

[NOTE: This is the only thinksheet in double-space, a stricture severe upon me and, no doubt, enjoyed by my reader.]

1. One root of the pastor's present typical inferiority-feeling vis-a-vis the secular counseling profession(s) is the notion that the latter has more "scientific" grounding. This feeling is a neurosis itself, iatrogenic by indirection--i.e., our competition sickens us only in the sense that we go asthenic just at the thought of our competition and its comparative therapy-resources! Numerous factors are reducing this temptation.

2. Are you an encyclofreak? Me, I hit the dictionaries and encyclopedias before the "books" or even the articles (i.e., periodical in contrast to encyclopedic). One set I "hit" and underline often is the 8-vol. (in 4 bindings) THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PHILOSOPHY (Mac/67-72). This thinksheet surveys it for the boundary between theology and psychotherapy. (Other possibilities; encyclopedias of theology, psychology-psychiatry, sociology--sometimes mis-nomered "dictionaries.")

1.198-207: AUGUSTINE. The first "psychologist"? Comprehensive of his past.

1.409-411: BUBER. Possible counseling foci: "You/It" (my term for centering in the counselee), "I/It" (centering in the counselor, who observes the counselee as part of the world, and reflects in both senses, whether or not judges), "I/Thou" (centering between counselor and counselee: the involved, engaged, participant style of counseling, with two vertical betweenesses [God/counselee and God/counselor] added to the horizontal betweenness: ideally, a triangular mutuality of Thouness). [Only God, the eternal Thou, cannot be reduced to It, i.e. the situation in which I am no longer being addressed either because of mystical union or because of personal rejection of God by me. If then the situation is as though prayer were possible but not theology, in the counseling situation conversation is possible but not therapy. In both cases, modesty should overcome the hypertrophy of arrogance as well as the hypotrophy of timidity.]

4.294-296: JUNG. His "collective unconscious" has the same standing as the existence of G: logically unprovable, ontologically probable, existentially confirmable. Cp. 2.147-155 ["Common Consent Arguments for the Existence of God"] and 6.407-410 ["Popular Arguments for the Existence of God"]--both, atheist. Also, 7.148-150 ["Religion, Psychological Explanations of": a form of (Freud) or an alternative to (Jung) neurosis].

6.13-15: OTTO. Like Wm. James, importance of the feeling/irrational elements.

3. Metaphysics is open, not scientifically or theologically determinate: "no [incontrovertible] answers to the problem of causation or the mind-body problem" ("Introduction," 1.x). Theoretically, infinite regress/hypothesis; but practically, commitment: acceptance of some value judgment as not based on another (i.e., as terminal). And reversibility of argument. *

*Reversing propositions will often prove the confusion of similarity with identity: a dog is indeed an animal, but not all animals are dogs (+ the principle of nonexhaustion: a dog is not "nothing but" an animal). Try applying to Freud's God-as-projection (which can be reversed also as that God provides a psychological mechanism that both makes possible and promotes the God-belief). See also on the unprovability of God's existence: God gives freedom from entrapment in the God-belief, so trust and love can become mature.