E. O. (1948), *The Beginnings of Religion*, p. 155.
(12) Barnes, Ernest W. (1947), *The Rise of Christianity*, p. 281.
(13) Underhill, Evelyn, *Mysticism*, p. 70.
(14) *Idem, ibid*, p. 81.
(15) James, William (1902), *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 371 in 1947 edition.
(16) Elmslie, W. A. L. (1948), *How Came Our Faith*, p. 107.
(17) Bhagavad-Gita, *Trans. S. Radhakrishnan* (1948), p. 75.
(18) Baynes, H. G. (1940), *Mythology of the Soul*, p. 175.
(19) Barnes, Ernest W. (1947), *The Rise of Christianity*, p. 166.
(20) Toynbee, A. J. (1934), *A Study of History*, Vol. III, p. 248.
(21) *Idem, ibid.*, p. 234.
(22) Isaacs, Susan (1945), *Social Development in Young Children*, p. 416. (Routledge.)

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.96.404.663 Published online by Cambridge University Press