Psychology of Religion and the Coordination of Two or More Views: From William James to Present-Day Approaches (Part II)

K. Helmut Reich, University of Fribourg (Switzerland) and Senior University, Evanston (W), USA and Richmond (B.C., Canada)

William James Award Address at the 105th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association August 10, 1997 Chicago, Illinois

(Editors Note: The first half of Dr. Reich's talk appeared in the Winter '98 Division 36 Newsletter)

Relational and Contextual (Complementarist) Reasoning

A ten-year study (Oser & Reich, 1987; Reich, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1995a, b, 1996a) has revealed the existence of a specific form of reasoning used for the description or explanation of a particular phenomenon in terms of at least two "competing theories". Historical examples of such theories are the wave theory, A, and the particle theory, B, of light, or the nature theory, A, and the nurture theory, B, of human performances, a current example is the description of fear in terms of introspection, A, body language, B, and physiological variables, C. In the course of our research it became clear that the central characteristics of the reasoning we are discussing concern (1) relationships between (a) A, B, C, ... and the explanandum, and (b) between themselves, and (2) context dependencies of the explanatory potential of A, B, C, ... For instance, during a conversation or a game of chess primarily the mind characterizes human activity, during dancing or singing the body. Hence, the preferred label is now Relational and Contextual Reasoning (RCR).

As to the developmental logic of RCR (e.g., Reich, 1995a, b, 1996a), the characteristics of the five levels in the development of RCR are very briefly as follows (Table 2). From a single-aspect view at level I, a person using RCR gets a second (third) aspect tentatively into view at level II, the need for A, B (and C) is recognized at level III, the various (intrinsic) relations are grasped at level IV and the context dependence (dim) noted, with an overarching synopsis or even theory falling into place at level V. According to Jean Piaget and Rolando Garcia (1983), such a "developmental logic" (intra-inter-trans) is evident both in the history of science and in ontogenesis. Just a culture or a growing-up person discovers one aspect or explanation of a complex "system" (intra, partial aspects), then tentatively another (inter, partial aspects), next there are attempts to bring them together (trans-inter), and finally the entire system is understood and explained (trans-trans). (Ed. note: See Table 2.)

As may already have become apparent, RCR is not a simple form of thought, but rather a composite pragmatic reasoning scheme. In order to understand the importance of RCR for religious development, two of its components need discussing, grades of cognitive complexity, and thinking in other logics than formal (binary) logic.

The cognitive complexity of one's inferring thinking/reasoning is usually measured in terms of differentiation (discernment and use of differing categories for distinguishing and assessing various aspects) and integration (establishment of various connections aimed at achieving a balanced (Continued on page 2)
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overall view and assessment). On a seven grade scale (Baker-Brown et al., 1992) grade I means no differentiation and no integration, a lower middle level differentiation but no integration, a higher middle level good differentiation and some integration, and at a high level both differentiation and integration are mastered. The original work on grades of cognitive complexity was done within the psychology of information processing (Schroder, Driver, & Streufert, 1967); however, Reich (1995a) and Rollitt and Kamminga (1996) could show empirically that these grades also form a developmental sequence.

Their developmental logic is in line with the “intra-inter-trans-schema” of Piaget and Garcia (1983/1989) indicated above.

A further central feature of RCR has to do with understanding (at least intuitively) the limitations of traditional logic. Formal (binary) logic derives mainly from an analysis of arithmetical sentences. That creates a problem for everyday use, because arithmetic is an unusual domain of discourse; among other things, the objects coming into play are “eternal and unchanging, and all their properties are necessary ones” (Machamer, 1994, p. 150). In ordinary discourse, and equally in religious discourse, changes, indeterminate states, and contingency (in the Aristotelian sense of “not necessarily so”) need to be dealt with. For that a different type of logic is needed, in particular a context-sensitive, trivalent logic (Reich 1990, 1995a). In a culture which is heavily impregnated with traditional binary logic, it takes development to arrive at a reasoned statement like “It is not logical, but it is factually true.”

The Logic of Religious Development and of Development of RCR

What is the connection between RCR and reaching the higher stages of faith development according to Fowler (1981; 1987) and of religious judgment according to Oser-Grohnder (1991)? Fowler epitomizes explicitly the form of logic involved at each stage. Here we are concerned with his fifth stage, Conjugate Faith. Given the complexity of the argument, I begin by quoting Fowler somewhat at length:

In the transition to Conjugate faith one begins to make peace with the tension arising from the fact that truth must be approached from a number of different directions and angles of vision. As part of honoring truth, faith must maintain the tensions between these multiple perspectives and refuse to collapse them into one direction or another. In this respect, faith begins to come to terms with dialectical dimensions of experience and with apparent paradoxes: God is both immanent and transcendent; God is both an omnipotent and a self-limiting God; God is sovereign and free; God is the master and the servant. In physics, in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of RCR</th>
<th>Core characteristic of level</th>
<th>Stage according to Piaget &amp; Garcia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>A or B (or C)</td>
<td>intra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>A, but also B (C)</td>
<td>inter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>A and B (and C)</td>
<td>trans-intra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Logic of and</td>
<td>trans-inter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Synopsis, context</td>
<td>trans-trans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Source references may be found in text.)
order to account for the behavior of light, two incompatible and unintegrable models must be employed—one based on the analogy with packets of energy, and the other upon the analogy with wavelike motions somewhat as in sound. Similarly, many truthful theological insights and models involve holding together in dialectical tension the coincidence of opposites (Fowler, 1987, p. 72).

If Fowler had not brought in "dialectical" (twice) and Nicholas of Cusa (at the end), would this not be a perfect intimation of RCR in the light of the foregoing? So, is fully dialectical thought or RCR involved in Conjointive Faith, keeping in mind that RCR contains some elements of dialectical thought (Reich, 1996a, pp. 131-155), and that in particular the dialectics of assimilation and accommodation brings (religious) cognition up to that level? To my knowledge, there exist no direct data to settle that issue. However, in Birgitta Rollett and Gertrud Kiblinger's (1996, p. 105) assessment of the stage of religious judgment and the grade of cognitive complexity of over 1,000 adolescents attending various schools in grades 8 and 9, the rank correlation (Spearman) between those two sets of scores was r_s = .54, a moderately high value. Reich (1995a, p. 13) found a correlation of .68 between RCR levels and grades of cognitive complexity. Thus, there are at least indications that RCR plays a role in religious judgment. Why should not similarly the case in faith stages? Theoretically, one can argue in favor of RCR to the effect that RCR does not "maintain a dialectical tension" (as claimed above erroneously?) by Fowler as a characteristic of Conjunctive Faith) but (a) always relates the particular perspective or dimension to the explication and (b) relativizes it to a particular context. That would explain, for instance, a functional differentiation of religious metaphors: The omnipotent God has brought the universe into existence, the self-limiting God suffers with the tortured inmates of Auschwitz, but does not stop the torturing. Obviously, more work is needed to settle the issues but I interpret the few data available in favor of RCR over pure dialectics at least as far as Conjunctive Faith is concerned.

The practical importance of knowing which kind of thought is involved relates to its stimulation in religious education (Reich, 1996a).

A variant of the above developmental logic (Table 2) applies to human relationships with an Ultimate Being according to Oser/Guttinder (1991). The sequence then is as follows: At stage 1, all power is with God ("The Ultimate Being's will must always be fulfilled" — A). At stage 2, some power goes to the individual ("An individual can influence the Ultimate Being" — A and some B). At stage 3, practically all power goes to the individual ("Freedom, meaning, and hope are linked to one's own decisions" — B). At stage 4, some power goes back to God ("The Ultimate Being becomes the condition for the possibility of human freedom, independence, etc." — B and some A), and at stage 5 equilibrium is reached ("Transcendence and immanence interact completely" — A and B). Thus, the stage progression is not "linear", but "dialectical" (cf. Steiner, 1986, for a "parallel" case).

RCR and Certain Religious Teachings

So far we have discussed issues focused on religious vs. nonreligious explanations and in particular potential benefits of RCR for coordinating across-domain explanations, as well as its role in religious development. But RCR can also help to understand certain religious teachings as opposed to simply believe them. Here I make a difference between the more general religious issues referred to above, and specific teachings like those of Christian churches. Take the three personae of the Trinity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, who are declared to be one God.

As indicated, high-level RCR involves an understanding of the limited applicability of formal logic, and the concomitant insight into a possible context-dependency of the explanatory potential of partial aspects. In the interviews, I also explored (on a voluntary basis) what participants thought about the Doctrine of the Trinity. I found a clear correlation between RCR levels and response levels to the Trinity issue (Reich, 1994). Whereas respondents (Continued on page 4)
arguing the nonreligious cases at lower RCR levels were of the opinion that the Doctrine of the Trinity could not be understood, respondents arguing at higher RCR levels said things like, “Depending on the problem, we each time address ourselves to another person like the Creator, to the Mediator, or to Sophial” — RCR level IV, “Our mind can’t seize up God as creator in his entire dimension. But our mind grasps certain aspects, God, the wholly Other, if he wants to reveal himself to us, then he must do this in a manner that we can understand. Moreover, the formulation of the doctrine matches our capacity of mental reception” — level VII; “The Trinity somehow combines the human longing for community with longing for individuality” — level VII). Similar observations apply to the Chalcedonian Definition (the two natures of Christ) and the Theodicy (How can an all-powerful, all-knowing, loving God tolerate evil?) (Reich, 1990, 1991, 1991). The context-dependency of the respective explanatory potential and the internal links between the partial explanations were explicated in a differentiated and integrated manner by those participants who argued the nonreligious issues at level IV or higher.

**Concluding Remarks**

After many battles between science and theology in general, and “believing” and “nonbelieving” psychologists in particular, the times seem ripe for more plurality and dialogue as striving for by William James. The inclusive relational perspective underlying RCR supports such moves. RCR opens a window through which even various language games can be observed and understood, at least partially. The logic of RCR encourages one to attempt a synopsis of aspects seemingly unrelated prior to such an effort. More specifically, the theory of RCR explains certain features of a person’s evolving worldview and of religious development. Teachers can attempt to stimulate students’ RCR in order to enable them to understand better certain religious doctrines.

In closing, I would like to express my gratitude for having been honored by the William James award and for having been given the opportunity to present my work organically. Thank you.


Durston, 1971 (to which the page numbers indicated here refer).
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For the Office of President

PETER C. HILL

Peter C. Hill has his doctorate in Social Psychology from the University of Houston (1979), and is Professor and Chair in the Department of Psychology, Grove City (PA) College. He has served Division 36 as Chair of the Continuing Education Committee (1989–93), Newsletter Editor (1993–97), and is currently Chair of the Awards Committee. He is a Fellow of the APA (Div. 36) and is Editor of the *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*. He has over 50 published articles and conference presentations related to the psychology of religion. He is co-editor (with Ralph Hood) of *Measures of Religiosity* (due out Fall, 1998); and (with David Berner) *Baker Encyclopedia of Psychology and Counseling*, 2nd ed. (1998). He is the 1998 recipient of the Father Bier Award presented by Division 36.

With the upsurge of interest in spirituality and religion, this is an exciting but crucial time in the history of Division 36. If elected, I will do my best to continue the Division 36 tradition of reinvigorating our profession and society as a whole of the significance of the spiritual dimension in psychological makeup.

ROBERT J. LOVINGER

Robert Lovinger is a clinical psychologist and professor emeritus at Central Michigan University. He is on the Division 36 Task Force on Religious Issues in Graduate Education and Clinical Training, and is a member-at-large of the Board of Directors. As well, along with Edward Shafranske and Shang-yang Tan, he has led several Continuing Education workshops for APAs on religious factors in clinical work. He is the author of *Working with Religious Issues in Therapy and Religion and Counseling* as well as several journal articles. Lovinger is a Fellow of Division 36 and an ABPP Diplomate.

I think it is important to continue to develop connections with other divisions, to foster both professional awareness and scientific inquiry. With the increasingly favorable attention religious factors are receiving in the professional literature and popular media, this is a propitious time. As well, the work of the Task Force is important and I hope to further its impact on graduate education. Along with this, I think it is important to try to increase student awareness of the Division and to foster student membership for long-term growth of the Division.

For the Office of Treasurer

RODNEY L. BASSETT

There are several times during my life when I can count on experiencing moments of reflection. Typically, one of those times is when I write a check for my APA membership.

(Continued on page 8)
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dues. As I fall in the steady increasing amount, I ask myself why I continue to be a member of APA. Consistently, the answer is that I enjoy being a part of Division 36. I find Division 36 activities intrinsically interesting and rewarding and attend their presentations at the APA annual meetings because the topics typically interest me and cause me to grow professionally. Serving as Treasurer for Division 36 would be one way for me to say "thank you" for the comradeship and intellectual stimulation I have received from members of Division 36. My academic training is in the area of social psychology, and I teach at a religiously oriented liberal arts college. My research interests continue to be in the psychology of religion with a current emphasis upon religiousness and sexual attitudes, emotions and religious experience, and the assessment of religiousness. I would be pleased to serve as the Treasurer for Division 36.

DONNA GOETZ

I would like to serve as treasurer of Division 36. I have been an active member of the Division since 1992. I served as Co-Chair of the Hospitality Suite in 1997 and am the Chair of the Hospitality Suite Program in 1998. When I attend APA conventions, I consider Division 36, "my home away from home."

I am an Associate Professor at Elmhurst College, a liberal arts college, affiliated with the United Church of Christ. I teach Adult Development and Aging, Mysticism, Psychology of Women, and History of Psychology. I have taught with theology professors five times. My first contact with Division 36 was when I presented "Carl Jung and Taizhàr de Chardin: The Childhood Development of Two Visionaries" in the Hospitality Suite program. Since then, I have presented on topics of the development of the image of God in young girls and gender differences in leadership. I will present on a panel for Division 36 this August and I will also chair a panel on the topic of religious development in childhood and adolescence. I have also submitted a paper for Division 35 on "Women Doctors of the Roman Catholic Church." For August 1998.

For the Office of Member-at-Large

CRYSTAL PARK

I first discovered the Psychology of Religion when I began my graduate studies in clinical psychology in 1986, and I have been actively researching and publishing in this area ever since. My current interests are in various aspects of religiousness in the stress and coping process, particularly in how religiousness influences people's meaning making and adjustment following stressful life events. I feel strongly that religion, broadly defined, is a crucial aspect of the human experience, and I would like to see our division continue to take the lead in exploring and promoting the psychology of religion. I also think that, as a division, it is important that we encourage the use of a variety of approaches and perspectives. Last year I was Program Chair for our division, and I enjoyed working closely with many different people and ideas in the service of promoting Division 36. I would like to continue serving our division by being Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee.
LEE J. RICHMOND

If elected, I will serve the Division with vigor. My qualifications for office are as follows. For the past 10 years, I have worked with the division, presenting programs at every APA Convention, serving as program chair in 1996, and also as a member of the Board of Directors. Recently, I have been the president of a 60,000 member organization (ACA), have completed and have published two books on the subject of religion and career development. A professor who also works in private practice, I have won an award for excellence in teaching from the Maryland State Psychological Association.

For the Office of Council Representative

STANTON L. JONES

I have been both a faculty member of Wheaton College and a member of Division 36 since I finished my Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology in 1981. My interests over the years have tended to focus on two areas: 1) the examination of how religious beliefs and practices of both clients and psychologists influence our understanding of and delivery of psychological services; and 2) the examination of the meta-theoretical issues which are involved in work at the interface of religion and science (it was this latter work that resulted in my 1994 American Psychologist article). I am now Provost of Wheaton College. I have served the Division as Membership Chair and Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee. Were I elected to serve as Council Representative for the Division, it would be my goal to fairly represent the membership of the Division on all issues, but to be especially attentive to matters relating to the role of religious variables in professional training and service delivery as well as in teaching and research, and also to the role of religion in individual and family life, and in American and world culture.

MARY E. REUER

Mary E. Reuder, Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, M.A., Brown University, B.A., College of St. Catherine; Professor Emerita and past Chair, Psychology Department, Queens College of CUNY; Fellow, APA Divisions 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, 15, 20, 24, 26, 32; Charter member PIRL, President (1979–80), Council Representative (1979–82, 1991–97), Executive Committee, Fellows Committee, Elections Committee. In Division 1, served as President (1986–88), Executive Committee, Fellows Committee (Chair), By-Laws Committee and Elections Committee, Division 52 Fellows Chair (1997–99). Fellow, New York Academy of Science; past member, national Board of Directors of Sigma Xi (1972–75, 1977).

I believe it is important that all aspects of the psychology of religion be represented on Council. Our senior representative is a strong representative of the clinical theoretical aspect. My background would help to reinforce the science-research aspect. I also believe that it is important for Division 36 to be heard as a supporter of all efforts to ameliorate past divisiveness and to strengthen the direct impact of divisions on the government structure.
In God's Shadow: The Collaboration of Victor White and C.G. Jung


Lammers' book is part of the Jung and spirituality series edited by Robert Moore. Unlike Freud, Jung hoped to synthesize his ideas with religious teachings and imagery. Victor White, a Dominican priest/scholar, shared Jung's hopes. This volume presents the story of the attempted synthesis of Jung's ideas with the Roman Catholic teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas by Victor White, Professor of Dogmatic Theology at Blackfriars, Oxford, England. The relationship between Jung and White spanned some 16 years, from 1945 until White's death at the age of 58 in 1969.

The attempted synthesis was not completed. White believed that God exists and acts outside the psyche and that something of God can be known through revelation and logic. Jung, on the other hand, believed that one can know nothing of the metaphysical God, but could only know and study the god image on a strictly intrapsychic basis.

The first contact between the two was made by White, who wrote to Jung in August of 1945. He sought out Jung because he felt that Jung's work was closer to the theology of Aquinas than Freud's or Adler's. He hoped to create, with Jung's help, a modern Thomistic synthesis, so that the true meaning of Christian faith might be better conveyed to the modern mind. Jung happened, at the same time, to be looking for a reputable Roman Catholic theologian with a grasp of psychology who could work with him to redefine his interpretations of Catholicism. Jung was delighted to find such a person in White.

Their relationship went relatively well for eight years. This was followed by disagreements, misunderstandings, and frustrations, with mutual hostility during 1954-1955 and a four-year, all but complete, break between 1956 and 1959. Finally, just before, White's death there was a personal and emotional (although not intellectual) reconciliation.

After a period of mutual praise and some exchanging of advice on personal matters, White wrote a review of Answer to Job in 1955 in which he criticized both the book and its author. "Even an instructed Christian may expect an explosion when an adult whose religious development has become fixed at the kindergarten level... becomes confronted with the realities of life, of the ways of God, both in the Bible and in contemporary events. The only reaction is that of a spoiled child." In turn, Jung replied that "what Victor White writes about the assimilation of the shadow is not to be taken seriously. Being a Catholic priest, he is bound, hand and foot, to the doctrine of his church and has to defend every syllogism."

Between 1955 and 1956, White wrote to Jung a few times, but received no direct answers. Upon hearing in 1959 that White had been seriously injured, Jung contacted him. White replied with an appreciative letter. Jung wrote back to White implying that their differences needed to be explored if the friendship was to be continued. White, who had in the meantime been diagnosed as having cancer, responded to Jung with a long letter. It was written as if there had never been a serious disagreement between them.

During White's final days, Jung used more personal hand-written letters and said he would come to England to see White if only his health would allow it. (Jung died the next year.) He assured White of his friendship, apologized for being a "petra scandalis," and expressed his gratitude for all that he had learned. Earlier White had apologized for his antagonistic review of the Job book. In his last letter, he wrote: "Do not know if it is true that you have been a "petra scandalis" to me... but to the extent that you may have been, I think that I can honestly say that I am grateful for it."

The volume also includes an account of White's conflicts with is superiors in the church, a report on and selections from eulogies at Jung's funeral, and more.
I highly recommend Lammers' book to anyone interested in the philosophical underpinnings of Jungian psychology and of Thomistic and related philosophies. I also recommend it to anyone interested in one of the human interest stories surrounding the analytical movement in psychology.

—Reviewed by Carl E. Begley

Religion, society, and psychoanalysis: Readings in contemporary theory.

Any time religion, society, and psychoanalysis are considered together, the usual approach in psychoanalytic circles is to treat societal functions, including religion, as the outworkings of intrapsychic and unconscious processes. One strength of this edited volume is that it reorganizes the usual order of things, viewing psychoanalytic theory as a product of specific sociocultural and religious contexts. A second strength is the breadth of religious experience addressed, including Jewish mysticism, Protestant fundamentalism, new religious seekers, and Zen Buddhism, among others.

The subtitle, "Readings in Contemporary Theory," applied more to readings in contemporary theories on the relation between texts and interpretive communities than to readings in contemporary psychoanalysis. Although the collection of essays addresses classical drive theory, ego psychology, object relations, self psychology, and Lacanian analysis, the article contents stop at about 1980 with developments in psychoanalysis in the United States. Relational psychoanalysis, intersubjectivity theory, and the implications of infant research for adult psychoanalytic treatment—developments which have dominated American psychoanalytic theory for the past 15 years or so—are virtually unaddressed in the present volume.

The essays stand on their own merits, however, and display valuable and provocative scholarship. Two examples of this are Patricia Davis' Kleinian interpretation of Dobson's view of motherhood and Ralph Hood Jr.'s description of parallels between feminist critiques of Freud's abandonment of the seduction theory and fundamentalists' Realist epistemologies for religion.

Most of the contributors are full-time academicians writing about psychoanalysis and the volume probably will appeal most to readers whose primary affiliation is with academia. For others who see themselves primarily as clinicians, a useful complement is the 1997 volume edited by C. Spezzano and G. Gurguilo, Soli on the Couch (Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press).

—Reviewed by Randall Lehmman Sorenson
The Spring Newsletter contains the second half of Helmut Reich's William James Award Address. Since publication of the Winter Newsletter, Dr. Reich was informed of a change in one of his pending publications he referenced in the first half of the address, found in the Winter 1998 Newsletter. On page 4, he references Oser and Reich, 1997. Dr. Reich has since learned that the article was actually published in the 1998 volume of the journal. Thus, if you consult his reference list in the Spring Newsletter, you will find Oser and Reich (1996).

Division 36 is interested in continuing to have four Newsletters per year. After the Fall Newsletter, which will contain the Division 36 Presidential Address as the lead article, the major article for two of the next three issues is not finalized. I encourage you to send articles that you believe are appropriate for publication in the newsletter.