

- 1 Christina Scott, *A Historian and his world. A Life of Christopher Dawson*, (1984), p. 15.
- 2 Ibid, p. 28.
- 3 Ibid, p. 29.
- 4 Ibid, p. 64.
- 5 *Religion and Culture*, (1948), pp. 48—9.
- 6 Ibid, p. 50.
- 7 *Progress and Religion*, p. 52.
- 8 *Religion and Culture*, pp. 131, 53—4.
- 9 Ibid, p. 59.
- 10 Letter to *The Catholic Herald*, 30th September 1945.
- 11 Dawson did not write a single account of this process, but it can be pieced together from the relevant sections of *The Movement of World Revolution* (1959), *The Dividing of Christendom*, *The Judgement of the Nations* and, especially, *The Gods of Revolution*.
- 12 Scott, op. cit., p. 133.
- 13 From unpublished notes. Quoted by Scott, p. 150.
- 14 *Progress and religion*, pp. 74—6.
- 15 Ibid, pp. 44—6.
- 16 *The Gods of Revolution*, pp. 32—3.
- 17 See A. MacIntyre, *Secularization and moral change* (1967) and V. Pratt, *Religion and secularization* (1970).
- 18 *The Gods of Revolution*, p. 105.
- 19 *Progress and religion*, p. 243.
- 20 *Understanding Europe*. Quoted in Scott, p. 166.
- 21 *Progress and religion*, p. 218.
- 22 'The Tragedy of Central Europe', *New York Review of Books*, April 1984.
- 23 'The Problem of Metahistory', *History Today*, I, 1951, pp. 9—12.
- 24 David Knowles, Introduction to Dawson's *The Dividing of Christendom*, (1971).

I wish to thank the editor for his useful suggestions to an earlier draft, and Dominic Scott for kindly reading the proofs and suggesting some stylistic improvements.

Response

The Psychologisation of the Church: Michael Doyle's July/August critique of a book review by Jack Dominian

I am grateful to Michael Doyle's short article on the psychologisation of the Church. A full reply would need several books. Indeed, many such exist, and I have written three—an early one, *Psychiatry and the Christian* (Burns & Oates); *Authority*; and *The Capacity to Love* (both Darton Longman & Todd).

The Christian faith is based on a relationship with an unseen and unknown mystery of God who has revealed Himself at various times, and in particular in His son, Jesus Christ. I would maintain that, in order to have such a faith, dependence on psychology is essential and that, instead of having too much psychology, we have too little.

Here I want to illustrate briefly my reasons for emphasising the importance of psychology.

If at the heart of faith is relationship with God, then all we know about relationship springs from our human experiences. Psychology teaches us about the infant's basis of forming attachments which form the infrastructure of all adult relationships. Relationship depends on commitment, which in turn relates to the sustaining, attenuation, reinforcing, loss of links with others, which are all psychologically determined. Within an attachment we experience trust, affirmation, acceptance, rejection, conflict, forgiveness, reconciliation, which result in fluctuations of relationship, and are all dominated by psychological components.

In the world of Sacraments, I will focus on three—the Eucharist, Marriage and Reconciliation. The Eucharist is the re-enactment of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. It is the central Sacrament. In order to let it accomplish its Sacramental effect, we need to identify with the person of Jesus Christ and internalise his life. No source has given us greater insights into the processes of identification and internalisation than dynamic psychology.

With regard to the neglected Sacrament of Marriage through which the overwhelming majority of Christians experience the transcendental, God and the sacred, its components of falling in love, loving, with its sustaining, healing and growth, and sexual love are full of psychological processes.

As far as Reconciliation is concerned, I would start by commenting that the dramatic reduction of confession can only be understood in psychological terms, but at the centre of this Sacrament is to be found guilt and metanoia. Metanoia is a process of change of heart, a complex phenomenon in which motivation, unlearning faulty patterns of behaviour, learning new ones and receiving the hope of sustaining change, are essential components which are steeped in psychology. Preaching the word of God is communicating the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ as we have received it in the Scriptures and tradition. Such a commentary depends on appreciating both the divine and the human personality of the second person of the Trinity. The life of Jesus is full of psychological incidents, some of which I have tried to show in my book *The Capacity to Love* (Darton Longman & Todd).

Finally, the life of prayer is a continuous dialoguing relationship with God. This is essentially a psychological process, and the more we know about psychology the deeper will our insights into prayer become.

It may well be asked, if psychology is so important how have we managed up to now? The answer is that all along we have been psychologising at the level of what was known and understood in various epochs. In the last 100 years psychology is unravelling human experiences which have remained profound mysteries up to now.

It is my contention that psychology must become to theology what philosophy has been in the past, and that the current neglect of this subject in the seminaries and life of the Church is an important contribution in the demise of the practice of faith.

**J. Dominian
Pefka, off Parrotts Close,
Croxley Green, Rickmansworth, Herts.**

Michael Doyle's article 'The Psychologization of the Church' raises some important questions about the relationship of the Church to the disciplines that come under the general heading of 'psychology'.

It is clear that Michael Doyle realizes that Jack Dominian is a psychiatrist (i.e. a doctor who has specialized in the treatment of 'mental illness') but less clear as to whether he realizes that Dominian is not a psychologist (i.e. a person who has a basic degree in psychology as an empirical discipline, plus certain further training in a particular applied discipline e.g. clinical psychology).

Psychiatrists and clinical psychologists must also be distinguished from most practitioners of 'psychodynamic psychology', whose tenets stem from the theories and practice of psychoanalysis. No-one can practice as a 'psychoanalyst' of any school without a personal analysis, so while some psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, and priests may be qualified psychoanalysts the presumption cannot be that they do have such qualifications.

Sullivan's focus on 'self-esteem' in the book reviewed by Dominian which started this discussion indicates that he may be interested in a variable that is of importance both within psychoanalytic theory and in the field of personality and social psychology (see the recent discussion on the effectiveness of psychotherapy by Ian Howarth and David Shapiro in *The Psychologist* vol. 2 no. 4, April 1989, pp. 149—154).

Doyle argues that Dominian is offering a reductionist account of 'sin' and a commercial for 'psychologists'. My purpose is only to indicate that there are psychologists and psychologists and that not all psychologists interested in the relationship of psychology and religion are involved in the enterprise of 'psychologisation'. Many practising psychologists are as critical of the disciplines of applied psychology e.g. psychotherapy as Doyle himself. Witness the reference to the clinical psychologist David Smail in the same issue of *New Blackfriars* by Nicholas Harvey, which mentions Smail's comparison of his own profession of psychotherapy to that of prostitution.

It would be interesting to know to whom Doyle is referring in his last paragraph. Many Catholic (and non-Catholic) psychologists of various orientations would have some sympathy with a modified version of his thesis. They would hope also that he would accept that psychology is an umbrella term covering a great many types of enquiry and activity and that there is a difference between good and bad psychology.

Emma Shackle
tutor in psychology, Plater College, Oxford
lecturer in psychology, Allen Hall, London SW3 5AA