

COMPATIBILITY OF CHRISTIANITY
AND PSYCHOLOGY

DEBRA MOORE

COMPATIBILITY OF CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

A Research Paper

Presented to

the Graduate Council of
Austin Peay State University

In Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by

Debra Moore

August 1981

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a Research Paper written by Debra Moore entitled "Compatibility of Christianity and Psychology." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Psychology.

Linda Rudolph

Major Professor

Accepted for the
Graduate Council:

William H. Ellis

Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Linda Rudolph, Professor of Psychology, Austin Peay State University, for her aid, guidance and time given during the research paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
1. Introduction	1
2. Common Aims of Psychology and Christianity . . .	3
3. Complements and Differences	5
4. Errors of Christianity and Psychology	11
5. The Theories, Theorists, and Christianity . . .	17
6. Conclusion	47

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

"Christianity is in the throes of an encounter with psychology" (Carter & Narramore, 1979, p. 9). The two fields of Christianity and psychology are making inroads into the domains of each other. Carter and Narramore (1979) point out that religious bookstores are filled with psychology books, Bible conference lecturers are psychologists, and psychologically oriented seminars are replacing revivals. On the other hand, the American Psychological Association has conducted religious entitled symposiums and the Christian Association for Psychological Studies has been formed.

For years psychologists and Christians have regarded each other with mutual suspicion according to Koteskey (1980). He suggests that a stormy relationship has existed from the beginning of modern science to the present. Carter and Narramore (1979) say that Christians have reacted to psychology in three ways. Some have welcomed it with outstretched arms; others have rejected it totally as an implicit threat to the church and to Scripture; most have mixed emotions, seeing potential and encroachment.

It is time to stop defensiveness according to Koteskey (1980). "Too often we [Christians] reject truth by the non-Christian because we believe that it is not the whole truth or that there are non-Christian elements in the system" (p. 14).

Roberts (1950) insists that much cooperation is needed between the two fields of psychology and religion. If both are truly interested in helping people, he suggests that they must aid and cooperate with each other.

Man is a whole person according to Morris (1974). Man's heart, brain, soul, spirit, and body are useless alone. They are a unit together, and Morris notes that when one part is sick the whole is affected. "The psychologists, the man of medicine, the Christian minister: each of us has basically the same goal--to help. It is tragic that these three scientific disciplines, while following the trichotomy of man, fail in their efforts to act as one--as man does" (Morris, 1974, p. 8).

Each field, psychology and religion, has a great deal of truth to offer the other. In the course of this paper, specific points of differences and similarities of ideas, agreements and disagreements will be revealed by investigating research in the two fields. Much information written from a Christian perspective about structuralism, functionalism, psychoanalysis, behaviorism and humanism is available to the religionist which can facilitate the development of a well balanced perspective of these two extremes of psychology and Christianity.

Chapter 2

COMMON AIMS OF PSYCHOLOGY AND CHRISTIANITY

Psychology and Christianity share some common aims and goals in working with individuals according to Biddle (1955). He states:

Both professions (psychiatry and religion) aim to relieve frustrations, fears, and anxieties and to help men to live in peace. The psychiatrist deals with the attainment of intermediary goals. The clergyman is concerned with ultimates and absolutes. There can be no frustration if the individual can train his will to conform to the Will of the Supreme Being. (p. 15)

Biddle believes that helping people live productive, peaceful lives is a common concern of counselors, be they Christian or secular. He suggests that the therapist is concerned with aiding the client to become peaceful in this life, whereas the Christian's concern extends beyond this life to eternity.

Biddle (1955) also notes the similarity of both Christian and secular psychologists dealing with the same object, the psyche or soul. He sees that both are concerned with the study of the nature of man, the purpose of his existence, and the fulfillment of his destiny. It is

necessary to understand man and his intricate parts. Man's meaning for existence is vital according to Biddle even though it is viewed quite differently by Christians and psychotherapists. However, both realize man does have a purpose, and both desire to see man achieve that purpose. Perhaps Outler (1954) summed this up best when he said, "Psychotherapy and Christianity are related in alliance and tension. An alliance is clearly indicated because of their common concern. The tension arises because of the differences in basic perspective" (p. 19).

Thus, it appears that the same goals and aims are shared by psychology and Christianity. Their definition of the goals and their methods of achieving the goals may differ quite extensively, but the common ground exists nonetheless.

Chapter 3

COMPLEMENTS AND DIFFERENCES

Psychology complements Christianity in a number of ways, adding even more depth to its achievements according to Outler (1954). He notes three particular contributions of psychology to religion. One such value is psychology's help in understanding human behavior. Studies and research which delve into behavior are assets for the Christian to utilize in counseling. A second value is one of intellectual insight. Those who criticize the Bible and the church often base their criticisms on psychological arguments. Outler suggests that a wholesome knowledge of psychology can thus help the Christian show critics that the Word of God stands firm in spite of some psychological criticisms. Finally, Outler believes that psychology offers much practical value to the work of the local church. Principles of dealing with people and understanding people are applicable and useful to the local body of believers.

Psychology also shares common ground with scripture in its discovery that ". . . neurotic behavior is not really meaningless and ought, therefore, never be dismissed as simply weird or unintelligible" (Outler, 1954, p. 27). Biblical principles insist that Christians maintain proper attitudes toward those who are different, that they accept them, and that they understand them, according to Outler (1954).

Another complement of psychology, which at first appears to be a contradiction, is the study of the mind. Koteskey (1980) quotes Meyer as follows:

Research in neuropsychology seems to indicate that there are at least "two minds"--a verbal, analytic, dominant hemisphere and a spatial, gestalt, non-dominant hemisphere. Since we are to be transformed by the renewing of our minds, Scripture appeals to both minds. The Apostle Paul reasons and debates to spread the gospel. Peter exhorts us to study our faith so that we can give a reason for the hope we have. The intricate rational discourses in the book of Romans also appeal to the verbal, analytic mind of the dominate hemisphere. However, Ezekiel's message is of a great mystical experience when the Lord appeared to him. The Apostle John also received a similar vision of the Lord when God appeared to him at the Revelation. The highly symbolic descriptions of these men's visions appeal to the spatial, gestalt, non-dominant hemispheres. (Koteskey, 1980, p. 50)

Thus, Koteskey (1980) summarizes that reason and emotionalism or mysticism both have their proper balance with Christianity, and neuropsychology seems to be factually supporting that which the Word of God stated years ago.

Two further encouragements of psychology to religion involve the environment and culture. Some psychologists emphasize the social roots of personality. This implies to

Christianity that, ". . . in the study of the Scriptures the people who are written about must always be seen standing within a cultural context which helped to make them and their ideas what they were" (Ziegler, 1962, p. 23). Not only is culture important but also the realization that, as much as possible, one should see from the eye of the beholder. Freud, Sullivan, Murray, Rogers and others relate the importance of this concept of seeing the environment as it is seen by the person who experiences it. Christians need to realize, "It is not what God or the Church really is that will be determinative in the life of the learner, but what he sees God or the Church to be" (Ziegler, 1962, p. 27). So, psychology is not a separate entity but a complement to many of the ideas and principles of religion.

Just as psychology and Christianity hold common ground, they also have seemingly incompatible differences. "For the Bible's starting point for its view of man is with God himself and some of the most important features of the biblical model of man, that he is a sinner and needs forgiveness, are nowhere to be found in psychological models of man" (Jeeves, 1978, p. 84). This is perhaps the basic thrust and foundation of Christianity, and yet psychology does not deal with it according to Jeeves (1978). Some feel that this belief is grounds for immediate rejection of all psychology.

Not only is the basic premise of the two areas different, but also the first tasks of each area. The Christian's first task is to, ". . . minister to man's spiritual needs including the need to believe, and the need to love by

helping to bridge the gap between seeing and believing, between reality of God and the possibility of man's acceptance of him" (Mairet, 1956, p. 22). The beginning task of the psychiatrist is essentially to ". . . relieve suffering at the human level for as long as possible, to prevent it when it can be prevented, and to treat it by whatever means are available when it cannot" (Mairet, 1956, p. 22). Thus, Mairet (1956) sees both similarities and variations in these first goals.

The values of science appear to be contradicted by the values of Christianity according to Collins (1973). He sees the therapist believing in and promoting self-assertion, personal aggressiveness and defense of rights. However, he sees Christianity as a contradiction, promoting self-denial, meekness, and repression of pleasure. The therapist establishes a view of God as a "brake" man restricting life and enslaving men. Collins (1977) says such an appearance is not accurate. He points out that the Christian life is indeed a powerful, liberating force rather than a constant meek, mild-mannered one.

Perhaps one of the most profound differences between psychology and Christianity is the assertion by writers like McNeel (1963) that psychology does not insist on morals and standards of conduct. McNeel insists that, "Religious people could make a valid objection to psychiatric practice; namely, that it avoids moral and religious issues" (p. 31). According to many Christian psychologists like Crabb (1975), Christians need to accept the Bible, the Word of God, as the

ultimate standard of behavior and conduct. To them, anything less would be sinful in the sight of God.

The view of man is another apparent contradiction between science and religion. The strong behaviorist sees man as mechanical, a typewriter that types only in response to the keys which are pressed. Thus, man is a product of his environment. Freud and psychoanalysts view man as a biological figure composed of the conscious and the unconscious. According to Rogers and humanists, man is good, rational, self-sufficient, and capable of solving his own problems and controller of the future. Hopelessness describes man according to the existentialist.

But the Biblical view of man differs from all these others. Collins (1969) notes that the Bible views man in eight ways:

- 1) Men are created;
- 2) Man is unique--created in God's image, a superior creature, a rational creature and a spiritual being;
- 3) Men are equal;
- 4) Men are valuable;
- 5) Men are sinful;
- 6) Men are condemned;
- 7) Men are objects of God's redemption;
- 8) Men are free. (pp. 27-30)

One final existing difference between psychology and Christianity as expressed by Outler (1954) can be mentioned. Psychotherapy divides man into biological and psychological

vectors of life. Outler insists that the Christian looks at the self as a whole.

In summary, the rival points of psychotherapy and Christianity can be stated in five basic ideas as discussed by Outler (1954):

- 1) Reality and the nature of God;
- 2) Human self and its freedom;
- 3) The human quandary of sin;
- 4) The human possibility of salvation;
- 5) The ordering of life regarding ethics. (p. 53)

Chapter 4

ERRORS OF CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOLOGY

There are basically three beliefs that Christians maintain about psychology. One group sees the Christian faith and psychotherapy as being more or less neutral spheres. According to Tweedie (1963), the person holding this belief can utilize psychotherapeutic data without necessarily correlating it with Scriptural data. Psychotherapy is considered a scientific discipline while Christian faith is a religious discipline. Tweedie sees the second group as composed of those who criticize contemporary psychotherapy, especially psychoanalysis, for not taking the moral realm into consideration. This group sees psychology as disregarding the spiritual nature of man, moral implications, and ethical implications. Psychiatry and psychology are pictured as immoral and anti-Christian by this group, but the whole is not composed of simply non-Christian ideas. Some ideas correlate with the Bible and its principles. The final group Tweedie recognizes is that which believes that psychotherapy is only acceptable if it is an expression of specific Christian principles. These people see no necessary incompatibility because psychotherapy must be grounded in Biblical presuppositions.

Some Christian psychologists note that one of the most common errors of Christianity in the field of psychology is

its sheer narrowness. Outler (1954) insists that those in Christianity who believe that prayer is the answer to every human problem are much too simplistic, for prayer is only one aspect of the Christian life; it is not the answer to all. "There is mortal danger in the glib promises of peace and power through religion, which do not involve the regeneration of a new life in Christ Jesus and the remaking of society to a fit place for God's children to live in . . ." (Outler, 1954, pp. 34-35). To Outler religion does not solve every problem, for God gave man a rational mind and other attributes to utilize in this life.

Another example of narrow-mindedness is the fact that many Christians see psychology as an erosion of the Christian faith and a threat to the Christian church. One unnamed person quoted by Tweedie (1963) expresses this thought:

Many carnal, worldly Christians believe that they can be cured of their so-called nervousness by modern psychological therapies. Patients may be helped by these treatments and relieved of some symptoms, but this does not deliver them from fear and guilt. I have never seen them lifted out of their worldly state or drawn any closer to God by the psychological reasoning of man." (p. 23)

Many Christian psychologists, including Tweedie, disagree with such a statement as the preceding, noting that many people have received evident help from psychologists.

Roberts (1950) and others see self-condemnation as another basic error of many Christians. He concludes that

just because man has a sinful nature does not mean that he is worthless or inferior:

Christian theology has frequently allowed the doctrine of sin virtually to obliterate the first affirmation. The result is that one scolds himself, not merely for egocentricity, but for being a self; he feels guilty, not merely for grasping at power unduly, but for asserting and maintaining his own existence at all. (Roberts, 1950, p. 91)

Christianity should not promote or condone self-condemnation or lack of self-acceptance according to numerous psychologists such as Crabb (1975). Man is created in the awesome image of God and stands as an important creature.

Those in the Christian realm who curse psychology for its immorality often go to an opposite extreme by confusing moralism with Christian ethics, insists Outler (1954). Jesus was considered immoral in the New Testament because He did not keep all the rigid laws of the Pharisees. "Yes, Jesus transformed the moralism of his day into an ethic which springs from the self in that true self-acceptance and self-assertion which is grounded in our love and devotion to God" (Outler, 1954, pp. 34-35).

A final error of Christianity as discussed by Koteskey (1980) has been brought about by psychological error. He states that both fields have been very crude in their accusations against the other:

In general, psychology has attacked Christianity. The founders of the three major forces were atheists

and attacked the Christian faith either openly or in private journals. Watson called Christianity a "myth," Freud called it a "neurosis," and Maslow called it "crap." Unfortunately, Christians have often merely reacted in a similar negative, critical manner. We have tended to reject what psychologists have had to say because of their critical attitude toward our faith. (p. 44)

Thus, Koteskey insists that Christians stand firm in opposition to the attacks on their faith, but that they not let the manner of their opposition become unChristian.

There are five other errors of psychology in relation to Christianity which psychologists have mentioned. First, many theorists do not accept the idea of God or sin. "The cardinal error of which the psychiatrist is apt to be guilty in his approach to Christianity is implicit in the cult of 'psychologism'--in the attempt to explain away both the idea of God and the idea of evil" (Malret, 1956, p. 26). Malret views this as a serious error, for he believes God does exist as does sin and evil.

Akin to this error is another which is practiced by many psychologists. Outler (1954) states that psychotherapy generally agrees that "... moralism is an invalid and harmful incentive to psychological maturity" (p. 34). He further concludes that since immorality contradicts the Bible, it must be rejected by Christianity.

Thirdly, according to some psychologists like Malret (1956), psychology needs to realize that man does have a

basic need to believe. "Man needs to believe, and it is just the inescapable reality of this need which drives him to become an existentialist or a logical positivist, or a Communist, or a Christian" (p. 19).

Even though psychology has much to offer Christianity, according to Koteskey, it faces problems of being well balanced in its ideas (1980). He suggests that too often a theorist goes to one extreme or another in his practice or his philosophy. Balance needs to be achieved, for ". . . all these major approaches to personality have something to offer us as Christians. The problem is that each approach has overemphasized its own strong points" (Koteskey, 1980, p. 119). Those who say man is like God are right according to many psychologists, but others insist man is also like an animal in numerous ways. Some propose that man is an irrational being, while others view man as rational. Psychoanalysts stress that man is an unconscious being, but others conclude man is also conscious. Behaviorists see man as a conditioned person, but as cognitive theorists reveal, man also seems to be a thinking person. In summary, Koteskey (1980) asserts that great care must be taken to assure that one's strong point is not overemphasized to the point of weakening it by ignoring other principles.

Finally, Roberts (1950) insists that psychology is in error because it refuses to fit its concepts into religion. He states:

. . . the therapist's description of bondage to inner conflict should be incorporated in the doctrine

of sin, and his description of healing (through the release of involuntary changes which occur in a personal relationship of trust and acceptance) should be incorporated in the doctrine of grace. (p. 153)

As psychologists discover principles that go hand in hand with Scripture and Biblical truths, Roberts indicates that they need to willingly admit such correlations and hope that they will be of benefit to Christianity.

Chapter 5

THE THEORIES, THEORISTS, AND CHRISTIANITY

Psychology will be classified in three broad categories for the purpose of this paper. Freud is responsible for the first group called psychoanalysis. Jung, Adler, and others who followed Freud, modifying his techniques, are known as Neo-Freudians. Behaviorism is the second broad category of psychology. Psychologists credit Skinner, Watson, and Pavlov as the leaders of the behavioristic theory. With the appearance of Carl Rogers, Abraham Maslow, and others, humanistic psychology began to grow. Berne, Fromm, Allport, Glasser, Ellis, Gestalt, and Existentialism will all be discussed. As will be noted by numerous Christian psychologists, many of these theories and theorists both coincide with and contradict Christianity and the Word of God.

Prior to analyzing these three categories of psychology, two other minor areas will be mentioned. Structuralism is the study of the human mind and human conscious experience. It was one of the earlier psychological theories. By attempting to study the mind and conscious experience, Koteskey (1980) says structuralists were attempting to study a very God-like aspect of human beings. He notes that Christians would see this as a very worthy goal, one that should be pursued by man; but even though the goal may have been worthy, the problem was attempting to study this God-like aspect of humans

by using a model which was developed from the study of inorganic creation. Thus, he concludes that a proper goal with an improper means of reaching that goal is a weakness of structuralism.

Another movement which many feel is akin to behaviorism is functionalism. According to Cross (1952), this era described thought as a psychophysical process. Man was a mechanical being--biologically similar to lower animals. Cross suggested that for the Christian to ". . . believe mind is merely the functional activity of muscles, glands, nerves, visceral organs, is to make man little more than a mechanism. Mental activity is conditioned by and tied in with all of the bodily processes; but inherent in life is the God-given complex--the mind" (p. 96). Functionalism views man as merely a biological organism, no different from any of the lower animals except in complexity and adaptivity (Cross, 1952). Thus, Cross concludes that the Christian will disagree with the basic thrust of functionalism.

In turning to the first broad category of psychology, psychoanalysis, many similarities and differences can be noted. In order for psychoanalysis to occur, two processes must take place--regression and transference (Patterson, 1980). Regression is reverting to childhood (the first six years of life) and reliving experiences in order to gain insight into present circumstances. Neo-Freudians may not have the analyst actually relive those first six years but may allow him to review the earliest possible experiences of childhood and relate them to the present (Patterson, 1980). Psychoanalysts

believe, "No one can know himself or appreciate why he does what he does until he understands himself as a child in relation to his parents" (Biddle, 1955, p. 69). Even though many Christians such as Narramore (1979) would not support reliving childhood experiences, Scripture does put emphasis on becoming as little children (Mark 10:15). Tweedie (1965) proposes that as the Christians disagree with regression, the analysts see them as manifesting signs of regression. Psychoanalysts still ". . . regard a commitment to the Bible as a symptom of regression, an unhealthy defense which is too unrealistic to be able to effect an abiding sense of security in the modern world" (p. 19). Surrendering oneself to Christ and the Bible, says Tweedie, is not unhealthy nor a sign of regression. The Apostle Paul opposes regression when he says, ". . . forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before" (Philipplians 3:13). Paul did not forget that which was past, but he was no longer influenced or affected by it.

Psychoanalysis is also deterministic, believing that every event is caused or is determined to happen. People are helplessly driven by intrapsychic forces set in motion by the experiences of early childhood (Runestam, 1958). If one accepts the idea of determinism, indicates Collins (1973), he is removing personal responsibility of behavior. "If every event is caused, then it is foolish to assume that man can be held responsible for his problems and behavior" (p. 179). How can man be responsible when he has no control? Allport states:

Strict determinism would have to say that no one ever does anything. The person does not live his life; it is lived for him. He is no freer than a billiard ball responding within a triangle of forces. The two major forces are internal drives and environmental pressure. (Belgum, 1963, p. 37)

Jeeves (1978) interprets this phenomenon of a cause-effect relationship running through behavior as a fundamental Christian belief. It supports the Scriptural idea, "... whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" (Galatians 6:7). The fallacy of determinism is not the cause-effect principle but the assumption that man is nothing but a machine (Jeeves, 1978).

Psychoanalytic's conception of neurosis has a remarkable parallel at certain points to the Pauline-Augustinian conception of original sin, insists Roberts (1950). He says there is an inner conflict in man in both conceptions. This conflict is one of hatred, envy and mistrust toward neighbors. The condition of inner conflict is an enslaving force within man. Sins and symptoms are derivatives of the conflict while good deeds seem to have little effect. In both conditions, Roberts states, it is difficult to differentiate between personal reactions and the injurious influences of others because they are fused. Likewise, he notes that one can hardly disentangle the respects where man has of necessity or of personal fault fallen into sin or neurosis. Therefore, Roberts believes the main problem has no hope of being solved

by an effort of the will, if it is ever solved at all, but rather is solved only as the will itself is changed.

Cole (1955) declares that Christianity and psychoanalysis again agree, this time on recognizing sexuality. But each recognizes it in a different way. He feels the Christian sees it on the basis of the doctrine of creation while psychoanalysis sees it on purely naturalistic grounds.

Anxiety is also viewed by Christianity and psychoanalysis as "the central problem of the human situation" (Cole, 1955, p. 301). According to Cole, Christianity is basically concerned with existential anxiety while psychoanalysis places emphasis on neurotic anxiety.

Many Christians such as Morris (1974) insist that psychoanalytic techniques can often aid in gathering information for diagnosis. Morris believes interviews, testing, and psychoanalysis are all useful. After all, he assumes, the more one knows about the patient, the more capable he is to treat the person with the most effective treatment possible. The psychoanalytic method of diagnosis of human behavior is a highly valid one according to Morris. He even sees such methods strongly implied and possibly directly indicated in Scripture:

The object of lying down is to relax and to relieve tension. This in itself often brings symptomatic relief. A relaxed, tensionless state of mind is an excellent place for therapy to begin. It is the time when the mind is often the most constructive. The following Scriptures seem to indicate that

such a state of mind is beneficial and spiritually therapeutic: Psalm 4:4, Psalm 63:6-8. David reminds us that communing with our hearts (mind) upon our bed is a form of introspection that can provide insight into our problems. (pp. 33-34)

Spinks (1963) implies some of the techniques used by psychoanalysts can be related to Scripture while others are nowhere found in the Bible. Therefore, he concludes that perhaps psychoanalysis is neither religious nor the opposite, for any means that does not contradict Scripture but aids in helping people is permissible for use by the Christian. Pflister (1963) says, "In itself psychoanalysis is neither religious nor the opposite, but an impartial instrument which can serve the clergy as well as the laity when it is used only to free suffering people" (Spinks, 1963, p. 88).

Practically every psychoanalyst realizes the idea of the psychodynamic process of growth and development from infancy to adulthood or maturity, according to Outler (1954). He notes that Freud calls it the oral, anal, and phallic phases while Sullivan traces from primitive autism to mature and syntactic interpersonal relations. Psychologists call it various names, but Outler believes all admit that there is some process of growth for all humans. This truth coincides with Christianity in that personal relations are always in motion (Outler, 1954).

Another kinship between psychoanalysis and Christianity seems to exist. Koteskey (1980) indicates that, "Psychoanalysis

can be placed in a Christian perspective by noting that it consistently emphasizes how humans are like animals and different from God" (p. 114). He further assumes that concepts like determinism, neurosis, and anxiety demonstrate that men are like animals in numerous ways, but those identical terms also make men fall short of being like God.

Three psychoanalytic theorists, Freud, Jung, and Adler, have a number of ideas which will be examined from the Christian perspective. Freud's explanation of religion and man's interest in religion is anti-Christian according to Malret (1956). Spinks (1963) insists that Freud does not see God as Truth, but as an illusion used to meet some idea of man. Spinks summarizes Freud with several ideas. Religion is nothing more than a totemic handling of guilt. Men picture some great God sacrificing His Son to atone for their sins. People develop fixations on old family history such as the murder Moses committed, and such fixations actually revive feelings of guilt within those people today. Thus, they utilize totemic means of handling the guilt (Spinks, 1963).

Also, as interpreted by Malret (1956), "Freud sees the idea of God as an illusion created by people to comfort them as they are faced with helplessness after they had outgrown their parents" (p. 15). Malret also finds it interesting to note that a number of people who are Christians are at the same time still dependent on their parents.

Freud was a pansexualist in his day. His theory emphasized sex. The Freudian school is even "dogmatically bound

to the idea that mental conflicts have a sexual basis" (Runestam, 1958, p. 172). Many Christian psychologists such as Crabb (1975) see this as a definite conflict with Scripture which seems to indicate in I John 2:16 that conflict and sin are a result of the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life. Crabb insists these three seem to encompass more than just sex.

At the center of the human personality, Freud notes that there are two drives, eros (sensual pleasure) and thanatos (power and destruction). Therefore, Crabb (1975) points out that Freud's primary motivation of people as seen in these two drives is self-gratification. People are basically out for themselves, but most people do not know or acknowledge such selfishness, states Crabb. Judges 21:25 indicates that man does indeed live for himself. Scripture and Freud seem to agree on this problem but, as Crabb suggests, strongly disagree on the solution.

Freud's cure for self-gratification as summarized by Crabb (1975) is three-fold. First, the underlying motivation must be uncovered. Then the conscience should be softened to the point where the motive of self-gratification is acceptable. Finally, self-gratification is promoted within the bounds of reality and social acceptability. According to Crabb, "Freudian therapy essentially promotes living for oneself without the burden of a conscience" (pp. 29-30). He supposes then that morality is irrelevant according to Freud. "Behavior now takes into account the id (inner drives) and the ego (contact with the world) and disregards the superego

(contact with moral standards)" (Crabb, 1975, p. 41). It is as though Freud wants man to discover that he is selfish and then accept it as a part of himself, but Crabb notes that Scripture never condones such selfishness but rather condemns it as sin. Throughout the New Testament Jesus teaches that Christians should be servants, taking no thought for themselves.

One vital technique which Freud utilized in psychoanalysis was interpretation of dreams. Some feel this is a senseless technique, but Morris (1974) disagrees. "I do not accept for a moment Freud's approach to the interpretation of dreams. It is nonetheless a fact that dreams often provide a rich source of information about the roots and bases of aberrant behavior" (p. 35).

Some Christians see one tragic flaw of Freud's as being his denial of the fall of man. Cole (1955) states, "There is a tragic contradiction between man as he was created and man as he is. From the Christian point of view, one of the chief shortcomings of Freud was his failure to recognize such a contradiction. For him, man was entirely existence" (p. 298). The fall of man in the Garden of Eden is very basic to Christianity. Cole and others agree that to deny there was a fall denies the need for redemption.

Another mistake that Freud and other contemporary therapists make according to Collins (1973) is that they have failed to recognize that their view of religion is greatly distorted. They have studied people with problems in order

to develop their picture of Christianity. But there are normal, happy, self-actualizing Christians:

People with problems are not likely to present a picture of sane and authentic Christianity. Instead, these troubled individuals show a perverted form of belief which the counselor observes and incorrectly assumes to be typical of all believers. From this the therapist concludes that all religion is harmful and psychologically unhealthy.

(Collins, 1973, p. 167)

In searching for positive Scriptural ideas in Freudian theory, several items can be noted. Psychotherapy has put a constant stress on respect for persons, insists Outler (1954). One is free to be himself and to be accepted and dealt with as himself. "Even Freud laid great stress on the interpersonal relation between doctor and patient" (Outler, 1954, p. 23).

Freud emphasized wholesome, mature relationships (Koteskey, 1980). His theory of the Oedipus Complex, which states a son will strive with his father to win the love of his mother, is not promoted for human practice. Cole (1955) noted that Freud even seemed to condemn such behavior, but did insist that it was a natural conflict which humans should be aware of, yet refrain from committing. "Freud emphasized mature heterosexual adjustment as the developmental goal toward which the individual was moving. A Christian perspective likewise emphasizes a mature heterosexual relationship, two becoming one in the marriage" (Koteskey, 1980, p. 57).

Wise (1956) realizes that Freud saw the dire importance of love within an individual just as Scripture does. He expressed, "In the last resort we must begin to love in order that we may not fall ill, and must fall ill, if in consequence of frustration, we cannot love" (Wise, 1956, p. 93).

Freud has several characteristics of the id that correspond to Christianity's concept of original sin, according to Meehl (1958). To Freud the id is the unconscious, the instinctual aspect of man. It is present within each individual at birth. Original sin is also an instinct, an innate part of every human being since the fall of man in the Garden of Eden. At birth it is already interwoven in each person. Psalm 51:3 states that man is even conceived in sin in his mother's womb. Thus, Meehl says the two concepts exhibit important resemblances, even though they are not equivalent.

In summary of Freud's work, Collins (1973) proposes that he seems to replace the God of Scripture with a god of chance or probability. Further, he does not accept Truth as the Christian does, and many of his concepts do not harmonize with the Word of God (Collins, 1973).

Some of Freud's followers do not appear to be as anti-religious according to Biddle (1955). Such is the case of Jung, a Neo-Freudian. Jung does not see religion as some illusion or symptom of regression. Rather, he thinks religion is an integral factor in emotional adjustment (Biddle, 1955). Jung states that, "An intellectually and emotionally satisfying religion is essential to effective therapy" (Biddle, 1955, p. 4). Freud taught that religion was a symptom of

emotional problems, while Jung thought the lack of religion caused people to have problems (Jeeves, 1978). "For Jung it was the absence of religion that was the chief cause of adult psychological disorders" (Jeeves, 1978, p. 161). Therefore, Jeeves concludes that Jung expressed the necessity of religion while Freud expressed the necessity for lack of religion.

God is not an absolute being according to Jung. He insists that the absolute being cannot be known experientially. So, in order for God to be experienced, He cannot be absolute. "Jung's views appear to be in direct opposition to traditional beliefs. God, for Christian belief, is 'absolute,' but if God is absolute then He cannot be that God for whom men yearn. Jung's position is that God, to be 'psychologically real' cannot be absolute" (Spinks, 1963, p. 97).

Adler (1920) developed a theory of personality termed Individual Psychology. He believed individuation, or man's craving for completeness, was a force within each person. This force, according to Spinks (1963), appears in religion as the desire for re-birth; one of the main incentives in the life of the individual and one of the main engagements of religion. Adler's individuation drives man to find completeness, but for the Christian, Spinks states that this completeness is obtained only in Jesus Christ.

A second kinship of Adler with Christianity, according to Runestam (1958), is his idea of self-enhancement. Runestam explains that Adler's theory traces the egoistic drive of self-enhancement. Adler partly looks upon this drive as a

danger to the life of the patient. On the other hand, it partly seeks to:

. . . revive in him the sense of the life of fellowship, the courage to meet life's obligations, and an objective mind, which releases from preoccupation with self; and which in part finally seeks to enable the patient, by forsaking a life motivated by selfishness, to apprehend a new philosophy of life which, where it is most profoundly understood, actually has a tendency to orient towards eternity. (Runestam, 1958, p. 173)

In summarizing the psychoanalytic approach to psychology, several sources have concluded that Freud appears to be in conflict with Scripture, as do Jung and Adler. The ideas of determinism, religion as a symptom of regression, and pansexualism may not be compatible with Christianity according to Spinks (1963), Runestam (1958), Jeeves (1978), and Collins (1973).

The second large field of psychology to be discussed is behaviorism. Watson is considered by most psychologists to be the father of behaviorism. This school of thought can be divided into two parts: classical and operant conditioning. Textbooks associate the name of Skinner with operant conditioning, while classical conditioning bears the name of Pavlov. Meehl (1958) notes that behavior is learned and thus can be unlearned, according to the behaviorist. He further assumes that through reinforcements, both negative and positive,

behavior can be shaped into any form. It can be controlled by the experimenter.

One criticism of behaviorism, according to Meehl (1958) and Koteskey (1980), is the accusation that man is treated like an animal and is lowered to the standard of being animalistic in behavior. A number of psychologists and Christians have responded to this outlook. The theologian, as Meehl suggests, sees man as made in the image of God, not as some animal whose behavior can be controlled and predicted. Meehl further points out that God presently works in man in a unique manner different from the way He works in white rats. Koteskey summarizes this error as follows:

Behavioral psychologists believe that if an explanation works with animals, a more complex version of the same concepts will explain human behavior. The first behaviorist, Watson (1913/1968), stated that behaviorists recognize no dividing line between humans and animals. (Koteskey, 1980, p. 20)

Scripture does seem to bring out both sides of the issue as Koteskey (1980) submits, so balance is a key concept. Psalm 49:12-14 and Ecclesiastes 3:18-19 are two Scriptural passages which liken man to animal. But humans, not animals, are created in the image of God according to Scripture. Genesis 1:27, II Corinthians 3:18, and James 3:9 all support that fact. Koteskey (1980) insists that Scripture leaves no doubt but that man is created in the fashion and image of God. He likewise agrees with other theologians that

the mind is similar to God. Scripture, according to Koteskey (1980), lists characteristics of God and animals which are evident in man:

Many Christians have reacted negatively to behaviorism, but in the perspective taken here behaviorism is a very necessary part of the study of humans. Human beings are very similar to animals in some ways, and if we ignore these similarities, we will have as unbalanced a view as the behaviorists do.

(Koteskey, 1980, p. 39)

Many Christians have reacted strongly to behaviorism arguing that man is not like an animal, but, as Koteskey (1980) states, to go to that extreme is just as inappropriate as those behaviorists who possess the other extreme. "As Christians we say that the secular comparative psychologists are correct as far as they have gone. The problem is in thinking of humans as nothing but animals. Humans are like animals, but they are also similar to God" (Koteskey, 1980, p. 48).

Psychologists, scientists, and theologians have tried to discover which human traits are animalistic and which are God-like. Lectures in ethology and comparative psychology which were reported by Jeeves (1978) show that many of the basic behaviors of man can be studied profitably by observing non-human primates. Perception, learning, remembering, and problem-solving are only a few of such behaviors. Jeeves (1978) likewise insists that emotional and instinctive reactions can also be looked at by studying such non-human primates. He proposes that these types of studies do not

conflict with Christianity unless they are unjustifiable extrapolations made from those similarities which are observed. One of the basic differences between man and animal, as noted by Jeeves, is that man can have a personal relationship with the living, almighty God of the universe, thus making man more than a mere highly developed animal.

Behaviorists who see man as a more developed animal have a tendency to say that his behavior is the result of influences over which he has no control, according to Collins (1973). Tournier (1968) divides man into three parts: psychological, moral, and spiritual. He agrees with the behaviorists by concluding man is not responsible for his "psychological reactions," but disagrees by stating man is to blame for that which occurs on the "moral and spiritual level."

Behaviorism believes man is nothing but a big, empty zero, a totally controlled being, according to Crabb (1975). He insists that it is fiction to believe man is a choosing, personal, initiating, responsible being as suggested by behaviorism. Crabb lists six errors of the behaviorist and two positive qualities. The first error listed is that behaviorism robs people of their significance. To lower man to the stature of an animal removes his importance and value as seen by God. Crabb notes second that man's personal responsibility is emptied of meaning by the behaviorist. Since the environment determines the individual's behavior, man cannot be blamed. Third, behaviorists also settle for tangible motivation when the purpose and power of God are

available. Man does not always need a token or reward to perform certain behaviors, according to Crabb. Fourth, man is not just a complicated dog who responds to conditioning. He is made in God's image and possesses real value. Fifth, Crabb states that to control an individual through a series of rewards and punishments is to take away from man's freedom of choice as taught in the Scripture. The final error of behaviorism, according to Crabb, is the failure to realize man is responsible for his own behavior; the environment is not responsible.

Crabb (1975) cites two strengths of behaviorism. First, behavior is influenced by circumstances. While it is true that the environment does not totally determine the person, Crabb realizes that it is also true that circumstances in the environment do influence one's behavior. The second strong point of behaviorism Crabb establishes is the discovery that one breaks habits by avoiding tempting circumstances. Crabb summarizes Skinner by stating, "Skinner contends that man is neither good nor bad, that he is a complicated mass of responses which in terms of intrinsic value amounts to a large zero" (p. 37).

Watson was another important behaviorist. Cross (1952) views Watson as mechanistic and materialistic because he seems to reject everything that is not within the range of sensibility. By doing this Cross feels Watson ignores and overlooks an important sector of psychological study known as inferential thinking. "Watson's thesis is not so much in what he accepts; rather it is in the major areas of

psychological content that he rejects or ignores" (Cross, 1952, p. 103).

Some psychologists, according to Koteskey (1980), have argued the point of whether the use of rewards and punishments to control human beings is appropriate. However, he insists that reinforcement and reward is not a non-Christian concept. A number of psychologists, both Christian and secular, use reinforcement as an efficient means of changing behavior. One such Christian psychologist is Dobson. "James Dobson (1970), among many others, notes specific principles that must be followed if reinforcement is to be used most effectively. He further advises mothers to seek divine assistance and quotes extensively from scripture" (Koteskey, 1980, p. 73).

Koteskey (1980) gives his own proof of the acceptability of rewards and punishments. "The Christian sees reward in terms of justice as well as behavioral change. God uses positive reinforcement to induce changes in human behavior. Obedience is rewarded with spiritual blessings and often with material blessings" (p. 85). If Jesus used reinforcement to induce change, then Koteskey believes the Christian can safely conclude that it is permissible for his use.

In summarizing the ideas of behaviorism, Crabb (1975) draws several conclusions. He notes that man may have certain characteristics of animals, but he must never be lowered from the valued position that God placed him in by creating man in His own image. He further states that the environment around an individual may influence his behavior, but it

does not determine his behavior; each person must be held responsible for his own actions. Finally, Koteskey (1980) views behavior modification as an appropriate process unless it totally removes all freedom of choice that a man possesses.

Humanism is the third and final school of psychology which will be examined under the scope of Christianity. Rogers, who developed client-centered therapy, is one widely known humanist. Maslow, Glasser, Ellis, Fromm, Allport, Berne, Gestalt, and Existentialism will all be discussed under the umbrella of humanism even though some of these theorists, by their own admission, have only one or two points of similarity with the humanistic approach.

"Psychotherapy constitutes a prime instance of a practical wisdom which modern Christianity needs and can appreciate--associated with a humanistic world view which Christianity must reject" (Outler, 1954, p. 57). Humanism emphasizes numerous spiritual truths that have been long overlooked by Christianity, according to Outler (1954). However, he further states that it also brings to a head some ideas about man that contradict the Word of God. As the name "humanist" implies, man is at the center of everything. Crabb (1975) views humanism as an attitude or way of life centered on human interests or values. He notes that it is a philosophy that asserts the dignity and worth of man and his capacity for self-realization through reason, and supernaturalism is often rejected.

"Self-actualization," a word used often by humanists, is the goal of humanism according to Maslow (1968). He

defines a self-actualizing person as one who:

- 1) efficiently perceives reality;
- 2) accepts himself, others, and nature;
- 3) is spontaneous, simplistic, and natural;
- 4) focuses on problems rather than self;
- 5) needs privacy and independence;
- 6) is appreciative;
- 7) has had some "peak" experience;
- 8) has social interest;
- 9) builds interpersonal relationships;
- 10) is creative;
- 11) is democratic;
- 12) resists enculturation. (Maslow, 1968, p. 73)

"Several Christian writers have compared the psychological concept of self-actualization with the theological concept of sanctification and have concluded that the two are similar" (Koteskey, 1980, p. 61). The Christian who is becoming sanctified, as noted by Koteskey, is realistic, accepting, spontaneous in obedience to the Holy Spirit, focuses on problems without condemnation of self, is independent yet dependent upon others God may use in his life, is grateful, is being filled with the Spirit daily (a "peak" experience), is interested in society and building interpersonal relationships, is non-judgmental, and depends on the Bible rather than culture for instruction.

Maslow (1968) also describes values of being for humans to achieve. These are wholeness, perfection, completion, justice, aliveness, richness, simplicity, beauty, goodness,

uniqueness, effortlessness, playfulness, truth, honesty, reality, and self-sufficiency. Maslow has said, "These are attributes assigned to most conceptions of a god" (Koteskey, 1980, p. 49). Koteskey proposes that Scriptural attributes of God reveal many of the same characteristics. I Peter 1:16 says, "Be ye holy; for I am holy." "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (Matthew 5:48). "Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven" (Colossians 4:1). "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you" (John 13:34). "Be ye therefore merciful as your Father also is merciful" (Luke 6:36).

Koteskey states, "Maslow recognized the similarity between his list (the Being-values) and the attributes of God and concluded that humanity had created God in its (humanity's) best image. As Christians, we agree about the similarity, but disagree about who is Creator and created" (Koteskey, 1980, p. 41). Man did not create God in his image, insists Koteskey, but rather God created man to become conformed to Christ's image.

One of the strong Biblical points of humanism, mentioned by Hulme (1956), is its insistence that the counselor not be judgmental. According to Tournier (1968), a friendship relationship is to be established where there is no condemnation or judgment passed on the person. He views this as a Scriptural concept, for Christians are told, "Judge not, that ye be not judged" (Matthew 7:1). One stern rebuke Jesus offers

in the New Testament is against the hypocrisy of the Pharisees and Saducees for their judgmental spirit. For the Christian, however, Crabb (1975) insists that a clear line must be drawn between judging and sharing the Word of God. He views the Word as truth, and what it says, he feels needs to be shared with others. But he further notes that the Word of God is silent at times, and then Christians have no right to condemn. Tournier (1968) states that many psychotherapists who promote the humanistic philosophy are firmly convinced that no counselor need ever impose his conviction upon the counselee, nor need the counselor even reveal those convictions to the client. But Tournier suggests that it is impossible to hide convictions. He realizes that no "sermon," moral exhortation or advice need ever be given, but no one can claim to be really morally neutral. "We can indeed watch that we say nothing openly that might betray our secret reflections and judgements, but they are nonetheless there, and do not escape our patient's intuition" (Tournier, 1968, p. 85).

A little of the Roger's or humanistic method would be a wholesome influence for everyone, according to Hulme (1956):

The client-centered approach breaks with set patterns of thought and practice. It compels the pastor to set aside, at least for the time being, his own value judgements as he acknowledges the sentiments of the counselee. There is no attempt to rid the pastor of his convictions but only to prevent these convictions from controlling the interview.

Hulme insists the counselor can maintain his convictions, but he must not let them prohibit him from understanding, accepting and positively regarding the client.

Rogers, a prominent humanist, believes man is basically good (Crabb, 1975). Crabb says of Roger's belief that all that is within a person is good; corruption enters from without. Psalm 51:3 says that man is even conceived in sin in his mother's womb. The Bible says, "There is none righteous" (Romans 3:10), and "all have sinned" (Romans 3:23). "Rogers denies any inner badness and teaches that man is filled with goodness and should therefore let it all hang out" (Crabb, 1975, p. 81). Crabb insists that any parent knows that children are not basically good.

In Rogerian counseling, Morris (1974) mentions that the counselor prompts, never advises. He hopes the client will slowly begin to understand corrective measures himself as he becomes self-actualizing. To Rogerians, ". . . most people realize that what they are doing is out of joint with normalcy, and to articulate it is to objectify it. Such objectivity is decidedly therapeutic" (Morris, 1974, p. 40). However, it is reasoned by Morris that there are two fallacies to such a theory. First, the Rogerians do not really recognize that man does not have the resources within himself to cure a spiritual ill. Second, there is no recognition of the capacity of the Holy Spirit to operate through the life of another believer, that is, the counselor. Men do not have the ability to work out their own problems all the time, according to Morris. Others can many times offer one counsel or advice

which can be the solution to his trouble. Morris believes this principle is taught in Scripture.

Value of warmth, genuineness, and positive regard are Rogerian qualities which Crabb (1975) notes the Scripture recognizes as important. He insists that a realistic basis for these concepts exists in the Bible. Love is to be a character quality of the Christian life, the very mark of the Christian, according to Schaeffer (1970).

Crabb (1975) indicates that Roger's therapy also encourages the client to acknowledge all he is, including his gut feelings. Crabb sees this as a plus for Rogers but hastens to disagree with the idea that integration is best achieved by encouraging the Christian in honest admission of feelings, labeling them as sin, confessing them as sin, and learning to love in the power of the Spirit. The goal of counseling viewed by Crabb is not just to help the client assimilate his feelings as Rogers would believe. "There is nothing wrong and sometimes everything right with sensitively and warmly reflecting a client's feelings in an attempt to understand him and to help him feel understood" (p. 41). But regardless of how good sympathy is, Crabb insists it is not enough. Not only does Rogers put emphasis on feelings, he also ". . . encourages patients to move in whatever direction their 'gut feelings' lead them" (Crabb, 1975, p. 41). Some Christian counselors see this as wrong. Crabb believes the patient must move in the direction of the Word of God:

Counselors who encourage the expression of more feelings and entertain that if enough negative

feelings are gushingly poured out, the person then will be rid of his emotional problem and those who look for the cause of feelings in some external circumstance responsible for producing and locking in a negative emotion are wrong. (Crabb, 1975, p. 43)

Scriptural transformation does not come through pouring out feelings but, as Crabb notes, through the renewing of the mind. He feels that catharsis alone does not face the reality of a sinful nature.

Ziegler (1962) points out a few other relationships between Rogers and Christianity. He first lists six fundamental Rogerian principles:

- 1) the self develops from the interaction of the organism with the environment;
- 2) the self introjects the values of other people and perceives them in a distorted manner;
- 3) the self is constantly striving for internal consistency;
- 4) the organism behaves in ways that are consistent with the concept of the self;
- 5) experiences not consistent with the self are seen as threats;
- 6) the self changes with maturation and learning.

(Ziegler, 1962, p. 29)

According to Ziegler, these concepts relate to Christianity in that they first demand that the Christian have a clear, concise idea about the nature of the client's perception

of himself. Since the self is emphasized so much, the counselor must understand the client's self to the greatest degree possible. Finally, Ziegler states that the Christian should know the contribution that he wants to make to the client's self-concept.

Some Christian psychologists believe Rogers has both strong points and weak points. Crabb (1975) believes man is not basically good, and neither will he solve his own problems by expressing and moving toward his gut feelings. However, the two concepts of warm, genuine, positive regard and non-judgementalism are visible in the Bible, according to Morris (1974). Thus, he sees some Christians over-reacting to Rogers. Nevertheless, one Christian psychologist, Adams (1970) has stated according to Carter and Narramore:

The Rogerian system confirms sinful man's belief that he is autonomous and has no need of God. Conservatives must reject Rogerian counseling on the basis of its humanistic presuppositions alone. It begins with man and it ends with man. Man is his own solution to his problems. (Carter & Narramore, 1979, p. 38)

Wise (1956) insists that Erich Fromm establishes love, warmth, and acceptance in the counseling relationship as Rogers does. "Every Christian is familiar with the great commandment of Jesus that we should love God with our whole being and our neighbor as ourselves" (Wise, 1956, p. 93). Wise believes that Fromm sees religion as constructive to the degree that it promotes freedom, love, truth, and independence.

One of Fromm's positive points of counseling as revealed by Outler (1954) is his emphasis on listening. Outler agrees that the Christian perspective supports the individual through listening.

Spinks (1963) views Fromm's challenge for man to educate himself to face reality, grow up, and think for himself as essentially a sign of man's recognition of a separation between himself, others, and God. Fromm has the right idea, according to Spinks, but he seeks its answer in the wrong place. The answer, as Spinks observes, is to bridge the separation gap between self and God.

In the opinion of Collins (1977), Allport appears to profess Christianity when he goes so far as to indicate that love is a powerful therapeutic tool and a basic tenet of Christian faith. "Allport finds no conflict between science and religion and comes to the astonishing conclusion that religion is superior to psychotherapy in dealing with emotional problems" (Biddle, 1955, p. 4).

Murphree (1975) has one evaluating statement about Eric Berne's Transactional Analysis. According to Murphree, Berne establishes his theory on the realm of human relationships and one's relationship with himself. But as Murphree suggests, "What is missing from a distinctively Christian standpoint is in the area of one's relationship with God. . . . This 'vertical' relationship with God adds so much to one's 'horizontal' relationship in the world" (p. 10). He concludes that it is impossible to separate an individual's relationship with himself and with others from his relationship with God.

Crabb (1975) and Morris (1974) believe that one therapist in psychology who seems to have some very important points in common with Christianity is Glasser. Morris notes that Glasser is the originator of Reality Therapy which concentrates on the here and now, the reality of the present. He notices that, like Rogers, Glasser insists on involvement at the beginning of the relationship. However, as Crabb points out, Glasser leads the cry for a renewed awareness of the importance of personal responsibility. "Hold your patient responsible for what he does. Point out alternatives, help him evaluate their relative merits, then lay the burden for choosing what course to follow squarely on the client" (Crabb, 1975, p. 99). Crabb says Glasser's theory coincides with Scriptural love, responsibility, free will, and directiveness in what is right and wrong. He also states that Glasser insists that man must bear the consequences of his own behavior. Morris concludes that Glasser's rejection of irresponsible behavior while still accepting the person as worthwhile and Glasser's concepts of involvement, responsibility, and right and wrong are Biblical principles. The only weakness Morris sees is the rejection of diagnosis as a significant part of therapy.

Rational-Emotive Therapy, originated by Ellis, likewise has been diagnosed by Crabb (1975) and Collins (1977) from a Biblical perspective. According to Crabb, Ellis insists that it is not the event that controls a person's feeling but the evaluation of that event. The A-B-C Theory of emotion explains this process. "A (what happens to you) does not control C

(how you feel); B (what you say to yourself about A) is in fact directly responsible for C (how you feel)" (Crabb, 1975, p. 80). Crabb believes that the emphasis Ellis places on the mind agrees with Scripture. In Proverbs 23:7, Romans 12:2, and Ephesians 4:17, the Bible supports that how a person thinks has a great deal to do with what a person does and how a person feels, according to Crabb. However, Collins (1975) does not view Scripture dealing exclusively with the rational, and he says that for Ellis to do so is an error. Collins points out that the view Ellis has of religion is mistaken. "Albert Ellis in his no-nonsense 'rational-emotive' approach to therapy, is highly critical of religion. He views it as a hindrance to mental health and has no hesitation in attacking it during the therapeutic interview" (p. 98).

Perls, founder of Gestalt Psychology, emphasizes the wholeness and unity of man, according to Cross (1952):

From a conservative point of view we have no quarrel with Gestalt. While we do not find a definite place for the study of the spiritual nature of man in this system, we do find that the idea of wholeness, unity, and oneness easily harmonizes with our concept of the three-fold nature of man, and his integrity and oneness when obedient to God's law. (Cross, 1952, p. 130)

Koteskey (1980) brings to light one weakness of Gestaltism:

The Gestalt psychologists wanted to study consciousness, a God-like attribute of humans. . . . Unfortunately, they made an error in trying to model their

theories after the field theories in physics. Humanity's God-like attributes simply will not fit the models (chemical or physical) developed to explain inorganic creation. (p. 40)

The final approach to psychology which will be discussed briefly is existentialism. Having rejected Christianity, existentialists are left with an emptiness that they have tried to fill with cynical skepticism, according to Collins (1973). He mentions Nietzsche, Sartre, and Camus as examples. Existentialists believe in no design or designer. Everything is a question mark. Crabb states that this is not an objective approach. He insists that God provides objective meaning to life. Man is not just a question mark; he is created in God's image to bring glory to God. Man cannot find his own solution to problems; he must find God's solution (Crabb, 1975). "Existentialists don't know if man is bad, good, both or neither. Man is logically absurd but needs something besides rational meaninglessness; therefore leave rationality behind and blindly hope that some experience will fill the void" (Crabb, 1975, p. 41).

Chapter 6

CONCLUSION

In concluding this paper it might be well to mention counseling procedures in Scripture according to two Christian psychologists. The first is Collins (1977) who recognizes six various counseling confrontations in the Bible:

- 1) rational discussions with Nicodemus;
- 2) encouragement and support of John the Baptist;
- 3) criticism and directive counseling with the hypocrites;
- 4) confrontation with the woman at the well;
- 5) forgiveness with the woman taken in adultery;
- 6) listening and non-directive counseling with the two on the Emmaus road. (p. 185)

Carter and Narramore (1979) suggest the following prophetic and priestly Scriptural approaches to counseling: "convicting, confronting, preaching, lecturing, thinking for, talking to, proclaiming truth, disturbing the comfortable, comforting, confessional, interviewing, listening, thinking with, talking with, affirming truth, comforting the disturbed" (p. 114).

With such a variety of counseling approaches in Scripture, Collins (1977) suggests that many psychological approaches today coincide with the Bible in some way. He insists that the two concepts of Christianity and psychology are both

alike and dislike. Collins makes it the chore of the Christian to be such a student of the Word of God that he recognizes those similarities and those differences. There is a balance to be found in the relationship of those two fields. As Proverbs 11:1 says, "A false balance is abomination to the Lord: but a just weight is his delight."

A quote by Outler (1954) seems to convey that balance quite well:

Let Christians gratefully receive the best psychotherapy has to offer, in clinical help and practical wisdom. Let us learn what they can teach, about human motivation and behavior, about the disorders and repair of psychic life--and make responsible use of what we learn, in good conscience and with disciplined understanding. But the Christian must stand firm on Christian ground, and not be overly impressed by claims that the faith of psychotherapy has the same scientific authority as its clinical axioms. This is simply not the case. Christians are enjoined 'to bring all our thoughts captive to obey Christ,' not in sacrifice of the intellect, but in freedom and unity of the Christian life shaped by the Gospel of Christ. (p. 45)

REFERENCES

- Barbour, C. E. Sin and the New Psychology. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1930.
- Belgum, D. Guilt: Where Religion and Psychology Meet. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Biddle, W. E. Integration of Religion and Psychiatry. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1955.
- Carter, J. D. & Narramore, B. The Integration of Psychology and Theology. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979.
- Carrington, W. L. Psychology, Religion, and Human Need. New York: Channel Press, 1957.
- Cole, W. G. Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.
- Collins, G. R. Search for Reality: Psychology and the Christian. Santa Ana, California: Vision House Publishers, 1969.
- Collins, G. R. The Christian Psychology of Paul Tournier. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973.
- Collins, G. R. The Rebuilding of Psychology. Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 1977.
- Crabb, L. J. Basic Principles of Biblical Counseling. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1975.
- Cross, H. An Introduction to Psychology: An Evangelical Approach. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1952.
- Draper, E. Psychiatry and Pastoral Care. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

- Fuller, A. R. Psychology and Religion: Eight Points of View.
Washington: University Press of America, 1977.
- Hulme, W. E. Counseling and Theology. Philadelphia:
Muhlenberg Press, 1956.
- Jeeves, M. A. Psychology & Christianity: The View Both Ways.
Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1978.
- Jung, C. G. Psychology and Religion. New Haven: Yale
University Press, 1938.
- Klausner, S. Z. Psychiatry and Religion. London: The Free
Press of Glencoe, 1964.
- Koteskey, R. L. Psychology from a Christian Perspective.
Nashville, Abingdon, 1980.
- Kunkel, F. In Search of Maturity: An Inquiry into Psychology,
Religion, and Self-Education. New York: Charles
Scribner's Sons, 1943.
- Mairet, P. Christian Essays in Psychiatry. New York:
Philosophical Library, 1956.
- Maslow, A. Toward A Psychology of Being. New York: D. Van
Nostrand Company, 1968.
- Meehl, P. What, Then, Is Man? Saint Louis: Concordia
Publishing House, 1958.
- Morris, P. D. Love Therapy. Wheaton: Tyndale House
Publishers, Inc., 1974.
- Murphree, J. T. When God Says You're OK: A Christian Approach
to Transactional Analysis. Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1975.
- Oates, W. E. The Psychology of Religion. Waco, Texas: Word
Books, Publishers, 1973.

- Outler, A. C. Psychotherapy and the Christian Message.
New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1954.
- Patterson, C. H. Theories of Counseling and Psychotherapy.
New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1980.
- Roberts, D. Psychotherapy and A Christian View of Man.
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950.
- Runestam, A. Psychoanalysis and Christianity. (Translated by
Oscar Winfield) Rock Island, Illinois: Augustana Press, 1958.
- Schaeffer, F. A. The Mark of the Christian. Illinois:
InterVarsity Press, 1970.
- Spinks, G. S. Psychology and Religion. Boston: Beacon
Press, 1963.
- Tournier, P. A Place for You: Psychology and Religion. New
York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968.
- Tweedle, D. F. The Christian and the Couch. Grand Rapids:
Baker Book House, 1963.
- Wise, C. A. Psychiatry and the Bible. New York: Harper &
Brothers, 1956.
- Ziegler, J. H. Psychology and the Teaching Church. New
York: Abingdon Press, 1962.