Love's Labors Lost – And Found?
Reality, Reason, and Religion
Finiteness, Fallibility, and Faith
Philosophy, Psychology, and Principles
Liturgy, Loss, and Love

Some Preliminary Context

In his book, *Servant Leadership*, Greenleaf (1977) asked, "In saying what I have in mind, will I really improve on the silence?" In today's culture of Facebook, Twitter, and all the other social media through which people reveal all sorts of trivial and personal matters to the rest of the human race, that question seems more relevant than ever. Thus, in preparing for these presentations, I have tried to select ideas which might not only "improve on the silence" but which also might help us regain what "love's labors lost". When we are finished, you will have to decide if I was successful.

Since the 1950's, psychology, science, and technology have made almost unimaginable advances. Because we **loved** ourselves and others, i.e., wanted what was good for ourselves and others, we applied our knowledge of the advances in the various areas to promote what we considered to be that good. Those applications, thus, were **love's labors**. However, somehow those labors have not produced the desired results. As the daily news provides copious evidence, we still have many problems, possibly even more than before the advances. So why are there still so many problems? How did all those labors of love get **lost**? Are there some ways we can make love's labors found? The ideas to be addressed are some which seem to be especially relevant and helpful to maintaining our humanity, our sanity, and our spiritual health, i.e., our good, in the present society and world – in other words, ways to find the desired outcomes which "love's labors lost." A first idea might be to think about **what is really good for us and others to make sure we are promoting what is good and not what is harmful**. To do that, we need to begin with what it means to be human in the universe.

What Does It Mean to Be Human in the Universe – Or Has It Become the "I-niverse"?

For centuries, even millennia, we humans have looked to religion, and later philosophy, to help us answer our basic question about ourselves and the universe we inhabit. Still later, science developed into a third resource for the purpose. In the latter part of the 20th century, Western culture, with its scientific and technological achievements, became so enamored with science that some began to **assume** that science was the only source of explanation for everything. About the same time, Carl Rogers proposed the concept of unconditional positive regard which came to be widely accepted as essential for humans to function well psychologically. Because his focus was on psychotherapy, his findings led to emphasis on the individual to a great extent. B.F. Skinner attempted to be more scientific and developed the process of operant conditioning based on the principle that behavior which is rewarded/reinforced tends to increase in frequency. However, misinterpretation and/or misapplication of some scientific and psychological ideas led many, not just to assume, but to **behave** as if science or the individual provide the only explanation for everything – the beginning of the "I-niverse" perhaps. That there was correlative increase in various individual and social problems tended to be ignored as possibly being related to the reduced emphasis on religion and philosophy and the pervading societal faith in science and the individual. Note that, even in science, **any effect is likely to have multiple causes**; thus, assuming that there is only one cause has a good likelihood of being inadequate or incorrect. Whatever our errors, however, reality has a way of asserting itself, and in the light of some of the realities reported daily in the news media, it may be useful to consider some potential relations among a few ideas which may have fallen

out of favor, but which may be relevant.

When something we dislike happens to us, we often ask, "Why me?" When we become more mature and realize just how many good things have happened to us and how many much worse things have happened to others, and could have happened to us, we also occasionally ask, "Why me?" with the opposite meaning – "Why have I been so blessed when I have done so little to deserve all those good things?" – or put in Scriptural terms, "What is man that you should be mindful of him, or the son of man that you should care for him?" (Ps. 8:5). Whether it be because of negative or positive experiences, **we ask *why* because we are *aware of reality* and we *can reason***. Indeed, according to the philosophers, what makes us humans different from other animals is that we are rational, at least potentially. Philosophy also examines how we reason correctly, and addresses why when we do so incorrectly. As noted earlier, until relatively recently when it became somewhat unpopular to do so, we humans often looked to **religion** for some answers and explanations for our experiences.

One reality of which we are aware almost immediately is that we are limited. One of our basic characteristics is **finiteness**. That characteristic is closely linked to another, **fallibility,** we make mistakes. However much we may try to ignore both our finiteness and our fallibility, their reality keep impinging on us. Being finite and fallible makes us need **faith**, and this on both the natural and supernatural levels. We need faith in ourselves and our environment, especially other people in that environment. Further, we need faith in a transcendent God which is the basis for religion.

Despite our finiteness and fallibility, or perhaps because of them, we seem drawn to what transcends us. In the Genesis story, in addition to the attractiveness of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, the serpent tells Eve that, if she eats the fruit, "You will be like gods" (Gen. 3:5), and that seems to be a perduring quest in human experience. After our original attempt failed, we humans have continued attempting to transcend our finiteness and fallibility. Also, we have developed a number of ways to try to understand and organize how we relate to the transcendent. As already noted, religion is a basic way to relate to the infinite and transcendent. Philosophy and psychology, notably scientific psychology, are other ways we try to make sense of the realities we encounter. While **philosophy** focuses on the rational aspect of our nature, **psychology** tends to focus on our attitudes and perceptions, as well as aspects we share with other animals, our emotions and social interactions. Further, study in philosophy, psychology, and science has discovered certain **principles** which describe our activities and regular relations among them. These principles enable us to predict and understand ourselves and the rest of reality better.

A very important experience and activity of humans is **love,** and a universal human experience is **loss**. Another less obvious human activity is **liturgy** in the sense that essentially every human and human group have some experience of transcendent power in relation to ourselves, perhaps based on our very finiteness and the immensity of our environment both terrestrial and celestial. Human attempts to relate to that transcendent power result in religion and liturgy.

By considering these ideas, which originally may seem merely random thoughts, we may become aware of some relations among them, and knowing such relations, we may be able to apply some of the ideas and principles to our lives, both natural and supernatural, so that we can improve ourselves and our environment; thus, we may regain what "love's labors lost".

Reality, Reason, and Religion

One **reality** is that**,** by nature, **we are both animal and rational**, **material and non-material**. The animal aspects of our nature mean that we are naturally going to be aware of things; the rational aspects lead

us to ask why things happen, and enable us to be aware of ourselves thinking about such things. Thus, by our very nature we seem to look for relations between/among things, especially for the relations between the effects we observe and their causes. Our seeking the causes for the effects we observe leads us directly to **religion,** though that viewpoint is not popular in contemporary secular culture. Nonetheless, we do observe effects and seek to reason to their causes. An example of that is a TV series, *What on Earth?*, on the Science channel. The individual segments show satellite images of various areas of the globe, and scientists attempt to ascertain what the item is and what caused it. One such segment showed a large black area in the Gulf of Mexico off the west coast of Florida. On viewing the image, one scientist made the typically human remark, "Someone must have put it there!" He recognized that the effect must have a cause and hypothesized that "someone" was that cause. Scripture also attests to the same tendency: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament proclaims His handiwork. Day pours out the word to day, and night to night imparts knowledge." (Ps. 19:2-3). By observing our environment and realizing that we did not create it, we rational animals are led to reason that its Cause is a Being Who transcends us, God. And reasoning about God can lead us to want to be joined with Him. Religion, etymologically, means to tie again, *re-ligare*. Note that the Gospel, the "good news", is that God became man to enable us to succeed in being reconnected to Him, thus fulfilling our basic desire since Eden. Thus, **reason and religion are not in opposition but are intimately related, and both are based on our observations of reality**.

Many relations which thoughtful humans have discovered are principles which we can use to improve our understanding of reality and our place in it. Philosophers, psychologists, and scientists have organized much of this information into various systematic forms. Nonetheless, some of our observations may lead us to question the philosophers' conclusion that we are rational animals. When we listen to the daily newscasts, read the news in the daily papers, or even observe our own behavior on many occasions, it seems that a lot of what we humans do is clearly not rational. Driving drunk or drug-impaired, eating ourselves into obesity, spending money we don't have on things we don't need, confusing needs with wants, killing one another because one cut off another in traffic – these are not rational ways of behaving. Thus, if we apply the scientific method and look at the data, there seem to be a large amount of data which indicate that humans are not rational animals. Fortunately, studying science also leads to discovery of other regularities and principles. More on principles later.

The scientific, statistical data which lead us to question our rationality also seem supported from a religious viewpoint. When we read the Bible and/or hear explanations of its contents by religious experts of various sorts, we hear that we are made in the image of God, that He is the Supreme Being, omniscient, almighty, all-loving, and perfect in every way. Yet the Scriptures and the experts also tell us that God has done things which don't seem *to us* to be rational or very loving. For example, though He created them, gave them a paradise as their home, and provided instructions how to behave in order to be happy, He also allowed Adam and Eve to sin and drove them out of Eden. Later, He even allowed their descendents to sin so much that He sent the Deluge to destroy most of them. Yet, He preserved those who did His will and forgave others who repented of their sins. Indeed, the Father sent His Son to take our human nature and even be crucified for us, and then He even forgave those who did so from His Cross. As the king in the musical, *The King and I*, noted: "Is a puzzlement."

Finiteness, Fallibility, and Faith

Finiteness is **s**omething which we humans tend to ignore and even try to overcome, yet it may provide a key to the puzzle of our lack of rationality, and **faith** provides another. Most of our problems as humans seem to stem from our attempts to reject our finiteness – despite the overwhelming evidence for it – and pretend that we are infinite, God's equal or better. To counter that erroneous viewpoint, we can use the supernatural means of prayer for increased faith and a stronger practice of the virtue of religion. It might also be useful

to employ some natural means. For example, we can look at one of the items on the Internet titled, *Powers of 10,* and use our power of reason to begin to understand its ramifications for us. One of the presentations begins with a photograph of a leaf on a shrub in Florida taken from one meter away. The next photo is taken from 10 meters, the next from 100, and so on to about 10^{16}. In that final photo, most of the screen is black with tiny white dots representing whole galaxies, and there is a small red rectangle around one of the fainter dots, our Milky Way, a relatively insignificant galaxy in contrast with many others. When we see these images and realize that we are just a single person on a small planet orbiting a minor star in a relatively tiny galaxy, we just might begin to realize what human **finiteness** means, and we also might begin to realize that, to quote our scientist again, "Someone must have put it there!" Someone Who is infinite was needed to create it all. Indeed, the scientific assumption that everything is due to chance is also a statement of faith. Hence the importance of **faith** in making sense of our experiences. Moreover, essentially every human sin stems from a lack of faith in God, the Supreme Good. Perhaps the old *Baltimore Catechism* can assist a bit when it asked, "Why did God make man?" Then it provided the answer, "God made man to show forth His goodness and to share with him His happiness in heaven." Forgiving our failures to be outstanding images of God, perhaps due to our very finiteness, is certainly enormous evidence of His goodness and desire to share His happiness with us.

Further, our finiteness is the basis for our **fallibility**. Despite what some of us may think or how we act, especially those of us who are or were teachers, we humans are all fallible. That means that we sometimes think, remember, and/or act incorrectly. Though that reality may make us uncomfortable, and we may attempt to deny our fallibility, it is a fairly common human experience. Thus, our very finite human nature makes us need **faith**, both faith to negotiate everyday life and faith in God. Psychologist James Fowler (1981) studied how humans develop faith and described the stages of faith development.

Fowler's Stages of Faith Development
          The following summarizes Fowler's stages of **faith development**. For a slightly longer summary than what follows, see my notes for the Carmelites titled, "'I Believe' – 'You Got to Have a Dream': Stages of Faith Development" (Hetzel, 2001), or for his full treatment see Fowler's original work, *Stages of Faith: The Psychology of Human Development and the Quest for Meaning*. Those familiar with Erikson's stages of psychosocial development and the *Taxonomies* specifying levels of affective (Krathwohl), cognitive (Bloom), and psychomotor (Harrow) functioning may recognize some parallels in Fowler's findings.

          The Pre-stage of *Undifferentiated Faith* is the time when we establish the underlying background for faith development, notably the establishment of basic trust (Erikson). If we develop such trust, faith, like other areas, is likely to develop well, as Erikson points out. If we develop basic mistrust, it will be more difficult to develop faith appropriately.
          In **Stage 1:** *Intuitive-Projective Faith*, we acquire the background stories and images which we can use as basic content to understand reality and to provide the material for later refinement of faith (Bloom's knowledge level. Harrow's perception level, Krathwohl's receiving level).
          In **Stage 2:** *Mythic-Literal Faith*, we begin the internalization of the material acquired in the earlier stage (Bloom's comprehension level). We accept stories as **embodying** all of reality with little or no realization that some aspects of the stories do not fit together readily.
          In **Stage 3:** *Synthetic-Conventional Faith*, our purview becomes broader and this requires some analysis and synthesis (Bloom) as well as valuing and organization of our values into a system (Krathwohl) which provides a hierarchy which can assist in making sense of the apparent contradictions we began to experience in the transition from the previous stage.
          In **Stage 4:** *Individuative-Reflective Faith*, we not only continue internalizing the matters in which we believe by reflecting on them and their ramifications but also begin taking personal responsibility for the commitments required by those matters (Krathwohl's characterization by a value or value system).

In **Stage 5: *Conjunctive Faith***, we learn to accept that, even with a set of priorities, there are still experiences which contain paradoxes. At this stage of faith development, we come to accept these apparent contradictions and seek to unify them to the extent possible (Bloom's synthesis).

By **Stage 6: *Universalizing Faith***, we have internalized our beliefs, including their paradoxical elements, and extend those faith convictions to all people and all truth. We may be willing to die in order to witness to – remember "martyr" is another term for witness – the vision and values which we believe and hold so deeply.

Though Fowler's work is secular, the stages are relevant to our development of faith in God, if for no other reason than that "grace builds on nature". **Healthy development of faith on the natural level can provide a good substrate for healthy development of faith in God – and that faith can help us cope with our finiteness and fallibility while maintaining the good reality contact which, psychologically, is a basic characteristic of sanity.**

Philosophy, Psychology, and Principles

As rational animals created by God, each of us has a body, emotions, intellect, and will. Thus, in addition to religion, **philosophy**, and **psychology**, both scientific and theoretical, can help us understand ourselves, other individuals, and groups by discovering commonalities and regularities in human activities. Thus, we tend to operate according to **principles**. Some of those principles come from faith/religion, some from reason/philosophy, and some from personal experience/science. The principles discovered by scientific psychology, like those based on personal experience, are based on observation of data. This process makes the principles so discovered **probable**, which means they may not apply in some cases. Furthermore, the data must be interpreted, and that involves perception, the process by which we try to "make sense" of our observations. But perception introduces an additional potential source of error because we may misperceive and/or misinterpret the data. Another problem arises because we sometimes implement principles deliberately and are well aware we are doing so; however, sometimes we implement principles in our actions but aren't aware we are doing so. The dog owner who gives his pet a treat when it rolls over on command is an example of accurate and explicit implementation of a psychological principle – positive reinforcement leads the reinforced behavior to occur more often. On the other hand, the parent who provides a treat for a whining child is implementing the same principle but probably isn't aware of doing so. Nonetheless, the child will whine more often. Thus, sometimes we implement the principles rationally and well, and sometimes we implement them erroneously. Indeed, we sometimes think something is a principle when it really is not, and vice versa. This is especially the case with scientific principles which are probable because we seldom have all the data on any given topic. All of these factors certainly create additional problems for us, unfortunately – finiteness strikes again.

Some Philosophical Background

To some extent, we are all philosophers because we typically have a set of assumptions and principles which we use to help us understand ourselves and the rest of reality, though often we are not aware of having such a personal philosophy. Some thinkers have developed more explicit philosophical views, and knowing about those may help us recognize some aspects of our own philosophy and broaden our perspectives.

The term philosophy comes from two Greek root words: *Philos* meaning love, and *Sophia* meaning wisdom. Thus, etymologically, philosophy means love of wisdom. **A philosophy is a set of related ideas "that seek to explain all of reality and the human being's relationship to that reality in terms of being, knowledge, and values"** (Gutek, 1997). At various times and places, different individuals and groups have developed different philosophies depending on their assumptions and emphases. Despite differences, however,

the various philosophies tend to address the same basic areas: being, knowledge, and values.

Areas of Emphasis in Philosophy

Ontology deals with being, with what is real. One major difference of assumption involves whether reality is material (physical), non-material (metaphysical, i.e., beyond the physical), or both. A second major difference of assumption involves whether reality is objective (existing outside the individual) or subjective (existing only within the individual), or both.

Epistemology deals with knowledge, specifically with how one knows truth. A major difference of assumption in this area is whether truth is already within the person, comes from outside, or both. A second difference involves whether truth is absolute, relative, or both. Still a third difference involves whether one considers truth to be subjective, objective, or both.

Axiology deals with values, with what is good. It has 2 branches, **ethics** which deals with what is **good behavior and/or choices**, and **aesthetics** which deals with what is **good work**, i.e., things which have been made. In both cases, a major difference of assumption is whether good is absolute, relative or both.

Logic deals with how to think well, i.e., the thinking process leads to truth. To achieve truth in thinking requires 2 conditions: **The input** – premises and/or data – into the process **must be true**, and the **process must be validly done**. Two basic thinking processes, deductive and inductive, have been identified. The **deductive process** is syllogistic; it **involves reasoning from related premises to a conclusion**. The result of deductive thinking properly done is proof. The **inductive process** is synthetic; it involves **reasoning from many specific observations to a generalization about similar cases**. Inductive thinking usually leads to a probable conclusion rather than a proved one because it is almost always impossible to observe all cases; hence, there might be an exception which was not observed. Note that, because some premises in deductive reasoning may be derived inductively and are probable, even the conclusion of a syllogism may be probably true even though it is validly derived (proved).

Some Influential Philosophies

As noted earlier, we humans have developed various philosophies based on differing assumptions and/or emphases. Major ones are Idealism, Realism/Theistic Realism, Naturalism, Pragmatism, and Existentialism. The following summarizes the varying emphases of each of the philosophical viewpoints.

Philosophy	Function Emphasized Most	Associated Human Faculty
Idealism	Thinking	Intellect or mind
Existentialism	Choosing	Will
Naturalism	Feeling	Emotions
Pragmatism	Doing	Body, especially the senses
Realism	All functions in proper balance	All human faculties
Theistic Realism	Believing	All human faculties notably spirit or soul

The philosophy of **Idealism** originated with Plato (427?-347? B.C.). It emphasizes that ideas, which are not material, are the most important reality, and that material things limit and/or interfere with the attainment by humans of the most perfect reality, the non-material. Thus, **Idealism emphasizes the non-material (ideas) and what is best (ideals)**. It also stresses the whole, its parts, and the relations among the parts and of the parts to the whole. Further, it holds that ideas are "held" within our non-material mind by our material bodies and must be released, often through education. Note that the very word "education" is implicitly Idealist in its etymology (*e-* out of, *ducere-* to lead, draw, bring).

The philosophy of **Realism** was developed by Aristotle (384-322 B.C.). Because Idealism underemphasized material reality, **Realism set out to establish a *balance* between the non-material and the material**. Because Realism addressed two complementary ideas originally, it frequently considered other ideas in pairs called dualisms. Because the idea that rationality was the defining characteristic of humans became so strong in the Middle Ages, Realism was somewhat overshadowed by a kind of return to a more Idealist view, Rationalism, which overly emphasized the intellect and under-emphasized the body, emotions, and will. The imbalance of Rationalism led to the development of Naturalism to stress the importance of emotion/feeling, Pragmatism to stress the importance of body/doing, and Existentialism to stress the importance of will/choosing. **Theistic Realism** is a philosophy which **adds the idea of God to Realism**. The most fully developed form of Theistic Realism is Thomism, so called because it was developed by St. Thomas Aquinas (1225?-1274 A.D.) who used Aristotle's work as the philosophical basis for Roman Catholic theology in order to help people understand their beliefs better.

The philosophy of **Naturalism** was developed by Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778). It **was a reaction against the perceived strictness of religious and social norms and discipline which called for inhibiting one's impulsive behavior and also against the excessive emphasis placed on reasoning by Rationalism**. Naturalism is idealistic rather than realistic. Rousseau romanticized nature and blamed society for the problems he, and presumably others, experienced.

The philosophy of **Pragmatism**, sometimes also called Experimentalism, though developed by William James (1842-1910) was greatly popularized when applied to education by John Dewey (1859-1952). Dewey's application to education became the theory of Progressivism. As a philosophy, **Pragmatism sought to counteract the overly mental emphasis of Rationalism by insisting on the use of the scientific method rather than taking the word of an authority**. Applied to education as Progressivism, there was insistence on learning through use of the scientific method, and by extension, through direct experience with reality rather than verbal descriptions of it.

The philosophy of **Existentialism** was developed by Soren Kierkegaard (1813-1855) and popularized in the work of Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980). To counteract the emphasis of Rationalism on reasoning to the detriment of choice, **Existentialism emphasized choice as the most significant human faculty**. Following Existentialism in practice led a number of adherents to depression because it held that one must choose but has no basis for choice. Existentialism suffers from the problem of failing to recognize the difference between the objective and the subjective.

As a bit of relief from the rather dry exposition of each philosophy, the following limericks also summarize some of the basic ideas of each in a somewhat humorous form.

Idealism
Plato emphasized matters ethereal,
From his God to his cold breakfast cereal.
    Others found his Ideal
    Greatly lacking in Real
And pronounced all his work immaterial.

Realism
Aristotle had feet on the ground.
With his senses, the matter he found.
    But for all of his balance,

Pragmatism
Calling science's method pragmatic
Doctor Dewey waxed really ecstatic.
    He held that all schooling
    Should be students fooling,
And their learning would be automatic.

Existentialism
The Rationalist excess redressing,
Existentialists choice were expressing.
    "What's real is my choice!"

And for all of his talents,   They averred with one voice,
His successors got things wrong way round.   But they ended up merely depressing.
Naturalism   **My Own Philosophy of Education/Life**
Jean-Jacques Rousseau exulted in nature.   Educational balance, I think,
He made it his sole legislature.   Must the ends of continua link --
    Denigrating society   Secular to divine,
    As too much sobriety,   Content, process entwine
Poor Emile he left saying, "I hate yer!"   Lest to dreadful extremes we all sink.

If the foregoing summary of various philosophies whets your appetite for more detail, see Hetzel (2008). It should be available on the Institute website, www.sfis.org. Or better, read the originals and expert commentaries.

Some Psychological Background

In trying to understand why we humans are the way we are and act the way we do, it is useful to consider where we came from. Theologically, we came from God. That seems to be the original viewpoint in essentially all human cultures. The various philosophies also provided some answers. But with the ascendency of science as a way of discovering truth, the viewpoint changed. Astrophysicists say we began with the "Big Bang". According to biology, we evolved from a kind of "primordial soup". Given we are here, psychology began to examine how we got to be the kind of individual each of us is. As with philosophies, psychology developed several viewpoints depending on assumptions and emphases.

Some Influential Schools of Psychology

Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) proposed his theory of psychosexual development which gave rise to **Psychoanalytic Psychology which holds that the kind of person we become, and the source of our behavior patterns, is basically biological, what he called "biological imperatives", and, to some degree, unconscious**. Thus, according to this view, we are products of **forces within us over which we have no control** and of some of which **we may not even be aware**. This deterministic position contrasts sharply with the Realist and Christian view that we humans have free will, can control our actions to some extent, and so are responsible for what we do and become. Widespread acceptance of the psychoanalytic view has provided a basis for behaving as we please because our behavior is not under our control but is due to **biological imperatives** and **unconscious forces**. Such being the case, there is no reason not to do as we please, and if the view were correct, we would not be able to do otherwise. Further, by eliminating our control of our behavior, psychoanalytic psychology also eliminated any responsibility for it or its effects. By eliminating control and responsibility, Freud also eliminated guilt which he considered harmful; however, that viewpoint also eliminates human freedom. Based on such assumptions, it is not surprising that people behave in unhealthy and/or antisocial ways. However, human experience indicates that we are able to control our thoughts and actions, at least to a great extent.

Based on the reality of our experience that we are in control of at least some of our behavior, **Gestalt Psychology recognized that our behavior is influenced not only by biological forces within us and the stimuli which impinge on us from outside ourselves but also by *our interpretation* of those stimuli, our perception**. For example, encountering a large alligator while on a picnic or outing – the author is from Louisiana where this is not a farfetched experience – would lead most of us to find a safe place behind a barrier; but to a conservationist, such an encounter might well lead to capturing the reptile to relocate it. The two kinds of behavior are based not just on the stimulus, the gator, but also on the interpretation we place on it or the meaning it has for us. The gestalt point of view thus has behavior influenced by **both the things themselves** (external forces) *and* **the meanings we have for those things** (internal forces). While gestalt psychology took into account not only external but internal influences on behavior, it did not develop into the kind of science some researchers wanted.

With a view to developing a truly scientific psychology based only on what is directly observable, B.F. Skinner, developed **Behaviorism which maintains that behavior is determined by environmental stimuli with no internal factors influencing it**. By eliminating the internal forces of emotion, thought, and choice, Behaviorism, like Psychoanalytic Psychology, effectively eliminated human responsibility, and correlatively , human freedom. The popularity of this viewpoint in the 1950's and 1960's gave another basis for today's behavior pattern in which people do what they please, ostensibly because that's what the environmental stimuli elicit. This theory provided a powerful tool, **operant conditioning**, for controlling behavior, especially behavior of animals, and research demonstrated that it works fairly well in modifying human behavior also. **A significant problem with the Behaviorist view was that it did not provide a basis for deciding which behaviors were worthwhile and should be reinforced and which were undesirable and should be extinguished by withholding reinforcement**.

As a reaction to the Behaviorists' ignoring any internal factors in causing behavior, **Humanistic Psychology** developed from the Gestalt basis. The two primary theorists who popularized Humanistic Psychology were Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers. Maslow was interested originally in scientific examination of causes of behavior while Rogers was a psychotherapist who tried to ascertain what factors tended to make the process of therapy successful. Both also became influential theorists.

Abraham Maslow: A Hierarchy of Needs

Maslow theorized that everyone has an inner nature which is "pressing always for open, uninhibited expression" (ASCD, 1962, p. 35). In this, he and Rogers agree with Rousseau's earlier view that "the first movements of nature are always right; there is no original perversity in the human heart" (In Miller, 1945, p. 33). However, even Rousseau recognized that there is a difference between self-esteem (*amour propre*) and selfishness (*amour de soi*). Unfortunately, that distinction, also made by Maslow and Rogers, seems to have been lost on many of their interpreters and in many applications made of the Humanist viewpoints. Maslow clearly indicates that our inner nature is affected by the external environment, our interpretations of it (perceptions), and our choices about it (See ASCD, 1962, p. 36). Indeed, in a later work, he makes this quite explicit: "The only real path ... (is) salvation via hard work and total commitment to doing well ... any important job that 'calls for' doing" (Maslow, 1965, p. 6). Later on the same page he states, "I can put this very bluntly: *Salvation Is a By-Product of Self-Actualizing Work and Self-Actualizing Duty*" (Maslow, 1965, p. 6, italics his). He follows that statement with what almost amounts to a tirade about how his view of self-actualization has been misinterpreted:

> *The trouble with most of these youngsters who have been after me is that it seems they have in the back of their heads some notion of self-actualization as a kind of lightning stroke which will hit them on the head suddenly without their doing anything about it. They all seem to want to wait passively for it to happen without any effort on their part. Furthermore, I think that practically all of them have tended unconsciously to define self-actualization in terms of getting rid of all inhibitions and controls in favor of complete spontaneity and impulsivity. My impatience has been largely because of this, I guess, that they had no stubbornness, no persistence, no frustration tolerance, etc., -- apparently just these qualities they consider as the opposite of self actualization* (p. 7).

From the foregoing, it is clear that Maslow, who developed the concept, construed the need for self-actualization quite differently from what it has come to mean since he wrote the foregoing.

Maslow's theorizing led him to posit a **hierarchy of needs** which, he maintained, a person would attempt to satisfy in a specific predictable order. In his original formulation, **Maslow posited 5 needs** beginning with **Physiological**, and going through **Safety**, **Belonging and love**, and **Esteem**, and concluding with **Self-actualization**. Thus, he posited that the reason for a person's behavior was to satisfy whichever need was "prepotent", i.e., the highest level not yet satisfied. In this view, human development, and the behaviors leading to it, could be understood as caused by attempts to fulfill the needs in their hierarchy. Further, self-actualization became the goal of human development. **Only later did Maslow add** to his list a need for **Knowledge and understanding** and an **Aesthetic** need. Even later, he began to consider **spirituality** and posited **Self-transcendence** as a need. However, for decades, the focus remained on self-actualization and how to achieve it.

A Digression: "Where is Love?"

Though we will address the concept of love later in a different context, it might be enlightening to question Maslow's placement of love with belonging in his hierarchy. The song, "Where is Love?" from the musical, *Oliver*, raises a question which is relevant at this point given the importance of love in human life. Traditionally philosophers and others have identified 4 kinds of love. They designate *eros* as primarily physical and sexual

attraction. From that they distinguish *amicitia* as love of friendship, *philia* as more rational or intellectual love, and *agape* as self-giving love. If Maslow's placement of love with belonging is appropriate, which of the kinds of love is it? Indeed, *agape* and *philos* do not seem to fit with the concept of belonging. Further, *eros* seems more appropriately placed with physiological needs. So it seems that *amicitia* might best fit with the Maslovian concept of belonging and would expand that concept. This is so because one can belong to a group, not only as a valued member but also as an outcast, and there are people, especially adolescents, who will suffer insults and ill treatment just to be allowed to be considered a member of the group, even in that role. Thus, *amicitia*, which refers to love between or among friends, constitutes an improvement on mere belonging which may be why Maslow designated the need belonging *and love* instead of just belonging.. Such placement might also allow it to serve as a bridge to the need for esteem.

If the foregoing is correct, where might *philia* and *agape* fit into the hierarchy. Because love is widely recognized as one of the highest human activities, it might be a way one can come to self-actualization. If we accept that knowledge and understanding and aesthetic need satisfaction are methods of actualizing oneself, the highest two kinds of love seem to serve a similar purpose. Knowledge and understanding are rational processes in which reality is comprehended at a deeper level than the merely superficial. Thus, *philia* seems to match well this concept because *philia* is a rational love of the good of the other. This seems very similar to what Maslow calls understanding. It even has similar connotation to his use of the term *synergy*, which he describes as a state in which what makes me happiest is what makes you happiest and vice versa. Indeed, in *Eupsychian Management* he notes that his view of synergy is "a pretty decent definition of love" (1965, p. 89).

Having placed the other three kinds of love in relation to Maslow's hierarchy of needs, it remains to locate *agape* somewhere also. Maslow's tending to treat spirituality or self-transcendence as another need in his hierarchy may provide a reasonable location. Though he didn't actually publish anything making that placement, his later writings seemed to be moving in that direction. Even his concept of synergy, while couched in terms of personal satisfaction, seems to require the kind of selfless love which has been called *agape*. Maslow even indicates that, in some sense, synergy transcends the distinction of the self and the other so that the two form a new unit which makes the good of one the good of the other. Such self-transcendence may well be the highest form of self-actualization. This certainly agrees with the Christian teaching that one must lose one's life in order to save it (See Mt. 10:39; Lk. 9:24; Mt. 16:25). That concept may even cast light on our belonging to the Mystical Body of Christ as Pope Benedict notes in a number of his writings (See Cameron, 2006, pp. 41, 72, 95, 153, 154, 159,168, 169, 176, 290, 292). End of digression.

Carl Rogers: Congruence, Authenticity, and Unconditional Positive Regard

In researching the effectiveness of psychotherapy, Rogers found that the process tended to be successful, i.e., his clients learned things which helped them function with greater psychological health, when 3 conditions obtained:
 1. The client **faced the problem** as something real and influential in her/his life;
 2. The therapist was **congruent and authentic** in the relationship;
 3. The therapist provided **unconditional positive regard** for the client (Rogers, 1961).
When these conditions obtained, Rogers found, the client developed greater understanding and acceptance of her/himself. These he considered signs of improving psychological health and self-actualization. Note that achieving these 3 conditions implies improved reality contact, a basic requisite of sanity.

As he continued his research and practice, Rogers seems to have recognized that his early views had been inaccurate, inadequate, misinterpreted, and/or misapplied. When he began his therapeutic system, he called it **non-directive** which meant that the therapist did not offer directions or solutions, but simply reflected the client's ideas back to her/him. This led some to dub the process, jocularly, the "Un-huh" school of counseling. An underlying assumption in the process was that the solution to the problem(s) was in the client in some sense – note the parallel with Idealist philosophy. Later Rogers referred to his form of therapy as **client-centered** which focused on the client but allowed the therapist to be congruent and authentic when he/she had a position relevant to the topic under consideration. The change seems to have come from a recognition that the therapist had to have some criteria in order to be congruent and authentic as well as providing unconditional positive regard for the client. With time, the importance of the client's accepting that he/she had a problem, and the concepts of congruence and authenticity tended to be ignored while unconditional positive regard became essentially the sole factor considered in much of therapy, education, and many human interactions in the U.S. at least. Also de-emphasized was recognition that congruence and authenticity needed to refer to **all** of areas of reality not just oneself. There also seemed to

be a failure to distinguish between the person and her/his behavior. Notice that the third characteristic needed for positive therapeutic outcomes of counseling was unconditional positive regard **for the client** not for all her/his behavior. Misunderstanding and/or misapplication of this third criterion seems to have created problems. Note also how "unconditional positive regard for the person" is also an important aspect of love for oneself and others.

Failure to distinguish the person from the act is understandable if one accepts Skinner's "law of least effort". In his research, Skinner discovered that organisms, including people, tend to make the least effort needed to achieve their goals. Thus, organisms learn to make distinctions only if there is a "reason" for doing so. In Behaviorist terms, the reason for making the distinction would be receiving a reinforcer, while in Humanist terms the reason would more likely be cognitively or affectively based. Still, the data seem to support that distinctions tend not to be made unless the person "needs" to make them.

Rogers (1961) does make the distinction explicitly when he states "the therapist feels his client to be a *person* (italics mine) of unconditional self worth: of value no matter what his condition, his behavior or his feelings" (p. 185). By attempting to foster self-actualization through providing unconditional positive regard but failing maintain the distinction between the person and her/his behavior, many in Western society came to reinforce unacceptable, undesirable, antisocial, or even behavior which was harmful to the person or others. What was needed was continuing to provide unconditional positive regard **for the person**, while rejecting and refusing to reinforce behavior which was detrimental to the person and/or to others. Indeed, when we make the distinction and hold the person to better behavior patterns, the implicit message is that the person is good and can behave better. When we fail to make the distinction, the implicit message is that the person is so inferior that he/she can only behave badly. Thus, the misinterpretation and/or misapplication of the concept of unconditional positive regard, i.e., failing to distinguish the person from the act and giving approval to harmful behavior which effectively reinforces the harmful behavior, has had just the opposite effect from the one desired. Instead of the person's self-esteem going up, it has gone down in many cases. In effect, misapplication of the Humanist principle of unconditional positive regard and, correlatively, implementation of the Behaviorist principle of reinforcing behavior leading to its increase in frequency led to "love's labors (being) lost". More about this when we consider the matter of love.

Rogers' view of unconditional positive regard has been very influential in contemporary society, notably because prospective educators were taught its importance. Thus, the view became widely accepted in the schools. Further, many parents, wishing to follow the most influential psychology of the day, also adopted the viewpoint. Such widespread popularity of the concept of unconditional positive regard led to problems created by misinterpretation and failure to distinguish person from act. Rogers' concepts of congruence and authenticity were also lost and/or misapplied.

His discovery that therapy was more likely to be successful if the therapist was congruent and authentic in the relationship did not receive the attention given unconditional positive regard and doing what "feels right", and that despite the fact that both Rogers and Maslow noted that, to follow what "feels right," the client, as well as the therapist, had to develop congruence and authenticity. This is implied by the first condition of successful therapy that the client faces the problem as real and influential in her/his life. Rogers maintained that it is likely that a person who is authentic will make good decisions based on her/his feelings because those feelings will be congruent with reality. He suggested that such authenticity and congruence would lead a person to do what "feels" right, and that actions taken on that basis were "good" for both the client and the therapist. Unfortunately, the idea of doing what one feels right somehow got separated from the concepts of congruence and authenticity. Moreover, the state of being congruent with all of reality, a state which can be construed as a state of **self-actualization, is a state NOT frequently achieved according to both Rogers and Maslow**. A reason for that is that even the humanistic psychological view omitted some aspects of reality, at least in many applications. Unfortunately, this insight tended to be lost and doing what "feels right" became doing whatever one "feels like" doing without first developing the appropriate congruence and authenticity, i.e., reality contact.

The reality with which we must be congruent in order to be authentic – and we must be authentic if we are to follow our feelings appropriately in making decisions – includes reality within ourselves; the reality of the environment outside ourselves, especially that part of the environment constituted by other human beings; and the ultimate reality, God. Unfortunately, in application, the congruence prerequisite to authenticity did not receive much emphasis. Even intrapersonal congruence between emotions and rationality, the cognitive and affective domains, was ignored despite the fact that lack of such congruence was often the reason a person sought therapeutic

help in the first place.

Festinger's Insight: Cognitive Dissonance as Incongruence between Inner State and Behavior
        Leon Festinger (1964) provided additional insight into the concepts of congruence and authenticity when his research led him to note that, when we behave in ways which are inconsistent with our inner states, we experience **cognitive dissonance**, i.e., we know that we lack intrapersonal congruence and that makes us feel uneasy. Note that this uneasiness would probably be called "guilt" in religious contexts, and even in psychological contexts until Freud declared guilt unacceptable. Unfortunately, Freudians failed to distinguish appropriate guilt due to misbehavior, and inappropriate guilt which did not involve misbehavior. Festinger also found that, t**o overcome the dissonance, people try several options**. We can **deny the behavior** unless, or even if, it has been done in public. Another option is to **change our inner state**, often an attitude or value, so that the behavior and the inner state match. A third option is **undoing** in some form which restores the previous congruence. Denying our inappropriate behavior is a problem because it leads to lack of contact with reality which is essential to psychological health. Further, denying public behavior is typically not a plausible option because others can testify to the behavior we attempt to deny. Further, because we can't unsay a hurtful word or undo a hurtful deed, the third option is often not feasible. Thus, attitude change is the most frequent and likely outcome. That means that, if we have behaved badly, we are likely to change from a healthy, desirable attitude to one which is less so. This, like denial, is itself a problem.

        Lack of intrapersonal congruence can leave the individual following the "if it feels good, do it" dictum. Unfortunately, such a lack of congruence within oneself prevents authenticity, the lack of which, by Rogers' own statement, inhibits rather than enhances relationships. Indeed, it seems to have led some to self-involvement or self-absorption to the degree of becoming unaware of what is not oneself, or at least of behaving in ways which seem not to take awareness of what is outside oneself into consideration – loss of contact with the "universe" leads to inhabiting the "I-niverse". Such a viewpoint has been socially sanctioned, indeed socially mandated, from the 1960's into the 21st century. Though this position may seem to "solve" the problem of incongruence and the dissonance which it generates, ultimately it leads to a lack of reality contact which creates other difficulties. Because such a view has been based on only one aspect of reality, the affective domain of the individual, it has led to loss of congruence which seem to be the source of many of the social problems of contemporary U.S. society.

        Exacerbating the problems which arise from lack of intrapersonal congruence is the lack of congruence with the reality outside ourselves, notably lack of interpersonal congruence. If we are so self-absorbed as to be but little aware of inconsistencies between our own feelings, thoughts, and actions, it is likely that we will be but little aware of factors outside ourselves. This lack of awareness can frequently lead to lack of congruence with other people and groups and the larger reality. For example, murder ignores another's right to life, theft ignores their right to property, driving while intoxicated ignores the social convention/law of driving on the right with the correlative danger to oneself and others. Unfortunately, the ubiquity of personal electronic devices has contributed to this lack of congruence to the extent that "driving distracted" has become as serious a problem as DWI. All of these indicate lack of interpersonal and environmental congruence.

        As if these were not enough bases for problems, the fact that science chooses to ignore the reality of God sets the stage for even more problems. No rational person would operate an expensive new machine without consulting and following the manufacturer's directions for its use. Yet science limits itself by omitting reference to God because it limits itself to studying phenomena which are empirical. When we humans have made science our preferred source of information since the 16th century, at least in the Western world, we have a situation in which incongruence with the Ultimate Reality is guaranteed. Lack of congruence with Ultimate Reality, like lack of intrapersonal, interpersonal, and environmental congruence, can only lead to problems. Perhaps the simplest solution is to follow the "Manufacturer's Directions for Use" (the Commandments).

Leaving God Out
        Because science focuses on observable, verifiable, replicable phenomena which are regularly and causally related, and because it seeks to describe, predict, explain, and control those phenomena, it "had to" omit reference to God as a factor influencing those phenomena. God is not an observable, verifiable, replicable phenomenon in the usual scientific sense, and He is clearly not within our human control. Interestingly, science is quite willing to infer the presence of causes which do not meet its own criteria, as in cases of subatomic particles and "the Big Bang" which were inferred from observed effects. Further, the scientific method proceeds by eliminating possible influences and concluding that those which were not eliminated were, indeed, the unobserved causes of

the observed effects. Because God cannot be observed directly, science **assumed** that He was not a factor. This assumption has become more prevalent since the 16th century when the scientific method became a popular way of achieving knowledge. In the late 20th century, cutting-edge scientists seem to have begun to realize that there are forces outside the realm of the observable, verifiable, and replicable. Indeed, the pure Behaviorism which was popular in psychology has become less influential as even scientific psychologists began studying internal states by inference from external behaviors. When such non-observable phenomena are accepted as amenable to scientific study, perhaps scientists may realize that the Ultimate Reality can also be studied as inferred from external evidence. This has been known for millennia as indicated by the phrase from the Psalms, "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament proclaims his handiwork" (Ps. 19:1). The Book of Wisdom is even more explicit, almost as if referring to some scientists, when it says, "For if they so far succeeded in knowledge that they could speculate about the world, how did they not more quickly find its Lord?" (Wis. 13:9).

Maslow seems to have been among those who were beginning to recognize the importance of the meta-scientific. Unfortunately, he died before he completed his work which seemed to be leading him to add an additional need, self-transcendence, to his hierarchy. His late writings, however, indicated he was examining this as the highest need in his hierarchy. About the same time, other psychologists began to look at self-transcendence as possibly a higher need than self-actualization, or possibly as a way of actualizing oneself fully. One such development was that of Harvard professor, Howard Gardner, who provided a formulation of multiple intelligences. In the process he examined whether spirituality, or what he called philosophical-existential intelligence, should be included in the list. The following provides a short summary of his view.

Gardner maintained that intelligence was not a single thing but that there were several. He suggested that an intelligence is a set of skills for solving problems and of finding or creating problems. His work led him to posit 9 intelligences: Linguistic, musical, logical-mathematical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, intrapersonal, interpersonal, naturalistic, and philosophical-existential. It is the final one which might also be called spiritual intelligence.

Legacies of Psychological Theories

From the foregoing, we can see that two influential psychological theories, Psychoanalytic Psychology and Behaviorism, took positions which effectively eliminated a person's ability to control her/his behavior. Further, a third influential theory, Humanistic Psychology, was misinterpreted and misapplied so that unconditional positive regard was provided for all behavior instead of for the behaving person. Doing so also applied a Behaviorist principle. By reinforcing all behaviors with unconditional positive regard, both helpful and harmful ones increase in frequency. Further, Rogers' emphasis on congruence and authenticity was forgotten by some practitioners who failed to distinguish between acknowledging the experience of an emotion and acting on it without thinking or choosing. Still further, loss of reference to the importance of congruence and authenticity with **all** areas of reality led some to make feeling the sole criterion for behavior rather than including the authenticity which was needed to assure that the feeling was congruent with thought and the rest of reality. All of these provide bases for a common occurrence in contemporary society in which people do as they feel without adverting to the effects of their behaviors on themselves, their environment, and/or other persons or groups. Further, many also do not advert to how doing what they feel is or is not congruent with the Creator's instructions. The decrease of Catholics going to confession in recent years supports this idea.

Because of such kinds of failures to distinguish appropriately and/or to advert to and be congruent with reality in various aspects, society has many problems which also occur in individuals who were the focus of Rogers' therapeutic efforts and Maslow's thrust for self-actualization. Such failures led to "love's labors (being) lost" to a significant extent. It is fairly clear that, individual problems cause those of society and vice versa; the two are reciprocally related. In any case, however, the problems need solution at both levels. The psychologists, notably Maslow and Rogers have tended to address the issue at the individual level. Science typically addresses the general level, and fortunately, the scientific method is essentially self-corrective, so there is hope that by using scientific psychology and principles discovered using that method, and others, we may address the problems successfully.

<center>**Not at Sixes and Sevens But …**</center>

Lest it seem that we have considered problems too much, consider how some of the following ideas from psychology may be related to some basic religious ideas.

Erikson proposed 8 stages of human development. Maslow suggested 7 needs if we leave belonging and love together and adds self-transcendence to the hierarchy totaling 8. There are 3 theological and 4 cardinal moral virtues for a total of 7. There are 7 sacraments and 8 beatitudes. There are 7 capital sins, and there are 7 gifts of the Holy Spirit. There are 10 commandments which reduce to 8 if the sixth and ninth as well as the seventh and tenth are grouped by topic as they sometimes are. In traditional Catholic teaching, there are also 7 corporal and 7 spiritual works of mercy, though in each case 2 are sometimes combined. The closeness of the numbers in each of the categories makes one wonder if there is something non-random here. While the numbers may be as they are only to accommodate memory – psychologists have found that we can usually remember 7 plus or minus 2 items at a time – there may be other reasons for them. Possibly the following facts are also relevant.

1. Erikson's stages constitute significant events in human psychosocial development.
2. Maslow's needs are foci for physical survival and psychological growth and health.
3. The sacraments have long been considered markers of significant events in human life.
4. The commandments govern pivotal areas of our relation to God and others.
5. The theological and cardinal moral virtues are especially important to spiritual development.
6. The corporal and spiritual works of mercy are ways of practicing the virtues on which our very salvation depends (See Mt. 25: 35-46; *Catholic Encyclopedia*).
7. The beatitudes are proposed as positive ways to happiness.
8. The capital sins are the principal dangers we face as we seek salvation.
9. The gifts of the Holy Spirit are special helps given us to overcome problems we face to salvation.

        Taken together, these items make it interesting to consider possible parallels among all of the foregoing. Perhaps, in considering possible parallels, we might find some relationships among the items which could lead us to a fuller realization of what the spiritual life entails. Should we discover parallels, we might find better ways of growing spiritually, and we might be more confident that the formulations of Erikson and Maslow are accurate because faith would be supporting or confirming the psychological. With that in mind, consider the parallels proposed in the table below. Note that, because they really refer to meeting needs, and admitting space constraints, the works of mercy are included with Maslow's needs. Refer back to the table as you read the ideas which follow it to see if they make sense. Note that the suggested parallels do not all have the same basis but may be based on different relations.

Some Possible Parallels Among Some Psychological and Spiritual Categories

Erikson's Stages	Maslow's Needs *Works of Mercy*	Cardinal Moral and Theological Virtues	Command-ments	Capital Sins	Sacraments	Beatitudes	Gifts of the Holy Spirit
Trust	Physiological *Feed hungry Give drink to thirsty Clothe the naked*	Faith/trust	I am the Lord, your God, you shall not have strange gods before Me	Gluttony	(Faith is a prerequisite to receiving any of the sacraments.)	Poor in spirit go to heaven	Fear of the Lord
Autonomy	Safety *Shelter the homeless*	Prudence	You shall not take the name of the Lord in vain	Pride	Baptism	Meek shall possess the earth	Piety
Initiative	Belonging *Ransom captives*	Justice	Keep Lord's day holy	Envy	Penance	Mourners shall be comforted	Knowledge
Industry	Esteem *Visit the sick and imprisoned Bury the dead*	Fortitude	Honor parents	Sloth	Anointing of the Sick	Persecuted go to heaven	Fortitude
Identity	Self-actualization *Instruct the ignorant Admonish the sinner Counsel the doubtful*	Charity	Do not kill	Pride	Confirmation	Pure of heart shall see God	Counsel
Intimacy	Knowledge & Understanding Love *Bear wrongs patiently Forgive all offenses*	Charity	Do not commit or desire adultery	Lust	Holy Eucharist	Peacemakers will be children of God	Understanding
Generativity	Love Aesthetic *Comfort the sorrowful*	Temperance	Do not steal or covet others' goods	Greed	Matrimony or Holy Orders	Hunger and thirst for justice are satisfied	Understanding
Integrity	Self-transcendence *Pray for living and dead*	Hope	Do not lie	Anger	Anointing of the Sick	Merciful will obtain mercy	Wisdom
Unity (Beatific Vision)	Knowledge & Understanding Love	Charity	(Not applicable)	(None possible)	(Holy Orders: "alter Christus")	Pure of heart shall see God	(Beatific vision)

The **trust** which Erikson holds necessary for healthy development is certainly also necessary to move from the prepotency of Maslow's **physiological** needs to higher levels of development. **Feeding** the hungry, **giving drink** to the thirsty, and **clothing** the naked are **works of mercy** which address these needs directly. The virtue of **faith**, especially in its aspect of trust which St. John Baptist de La Salle calls the "spirit of faith", is necessary both on the natural level, trust that physiological needs will be satisfied properly, and on the spiritual level, trust that God is a provident Father who will care for our needs both physical and spiritual. The **first commandment** provides the ultimate basis for trust, "I am the Lord, your God" and calls us to recognize and accept that fact which, in effect, is the undoing of original sin. Such trust enables us to be **poor in spirit** and avoid the overdoing of physiological need

satisfaction which is the sin of **gluttony**. This problem may develop if physiological needs are not regularly met. The development of trust, in parents and in God, links well with the gift of **fear of the Lord** because we would fear to offend those whom we love and depend on. A similar fear also often characterizes those who are poor in spirit. No sacrament is specified because faith, either personal faith of that of one's godparents, is prerequisite to receiving any sacrament.

When a toddler seeks **autonomy**, the issue of **safety** is clearly an important matter because, at that stage of cognitive development, the child is not yet characterized by much **prudence**. Thus, prudence, typically supplied by the parents, seems an important virtue in establishing and maintaining autonomy. Also related to providing safety is the work of mercy of **sheltering the homeless** whether they be children or adults. The **second commandment** calls us to revere God's name and, by doing so, reminds us that the ultimate name we can give ourselves, autonomy, is children of God. In spiritual development, autonomy can be overly emphasized to become **pride** when the unconscious egocentrism of toddlerhood endures to become the conscious egocentrism of the proud adult who puts self ahead of God. The sacrament of **Baptism** provides us with the correct self, a Christian child of God, and sets the basis for 'naming oneself' (autonomy) accurately as such. The beatitude of **meekness** indicates that there are limits to our autonomy and only by observing those limits can we be truly happy. The gift of **piety** has much the same effect of helping us to be submissive and attentive to God and those who represent Him for us.

Erikson's **initiative** and Maslow's need for **belonging** address 2 different aspects of development. Initiative relates to learning to set goals and begin 'work' while belonging refers rather to relating to others in developing a sense of group membership as an enhancement of one's self which was the emphasis of autonomy. Fortunately, in Western society at least, there is not much opportunity for the work of mercy of **ransoming captives**; however, doing so clearly relates both to taking initiative should the need arise and to providing those who in need a sense of belonging. There is a sense in which everyone is a captive of her/his negative characteristics, so providing help to overcome them might also be relevant, though this is more a spiritual work of mercy rather than a corporal one. The **third commandment** calls us to worship God not only as individuals but also as a member of the Church; thus it is relevant to belonging. Belonging, too, balances autonomy. The virtue of **justice** can be seen to relate to initiative while the sacrament of **Reconciliation** and the beatitude of **mourning** refer to errors we make which affect the group. **Justice** requires us to give others room for their own initiative in various areas. **Reconciliation** enables us to correct offenses which, in the context of the Mystical Body of Christ, are not just personal aberrations before God but also have communal effects which are detrimental. When we bring a spirit of **mourning** for the sins which create such effects, essentially sins of injustice, we are made happy by restoring the proper relation among ourselves, God, and others, and we are protected somewhat from repeating similar offenses. **Envy** can relate to both initiative and belonging. Envy can result when our own initiative does not lead to any product, or to an inferior one, while others' initiatives produce excellent effects. It is also a possible reaction when we see others belonging to the group and ourselves on the outside. The gift of **knowledge** can do much to enhance our belonging to a group and contributing to it. By recognizing the needs of others which may be below the surface and by recognizing that God is in each group member, both a form of knowledge, we are likely to be a better member of the group and achieve a greater sense of belonging.

Industry, which leads to bringing plans to successful implementation, clearly fosters developing **esteem,** both self-esteem and esteem from others. **Visiting the sick** and **burying the dead** are both works of mercy which indicate that we esteem those whom we serve, and in the latter case, their loved ones. Further, any work needed to reach worthwhile goals typically requires an effort of some duration; thus, the virtue of **fortitude** is important. Without that virtue, the capital sin of **sloth** occurs. The **tenth commandment** supports having the industry and fortitude to do our own work rather than desiring and/or expecting that others will do it for us. Because the sacrament of **Anointing of Sick** can have the effect of restoring strength (fortitude) and health, it can assist us in continuing to "fight the good fight" (1 Tim. 6:12) required to live a spiritual life. And because that effort is often persecuted, the beatitude of **suffering persecution for justice's sake** reminds us that there is a reward for enduring such suffering, ultimately the happiness of heaven. In this stage, the virtue of fortitude unites with the gift of **fortitude** to have the same effects.

Maslow's need for **self-actualization** is essentially addressed by the process of developing Erikson's characteristic of **identity**. It is possible to view the development of our own identity, and the repudiation of other possible identities which is its complement, as essentially an exercise in the virtue of **charity**. This virtue leads us to establish the proper priorities as specified by Jesus when He said that we must love God and our neighbor as ourselves. Because those developing identity are often uncertain, the works of mercy of **instructing** the ignorant, **admonishing**

the sinner, and **counseling the doubtful** are relevant. Because **all the commandments** are simply specifications of significant ways in which we love God, others, and ourselves; they specify means of self-actualization and identity formation. Identity formation also requires us to love ourselves as children of God and put aside loving incompatible selves which may have been options in earlier stages of development. The gift of **counsel** can inspire us with the proper criteria for selecting an appropriate identity and rejecting inappropriate ones. The sin of **pride** is the negation of the appropriate love of God and others and an exaggerated and distorted love of self. The sacramental grace of **Confirmation** has as a major effect strengthening our identity as God's child and protecting us from whatever might tend to weaken that identity. The beatitude of **purity of heart** reminds us that the single-minded attention to God and His will, which is the flowering of our identity as of children of God, is what makes us truly happy or blessed. Indeed, having any other identity typically leads to a life which is less than completely fulfilled and happy.

The stage of **intimacy,** as proposed by Erikson, requires addressing Maslow's need for **knowledge and understanding**. However, though Maslow joined belonging and love at the third level of his hierarchy of needs, he could as easily have separated them. By joining belonging and love at the 'deficiency' level of his hierarchy, he was noting that, like other deficiency needs, these require others for their satisfaction. His later work indicates that he further realized that love, considered somewhat differently, also fits at the 'becoming' level. In addressing the concept of synergy in his book, *Eupsychian Management*, he comments explicitly that his description of synergy, which was at the 'becoming' level, is a reasonable definition of **love**.   For that reason, it is appropriate to parallel love with intimacy. In effect this recognizes that there are two kinds of love or that love functions at two levels, to satisfy deficiencies and to enhance identity through intimacy. Because sharing identity with another can be difficult, the works of mercy of **bearing wrongs patiently** and **forgiving injuries** are relevant at this stage. The capital sin of **lust** involves seeking intimacy without love. It exaggerates love of self, denigrates love of others, and negates love of God. The **sixth commandment** specifies that we must avoid lust while the **tenth** reminds us to avoid even the temptation to it. The **Holy Eucharist** reverses the priorities placing union with God first and establishing union with others through union with Christ as the optimum form of love of oneself. To maintain such union as proper love requires, or to maintain intimacy as Erikson would call it, it is frequently essential to be a **peacemaker,** and the Lord indicates that exercising such a function is a source of happiness. To include the aspect of being able to take the other's viewpoint which is so important for intimate relations, it is clear that the gift of **understanding** can assist with such a difficult task by providing the infused grace to assist the natural effort.

The stage of **generativity** relates directly to the **aesthetic need** because we would want what we generate to be something which is of good rather than poor quality. Once good things are generated, they need to be properly cared for. To provide that care, we may need to **comfort the sorrowful,** though that work of mercy would fit in other stages equally well. To assure that such care includes the appropriate holding on and letting go, the virtue of **temperance** can be of great assistance. This is so because, when we generate excellent products, there is the tendency to hold onto them, the sin of **greed**, which easily expands to seeking to have anything which is good whether we have a right to it or not. The **seventh commandment** is relevant to controlling greed, the **fourth** assures that we care for those who generated us, and **fifth** protects the lives of those whom others have generated. The sacraments of generativity are clearly **Matrimony** and **Holy Orders**. The one provides and enhances generation on the natural level, the other on the spiritual level. The beatitude of **hunger and thirst for justice** identifies what is worth generating as does the gift of **understanding** applied to ultimate goals in life.

In the stage of **integrity,** we recognize that our lives have been worthwhile and tend to identify with all humankind. Because we identify with humanity at this stage, the work of mercy of **praying for the living and the dead** is most apt. The **eighth commandment** calls on us to speak the truth which is essentially integrity between the reality and what we say about it. The process of identification with others is one of the forms of **self-transcendence** which Maslow addresses in his treatment of 'peak experiences'. The capital sin of **anger** results from a failure to identify with the other and prevents us from developing such identification. In addition to strengthening us for continuing life, the **Anointing of the Sick** also provides preparation for death. It facilitates the release of attachments to life, as it is presently, in order to become one with God and others in the eternal happiness of heaven. Because persons in the stage of integrity identify with all others, they experience the beatitude of being **merciful**. Identification with others also makes being merciful easier because it enables us to take the other's position and realize how we should treat them to make them happiest. The gift of **wisdom**, sometimes defined as a taste for what is best, seems clearly the appropriate gift of the Holy Spirit for this final stage of human development before death. Indeed, Erikson's integrity might be viewed as the natural counterpart of such supernatural wisdom.

That Erikson ended his psychosocial stages with integrity is understandable because he was a scientifically

trained person whose field ignored the supernatural. However, according to Christian teaching, there should be another stage, **unity** with God. The face-to-face unity of the Beatific Vision is the eternal outcome and reward of a life of increasing service to and identification with Christ in others. This is associated, as St. Paul says, with the virtue of **charity**, the only theological virtue which continues to exist in heaven (See 1 Cor. 13:8, 13). The point can also be made that Maslow's need for **knowledge and understanding** is satisfied perfectly in this Vision. In heaven we become one with God to the extent a finite being can, and this is knowing in the Biblical sense. And such unity brings about the maximum understanding we finite beings can have. Clearly, there is no possibility of sin in heaven so there is no parallel with the capital sins in this stage unless it be **hell**, the ultimate result of committing those sins and not repenting. Sacramental signs are no longer needed in this final state of blessedness. The beatitude of **purity of heart** specifies the source of earthly happiness and notes that those possessing the characteristic "shall see God". The Beatific Vision is the heavenly fulfillment of this promise. Similarly, because the Beatific Vision is the ultimate gift of the Holy Spirit, there seems no parallel gift in this state. Nor is there in heaven any commandment which we must keep.

Perhaps the foregoing possibilities indicate somewhat how our knowledge of principles from various sources, notably psychology, can not only create problems when we implement they incorrectly but can also support our human and spiritual lives.

Love, Loss, and Liturgy

As noted several times already, the experience, idea, and reality of love is a pervasive human one. Because we humans are both rational and animal, we have bodies, emotions, minds, and wills. Further, all our faculties form a unity if we are healthy. Indeed, one of the defining characteristics of psychological health is the congruence and authenticity which Rogers noted, while psychological disorder is a lack of unity among our various faculties and a lack of unity of our self with the reality outside our skins. Love, because it is essentially relational, is perhaps the most basic unifying force among all our faculties and between each of us and external reality. Thus, it is crucial to give some attention to love, and how to love well.

Love Is a Four-Letter Word
Because one of the talks to the Carmelite Sisters occurred on St. Valentine's Day, we considered LOVE, a four-letter word which is widely used, and misused. We began that consideration with each of us thinking of our favorite Scripture passage is which contains the word love, or charity, if you prefer. My favorite passage has always been: "God so loved the world that He gave his only-begotten Son that whoever believes in Him may not perish but may have eternal life" (Jn. 3:16). In addition to being extremely comforting in its message, that passage also embodies very well the basic meaning of the term, love.

When I first began teaching, we were addressing love in a freshman religion class so I asked my students for a definition of love. One of them immediately responded, "**Love is wanting someone's good**". For a high-school freshman to have learned that, is really impressive and indicated how well his parents and teachers had educated him. I have used his definition repeatedly throughout my teaching and students seem to understand and resonate with it. If we look at my favorite Scripture passage and substitute the phrase for the word, we get "God so wanted the good of the world that He gave his only-begotten Son that whoever believes in Him may not perish but may have eternal life" (Jn. 3:16). That passage not only shows that God wants our good, but adds an additional aspect to the meaning of love. Love is wanting someone's good **AND doing what we can to promote it**. Hence, God didn't just want our good; He took action to achieve it; He loves us. First, He gave us existence. Then He provided guidelines on how to live so we would achieve good and be happy. Thirdly, He gave us His Son, thus making available to us the Good He wanted for us. That dual concept of willing and acting seem crucial to what love is; however, willing and acting presupposes knowing what is really good and how to promote it. The emotional aspects are concomitant with the others in healthy humans. If any of these factors is lacking, whatever there is, it isn't fully love. To love fully requires knowing what is good, choosing it, and taking action to promote it; doing so typically produces the emotions we often associate with love.

To relate the concept of love to an earlier point, note that Rogers' concept of **unconditional positive regard** is an important one but was misinterpreted and/or misapplied. The reason a therapist provides unconditional positive regard is that he/she wants the good of the client and is providing therapy to promote that

good. Said more succinctly, the therapist loves the client. But in any situation where real love is involved, it is **crucial to know what is good for the person and what promotes that good**. That is not always easy to decide, but is essential if we are to promote the good instead of its opposite. Providing unconditional positive regard for harmful behavior is not good for the client, so the misapplication of the principle of unconditional positive regard has had the opposite effect in many cases. From what we hear on the news, it is evident that many people who engage in illegal or harmful behavior, despite social arrangements which favor unconditional positive regard for all their actions, do not have higher self-esteem or self-actualization which were the desired outcomes of giving them that unconditional positive regard. The very pattern of their actions, and the fact that so many are repeat offenders, indicates that they are **not** self-actualized, not really happy.

Holy Scripture provides us with much information about what is good for humans and also much evidence of the love of God for us, so examining what it says about love is revealing. The old-fashioned way to find references to love in Scripture is to use a *Concordance*. Following that procedure, and counting references to "love" including the past tense provided some interesting results because we tend to perceive the Old Testament as more harsh and rigorous and the New Testament as more gentle and understanding. The data were as follows. In the 43 books of the Old Testament, there were 136 references to love while in the 27 books of the New Testament, there were 86. If the two sources are, indeed, different with respect to references to love, the ratio of books and the number of references in each Testament should be different. The calculated ratios were: the ratio of number of books in the Old Testament to that in the New is 43 divided by 27 or 1.59. The ratio of number of mentions of love in the Old Testament to those in the New is 136 divided by 86 or 1.58. In other words, love is mentioned essentially the same proportion of times in the books of the Old Testament and those of the New. Because such data did not confirm the perception of difference between the two covenants, the ratio of number of mentions to number of books in each might support the view. The ratio for the Old Testament is 136 mentions in 43 books or 3.15 while the ratio for the New Testament is 86 mentions in 27 books is 3.14, again essentially identical results

Because the calculated ratios were almost equal, the perception that the Old Testament is more demanding while the New is more lenient may be inaccurate, or there might be a different basis for the perception. A review of the references showed that, in the Old Testament, many referred to love between spouses, between parents and children, and other forms of what might be considered human love while those in the New Testament seemed more about what might be called "supernatural love" – love of God, love of neighbor, love of enemies. Perhaps that difference was due to the possibility that translators may have used a different term, charity, in the New Testament to refer to supernatural love. A check of the *Concordance* again for references to charity showed that the Old Testament had only 3 while the New Testament had 50. Thus, though there are 43 books in the Old Testament and only 27 in the New, charity is mentioned in the latter 16.6 times more frequently (50 divided by 3). Evidently, charity is mentioned proportionately much more in the New Testament.

When we recognize the distinction between what might be called human love and divine love, it may be useful to remember that philosophers and religious thinkers have distinguished four kinds of love: *Eros*, *Amicitia*, *Philia*, and *Agape*. Though we referred to these earlier in the context of Maslow's hierarchy of needs, we will expand a little now.

Eros can be thought of as romantic, sexual love. It seems to have a goodly amount of self-interest involved in it. It certainly involves wanting another's good, but there is a large component of wanting that good **for oneself**. It is love because it includes wanting another's good, but it seems to be a lower form of love because it has a somewhat selfish component.

Amicitia is the love of friendship. It involves wanting the good of the other and their reciprocal wanting of our good. This form of love provides that wonderfully psychologically beneficial response from the other that they accept and care for us even when we don't live up to functioning as our best self. Perhaps this is close to Rogers' unconditional positive regard for the other. Because this is reciprocal, it involves less self-interest than *eros* so can be considered a higher form of love.

Philia seems to be a more rationally based love. It goes beyond physical or emotional attraction and leads us to appreciate what is really good **for** others and to try to assure that they get that good. Because it involves intellect and will more than the other two types, it seems to be a higher form of love. *Philia* leads us to transcend what might make others **feel** better, often temporarily, and leads us to try to provide that which helps them **be** better, permanently if possible. Without a rational basis, love can lead us to do things which may produce nice

effects in the short term but which have unfortunate effects in the long term. When this occurs, our efforts have not really helped achieve the other's good even though that's what we wanted to do. As the poet, Robert Burns noted, "The best-laid plans of mice and men gang aft agley". My mother, who seemed to have an aphorism for every occasion, used to tell me that the road to hell was paved with good intentions.   More recently, Fr. James Schall, S.J. (2009), a sociology professor at a prestigious Jesuit university, pointed out in an article in the *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly*, that, "Compassion, sympathy, charity, kindness, benevolence, justice, and friendship without truth are among the world's most dangerous realities. *Good will does not replace good sense* (p. 12, italics mine). Those statements encapsulate what can happen if we don't have rational bases for what we do because we love someone, want their good. Our well-intended efforts may make them feel better in the short term but harm them in the long. This, unfortunately, seems to have become quite prevalent in the U.S. since the 1960's with the social emphasis on unconditional positive regard and following one's feelings without a rational basis for doing so. Also unfortunately, Maslow and Rogers have been identified with some of the problems despite their attempts to forestall the misuse of their ideas. Thus, Marc Antony's comment about Julius Caesar seems applicable to these psychologists: "The evil that me do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones."

Agape is often referred to as selfless love. Selfless is a better term than unselfish, because other forms of love can be unselfish in that they can lead us to do things we don't feel like doing or which we find difficult. In the case of *agape*, the person may not even be aware of her/himself. In that sense, it is self-less. In wanting another's good and acting to assure they get it, we become so focused on the other that we have no awareness of ourselves at all. This seems to be what happens in contemplation. We get so engaged with God that we are not even aware we are so engaged. This is also what happens in the Beatific Vision, if I understood my catechism properly.

A Small Educational Digression: When the Education Department at the College of Santa Fe had its first Celebration of Teaching, which involved having a number of high-school students who were interested in becoming teachers come to campus and hear about our program, the faculty member who planned the event, asked me if I would provide the 'keynote address' at the closing luncheon. When I asked why me, she told me that I must have many amusing anecdotes I could tell because I had been teaching so long, some 44 years at the time. As I thought about what to say to these young people, I decided that they deserved better than a series of amusing anecdotes. So I thought about what I consider important in education, and what St. La Salle told the Brothers about how to relate to their students. Because he said that the Brothers must not just teach their students but must love them, I began to consider some implications of that mandate.

I have held for many years that **a good educator** – and we are all educators in some sense, especially since the mandate from Vatican II about the "new evangelization" – **must have a soft heart and a hard head**. As I juxtaposed that with St. La Salle's advice to love one's students, I realized that those two characteristics embody the two aspects of the definition of love. We must love others, be they students or even our enemies. That is, we must want their good. Further, we must act to provide or help them achieve that good. Having a soft heart indicates wanting their good. Having a hard head indicates that we know what brings about their real good and not just a temporary feeling of pleasure or well-being and implement it. In effect, St. La Salle has challenged the Brothers with respect to their students, as Jesus challenged all of us with respect to everyone, to love as He has loved us (Mt. 5:44; Mt. 19:10. 22:39; Mk. 12:31; 12:33; Lk. 6:27, 35; Jn. 13:34, 35). End of digression.

Secular culture has grasped St. Valentine's Day and turned it into a commercial event. Still, there are benefits to using the day to remind ourselves what love really involves and ask the saint's help to achieve that universal love to which Jesus calls all of us. For everyone's benefit, we humans need to get beyond the commercial to the one thing to which essentially all the great world religions call their adherents: Love one another as you would be loved. The following material summarizes how those religions have come to the same conclusion. Perhaps it would be helpful to remember our commonality in this rather than the differences which we sometimes seem to emphasize to the detriment of loving our neighbor.

<div align="center">

THE UNIVERSAL RULE

</div>

Scholars of comparative religion have discovered that one central ethical teaching is found in almost identical form in all major religions:

"This is the sum of duty: Do nothing unto others which would cause you pain if it were done to you."
        Hinduism (Mahabharata 5:1517)

"In happiness and suffering, in joy and grief, we should regard all creatures as we regard our own self."
      Jainism (Lord Mahavir)

"Hurt not others in way that you yourself would find hurtful."
      Buddhism (Udana-Farga, 5:18)

"Do not do unto others what you would not have them do unto you."
      Confucianism (Analects of Confucius 15:23)

"That nature only is good when it shall not do unto another whatever is not good for its own self."
      Zoroastrianism (Dadistan-i-Dinik, 94:5)

"What is hateful to you, do not do to your fellow human being. That is the law; all the rest is commentary."
      Judaism (Talmud, Shabbat 31a)

"Always treat others as you would like them to treat you: That is the Law and the prophets."
      Christianity (Matthew 7:12)

"No one of you is a believer until he desires for his brother that which he desires for himself."
      Islam (Sunnah)

"Do not create enmity with anyone, for God is within everyone."
      Sikhism (Guru Granth Sahib 259)

"The foundation is respect for all life."
      Native American (The Great Law of Peace)

[adapted from a compilation by the Temple of Understanding]

Fisher, M.P. (1999). *Religion in the twenty-first century*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Loss
      As noted earlier, all humans experience **loss** in some form, and loss of love is probably the most serious loss we experience. Essentially, all sin is a loss of connection with God, not loving Him as we ought. Because of that loss, we seem naturally desirous of re-connecting with God as St. Augustine pointed out when he commented in his *Confessions* that "our hearts were made for Thee alone, and they are restless until they rest in Thee". Fortunately, God has enabled us to re-establish that connection. The Old Testament is an account of a series of such losses and re-connections of the Israelites to Yahweh. The New Testament provides the ultimate solution with God – "God is Love" (I Jn. 4:8) – taking to initiative to re-bind us to Himself in Christ. This is the essence of religion, *re-ligare,* to tie together again. And the practice of religion is formally embodied in **liturgy**. Given the changes in liturgical practice in the Church since the Second Vatican Council, some of us may have experienced a sense of loss in that area. Before considering that area, however, let's consider the broader picture.

What We Have Lost?
      If we compare and contrast the past with the present, we might summarize our basic loss as **loss of balance** in a number of areas. We seem to have lost the balance between others and self, between self-denial and self-indulgence, between the common good and the individual's desires and needs, between Penance and Reconciliation in the case of the sacrament, between God's divinity and our creaturehood, between mortification and vivification, and other similar dualities. All of these losses of balance seem to indicate a **loss of reality contact**, an essential characteristic of human sanity. In the past, the first of each of the two dualities noted above may have become emphasized too much, a loss of balance in one direction. As is so typical of humans, we seem to have tried to restore the balance but ended by losing balance in the other direction. Of course, maintaining balance is not easy. That is why we admire gymnasts who perform on the balance beam and those who walk tightropes, for example. Thus, our contemporary emphasis on making everything easy instead of difficult seems to have led us to serious imbalance in a number of areas – because we are finite, the reality is

that not everything will be easy. Although each of these dualities is worth consideration, we will focus on one of those areas in which balance between God's transcendence and our ordinariness seems to have been lost, the liturgy.

Liturgy: Loss in a Specific Area

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* lists several causes of our having problems relating well to God. One such cause is "the cares and riches of this world" which distract us from our ultimate goal, God. The back cover of *Celebrating the Eucharist*, the missalette for summer, 2015, provided an example relevant to the Liturgy and how changes may have had unanticipated and undesired effects.

The ultimate test of a Christian community's liturgical life is whether it changes lives.
Does our liturgy call us to be one with the poor, to share our table with the hungry, to
visit the sick, to embrace the dying? If so, then we are well on our way to being more
like Christ and our liturgy, no matter its style, is truly a foretaste and a rehearsal of the eternal
Jerusalem.

In the end, if the liturgy does not change us into becoming more like Christ,
then it is nothing but ritual fits and follies. So, let's celebrate the liturgy well so it may
change our hearts and minds and send us into the world to make a difference.
-- Johan van Parys, *What's the Smoke For? And Other Burning Questions about the*
Liturgy, Liturgical Press, 2014

This simply repeats the criterion Jesus Himself gave us when He told His disciples, "By their fruits you will know them" (Mt. 7:16). It might be worthwhile to remember, with reference to the foregoing quotation, that we may sometimes "make a difference" which is not an improvement, as the author of the *Imitation* noted centuries ago, we may "change but not better thyself" (Bk. 3, Ch. 27, V. 3). This "medieval" view is corroborated by two contemporary commercials. One is from a major auto manufacturer which emphasizes that their new models are improvements over earlier ones. The other, for Valvoline motor oil, poses the question directly, "What good is change if it doesn't make you better?" The answer, of course, is that our goal should always be to make an improvement, not just a difference! Perhaps, contemporary advertising, despite the bad press given to the medieval in recent decades, is realizing that there was wisdom in that time!

Have "the Cares and Riches of the World" Contaminated the Liturgy?

Both the quotation above concerning the liturgy, and the fact that one day a Brother commented on a French idiom which he had encountered, seem relevant to the problem of "the cares and riches of the world" and what we may have lost liturgically. The idiom was *manger la balustrade,* literally, to eat the altar rail. Brother pointed out that the phrase was the French equivalent of our English phrase "holier than thou". The French term *balustrade* is used to refer to the altar rail as well as other handrails; hence, the implication that someone who considered her/himself "holier than thou" not only ate the Body of Christ in Communion at the altar rail but also ate the altar rail itself. The reference to the liturgy and to the altar rail, and its present absence, precipitated some observations which seem relevant.

The basic principle of human life, and most notably of the liturgy and anything associated with it, **is that God should be our center, our focus** – love of God is the first Great Commandment, after all. **"The cares and riches of the world" are a problem for us specifically because they distract us from our proper focus**. Loss of proper focus, in its extreme form, is idolatry. Pope Benedict XVI makes the same point in his treatment of the temptations of Jesus when he points out, "Thus the temptation story summarizes the entire struggle of Jesus: it is about the nature of his mission, but at the same time it is also about the right ordering of human life, about the way to be human, about the way of history. Finally, it is about *what is really important in the life of man*. This ultimate thing, this decisive thing, *is the primacy of God (Emphasis mine)*. The germ of all temptation is setting God aside, so that he seems to be a secondary concern when compared with all the urgent priorities of our lives. To consider ourselves, the needs and desires of the moment to be more important than he is – that is the temptation that always besets us. For in doing so we deny God his divinity, and we make ourselves, or rather, the powers that threaten us, into our god" (Cameron, 2006, p. 110).

From some time after the Council of Trent until some time after the Second Vatican Council, the church was a place set aside to focus on and worship God. On entering, we made the Sign of the Cross with holy water to remind us of our baptism and cleansing from sin. We genuflected before entering the pew to acknowledge God's real presence in the tabernacle, then knelt to adore Him. Everyone faced God and prayed to Him individually in their hearts or responded as a congregation when the liturgy called for communal response.

These congregational practices, and the very architecture of churches, made Christ in the tabernacle – Immanuel, God with us – the center of focus. Those arrangements implemented well the basic principle that God is the center of focus and attention, and promoted that focus. The fact that the altar rail separated the sanctuary (etymologically, sacred place) from the people in the pews further reminded us of **another truth, that God is transcendent and that we have a subordinate relation to Him as finite creatures**. All these arrangements and practices were apt implementations of the principle that God is our focus.

Also in the older arrangement, **the priest was in the leadership position**. He changed that position when his function changed and he was engaged in proclaiming the Word and was teaching the people its applications. For that purpose, he, quite logically, faced them; but, appropriately, he returned to his leadership position for the rest of the Mass. It may be worth recalling that **leaders should be in front of the followers *and heading in the same direction toward the same goal*** as is illustrated poetically by W.S. Gilbert's poem, *The Duke of Plaza Toro*, which satirizes the reverse:

> *In enterprise of martial kind, when there was any fighting,*
> *He led his regiment from behind; he found it less exciting.*
> *But when away his regiment ran, his place was at the fore, O-*
> *That celebrated, cultivated, underrated, noble man, The Duke of Plaza Toro*
>   *In the first and foremost flight, ha, ha!*
>   *You always found that knight, ha, ha!*
> *That celebrated, cultivated, underrated, noble man, The Duke of Plaza Toro.*
>
> *When to evade Destruction's hand, to hide they all proceeded,*
> *No soldier in that gallant band hid half as well as he did.*
> *He lay concealed throughout the war, and so preserved his gore, O!*
> *That unaffected, undetected, well connected warrior, The Duke of Plaza Toro.*
>   *In every doughty deed, ha, ha!*
>   *He always took the lead, ha, ha!*
> *That unaffected, undetected, well connected warrior, The Duke of Plaza Toro.*
>
> *When told that they would all be shot unless they left the service,*
> *That hero hesitated not, so marvelous his nerve is.*
> *He sent his resignation in, the first of all his corps, O!*
> *That very-knowing, overflowing, easygoing paladin, the Duke of Plaza Toro.*
>   *To men of grosser clay, ha, ha!*
>   *He always showed the way, ha, ha!*
> *That very-knowing, overflowing, easygoing paladin, the Duke of Plaza Toro.*

The changes in orientation of the priest to face the congregation, the relocation of the tabernacle to one side or elsewhere, and the acceptance of "visiting" with one another in the church all go counter to the principle that the church is a place to worship God, and that He should be the focus of our worship. The present arrangement is more conducive to the priest being "the sage on the stage" or "the star in the spotlight" instead of the leader of the people **to God**. Perhaps the changes were made because there was a desire to be more egalitarian, or to make the congregation feel good about themselves. Perhaps they were made because the earlier requirements were difficult; but whatever the reasons, the changes seem to go counter to the second part of the definition of love. The intent was wanting the good of the Faithful, but what was actually done seems to have had a counterproductive effect. A study by the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA) records the state of religious ignorance and indifference in the U.S. noting that only 4 percent of U.S. Catholics responding to the survey live as the Church says they should. Further, psychological research indicates that a difficult initiation and the requirement of difficult tasks to maintain membership in a group leads to greater commitment to the group, as the Marines and some athletic teams illustrate. The decrease in the number of practicing Catholics since the changes "made things easier" seems to indicate less commitment than before rather than more, clearly **not** the intended outcome. The fact that the focus changed from God to ourselves may be the crucial point.

Changes in language and language usage also indicate that the focus has changed. Over the years, some College students, and others not familiar with Catholic liturgy, have asked occasionally who the priest

was who "performed" Mass for some College function or which priest was "performing" daily Mass for the Brothers. The verb seemed strange until recently. In former times, the phraseology was that the priest "offered the sacrifice of the Mass" or "offered" Mass; then the more common usage was that the priest "said" Mass. With the change in sacerdotal orientation, perhaps "perform" has become the most apt verb to describe what actually happens in many cases. Have churches become theaters, or in the case of socializing, living rooms or pubs? Certainly, neither performing nor socializing was their original purpose. George Weigel (2016) has noted something similar in a column in the *Denver Catholic* titled "Dear Father: Please stop it".

There is another relevant language matter. When the liturgy was in Latin worldwide, the unity of the Church was clearer, and the faithful were able to participate everywhere. Since the vernacular became the rule, for the best of reasons, the faithful are at a loss unless they understand the local language, and some priests seem to succumb to the temptation to impose their preferred "translations" on the congregation instead of providing them with the Church's official texts. Scott Hahn (2015) quotes Pope Benedict XVI in the context of the meaning of theology, but the implication of the quotation is relevant here. Hahn notes that, "Benedict also attaches great importance [not only to reading the Scriptures but also] to the readings of the Fathers of the Church, and an even greater importance to the liturgical and sacramental dimension of the Word. The Word must always be read 'in the great company of the Church, in whose liturgy these events never cease to become present anew and in which the Lord speaks with us today'" (Hahn, 2015, p. l6). This statement implies that, just as the priest should not change meaning of Scriptural texts to suit his personal preference, so he should hold to the liturgical texts when celebrating Mass because, in both the Scriptures and the Liturgy, the **Lord** is the speaker rather than the priest. In those settings, the priest is functioning *in persona Christi* rather than as a private person. In taking this position, both Hahn and Pope Benedict XVI are following St. Augustine who, in his sermon, *On Shepherds,* states, "The friends of the Bridegroom are not enamored of their own voice but rejoice to hear the Bridegroom's voice." Later he adds, "Let all shepherds, then, live in the one Shepherd and make his voice heard so that the flock may hear and follow their Shepherd – not this or that shepherd but the one Shepherd. And let all who are in him have one voice, not different voices" (*Book of Prayer*, p. 640).

The foregoing observations also relate to the matter of decisions having unanticipated negative consequences rather than, or as well as, the intended positive ones. Use of the vernacular did have the positive result of making the liturgy more readily understandable locally, but has had the negative effect of making it less understandable globally, and that at a time when global travel has become more common than ever. Further, when the congregation used a missal to follow the Mass said in Latin, there was a common translation instead of the idiosyncratic ones of various publishers or of each celebrant. Thus, another unanticipated effect is that 2 of the 4 marks of the true Church – one and catholic (i.e., universal) have been dimmed. Will holiness and apostolicity also dim as "the cares and riches of the world" have their influence?

Similarly, and relating to both arrangement and phraseology, singing the *Benedictus* after the consecration made our response focus on Jesus Who had just come to be physically present on the altar. Also, the very phraseology, "Blessed is **He** Who comes in the name of the Lord", emphasized that the focus was Christ not the people in the pew, and the "Hosanna in the highest" praised and thanked Him for His coming; and that was a completely appropriate acclamation. When the *Benedictus* was moved to be said or sung before the consecration, evidently some liturgists recognized, most appropriately, a need for the congregation to respond to the consecration; thus, other acclamations were added. An earlier one, "**Christ** has died, **Christ** is risen, **Christ** will come again" maintained the focus on Christ. The current responses change the focus: "**We** proclaim your death …; When **we** eat this bread and drink this cup …; Save **us**, Savior of the world …." Have "the cares and riches of the world" led us to be so conscious of our own needs and wants, and of our own achievements and importance, that we have attempted to make ourselves the focus instead of God? Present liturgical arrangements can readily be interpreted as an affirmative answer to that question. It seems we have made the same error as our first parents attempting to put ourselves in place of God. Another example of the development of the "I-niverse"???

Though focusing on a completely different matter, totalitarianism, Smith, (2016) corroborates the points of both Pope Benedict XVI and Weigel, by noting an underlying commonality, shift from focus on God to focus on self:

> *Just as the totalitarian impetus of Nazism and Marxism is clear, so it is manifest in capitalism, for the unfettered market is the expression of the absolute individual human will, while the "global electorate" expresses the absolute will of the many. In each of these cases, God   has*

been harnessed as the absolute will of the most representative class of humanity according to   the theory.
       What has this to do with traditionalists and progressives in the Church?
       A liturgical controversy has plagued the Church since the Second Vatican Council. Both Pope St. John Paul II and Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI believed that some of the teachings of the   Council had been misinterpreted and misapplied, to the injury of Christ's faithful people.   Nowhere was this more apparent than in the liturgical changes of the post-conciliar era.   Liturgical   progressives, believing in the absolute primacy of the contemporary, pushed the reform of the liturgy   as far as they dared, promoting the human elements of the liturgy over the divine,   breaking down the   distinction between clergy and people, and replacing awe with good cheer.
       Traditionalists, on the other hand, particularly those who went into schism, also had an absolute, their own private judgment. They remained attached to the old liturgy by an act of the will.   Indeed, they elevated their own will above the will of the Church, making it just as absolute as the   progressives' will for the contemporary. One party remained grimly attached to a particular historical era in the history of the Church (the Tridentine), while the other came down from the mountain with   Zarathustra and announced its achievement of the modernist will. Neither party accepted the will of the   Council with Christian docility. Each understood its own will to be absolute (p. 30-31).

Despite our advancement in many areas, we humans seem bent on repeating original sin, allowing the "cares and riches of this world", some of the latter brought about by our own achievements, to lead us to behave as if we were absolute rather than docilely acknowledging the truth that only God is. Note that the point of addressing focus is in the context of love. When we love someone, we focus on them – the image of the "love-struck teenager" provides a stereotypic image. Thus, if we love God and do not want to lose His love, we focus on Him rather than "the cares and riches of this world", or even on ourselves.

While what was **lost** in **liturgy** through the various changes is a specific example, it encapsulates loss in a number of the other areas we have considered. By losing focus on God in the Liturgy, we lose contact with, and **love** of, the Ultimate Reality, and in doing so we lose a good deal of **reason** and **religion** as well. In losing **reality** contact, we lose apt awareness of our **finiteness** and **fallibility** and betray a certain loss of **faith** in God as our Creator, Savior, and Sanctifier. Further, we lose some of the appropriate applications of the **principles** we know from **philosophy** and **psychology**. So while liturgical losses may seem relatively unimportant, after all we spend only a small time of our lives in liturgical worship, they indicate losses in much more important areas including our basic sanity as humans and our proper relation with God.

An Expert Conclusion

To conclude our considerations, we could do worse than listen to an expert. Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI was a university professor of theology before becoming pope. He was also present at the Second Vatican Council, so he has considerable expertise, both academic and experiential, to share. He makes the following points in an excerpt from his writings included in Cameron, (2006). In a short meditation titled "The Creating Reason is Love", the Pope links a number of the ideas we have considered. He says:

       *"The more we can delve into the world with our intelligence, the more clearly the plan of creation appears. In the end to reach the definitive question I would say: God exists or he does not exist. There are only two options. Either one recognizes the priority of reason, of creative Reason that is at the beginning of all things – the priority of reason is also the priority of freedom – or one holds the priority of the irrational, inasmuch as everything that functions on our earth and in our lives would be only accidental, marginal, an irrational result – reason would be a product of irrationality. One cannot ultimately "prove" either project, but the great option of Christianity is the option for rationality and for the priority of reason. This seems to me to be an excellent option, which shows us that behind everything is a great Intelligence to which we can entrust ourselves… Therefore, we can confidently work out a vision of the world based on this priority of reason, on this trust that **the creating Reason is love and that this love is God**"* (p. 329) (Emphasis mine).

Love's Labors Found

To find again what love's labors have lost, it seems we need to regain touch with **reality**, **reason**, and **religion** so that we know what is truly good for ourselves and others and how to promote that good. Some of the realities we need to advert to are our **finiteness** and **fallibility** because of which we need to rely on **faith**, both natural and supernatural, to limit our mistakes. Turning to **philosophy** and **psychology**, along with science and religion, we can find some **principles** in which we can place our faith, both natural and supernatural. Such principles can serve as guidelines for decisions and actions for our own and others' good. Thus, with both natural and supernatural helps, notably the **liturgy**, we can **love** God, ourselves, and others well and promote what is really good for all of us increasingly well, thus regaining some important things we had **lost**. In that way, "love's labors lost" may be found.

Brother A. George Hetzel, F.S.C.
Professor of Education and Psychology (retired)
Notes for presentations given 10 June 2017 at St. Michael's High School, Santa Fe, NM

REFERENCES

ASCD 1962 Yearbook Committee. (1962). *Perceiving, behaving, becoming: A new focus for education*. Washington, D.C.: ASCD

Bloom, B.S., Englehart, M.D., Furst, E.J., Hill, W.H., & Krathwohl, D.R. (Eds). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York: Longmans, Green.

Book of Prayer for Personal Use. (1975). Collegeville, MN: St. John's Abbey Press.

Brothers of the Christian Schools. (1947). *Common Rule and Constitution of the Brothers of the Christian Schools*. Rome: Mother House.

Cameron, P.J. (2006). *Benedictus: Day by day with Pope Benedict XVI*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press

Catechism of the Catholic Church. (1994). Ligouri, MO: Ligouri Publications.

Festinger, L. (1964). *Conflict, decision, and dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Fisher, M.P. (1999). *Religion in the twenty-first century*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Fowler, J.W. (1981). *Stages of faith: The psychology of human development and the quest for meaning*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: A theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*. New York: Basic Books.

Greenleaf, R.K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. New York: Paulist Press.

Gutek, G. (1988). *Philosophical and ideological perspectives on education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hahn, S. (2015). Title unknown. *New Oxford Review*, Volume and issue unavailable.

Harrow, A.J. (1974). *A taxonomy of the psychomotor domain*. New York: David McKay.

Hetzel, A.G. (2001). *Spiritual Life: Grace builds on nature.* Available at www.sfis.org.

_____. (2008). *Philosophical and sociological perspectives on education.* Available at www.sfis.org.

Krathwohl, D.R., Bloom, B.S., & Masia, B.B. (1964). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Handbook II: Affective domain.* New York: David McKay.

Maslow, A.H. (1965). *Eupsychian management.* Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

Rogers, C.R. (1961). *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Schall, J.V. (2009, Winter). Why temporal things need ultimate things: On the purpose of the world. *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly.* **32**(2), 10-14.

Smith, R.U. (2016, April). Traditionalist and Progressive: Totalitarians in the Church. *New Oxford Review,* LXXXIII

Weigel, G. (2016). "Dear Father: Please stop it". *Denver Catholic*, Date, volume, issue unavailable.