

THE TEACHINGS OF CARL JUNG: A BIZARRE BLEND OF BLASPHEMY, MYTHOLOGY, & PSYCHOLOGY

The twisted psychological theories of Carl Jung have for a few decades dotted the landscape of modern literature and culture. Originally a friend and younger contemporary of Freud, Jung eventually went his own way, unable to agree with Freud's sexual emphasis. Today, Jung is revered by New Age proponents and known for his strategic role in the founding of Alcoholics Anonymous. His theories of the "archetype" lurk beneath the surface in *The Masculine Journey*, a book authored by Robert Hicks and heavily promoted by Promise Keepers today. Popular author M. Scott Peck, who wrote *The Road Less Traveled*, is thoroughly rooted in Jung's bizarre theology. Psychologists Minirth and Meier, popular among Christians, call Jung a "pioneering psychologist," adopting his theories of individuation in their claim that a person cannot establish a strong relationship with the Lord until close to the age of thirty.

In one of his lesser known works, *Psychology of Religion*, apologetics professor Cornelius Van Til lays bare the faulty underpinnings of the modern "psychology of religion" school, which he considers an *attack* on Christian theism. Jung's aberrations fall within the sphere of this particular battle. His atheism is masked by language that "explains" religious experience in the language of modern psychology.

Three books authored by Jung are reviewed in this paper. Their abbreviations are as follows:

<i>Answer to Job</i>	ATJ
<i>Memories, Dreams, Reflections</i>	MDR
<i>Psychology and Religion</i>	PR

JUNG'S BACKGROUND AND FOUNDATIONS

It is tragically misleading to note Jung's professed affiliation with Christianity:

"Jung explicitly declared his allegiance to Christianity, and the most important of his works deal with the religious problems of the Christian. He looked at these questions from the standpoint of psychology, deliberately setting a bound between it and the theological approach. In so doing he stressed the necessity of understanding and reflecting, as against the Christian demand for faith." (p. xi, MDR)

Jung is said to be "grieved" over the fact that his writings were not initially accepted by Christians. He believed that his *Answer to Job* was met with much misunderstanding, and anticipated a similar reaction to his memoirs in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, a book described as "Jung's religious testament" (p. x, MDR).

Today, however, the tide has turned. Jung would no doubt be pleased to see the uncritical acceptance of his work by numerous professing *Christian* psychologists. In view of the bizarre, blasphemous nature of his theology, this trend is alarming to believers who desire to earnestly contend for the "faith once and for all delivered to the saints" (Jude 3). The true nature of his writings must be exposed, so that believers are warned.

Despite his "allegiance to Christianity," it is clear at the outset that Jung radically rejects any orthodox understanding of the faith:

"Jung's concept of religion differed in many respects from traditional Christianity--above all in his answer to the problem of evil and his concept of a God who is not entirely good or kind. From the viewpoint of dogmatic Christianity, Jung was distinctly an 'outsider.'" (p. x, MDR)

Jung's early view of Christ. At an early age, Jung indeed showed himself to be an "outsider" to Christianity. His comments concerning our Lord speak for themselves:

"Lord Jesus never became quite real for me, never quite acceptable, never quite lovable, for again and again I would think of his underground counterpart, a frightful revelation which had been accorded me without seeking it." (p. 13, MDR; the "underground counterpart" is a reference to Jung's diabolical vision of a "phallic god" at age 3.)

"Lord Jesus seemed to me in some ways a god of death, helpful, it is true, in that he scared away the terrors of the night, but himself uncanny, a crucified and bloody corpse."
(p. 13, MDR)

"I made every effort to force myself to take the required positive attitude to Christ. But I could never succeed in overcoming my secret distrust." (p. 14, MDR)

"Consciously, I was religious in the Christian sense, though always with the reservation: 'But it is not so certain as all that!'" (p. 22, MDR)

During his very early years, even by the age of six, Jung was fascinated by illustrations of Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva: "I had an obscure feeling of their affinity with my 'original revelation'" (p. 17, MDR). That "original revelation" is recorded in Jung's memoirs. It is a highly obscene vision he experienced at age three, a demonic combination of obscenity with worship, wherein a ritual phallus is enthroned:

"On this platform stood a wonderfully rich golden throne. I am not certain, but perhaps a red cushion lay on the seat. It was a magnificent throne, a real king's throne in a fairy tale. Something was standing on it which I thought at first was a tree trunk twelve to fifteen feet high and about one and a half to two feet thick. It was a huge thing, reaching almost to the ceiling. But it was of a curious composition: it was made of skin and naked flesh, and on top there was something like a rounded head with no face and no hair. On the very top of the head was a single eye, gazing motionlessly upward." (p. 12, MDR)

Jung records an "aura of brightness" above the enthroned phallus, and a feeling of extreme terror. He calls the phallus "a subterranean God 'not to be named'" (p. 13, MDR), and as a child he began to associate this "god" with the Lord Jesus. Sadly, his early rejection of the Christian faith continued to escalate throughout his life.

Perhaps most distressing of all is the vision recorded in Jung's *Analytical Psychology* and recently quoted in *The Jung Cult*, by Richard Noll. During a descent into the "unconscious," and supposedly into the "underworld," here is what he sees:

"Then a most disagreeable thing happened. Salome became very interested in me, and she assumed I could cure her blindness. She began to worship me. I said, 'Why do you worship me?' She replied, 'You are Christ.' In spite of my objections she maintained this. I said, 'This is madness,' and became filled with skeptical resistance. Then I saw the snake approach me. She came close and began to circle me and press me in her coils. The coils reached up to my heart. I realized as I struggled that I had assumed the attitude of the Crucifixion. In the agony and the struggle, I sweated so profusely that the water flowed down on all sides of me.

Then Salome rose, and she could see. While the snake was pressing me, I felt that my face had taken on the face of an animal of prey, a lion or a tiger."¹

Jung has one thing right: "This is madness"!

Jung's father. Jung was the son of a Protestant minister, whose preaching he ignored:

"When I heard him preaching about grace, I always thought of my own experience. What he said sounded stale and hollow, like a tale told by someone who knows it only by hearsay and cannot quite believe it himself." (p. 42-43, MDR)

In later years, Jung's father experienced a "religious collapse" (p. 91, MDR). Jung recalls that:

"...my poor father did not dare to think, because he was consumed by inward doubts. He was taking refuge from himself and therefore insisted on blind faith." (p. 73, MDR)

Jung blames this collapse on the Christian church and its theology:

"I saw how hopelessly he was entrapped by the Church and its theological thinking. They had blocked all avenues by which he might have reached God directly, and then faithlessly abandoned him. Now I understood the deepest meaning of my earlier experience: God Himself had disavowed theology and the Church founded upon it." (p. 93, MDR)

In contrast to his father, Jung "reached God directly," but only by denying the God of Scripture and *equating the inner man with God*.

Jung notes that his father "could not even defend himself against the ridiculous materialism of the psychiatrists" who he believed "had discovered something in the brain which proved that in the place where mind should have been there was only matter, and nothing 'spiritual'" (p. 94, MDR).

Although Jung himself never embraced this "ridiculous materialism," what he did embrace is a thinly disguised form of atheism. We will be looking at his view of "religious ideas" as existing purely within the mind of man. Historical facts--the

¹ *The Jung Cult*, p. 213.

life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ--have no place in his system.

Jung's "peculiar religious ideas," as he calls them, are claimed to be "spontaneous products which can be understood only as reactions to my parental environment and to the spirit of the age" (p. 90, MDR). Biblically, however, his ideas must be understood as yet another attempt to "hold down the truth in unrighteousness" (Romans 1:18).

Jung's Apostasy. Jung describes at length a period in his childhood when he lived in terror of committing the unpardonable sin of blaspheming the Holy Spirit (p. 36-40, MDR). Finally, he simply "let the thought come," claiming to subsequently experience grace rather than damnation.

But, in view of Jung's diabolical theology, discerning Christians cannot consider Jung's experience to be one of genuine saving grace. His "grace" experience became his "secret." Jung himself describes his exit from Christianity:

"Church gradually became a place of torment to me."
(p. 45, MDR)

"I could no longer participate in the general faith, but found myself involved in something inexpressible, in my secret, which I could share with no one. It was terrible and--this was the worst of it--vulgar and ridiculous also, a diabolical mockery." (p. 56, MDR)

"Insofar as they all represented the Christian religion, I was an outsider." (p. 56, MDR)

"The farther away I was from church, the better I felt. The only things I missed were the organ and the choral music, but certainly not the 'religious community.'" (p. 75, MDR)

Family discussions of biblical narratives..."made me feel distinctly uncomfortable, because of the numerous and barely credible accounts of miracles." (p. 73, MDR)

This man is clearly out of place among God's people, and his continuing theological development proves beyond any doubt that he is an "outsider" to our faith.

Two Selves? In his memoirs, Jung frequently describes himself in terms of two personalities, "No. 1" and "No. 2." When

dominated by the latter, he says that "at such times I *knew* I was worthy of myself, that I was my true self" (p. 45, MDR).

Demonically driven. It is crucial to note Jung's admission of the demonic inspiration underlying his psychological theories:

"...there was a demonic strength in me, and from the beginning there was no doubt in my mind that I must find the meaning of what I was experiencing in these fantasies. When I endured these assaults of the unconscious I had an unswerving conviction that I was obeying a higher will, and that feeling continued to uphold me until I had mastered the task."
(p. 177, MDR)

"From the beginning I had conceived my voluntary confrontation with the unconscious as a scientific experiment which I myself was conducting and in whose outcome I was vitally interested. Today I might equally well say that it was an experiment which was being conducted *on me*." (p. 178, MDR)

"I have had much trouble getting along with my ideas. There was a demon in me, and in the end its presence proved decisive. It overpowered me, and if I was at times ruthless it was because I was in the grip of the demon. I could never stop at anything once attained. I had to hasten on, to catch up with my vision. Since my contemporaries, understandably, could not perceive my vision, they saw only a fool rushing ahead." (p. 356, MDR)

At least one demon, Philemon, was specifically identified:

"...another figure rose out of the unconscious. He developed out of the Elijah figure. I called him Philemon. Philemon was a pagan and brought with him an Egypto-Hellenistic atmosphere with a Gnostic coloration." (p. 182, MDR)

Jung credits this demon with teaching him "psychic objectivity, the reality of the psyche" (p. 183, MDR). Specifically:

"Psychologically, Philemon represented superior insight. He was a mysterious figure to me. At times he seemed to me quite real, as if he were a living personality." (p. 183, MDR)

"Philemon and other figures of my fantasies brought home to me the crucial insight that there are things in the psyche which I do not produce, but which produce themselves and have their own life. Philemon represented a force which was not myself." (p. 183, MDR).

Jung considered Philemon a "ghostly guru" or "spirit teacher," as explained to him by an elderly Indian friend of Ghandi's (p. 184, MDR). Clearly, however, we must agree with Jung's own analysis and acknowledge him as a demon.

Occultism. In view of the demonic force driving Jung, it is hardly surprising he was directly involved in the occult. He initially discovered a book about spiritualistic phenomena in the library of a classmate's father (p. 98, MDR). His response was skeptical, yet open:

"The observations of the spiritualists, weird and questionable as they seemed to me, were the first accounts I had seen of objective psychic phenomena." (p. 99, MDR)

It wasn't long before Jung experienced several "strange manifestations" in his own house that he equated with spiritualist phenomena. Soon he was regularly attending Saturday night seances in the home of relatives (p. 106, MDR). Personal experiences of "haunting" in his adult home, with an "ominous atmosphere," are described more than once in his memoirs (p. 190, 229-230 MDR).

The demonic source of Jung's teachings can hardly be overstated or overemphasized.

Psychiatry. Jung clearly recognized the *religious* nature of his chosen career path, as expressed in his own words:

"Here alone the two currents of my interest could flow together and in a united stream dig their own bed. Here was the empirical field common to biological and spiritual facts, which I had everywhere sought and nowhere found. Here at last was the place where the collision of nature and spirit became a reality." (p. 109, MDR)

Friendship with Freud. In his early years of psychiatry, Jung developed a close relationship with Freud, largely due to his work in hysteria and dreams (p. 114, MDR). The friendship was eventually broken, as Jung was unable to accept Freud's blind commitment to his sexual theory, and Freud refused to acknowledge the occultism in which Jung had immersed himself. According to

Jung, Freud interpreted "occultism" to mean "everything that philosophy and religion, including the rising contemporary science of parapsychology, had learned about the psyche" (p. 150-151, MDR). Jung offers detailed psychological explanations for Freud's attitude:

"Although I did not understand it then, I had observed in Freud the eruption of unconscious religious factors. Evidently he wanted my aid in erecting a barrier against these threatening unconscious contents." (p. 151, MDR)

"Freud never asked himself why he was compelled to talk continually of sex, why this idea had taken such possession of him. He remained unaware that his 'monotony of interpretation' expressed a flight from himself, or from that other side of him which might perhaps be called mystical." (p. 152, MDR)

Jung's psychologized explanations, however, take *religious* form. He notes that for Freud, "the sexual libido took over the role of...a hidden or concealed god" (p. 151, MDR). He goes on to claim that Freud's fears constituted a "mythological situation...the struggle between light and darkness" (p. 155, MDR).

The Bible speaks directly to the aberrations of *both* of these men. Jung's occultism and Freud's atheism can both be understood as attempts of the unbeliever to "hold down the truth in unrighteousness" (Romans 1:18).

Jung's other "heroes." In addition to Freud, Jung finds inspiration in Faust, which he claims "awakened" him "to the problem of opposites...good and evil...mind and matter...light and darkness" (p. 235, MDR). This combination of opposites is a cornerstone in Jungian theory, particularly obnoxious in his view of the nature of God.

Atheist philosopher Nietzsche, an outspoken opponent of Christian theism who spent the last few years of his life in an asylum, was another major "mentor" to Jung. The reading of Nietzsche's *Thus Spake Zarathustra* was "a tremendous experience" for him (p. 102, MDR). Numerous glowing references to Nietzsche occur throughout Jung's writings. At one point, Jung notes that his work and family made possible a "normal" life in spite of his "strange inner world." Nietzsche, by contrast:

"...had lost the ground under his feet because he possessed nothing more than the inner world of his thoughts--which incidentally possessed him more than he it." (p. 189, MDR)

We have already noted Jung's own admission that he was "possessed" by something or someone beyond him.

Gnosticism, Mythology, and Alchemy. Jung describes the early development of his theories as follows:

"I read like mad, and worked with feverish interest through a mountain of mythological material, then through the Gnostic writers, and ended in total confusion." (p. 162, MDR)

In the process of this research, Jung began to observe "the close relationship between ancient mythology and the psychology of primitives" (p. 162). Thus begins the descent into a "religion" grounded in mythology rather than historical fact and/or truth.

Jung describes his interest in Gnosticism and alchemy as an attempt to "find evidence for the historical prefiguration" of his "inner experience" (p. 200, MDR). His studies of the Gnostic writers revealed that "they too had been confronted with the primal world of the unconscious and had dealt with its contents" (p. 200, MDR). Then came alchemy, "the historical link with Gnosticism":

"Alchemy formed the bridge on the one hand into the past, to Gnosticism, and on the other into the future, to the modern psychology of the unconscious." (p. 201, MDR)

Gnosticism is an ancient heresy replete with theological and christological horrors. It was condemned by the early Christian church. However, its teachings haunt us again today in the form of New Age theology, which Jung has helped to popularize.

Travels. Jung spends considerable space in his memoirs describing travels to North Africa, India, Kenya, and Uganda. He was relieved to escape to places where "no Christian conceptions prevailed" (p. 238, MDR). He was intrigued with "homosexual friendships," Islam, and Oriental philosophy/religion. Here are some of his comments:

"In traveling to Africa...I unconsciously wanted to find that part of my personality which had become invisible under the influence and pressure of being European...but I was not prepared for the existence of unconscious forces within

myself which would take the part of these strangers with such intensity, so that a violent conflict ensued."
(p. 244-5, MDR)

Jung observed adolescents in Africa who were "preparing, with the aid of a slender knowledge of the Koran, to emerge from their original state of twilight consciousness, in which they had existed from time immemorial, and to become aware of their own existence, in self-defense against the forces threatening them from the North." (p. 240, MDR)

"India affected me like a dream, for I was and remained in search of myself, of the truth peculiar to myself."
(p. 275, MDR)

In his Indian travels, Jung concluded that he had to find *his own truth*, not that of others, even "holy men." Jung's rejection of absolute universal truth is a key to unraveling his system.

Visions. Jung's search for *his own truth* led him to look within himself, particularly his dreams and visions. One such vision occurred while Jung was on the verge of death. He envisioned himself above the earth, about to approach a temple where he was certain he would discover the reason for his own existence (p. 289-291, MDR). His doctor, however:

"...had been delegated by the earth to deliver a message to me, to tell me that there was a protest against my going away. I had no right to leave the earth and must return. The moment I heard that, the vision ceased...I was not allowed to enter the temple." (p. 292, MDR)

Although initially enraged at the doctor, Jung subsequently entered an "utterly transformed state...floating in space...safe in the womb of the universe...in a tremendous void, but filled with the highest possible feeling of happiness...'eternal bliss'" (p. 293, MDR). He goes on to describe this ecstasy as "the presence of sanctity...a magical atmosphere...the 'sweet smell' of the Holy Ghost" (p. 295, MDR). Additionally, all time frames (past, present, future) merged (p. 296, MDR). Jung expresses certainty that his experience was not a mere figment of his imagination, but totally real and absolutely objective (p. 295, MDR).

Following this visionary experience, Jung claims to have had a time of great fruitfulness in his work, surrounding himself with

the "current of his thoughts" rather than putting forth his own opinions (p. 297, MDR).

It should be obvious to any discerning Christian that the bizarre inner world of Carl Jung is *not* the place to seek eternal truth about God, man, Christ, salvation, and the like. Jung, however, bases his theories on the foundation of his own untrustworthy imaginations.

The "Tower." Jung built a house, "the Tower," to represent his own psyche in stone:

"I had to achieve a kind of representation in stone of my innermost thoughts and of the knowledge I had acquired. Or, to put it another way, I had to make a confession of faith in stone." (p. 223, MDR)

"I wanted a room in this tower where I could exist for myself alone." (p. 224, MDR)

"I added an upper story to this section, which represents myself, or my ego-personality." (p. 225, MDR)

"It gave me a feeling as if I were being reborn in stone." (p. 225, MDR)

In this tower..."thoughts arise to the surface which reach back into the centuries, and accordingly anticipate a remote future." (p. 226, MDR)

Jung also describes an unusual stone brought to his home by mistake, but which he very much desired to keep. He compares it to "the alchemist's stone, the *lapis*, which is despised and rejected" (p. 227, MDR). *Note here the distortion of biblical truth about Christ, the chief cornerstone the builders rejected (1 Peter 2:7-8)! Jung also mentions his demon friend, or "spirit guide," Philemon, coming to life in his tower home and taking the form of his "No. 2" personality, "who has always been and always will be...he exists outside time and is the son of the maternal unconscious" (p. 225, MDR).*

This is pure occultism! Note carefully the phrases "confession of faith" and "being reborn in stone." However, there is no confession of faith in Christ, and no biblical experience of being born again by the Holy Spirit. We have here a religious counterfeit.

Seven Sermons to the Dead. One of Jung's most bizarre writings is a series of "sermons," addressed to the dead, in which Jung identifies himself with a Gnostic writer (p. 378ff, MDR). The "dead" ask Jung questions about whether God is dead and where He is. Jung names two "god-devils," one "Eros" or "burning one," the other "growing one" or "tree of life." (Note again the borrowing of Christian terms, the "tree of life" from the books of Genesis and Revelation.) Jung teaches in these "sermons" that it is wrong to replace a multiplicity of gods with one single deity (p. 385, MDR), and that "the world of the gods is made manifest in spirituality and sexuality" (p. 386, MDR). There are grotesque distortions throughout this very strange writing.

Jung's View of Religion

Jung's writings are permeated with clearly religious discussion, but not a viewpoint compatible with Christian theism. Jung recognized that human beings are "by nature religious" (p. x, MDR). He calls religion "one of the earliest and most universal activities of the human mind" (p. 1, PR), "...a relationship to the highest or strongest value, be it positive or negative" (p. 98, PR). Further, religion according to Jung is:

"...a dynamic existence or effect, not caused by an arbitrary act of will. On the contrary, it seizes and controls the human subject, which is always rather its victim than its creator." (p. 4, PR)

Rejecting the equation of religion with a particular creed, Jung claims instead that:

"...creeds are codified and dogmatized forms of original religious experience." (p. 6, PR)

The *purpose* of religion, says Jung, is to serve as a *substitute*:

"...replacing immediate experience by a choice of suitable symbols invested in a solidly organized dogma and ritual...people are effectively defended and shielded against immediate religious experience." (p. 52-3, PR)

Religious *dogma*, Jung claims, "expresses an irrational entity through the image" (p. 56, PR). The existence of such dogma is supposedly due to two factors:

"...so called 'revealed' immediate experiences" and "the ceaseless collaboration of many minds and many centuries."
(p. 56, PR)

The dogma, according to Jungian theory, is related to "unconscious" material:

"The dogma is like a dream, reflecting the spontaneous and autonomous activity of the objective psyche, the unconscious. Such an expression of the unconscious is a much more efficient means of defense against further immediate experiences than a scientific theory." (p. 57, MDR)

Jung is not concerned with objective truth *outside* the psyche (such as the suffering, death, and resurrection of Christ), but only with the internal world of man, particularly the "unconscious" as expressed in dreams and such. Thus religious dogma:

"...presents the soul more completely than a scientific theory...expresses aptly the living process of the unconscious in the form of the drama of repentance, sacrifice, and redemption." (p. 57, PR)

Jung believes that the "dogmas" of Christianity *occur equally often in pagan religions!* (p. 56, PR). For example:

"The suffering God-Man may be at least five thousand years old and the Trinity is probably even older." (p. 57, PR)

Truth is irrelevant here. Religious *symbols* within man, expressing particular moral and/or mental attitudes, are all that matter to Jung (p. 76, PR). The Trinity, in Jung's system, is transformed by the "unconscious" into a quaternity in order to add the feminine element to the equation (p. 76, PR). He considers the number four to be:

"an age-old, presumably pre-historical symbol, always associated with the idea of a world-creating deity...rarely understood as such by those modern people to whom it occurs."
(p. 71, PR)

Religious *experience* is for Jung an indisputable absolute. Some (notably atheists) may accuse him of replacing an "honest neurosis" with "the cheat of a religious belief," but he is concerned only with what occurs inside the mind of man. Note how

the experience of man, and man's interpretation, replaces *God's* revelation in Jungian psychology!

A new (but not really so new) form of idolatry occurs in Jung's writings, wherein the imaginations of the human mind are deified:

"...the gods in our time assemble in the lap of the ordinary individual and are as powerful and as awe-inspiring as ever, in spite of their new disguise--the so-called psychical functions." (p. 102, PR)

Jung deceptively "warns" against both materialistic atheism as well as psychologizing "god" out of existence:

"Since the throne of god could not be discovered among the galactic systems, the inference was that god had never existed. The second inevitable mistake is psychologism: if god is anything, he must be an illusion derived from certain motives, from fear, for instance, from will to power, or from repressed sexuality." (p. 103, PR)

Freud is one who clearly committed the error of "psychologism," yet *Jung is equally an atheist*. Both deny the transcendent Creator, distinct from His creation, to whom man is ultimately accountable.

Jung wants to equate modern atheists, like Nietzsche, with missionaries:

"...whereas early missionaries were conscious of serving a new God by combating the old ones, modern iconoclasts are unconscious of the one in whose name they are destroying old values." (p. 103, PR)

Jung supposedly wants to preserve religion, but the religion he maintains is not worthy of such preservation. Jung has denied the God of Scripture as blatantly as any atheist.

Jung and Christianity. Despite his rejection of orthodox Christian doctrine, Jung had much to say about the faith. He insists that he has left the "door open to the Christian message," which he considered "of central importance for Western man" if it were only "seen in a new light" (p. 210, MDR). His goal was to study "the relationship of the symbolism of the unconscious to Christianity as well as other religions" (p. 210, MDR). He gives "psychological interpretations" to the Trinity and other Christian

concepts, as well as the text of the Mass, comparing these interpretations to the visions of a third century Gnostic (p. 210, MDR).

Claiming that "every religion is a spontaneous expression of a certain predominant psychological condition" (p. 108, PR), Jung insists that Christianity in particular:

"...expressed one condition predominant just then, which does not exclude the existence of other conditions that are equally capable of religious expression." (p. 108, PR)

Jung utterly fails to see the exclusive truth of the Christian message. In fact, he remains totally in the dark concerning the core truth of the gospel:

"Our Christian religion--like every other, incidentally--is permeated by the idea that special acts or a special kind of action can influence God--for example, through certain rites or by prayer, or by a morality pleasing to the Divinity." (p. 253, MDR)

It is tragically misleading to see the phrase "our Christian religion," because Jung has no part in the Christian faith. There is no hint here that Jung recognizes man's need for salvation through faith alone in Christ alone.

Elsewhere Jung tells us that the most remarkable feature of Christianity, for him, is that "it anticipates a metamorphosis in the divinity" (p. 327, MDR). Actually, the incarnation is *not* such a "metamorphosis in the divinity." God the Son is co-eternal with God the Father. Jung also defines Christianity in terms of *myth*, stating that the "decisive stage" in the "myth" is "the self-realization of God in human form" (p. 328, MDR). Furthermore, he claims that the Christian faith includes:

"...the new myth of dissension in heaven, first alluded to in the creation myth in which a serpent-like antagonist of the Creator appears, and lures man to disobedience by the promise of increased conscious knowledge." (p. 327, MDR)

This is all a gross distortion of Christianity. Creation is not a "myth," but real historical fact. Our faith is grounded in real events of history, as God's eternal plan of redemption unfolds and culminates in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

But Jung carries his mythological ideas even further, lamenting that:

"The Christian nations have come to a sorry pass; their Christianity slumbers and has neglected to develop its myth further in the course of the centuries." (p. 331, MDR)

"Our myth has become mute, and gives no answers. The fault lies not in it as it is set down in the Scriptures, but solely in us, who have not developed it further, who, rather, have suppressed any such attempts." (p. 332, MDR)

The Bible makes it abundantly clear that Christianity is no "myth," subject to further development, but eternal truth grounded in real historical facts and the revelation of God to man. Jung's religion is *anything but* Christianity.

Jung reinterprets and redefines Christian concepts according to his own psychological imaginations and theories. Baptism, for example, is understood in terms of Jungian archetypes:

"Such initiations were often connected with the peril of death and so served to express the archetypal idea of death and rebirth." (p. 285, MDR)

In exploring the "Buddhist equivalent of prayer," Jung likewise subjects this Christian discipline to radical revision, saying that it is:

"...not adoration of a non-existent Buddha, but one of the many acts of self-redemption by the awakened human being." (p. 284, MDR)

This might suit New Age practitioners, but it has nothing to do with the biblical concept of prayer.

Christianity and Buddhism. Jung notes his experiences in reading Buddhist texts and visiting a Buddhist pagoda. In doing so, he observed young men who he believed to be filling their heads with sexual fantasies rather than spiritualization. A companion explained to him that they must first "fulfill their karma" prior to becoming "spiritualized" (p. 277, MDR).

Nevertheless, Jung was fascinated with Buddhism, seeing what he supposed to be parallels with Christianity. Both religions, he claimed, underwent a "transformation" concerned with becoming a

model for men to imitate (p. 279-80, MDR). Both, he insists, ultimately deify the *self*:

"For Buddha, the self stands above all gods, a *unus mundus* which represents the essence of human existence and of the world as a whole. The self embodied both the aspect of intrinsic being and the aspect of its being known, without which no world exists." (p. 279, MDR)

"Christ--like Buddha--is an embodiment of the self, but in an altogether different sense. Both stood for an overcoming of the world: Buddha out of rational insight; Christ as a foredoomed sacrifice." (p. 279, MDR)

"Both paths are right, but in the Indian sense Buddha is the more complete human being." (p. 279, MDR)

Buddha: "historical personality...easier for men to understand."

Christ: "at once a historical man and God...therefore much more difficult to comprehend." (p. 279, MDR)

Jung claims that Christ was incomprehensible even to Himself (p. 279, MDR)! It must be emphasized (again) at this juncture that Jung has mythologized the Christian faith and rejected its historical foundation. For him, the *facts* of the life of Christ are not so relevant as the *myths* created by the mind of man.

Gnosticism and Alchemy. As noted earlier, Jung was heavily influenced by Gnosticism, a heresy which Jung says "continued throughout the Middle Ages under the guise of alchemy" (p. 108, PR). Here is his description of the latter, mutilating key Christian concepts--Christ as the Second Adam, and the bodily resurrection anticipated by believers:

"The intention of the philosophers was to transform imperfect matter chemically into gold, the panacea, or the elixir vitae, but philosophically or mystically into the divine hermaphroditus, the second Adam, the glorified, incorruptible body of resurrection." (p. 111, PR)

Nowhere does Jung demonstrate an understanding of Christ as the Second Adam, whose righteousness is credited to those who believe in Him as Savior. Nor does he affirm the historical reality of our Lord's resurrection. For Jung, Jesus Christ is not even a real, historical being (as we will see later)!

"Catholic" sympathies. Jung offers us some twisted leanings toward Catholicism, and a repulsion toward the Protestant perspective. Concerning the latter he says:

"It is obviously out of touch with the tremendous archetypal happenings in the psyche of the individual and the masses, and with the symbols which are intended to compensate the truly apocalyptic world situation today." (p. 101, ATJ)

Jung calls Protestantism "a *man's religion* which allows no metaphysical representation of woman" (p. 103, ATJ). Obviously, he claims, the Protestant faith is out of touch with today's world, which affirms the equality of women. He wants to anchor that equality in "the figure of a 'divine' woman, the bride of Christ" (p. 103, ATJ), but later we will see that Jung is talking about the "goddess" Sophia, not the biblical view of the *church* as the bride of Christ.

Jung accuses Protestantism of having "intensified the authority of the Bible as a substitute for the lost authority of the church" (p. 23, PR). Jung also accuses the Protestant faith of causing man to be:

"...confronted with an inner experience, without the protection and the guidance of a dogma and a ritual which are the unparalleled quintessence of Christian as well as pagan religious experience." (p. 22, PR)

Jung believes that the church is an institution performing a "mediating function," protecting man from the influences of his unconscious mind (p. 22, PR). Protestantism, he claims, threatens this important function:

"...if it keeps on disintegrating as a church, it succeeds in depriving man of all his spiritual safeguards and means of defense against the immediate experience of the forces waiting for liberation in the unconscious mind." (p. 59, PR)

Jung also taught that dreams speak of religion, citing one in particular that he considered "a serious statement in favor of the Catholic church" because it favored "collective religious feeling" over the "individual relationship to God" of Protestantism (p. 31, PR). Clearly, Jung has no comprehension of the completed work of Christ, providing man the joy of direct access to God.

Religion and Psychology. Jung acknowledges the inseparability of religion and psychology, which:

"...cannot avoid at least observing the fact that religion is not only a sociological or historical phenomenon, but also something of considerable personal concern to a great number of individuals." (p. 1, PR)

Jung insists that he is dealing with religion "from a purely empirical point of view," a mere "observation of phenomenon" (p. 2, PR). (See paper entitled, "Van Til in Dialogue With Modern Psychology," for a detailed analysis of this supposedly neutral approach to the study of religion.) However, it is not possible to make this type of value-free study. Such statements mask the assumptions that lurk beneath the surface of Jung's psychology--*religious* assumptions. Jung must assume that Christian theism is untrue in order to undertake this type of study. His writings abound with blasphemous attacks on Christian doctrine concerning the nature of God and man.

Jung notes the existence of various religious rituals, all preceded by belief in an external, objective deity (p. 4-5, PR). Jung, however, is concerned only with religious *ideas* as such, not with the external, objective truth of those ideas.

In approaching his counseling clients, Jung claims to avoid all attempts at conversion:

"I never try to convert a patient to anything, and never exercise any compulsion. What matters most to me is that the patient should reach his own view of things. Under my treatment a pagan becomes a pagan and a Christian a Christian, a Jew a Jew, according to what his destiny prescribes for him." (p. 138, MDR)

Such an approach wrongly presupposes the equal validity of all religions, thus denying the claim of Christianity to exclusive truth.

Most of Jung's patients, however, were what he called "lost sheep...those who had lost their faith" (p. 140, MDR). Again, Jung is more concerned with inner symbols than with actual reality. The "neurotic" lacks the ability to participate in the living and experiencing of religious symbols (p. 140, MDR).

One such "neurotic," described by Jung as "rationalistic and intellectual," demonstrated in a dream "a return to the religion

of his childhood...but not a conscious attempt or a decision to revivify former religious beliefs" (p. 36-7, PR):

"It is just as if the spirit and the flesh, the eternal enemies in Christian consciousness, had made peace with each other in the form of a curious mitigation of their contradictory nature." (p. 37, PR)

Jung relies on dream material for knowledge of the inner man *and* for knowledge of truth in general.

Religious belief is basically considered a form of psychological defense in Jung's system. As long as the defense "works" for a particular patient, Jung leaves it alone:

"I support the hypothesis of the practicing Catholic while it works for him...without asking the academic question whether the defense is more or less an ultimate truth.... But if his dreams should begin to destroy the protective theory, I have to support the wider personality...." (p. 55, PR)

Once more, Jung disregards the question of *truth*. This attitude is a cornerstone to his system of thought.

Jung's View of Truth

Jung rejects eternal, absolute truth. There is no room in his system for God's revelation of His truth to man.

At times, he is irrational, claiming to know *nothing*:

"There is nothing I am quite sure about. I have no definite convictions--not about anything, really." (p. 358, MDR)

"At bottom we never know how it has all come about.... We do not know how life is going to turn out. Therefore the story has no beginning, and the end can only be vaguely hinted at." (p. 4, MDR)

But Jung *does* have definite convictions, particularly in the area of religious matters. He has *very definite convictions* about the nature of God, for example, as detailed in a later section. In the second quotation, Jung denies the truth of both Genesis and Revelation. We do indeed know about the beginning of God's *creation*, and we are also given revelation concerning the end of history when Christ returns. In his agnostic professions, Jung

expresses a very definite position that is antagonistic to Christianity.

In his memoirs, Jung asserts that he intends only to voice his individual opinion, not "eternal truth" (p. x, MDR). (In view of the contents...what he expresses is indeed not eternal truth!) He goes on to discuss "physical truth" as compared to "psychic truth," insisting that *religious* truths, such as the incarnation, are always "psychic" and never "physical" (p. xi-xii, MDR). This dichotomy is similar to the noumenal/phenomenal distinction applied by philosopher Immanuel Kant. The distinction is disastrous to the preaching of the Christian gospel. Kant wanted to "save" religion by relegating it to the sphere of the "noumenal," but in doing so he ruled out the entire foundation of the faith. Christianity is grounded in historical facts--the "phenomenal" realm, or Jung's "physical" truth--facts subject to God's divine interpretation. Like Kant, Jung opposes the Christian faith when he isolates religious faith, confining it to the sphere of "psychic" truth and divorcing it from actual fact.

Jung forges ahead, however, insisting that psychology is concerned only with the fact that religious ideas (such as the virgin birth) exist, but *not with whether or not the ideas are actually true*:

"It is psychologically true in as much as it exists."
(p. 3, PR)

"The psychologist, in as much as he assumes a scientific attitude, has to disregard the claim of every creed to be the unique and eternal truth...he is concerned with the original religious experience quite apart from what the creeds have made of it." (p. 7, PR)

Jung searches for such "psychological truth" in dreams, which he considers "a source of information about the possible religious tendencies of the unconscious mind" (p. 27, PR). He calls it a "primitive fact" that dreams are "the divine voice and messenger" yet also "an unending source of trouble" (p. 21, PR). Evidence of this "primitive fact" is claimed to be found in the "psychology of the Jewish prophets" (p. 21, PR). Thus he seeks "truth" within the mind of man, rather than the revelation of God, and he "explains" away the prophetic revelations of the Old Testament Scriptures.

Categories such as "true" and "false" have no objective basis in Jung's system, but are purely a matter of the individual's inner reality:

"I have also realized that one must accept the thoughts that go on within oneself of their own accord as part of one's reality. The categories of true and false are, of course, always present; but because they are not binding they take second place." (p. 298, MDR)

Jung insists that "nobody can know what the ultimate things are," and thus he asks whether there is "any better truth about ultimate things than the one that helps you to live" (p. 114, PR). He asserts that "the symbols produced by the unconscious mind...are the only things able to convince the critical mind of modern people" (p. 114, PR). He claims that the difference between "a real illusion" (whatever that is) and a "healing religious experience" is merely a "difference in words" (p. 114, PR). All of this may well appeal to the unregenerate man who wishes to escape his Creator, but Jung is dead wrong. We have God's revelation about "ultimate things," and thus we are not left with Jung's hopeless agnosticism.

Jung claims the existence of opposites in the psyche, which "cannot leap beyond itself...cannot set up any absolute truths" (p. 350, MDR). When, however, "the psyche does announce absolute truths...it necessarily falls into one or the other of its own antitheses" (p. 351, MDR). Such statements neatly "explain" the Christian claim to absolute, exclusive truth. But Jung defies Scripture and *assumes* at the outset that Christianity cannot be true.

The biblical categories of good and evil clearly depend upon the existence of eternal, absolute truth. But Jung refuses to comply:

"One does not really believe in evil, and one does not really believe in good. Good or evil are then regarded at most as *my* good or *my* evil.... Indian spirituality lacks both evil and good, or is so burdened by contradictions that it needs...the liberation from opposites.... I, on the other hand, wish to persist in the state of lively contemplation of nature and of the psychic images." (p. 276, MDR)

Jung wants to *combine* good and evil, even in the Person of God. He does not see these categories in antithetical terms, yet wants to affirm them in the sense noted above:

"We must beware of thinking of good and evil as absolute opposites.... In practical terms, this means that good and evil are no longer so self-evident.... The relativity of 'good' and 'evil' by no means signifies that these categories are invalid, or do not exist." (p. 329, MDR)

An ethical decision, for Jung, is "a subjective, creative act...there must be a spontaneous and decisive impulse on the part of the unconscious" (p. 330, MDR). The idea of a *decisive* impulse arising out of the *unconscious*, however, is pure nonsense--another devious attempt of sinful man to escape responsibility *before God*.

To consider the problem of evil--which in Jung's system is hardly posed as a true *problem*--Jung seeks wisdom within man (rather than God):

"...the individual who wishes to have an answer to the problem of evil, as it is posed today, has need, first and foremost, of *self-knowledge*, that is, the utmost possible knowledge of his own wholeness." (p. 330, MDR)

Such "wholeness," according to Jung, contains elements of both good and evil.

Jung himself, when considering the "problem of evil," offers absolutely no answers:

"What were the reasons for suffering, imperfection, and evil? I could find nothing." (p. 59, MDR)

But just as Jung defines "truth" as "psychic" truth, his concern with the problem of evil is with "the psychological nature of evil" (p. 275, MDR). He observed in India that "people are able to integrate so-called 'evil' without 'losing face'...good and evil are meaningfully contained in nature, and are merely varying degrees of the same thing" (p. 276, MDR). Following the Indian example, Jung seeks to be "outside good and evil...to realize this state by meditation or yoga" (p. 276, MDR).

Having denied absolute, eternal truth, Jung has no basis on which to *define* good and evil, much less to offer coherent solutions. For him, "truth" is mythological and is found only within the self. External, objective reality is irrelevant.

Facts or Fiction? -- Jung and Mythology

Jung is more impressed with mythology than with the facts of the real world. He states that if religion means *anything at all*, its purpose is to "link us back to the eternal myth" (p. 47, ATJ). He is concerned that:

"The modern mind has forgotten those old truths that speak of the death of the old man and of the making of a new one, of spiritual rebirth and similar old-fashioned 'mystical absurdities.'" (p. 41, PR)

This is a caricature of the biblical truth about regeneration and sanctification--becoming a new creature in Christ, restored to the image of the Creator in true righteousness and holiness (Ephesians 4:22-24).

Jung defines "myth" as:

"...not fiction: it consists of facts that are continually repeated and can be observed over and over again."
(p. 47, ATJ)

"The mythical character of a life is just what expresses its universal human validity. It is perfectly possible, psychologically, for the unconscious or an archetype to take complete possession of a man and to determine his fate down to the smallest detail." (p. 47, ATJ)

The "unconscious or an archetype" replaces the sovereign *God* of Scripture in this scenario.

Jung calls his own biography "my personal myth," explaining that:

"Whether or not the stories are 'true' is not the problem. The only question is whether what I tell is *my* fable, *my* truth." (p. 3, MDR)

Again, we are faced with Jung's utter disregard for *truth*.

Jung acknowledges having picked up mythic tales from the tradition of Gnosticism, a heresy condemned by the early Christian church. He is particularly fascinated with the snake in mythological accounts, "a frequent counterpart of the hero...an indication of a hero-myth" when present in his own fantasies (p. 182, MDR). Genesis reveals that Satan took the form of a snake

when he initially tempted Eve. As noted earlier, Jung admits to demonic inspiration in the development of his psychology, and one of his most diabolical visions includes a snake.

Mythology and Psychology Unite. In Jung's bizarre system, mythology is the key to psychological counseling. He boastfully says to himself:

"Now you possess a key to mythology and are free to unlock all the gates of the unconscious psyche." (p. 171, MDR)

He considered mythology the key to unlocking the mysteries of the psychotic mind:

"As early as 1909 I realized that I could not treat latent psychoses if I did not understand their symbolism. It was then that I began to study mythology." (p. 131, MDR)

Jung interprets Freud's psychology in mythological terms, and in doing so he mythologizes God the Creator:

"The motifs of the Gnostic Yahweh and Creator-God reappeared in the Freudian myth of the primal father and the gloomy superego deriving from that father. In Freud's myth he become a demon who created a world of disappointments, illusions, and suffering." (p. 201, MDR)

Equating God with a demon! This is pure blasphemy.

Mythology and Christ. Jung's aberrations are particularly repugnant when his mythological view denies the historical reality of the life of Christ:

"God's Incarnation in Christ requires continuation and completion because Christ, owing to his virgin birth and his sinlessness, was *not an empirical human being at all.*" (p. 52, ATJ, emphasis added)

"...the oldest writings, those of St. Paul, do not seem to have the slightest interest in Christ's existence as a concrete human being. The synoptic gospels are equally unsatisfactory as they have more the character of propaganda than of biography." (p. 45, ATJ)

Jung is badly misinformed on this crucial point. The apostle Paul is *extremely* concerned about the concrete existence of Jesus

Christ, particularly the events of His death, burial, and resurrection:

"For I delivered to you first of all that which I also received: that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures.... Now if Christ is not risen, then our preaching is empty and your faith is also empty... And if Christ is not risen, your faith is futile; you are still in your sins!" (1 Corinthians 15:3-4, 14, 17)

The apostle John, in his epistles, demonstrates equal concern for the actual facts of the earthly life of Christ:

"By this you know the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God, and every spirit that does not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is not of God. And this is the spirit of the Antichrist, which you have heard was coming, and is now already in the world." (1 John 4:2-3)

Jung's teaching, according to Scripture, is associated with the spirit of the Antichrist!

Jung rejects "rationalistic attempts" to view our Lord as a real Person who lived in history, because any such attempts:

"... would soak all the mystery out of his personality, and what remained would no longer be the birth and tragic fate of a God in time, but, historically speaking, a badly authenticated religious teacher, a Jewish reformer who was hellenistically interpreted and misunderstood." (p. 46, ATJ)

Jung does address "the question of the historical person, of Jesus the man," but he does so by considering the "collective mentality of his time...the archetype which was already constellated, the primordial image of the Anthropos" which was "condensed in him, an almost unknown Jewish prophet" (p. 211, MDR). Jung imposes his unique psychological categories onto Jesus Christ, and what results is a mutilation of the biblical truth.

The rejection of historical reality is not perceived by Jung as a problem, because "the spirit and meaning of Christ are present and perceptible to us even without the aid of miracles...in contrast to physical perception the spirit is autonomous" (p. xii, MDR). But John, in closing his gospel

account (John 20:30), informs us that the miracles of our Lord were written so that the reader might *believe in Him and have eternal life.*

Some of Jung's statements are remarkably similar to *gospels criticism*, a series of attempts over the past couple of hundred years to deny the life of Jesus Christ as revealed in the four gospel accounts of Scripture. A survey of gospels criticism is beyond the scope of this paper, but the reader should be alerted to the fact that many wish to reject the Scripture and create another (false) "Jesus."

Mythology and Scripture. According to Jung, the Scriptures "point to realities that transcend consciousness...archetypes of the collective unconscious." They "precipitate complexes of ideas in the form of mythological motifs," entering man's "inner perception" through such avenues as dreams (p. xiv, MDR). Again, Jung imposes the categories of his own imaginations onto God's revelation. Nothing in Scripture confirms the existence of any "collective unconscious" or "archetypes."

Jung has his own concept of the origins of Scripture. He claims that man summed up the facts of his existence:

"...under the idea of divinity...described their effects with the aid of myth...interpreted this myth as the 'Word of God,' that is as the inspiration and revelation of the numen from the 'other side.'" (p. 341-2, MDR)

Jung's revision of revelation cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be called *Christian*. It is a diabolical counterfeit not worthy of the name.

More Fiction, No Facts: Jung's View of Life After Death

No eternal hope is to be found anywhere in Jung's ramblings. His ideas about life after death, expressed near the end of his own life, make this sadly evident:

"What I have to tell about the hereafter, and about life after death, consists entirely of memories, of images in which I have lived and of thoughts which have buffeted me.... Even now I can do no more than tell stories--'mythologize'.... It is not that I wish we had a life after death. In fact, I would prefer not to foster such ideas." (p. 399, MDR)

But even while preferring not to "foster such ideas," Jung says that the aging person "ought to have a myth about death, for reason shows him nothing but the dark pit into which he is descending" (p. 306, MDR). But he acknowledges futility in such illusions, telling us that we can't know what such myths or dreams really mean:

"We cannot tell whether they possess any validity beyond their indubitable value as anthropomorphic projections.... We are strictly limited by our innate structure and therefore bound by our whole being and thinking to this world of ours." (p. 300, MDR)

"...myths and dreams concerning continuity of life after death are merely compensating fantasies which are inherent in our natures--all life desires eternity." (p. 304, MDR)

"We lack concrete proof that anything of us is preserved for eternity.... Whether what continues to exist is conscious of itself, we do not know either." (p. 322, MDR)

"...in most conceptions the hereafter is pictured as a pleasant place. That does not seem obvious to me.... The world, I feel, is far too unitary for there to be a hereafter in which the rule of opposites is completely absent.... Nor can I conceive that suffering should entirely cease." (p. 320-1, MDR)

None of this restrains Jung in his speculations, however. He sees all of his mythologizing as "futile speculation" to the intellect, yet "a healing and valid activity" on the emotional level (p. 300, MDR).

In Ecclesiastes, God says that He has *put eternity in the hearts of men*, "except that no one can find out the work that God does from beginning to end" (Ecclesiastes 3:11). In Jung, we encounter an unregenerate man who cannot deny eternity, yet distorts God's revealed truth beyond recognition.

Sources of Revelation. Having rejected *God's* revelation about life beyond the grave, Jung insists once more on looking to the myths of man, obtained through the "unconscious":

"We are dependent for our myth of life after death upon the meager hints of dreams and similar spontaneous revelations from the unconscious." (p. 316, MDR)

"The unconscious helps by communicating things to us, or making figurative allusions." (p. 302, MDR)

However: "The figures from the unconscious are uninformed too, and need man, or contact with consciousness, in order to attain to knowledge." (p. 306, MDR: Is this a vicious cycle or what??)

"Myth is the natural and indispensable intermediate state between unconscious and conscious cognition...the unconscious knows more than consciousness does...knowledge of a special sort, knowledge in eternity." (p. 311, MDR)

Happily, believers know that we are not dependent on such unreliable sources as the "unconscious" for true information about eternity. Our knowledge is surely incomplete, but God has provided what we need to know and made it possible for the Christian to know that he has eternal life:

"These things I have written to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, that you may know that you have eternal life, and that you may continue to believe in the name of the Son of God." 1 John 5:13

Jung and the Dead. Jung was clearly involved in occult activities, including seances. He vacillates about the meaning of his experiences:

"Parapsychology holds it to be a scientifically valid proof of an afterlife that the dead manifest themselves--either as ghosts, or through a medium--and communicate things which they alone could possibly know." (p. 301, MDR)

Having invented the "collective unconscious," Jung asks whether such manifestations are really communications from the deceased or merely knowledge present in the "unconscious" (p. 301, MDR). Despite his skepticism, Jung tells us that "it was the dead who addressed crucial questions" to him in one of his writings. He concluded from this that "the souls of the dead 'know' only what they knew at the moment of death, and nothing beyond that" (p. 308, MDR).

In questioning the existence of a *pleasant* hereafter, Jung is skeptical because, if it were:

"...there would be some friendly communication between us and the blessed spirits.... But there is nothing of the sort.

Why is there this insurmountable barrier between the departed and the living? At least half the reports of encounters with the dead tell of terrifying experiences with dark spirits." (p. 320, MDR)

What Jung fails to realize is the scriptural truth that *both* heaven and hell exist, and that God has forbidden communication between the living and the dead.

At one point, Jung recalls his experience of spending an entire day with his deceased wife, certain that she was "continuing after death to work on her further spiritual development" (p. 309, MDR). A deceased friend appears to him through "an inner visual image," and Jung "felt that he was in the room" (p. 312, MDR). His deceased father, prior to the death of his mother, appeared requesting psychological counseling for the marital relationship he would soon need to resume (p. 315, MDR).

Particularly revealing is a dream of Jung's following his mother's death:

"It was Wotan, the god of my Alemannic forefathers, who had gathered my mother to her ancestors.... It was Christian missionaries who made Wotan into a devil. In himself he is an important god...a nature spirit who returned to life.... Thus the dream says that the soul of my mother was taken into that greater territory of the self which lies beyond the segment of Christian morality, taken into that wholeness of nature and spirit in which conflicts and contradictions are resolved." (p. 313-4, MDR)

Jung's hostility to the Christian faith is once more evident.

Eastern Aberrations: Reincarnation and Karma. Jung discusses reincarnation as yet another "myth" concerning life after death. He imagines that some sort of "creative determinant...must decide what souls will plunge again into birth" (p. 321, MDR). He contrasts reincarnation with the Buddhist goal of "overcoming of earthly existence" (p. 316, MDR) and with the "Western man," to whom "the meaninglessness of a merely static universe is unbearable" (p. 317, MDR). Jung's conclusion is that "both are right," or perhaps he is merely pleading ignorance:

"I know no answer to the question of whether the karma which I live is the outcome of my past lives, or whether it is not rather the achievement of my ancestors, whose heritage comes together in me." (p. 317, MDR)

Jung proposes that "karma" may rather be "an impersonal archetype which today presses hard on everyone and has taken a particular hold on me" (p. 318, MDR). Examples of such "impersonal archetypes" include:

"...the development over the centuries of the divine triad and its confrontation with the feminine principle...the still pending answer to the Gnostic question as to the origin of evil, or, to put it another way, the incompleteness of the Christian God-image." (p. 318, MDR)

Testimonies supporting belief in reincarnation fail to persuade Jung, because "a belief proves to me only the phenomenon of belief, not the content of the belief" (p. 319, MDR).

As Christians, we must obviously reject both reincarnation and karma. However, it is interesting to note Jung's imposition of his own categories--"archetypes" and "collective unconscious"--on whatever subject matter he approaches.

Jung and Death. Jung holds two conflicting views of death, the one a frightening acknowledgment of its reality, the other a fanciful holding down of the truth:

"Death is indeed a fearful piece of brutality; there is no sense pretending otherwise. It is brutal not only as a physical event, but far more so psychically: a human being is torn away from us, and what remains is the icy stillness of death." (p. 314, MDR)

"From another point of view, however, death appears as a joyful event. In the light of eternity, it is a wedding.... The soul attains, as it were, its missing half, it achieves wholeness." (p. 314, MDR)

These statements witness to the fact that Jung cannot escape the reality of the living God--and of death, the wages of sin--yet he suppresses the truth about man's responsibility before God.

Jung also remains in darkness about the purpose of man, who he claims:

"...has fallen victim to unconsciousness. But man's task is the exact opposite: to become conscious of the contents that press upward from the unconscious...to create more and more consciousness. As far as we can discern, the sole purpose of

human existence is to kindle a light in the darkness of mere being." (p. 326, MDR)

Man's purpose is to glorify God, not to "kindle a light in the darkness of mere being"! Jung's teachings abound in spiritual darkness.

Jung's Mutilation of Scripture

In view of Jung's rejection of eternal truth, and his fascination with mythology, it is not surprising to learn that he twists Scripture according to his own sinful imaginations. His entire book, *Answer to Job*, presents a blasphemous view of God (covered more fully in a later section). In addition, Jung delves into other Scriptures and rips them to shreds, imposing his psychological categories onto biblical persons and concepts.

Ezekiel. Jung offers these choice comments about this respected Old Testament prophet:

"From a strictly clinical standpoint Ezekiel's visions are of an archetypal nature and are not morbidly distorted in any way." (p. 58, ATJ)

"Ezekiel has seen the essential content of the unconscious, namely *the idea of the higher man* by whom Yahweh was morally defeated and who he was later to become. In India, a more or less simultaneous symptom of the same tendency was Gautama the Buddha." (p. 58, ATJ)

Jung exalts man above God, here and elsewhere. Note his analysis of the prophet in "archetypal" terms.

The Apostle Paul. Jung says that Paul "is one of those people whose unconscious was disturbed and produced revelatory ecstasies" (p. 71, ATJ). Such a comment is possible only because Jung rejects the historical reality of miracles.

Peter. Jung considers it a "strange fact that it is precisely Peter, who lacks self-control and is fickle in character, whom Christ wishes to make the rock and foundation of his Church" (p. 72, ATJ). Jung has evidently not considered the radical change in Peter subsequent to the resurrection.

Epistles of John. Jung evaluates John as follows:

"His conscious attitude is orthodox, but he has evil forebodings." (p. 73, ATJ)

Jung ridicules Scripture line by line:

1 John 1:5: "In Him there is no darkness at all."

Jung: "Who said there was any darkness in God?" (Jung himself does so!!)

1 John 2:1-2: "My little children, these things I write to you, so that you may not sin. And if anyone sins, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. And He Himself is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but for the whole world."

Jung: "Why then do we need an advocate?"

1 John 3:9: "Whoever has been born of God does not sin, for His seed remains in Him; and he cannot sin, because he has been born of God."

Jung: "Who commits no sin?" (p. 73, ATJ)

Revelation. We know that trouble abounds when Jung quotes a Gnostic text and claims it to be analogous to the book of Revelation (p. 70, PR)!

The millennium in Revelation 20, to Jung, is "the term allotted by astrology to the reign of Christ" (p. 50, ATJ). Astrology?

Misunderstanding the entire setting and purpose of Revelation, Jung once again subjects us to a line by line mockery of God's Word:

Revelation 1:16-17: "What price now the perfect love which casts out fear?" (p. 74, ATJ)

Revelation 2:5: "How does this square with love of your neighbor?" (p. 74, ATJ)

Revelation 2:20ff: "Christ, as we know, teaches 'Love your enemies,' but here he threatens a massacre of children all too reminiscent of Bethlehem!" (p. 74, ATJ)

Revelation 3:3: "A none too friendly warning." (p. 74, ATJ)

Revelation 3:19: "It would be quite understandable if the Laodiceans did not want too much of this 'love.'" (p. 74, ATJ)

Revelation 12:16: "Even though the consciousness of that age was exclusively filled with Christian ideas, earlier or contemporaneous pagan contents lay just below the surface." (p. 80, ATJ)

Concerning our Lord, who at the culmination of history destroys His enemies, Jung states:

"This apocalyptic 'Christ' behaves rather like a bad-tempered, power-conscious 'boss.'" (p. 74, ATJ)

"His (John's) Christ-image, clouded by negative feelings, has turned into a savage avenger who no longer bears any real resemblance to a savior." (p. 80, ATJ)

Evaluating John according to his unique psychological categories, Jung calls the contents of Revelation "the outburst of long pent-up negative feelings" (p. 76, ATJ). John, he says:

"...in the course of time spun an elaborate web of resentments and vengeful thoughts which then burst upon consciousness in the form of a revelation. From this there grew up a terrifying picture that blatantly contradicts all ideas of Christian humility, tolerance, love of your neighbor and your enemies, and makes nonsense of a loving father in heaven and rescuer of mankind." (p. 76, ATJ)

Continuing his ungodly ramblings, Jung claims that John's unconscious has drawn on pagan myths in order to predict the birth of a second Messiah (which Jung prefers over the actual return of Christ):

"But in the unconscious is everything that has been rejected by consciousness, and the more Christian one's consciousness is, the more heathenishly does the unconscious behave." (p. 78, ATJ)

According to Jung, "John's problem was not a personal one" but rather involved visions arising out of the "collective unconscious" (p. 81, ATJ). Jung considers these visions "evidence of an unusual tension between conscious and unconscious" (p. 82, ATJ). Commenting on John's attempt to live an "exemplary Christian life," Jung turns it all upside down, claiming that:

"Irritability, bad moods, and outbursts of affect are the classic symptoms of chronic virtuousness." (p. 87, ATJ)

Jung condescendingly gives John a break, saying that while his "brutal" visions normally indicate severe psychosis, "John gives us no grounds for such a diagnosis" because "his apocalyptic visions are not confused enough" (p. 88, ATJ). (Jung, however, is definitely *confused enough!*) Jung credits John with "gnosis" or "knowledge of God" because, like Job, "he saw the fierce and terrible side of Yahweh" (p. 88, ATJ). But Jung also accuses John of "rank pessimism" due to his belief in "predestination in accordance with higher authority" (p. 83, ATJ). All of this is a horrendously unbiblical evaluation--not only of John, but of *God*, the ultimate author of Revelation.

But there is even more! Here is Jung's bizarre account of the destruction of Babylon pictured near the end of Revelation:

"If the elect turn themselves into 'virgins' in honor of the Great Mother Sophia, a gruesome fantasy of fornication is spawned in the unconscious by way of compensation. The destruction of Babylon therefore represents not only the end of fornication, but the utter eradication of all life's joys and pleasures." (p. 84, ATJ)

He moves right on to describe the heavenly city in pagan, Gnostic terms:

"The city is Sophia, who was with God before time began, and at the end of time will be reunited with God through the sacred marriage." (p. 86, ATJ)

Finally, Jung claims that Christ's victory is qualified because of the predicted reign of the antichrist (p. 88, ATJ), and he draws the following conclusion about the final demise of the devil and his associates:

"The solution, as here presented, does not consist in the reconciliation of the opposites, but in their final severance.... An indispensable condition for this seems to be the denial of propagation and of sexual life altogether." (p. 86, ATJ)

Jung demonstrates his utter failure to comprehend Scripture--not surprising, since he is unregenerate and therefore lacks the indwelling Holy Spirit (1 Corinthians 2:14). He does not

understand the nature of God as *holy* and *righteous*, not a combination of opposites. Nor does he see, except in the fuzzy sense above, that God will one day *justly* eradicate all sin and evil--all His enemies.

Jung's View of God

Jung's denial of eternal truth comes to its most diabolical expression in his view of God. His views can be summarized briefly as follows:

- (1) Jung believes that both *good and evil* exist in God.
- (2) Jung equates God with man's unconscious. He also equates man's unconscious with a demon!
- (3) God is merely a "concept" to Jung, created by the mind of man. Bottom line: Jung is an atheist!
- (4) God "needs" man to come to consciousness.
- (5) Jung blasphemously accuses God of injustice, tyranny, and other sins *against man*, based primarily on his analysis of the Book of Job.

This section concerning Jung's view of God is lengthy and contains numerous quotes, but it is important to document clearly Jung's blatant rejection of the God of Scripture.

Even in his childhood years, Jung demonstrated a lack of spiritual understanding, complaining about others at church:

"...thoughtlessly they swallowed all the contradictions, such as that God is omniscient and therefore foresaw all human history, and that he actually created human beings so that they would have to sin, and nevertheless forbids them to sin and even punishes them by eternal damnation in hell-fire."
(p. 46, ATJ)

Jung misunderstands some very basic theological concepts concerning the sovereignty of God and the responsibility of man. He fails to appreciate the mysteries of God, whose thoughts are higher than man's thoughts. Finite man can have true knowledge of God through His revelation, but not *comprehensive* knowledge of God. Unable to achieve such exhaustive knowledge, Jung turns against God in blasphemous accusations, particularly evident on the pages of *Answer to Job*. (Jung will one day have to give an *answer to God* for his blasphemies!)

To Jung, God is hardly a real Person distinct from His creation, but rather a mere *idea* or *concept* in the mind of man:

"If...we say 'God,' we give expression to an image or verbal concept which has undergone many changes in the course of time." (p. xii, ATJ)

"The God-concept, as the idea of an all-embracing totality, also includes the unconscious, and hence, in contrast to consciousness, it includes the objective psyche, which so often frustrates the will and intentions of the conscious mind. Prayer, for instance, reinforces the potential of the unconscious, thus accounting for the sometimes unexpected effects of prayer." (p. 94, ATJ)

Jung believes that modern man is currently experiencing a "universal religious nightmare" because he has:

"...experienced things so unheard of and so staggering that the question of whether such things are in any way reconcilable with the idea of a good God has become burningly topical." (p. 91, ATJ)

It will become very clear that Jung denies a *good* God!

First, however, we should note Jung's belief that *God needs man*:

"Yahweh (in contrast to pagan gods)...was interested in man. Human beings were a matter of first-rate importance to him. He needed them as they needed him, urgently and personally." (p. 8, ATJ)

"God alone in his Godhead is not in a state of bliss, but must be born in the human soul." (p. 94, ATJ)

Jung explains God's "need" for man in terms of His being *unconscious* and needing man in order to become *conscious*:

"Existence is only real when it is conscious to somebody. That is why the Creator needs conscious men even though, from sheer unconsciousness, he would like to prevent him from becoming conscious." (p. 11, ATJ)

The Bible expressly teaches that God is *eternal*. He is self-contained and has no "need" for man, but rather created man for His own glory.

Jung goes on to use the supposed "unconsciousness" of God to accuse Him of not being moral:

"It is the behavior of an unconscious being who cannot be judged morally. Yahweh is a *phenomenon* and, as Job says, 'not a man.'" (p. 21, ATJ)

"But he is too unconscious to be moral. Morality presupposes consciousness. By this I do not mean to say that Yahweh is imperfect or evil, like a gnostic demiurge. He is everything in totality; therefore, among other things, he is total justice, and also its total opposite." (p. 10, ATJ)

"Yahweh displays no compunction, remorse, or compassion, but only ruthlessness and brutality. The plea of unconsciousness is invalid, seeing that he flagrantly violates at least three of the commandments he himself gave out on Mount Sinai." (p. 14, ATJ)

Despite Jung's insistence that he is *not* saying God is evil, his accusations against God are pure blasphemy! It doesn't stop here, however. Jung asserts man's superiority over God, and accuses God of remaining "unconscious" of His inferiority:

"In view of the undoubted frightfulness of divine wrath...it was only to be expected that man's slight superiority should have remained unconscious." (p. 11, ATJ)

Multiplying blasphemies, Jung considers man a threat to God!

"Man, abandoned without protection and stripped of his rights, and whose nothingness is thrown in his face at every opportunity, evidently appears to be so dangerous to Yahweh that he must be battered down with the heaviest artillery." (p. 18, ATJ)

Jung insists that *Satan* is a "son" of God--even a "god" himself!--accusing God of double-faced and unjust behavior:

"It is amazing to see how easily Yahweh, quite without reason, had let himself be influenced by one of his sons, by a *doubting thought*, and made unsure of Job's faithfulness. With his touchiness and suspiciousness the mere possibility of doubt was enough to infuriate him and induce that peculiar double-faced behavior of which he had already given proof in the Garden of Eden." (p. 13, ATJ)

"Job is challenged as though he himself were a god. But in the contemporary metaphysics there was no *deuteros theos*, no other god except Satan, who owns Yahweh's ear and is able to influence him." (p. 19, ATJ, emphasis added)

"Whose words are without insight?" (Job 38:2) "But what is Job's guilt?... God does not want to be just; he merely flaunts might over right.... It is Yahweh himself who darkens his own counsel and who has no insight. He turns the tables on Job and blames him for what he himself does." (p. 16, ATJ)

Jung even equates God with Satan in his demonic reasoning:

"But, to his horror, he (Job) has discovered that Yahweh is not human but, in certain respects, less than human, that he is just what Yahweh himself says of Leviathan." (p. 21, ATJ)

"Unconsciousness has an animal nature.... Of the four animals of Yahweh only one has a human face. This is probably Satan, the god-father of man as a spiritual being." (p. 21, ATJ)

This is nauseating to the Christian, who loves and worships God the Creator!!

Jung believes that opposites--both good and evil--are combined in God:

"Light is followed by shadow, *the other side of the Creator*. This development reached its peak in the twentieth century." (p. 328, MDR)

"If Christianity claims to be a monotheism, it becomes unavoidable to assume the opposites as being contained in God." (p. x, ATJ)

He claims that one of the early church fathers, Clement of Rome, taught:

"...that God rules the world with a right and a left hand, the right being Christ, the left Satan." (p. ix-x, ATJ)

But that all changed, according to Jung:

"Later Christianity, however, is dualistic, inasmuch as it splits off one half of the opposites, personified in Satan, and he is *eternal* in his state of damnation." (p. x, ATJ)

Satan's damnation is indeed eternal; he is destined for the lake of fire (Revelation 21). The Bible also informs us, contrary to Jung, that "God is *light* and in Him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1:5).

Jung imposes his twisted reasonings onto the book of Job, accusing God of sinful self-absorption along the way:

"Job is no more than the outward occasion for an inward process of dialectic in God. His thunderings at Job so completely miss the point that one cannot help but see how much he is occupied with himself." (p. 16, ATJ)

We see the beginnings of Jung's most diabolic error, accusing *God* of sinning against *man*:

"Yahweh's divided attitude, which on the one hand tramples on human life and happiness without regard, and on the other must have man for a partner, puts the latter in an impossible position." (p. 22, ATJ)

In humiliating Job, Jung claims that God:

"...pronounces judgment *on himself* and gives man the moral satisfaction whose absence we found so painful in the Book of Job." (p. 23, ATJ)

Over and over, Jung reverses the crucial Creator-creature distinction, placing man on the throne that belongs to God alone, and hurling horrendous accusations at Him. He psychologizes God and accuses Him of *unfaithfulness* projected onto Job:

"His readiness to deliver Job into Satan's murderous hands proves that he doubts Job precisely because he projects his own tendency to unfaithfulness upon a scapegoat." (p. 28, ATJ)

Jung judges God to be a ruthless tyrant:

"Yahweh is still intoxicated with the tremendous power and grandeur of his creation...otherwise he would never have ridden so roughshod over Job's human dignity." (p. 41, ATJ)

Looking at the Lord's Prayer, Jung interprets the phrase "deliver us from evil" to mean that "Christ's immense certainty with regard to his father's character becomes somewhat questionable," because there remains a possibility that Yahweh "might yet revert to his former ways" (p. 49, ATJ). He goes on to insist that in Revelation, "Yahweh again delivers himself up to an unheard-of-fury of destruction against the human race" (p. 49, ATJ). Jung believes that in the Lord's Prayer, Christ is reminding God the Father "of his destructive inclinations toward mankind" and begging him not to engage in them. However, in a brief moment of clarity he seems to recognize that such accusations against a God of love are blasphemous:

"The incongruity of it is so colossal that if this petition were not in the Lord's Prayer one would have to call it sheer blasphemy, because it really will not do to ascribe such contradictory behavior to the God of Love." (p. 49, ATJ)

It is "sheer blasphemy"! Jung demonstrates no understanding of the phrase "deliver us from evil," interpreting it in terms of his own presupposition that evil is part of the character of God. That assumption is false, and Jung's words are indeed "sheer blasphemy."

According to Jung's assessment, God suffered moral defeat at the hand of Job, but did not immediately become conscious of that defeat (p. 42, ATJ). Again, his words are utterly blasphemous.

Equally blasphemous is Jung's claim that there is a lack of attention to "the feminine ideal of completeness," and therefore:

"Yahweh's perfectionism is carried over from the Old Testament into the New, and despite all the recognition and glorification of the feminine principle this never prevailed against the patriarchal supremacy." (p. 37, ATJ)

Jung fails to grasp basic biblical principles about male-female relationships as designed by God at creation.

Creation is an area that Jung mercilessly rips to shreds. Conveniently disregarding *man's sin*, Jung makes God the author of that sin and denies that His original creation was good:

"He had looked upon His work and called it good. But it was just this that I had never understood. Certainly the world is immeasurably beautiful, but it is quite as horrible." (p. 58, ATJ)

"He Himself had taken good care that the glory of paradise should not last too long by planting in it that poisonous serpent, the devil. Had He taken satisfaction in that too?" (p. 59, ATJ)

Jung imagines man to be the real creator. Looking for a "myth" of his own, he claims to have found:

"...that man is indispensable for the completion of creation; that, in fact, he himself is the second creator of the world, who alone has given to the world its objective existence--without which, unheard, unseen, silently eating, giving birth, dying, heads nodding through hundreds of millions of years, it would have gone on in the profoundest night of non-being down to its unknown end. *Human consciousness created objective existence and meaning*, and man found his indispensable place in the great process of being." (p. 256, MDR, emphasis added)

"Man, I, in an invisible act of creation put the stamp of perfection on the world by giving it objective existence. This act we usually ascribe to the Creator alone, without considering that in so doing we view life as a machine calculated down to the last detail, which, along with the human psyche, runs on senselessly, obeying foreknown and predetermined rules." (p. 255-6, MDR)

Jung grossly misunderstand God's sovereign ruling over the world. God is *personal*, unfolding His eternal plan of salvation. Man is also *personal* and is responsible before God for his actions. The world is not a "machine" running according to mechanical calculations, and the act of creation must indeed be ascribed to the Creator alone!

Moving right along, Jung imagines God to be created in the image of man! Commenting on the works of Biedermann, he says:

"In Biedermann's chapter on 'The Nature of God,' I found that God showed Himself to be a 'personality to be conceived after the analogy of the human ego: the unique, utterly supramundane ego who embraces the entire cosmos.'" (p. 57, ATJ)

Yet Jung, throughout his writings, ignores his own initial response to such blasphemy:

"I felt the strongest resistance to imagining God by analogy with my own ego. That seemed to me boundlessly arrogant, if not downright blasphemous." (p. 57, ATJ)

Arrogant and blasphemous it is, but Jung creates "god" in the image of man, embracing pantheism and equating God with man's "unconscious." His pantheism, or monism, is evident at times:

"Man and the proper animals...were bits of God that had become independent." (p. 67, ATJ)

"One, as the first numeral, is unity. But it is also 'the unity,' the One, All-Oneness, individuality and non-duality--not a numeral but a philosophical concept, an archetype and attribute of God, the monad." (p. 310, MDR)

Elsewhere, he equates God with the "unconscious" of man, or an "archetype":

"It is only through the psyche that we can establish that God acts upon us, but we are unable to distinguish whether these actions emanate from God or from the unconscious. We cannot tell *whether God and the unconscious are two different entities*. Both are border-concepts for transcendental concerns." (p. 106, ATJ)

"If...we speak of 'God' as an 'archetype,' we are saying nothing about His real nature but are letting it be known that 'God' already has a place in that part of our psyche which is pre-existent to consciousness and that He therefore cannot be considered an invention of consciousness. We neither make Him more remote nor eliminate Him, but bring Him closer to the possibility of being experienced." (p. 347, MDR)

However, Jung's disclaimer is to no avail. He does indeed consider God to be an *invention* on the part of man. He has created "god" in the image of man and effectively denied His existence apart from the creation.

In his memoirs, Jung states that both "demon" and "God" are "synonyms for the unconscious." He considers the terms useful because they provide a "much better objectification...namely, a personification" of these concepts (p. 337, MDR). The horror of these equations can hardly be overstated.

Jung recognizes that Christians are likely to see *atheism* (and rightly so!) in his statements:

"So-called believers in God see nothing but atheism in my attempt to reconstruct the primitive unconscious psyche. Or if not atheism, then Gnosticism--anything, heaven forbid, but a psychic reality like the unconscious." (p. 347, MDR)

At this point, Jung states that the "unconscious" consists of "earlier evolutionary stages" and flatly denies the possibility of the Genesis creation account as "too simple and archaic to satisfy us nowadays" (p. 347, MDR). However, it is not the Genesis account, but rather Jung's imaginative statements, that are beyond belief. Christians are correct to detect the atheism inherent in Jung's analysis.

Knowledge of God. It is not surprising that Jung, along with the New Age movement, seeks knowledge of God within man:

"The Oriental attributes unquestionably divine significance to the self, and according to the ancient Christian view self-knowledge is the road to knowledge of God." (p. 325, MDR)

Jung grossly misrepresents the Christian view here. It is *revelation from God*, not self-knowledge, that leads to man's knowledge of God.

Other "gods." At times, Jung recognizes "gods" other than the true God of Scripture:

"In classical times, when such things were properly understood, Eros was considered a god whose divinity transcended our human limits, and who therefore could neither be comprehended nor represented in any way.... Eros is a *kosmogonos*, a creator and father-mother of all higher consciousness." (p. 353, MDR)

This is idolatry and has no place in Christian doctrine.

On the next page, Jung states that man should call "the unknown" "God." This is:

"...a confession of his subjection, his imperfection, and his dependence; but at the same time a testimony to his freedom to choose between truth and error." (p. 354, MDR)

Jung's other writings, however, deify man in the place of God. Jung asserts man's autonomy, his *independence* of the true God, subjecting God to the rule of man.

Trinity or Quaternity? Jung believes that "the central Christian symbolism" is the Trinity, while "the formula of the unconscious mind is a quaternity" (p. 73, PR):

"The dogmatic aspect of the evil principle is absent from the Trinity." (p. 73, PR)

"...the unconscious is often personified by the anima, a female figure...she would be the matrix of the quaternity...the woman, as well as evil, is excluded from the Deity in the dogma of the Trinity." (p. 77, PR)

Even Jung evidently understands the diabolical implications present in his expansion of the Trinity to a "Quaternity" which includes both *evil* and the "*feminine principle*," but he only alludes to the obvious conclusion:

"It needs no particular effort of imagination to guess the far-reaching spiritual consequence of such a development." (p. 77, PR)

Presumably, Jung knows that he is equating *evil* and *female*! But he tells us instead that he is equating God and man:

"The quaternity as understood by the modern mind directly suggests not only the God within, *but also the identity of God and man.*" (p. 73-74, PR, emphasis added)

Ultimately, Jung is an atheist, seeing "god" as a projection of man's "unconscious" mind:

"If we want to know what is going to happen in a case where the idea of god is no longer projected as an autonomous entity, this is the answer of man's unconscious mind: The unconscious produces a new idea of man in loco dei, of man deified or divine, imprisoned, concealed, protected, usually dehumanized and expressed by abstract symbolism." (p. 106, PR)

Unlike more obvious atheists like Freud, Jung apparently attributes some useful purpose to such "projection." For example, in examining the life of atheist philosopher Nietzsche, who he so greatly admires, he says that:

"For such a man it seems to be dangerous to make the statement that God is dead...he should find out at once where this considerable energy, which was once invested in an existence as great as God, has disappeared to. It might reappear under another name.... Since it is a matter of a tremendous energy, the result will be an equally important psychological disturbance in the form of a dissociation of personality. The disruption can produce a dual or a multiple personality." (p. 104, PR)

Jung, therefore, might consider belief in God a "useful myth"!

Blasphemy. We have encountered blasphemy upon blasphemy in Jung's works, yet Jung himself fails to see the seriousness of his attacks upon God:

"I knew from experience that God was not offended by any blasphemy, that on the contrary He could even encourage it because He wished to evoke not only man's bright and positive side but also his darkness and ungodliness." (p. 70, ATJ)

Jung's "experience" is highly deceiving and unreliable. He is spiritually blinded to the true character of God.

Jung's "answer to Job." Jung concludes that:

"We therefore need more light, more goodness and moral strength, and must wash off as much of the obnoxious blackness as possible, otherwise we shall not be able to assimilate the dark God who also wants to become man, and at the same time endure him without perishing.... We also need the Wisdom that Job was seeking." (p. 95, ATJ)

Jung believes that Job was "answered" at the time of the incarnation:

"At that moment God experiences what it means to be a mortal man and drinks to the dregs what he made his faithful servant Job suffer. Here is given the answer to Job." (p. 46, ATJ)

When we examine Jung's view of Christ, it will become clear that Jung reverses the whole biblical doctrine of salvation. In his system, it is *God who sinned against man!!* Thus Jung's "answer" to Job in the suffering and death of Jesus Christ. But remember...Jung is unconcerned about historical facts. To him God

is man's "unconscious," a mere "projection," not a real entity who created and rules over the world!

Jung's View of the Holy Spirit

Jung speaks briefly of the Holy Spirit in *Answer to Job*, but clearly he does not speak of the Spirit as revealed in Scripture.

There are feminine overtones to Jung's view of the Spirit, claimed by him to be "symbolized by the dove, the bird belonging to the love-goddess" (p. 45, ATJ). He states also that the "feminine nature" of the Spirit is "personified by Sophia" (p. 45, ATJ).

Jung's deification of man emerges in his view of the Spirit:

"The indwelling of the Holy Ghost means nothing less than an approximation of the believer to the status of God's son. One can therefore understand what is meant by the remark 'you are gods.'" (p. 51, ATJ)

There is confusion about the incarnation demonstrated in Jung's view of the Spirit. Jung sees an *ongoing* incarnation rather than the historical event wherein the eternal Son of God became man:

"The continuing, direct operation of the Holy Ghost on those who are called to be God's children implies, in fact, a broadening process of incarnation." (p. 52, ATJ)

This continuing incarnation is also associated by Jung with ongoing divine revelation. He asserts that "with the assistance of the Holy Spirit the dogma can progressively develop and unfold," and he calls such development a "continuance of the Incarnation" (p. 51, ATJ). Scripture teaches that the Spirit, indwelling the believer, will sanctify that person and lead him into a deeper understanding of the *truth already revealed in God's Word*. But Scripture does not teach that additional dogma will unfold, and certainly not any "continuance of the incarnation"!

In considering our Lord's promise of the Holy Spirit after His departure, Jung believes that He is uncertain about man's future (p. 69, ATJ). Nothing could be further from the truth! Jesus Christ is God incarnate, *certain* of the accomplishment of His divine mission.

Sophia and Mary: From "God" to "Goddess" in Jungian Religion

There is a feminine twist to Jung's religious views, one that reflects the current New Age fascination with "goddess" Sophia.

Sophia. When initially introducing his readers to Sophia, Jung says that she is "coeternal...more or less hypostatized pneuma of feminine nature" (p. 24, ATJ). He equates Sophia with both the Johannine Logos (Jesus Christ!) and the Indian Shakti (p. 25, ATJ). In addition, he equates her with the Holy Spirit and makes her the equal of God the Father:

"As Ruach, the spirit of God, she brooded over the waters of the beginning. Like God, she has her throne in heaven."
(p. 26, ATJ; "Ruach" is the Hebrew word meaning *Spirit*.)

At the same time, Jung places Sophia *in opposition to God*:

"Taking a highly personified form that is clear proof of her autonomy, Wisdom reveals herself to men as a friendly helper and advocate against Yahweh, and shows them the bright side, the kind, just, and amiable aspect of their God."
(p. 34, ATJ)

In addition, Jung implicates Sophia in the incarnation:

"Sophia...reinforces the much needed self-reflection and thus makes possible Yahweh's decision to become man." (p. 43, ATJ)

(Don't forget--this bears repeating from time to time--that Jung denies the *reality* of God and of the events of the life of Christ. His concern is with "psychic" truth only, not objective facts. In his mind, he is analyzing only a "myth," not a reality.)

Mary. Closely related to Sophia, in Jung's system, is Mary. (Both are *mythological* characters, not real persons.) According to Jung, Mary is free from original sin and:

"...belongs to the state before the Fall...bears the image of God in undiminished purity...friend and intercessor for sinners, which all men are...incarnation of her prototype, namely Sophia." (p. 36, ATJ)

This is about as close as Jung ever comes to acknowledging the sin of mankind, but when he does, *Mary*, rather than Jesus Christ, is savior! In fact, he considers her to be divine; she is:

"...elevated to the status of a goddess and consequently loses something of her humanity." (p. 37, ATJ)

Elsewhere, in a patient's dream (!), he denies her divinity but continues to place her in the role of intercessor that biblically belongs to Christ alone:

"But why should the Mother of God not be mentioned? According to the dogma she is only beata, and not divine. Moreover, she represents the earth, which is also the body and its darkness. That is the reason why she, the all merciful, is the attorney pleading for all sinners." (p. 87, PR)

Earlier we saw how Jung identified Sophia with the Logos. Now there apparently is a three-way equation between Sophia, Mary, and Christ:

"This identity of mother (Sophia) and son (Logos) is borne out over and over in the myths." (p. 38, ATJ)

Finally, Jung takes note of the visions of Mary over the past few decades, attributing these to the work of the "collective unconscious" (p. 99, ATJ). Looking at Jung's comments concerning Sophia and Mary, we have a bizarre, incoherent mythology that clashes with biblical truth at every point.

Jung's View of Satan

Jung has admitted several times to demonic inspiration in the development of his psychology. Let's look at how he regards the mastermind of evil, Satan himself.

Presuming to know more than God, Jung says that it would be:

"...much simpler if Yahweh would, for once, call this 'practical joker' severely to account...thus eliminate the root of all evil...he would then not need the elaborate arrangement of a special Incarnation with all the unforeseeable consequences which this entails." (p. 39, ATJ)

How is it that Jung arrogantly presumes that the consequences of the incarnation are *unforeseeable* to the sovereign Lord? How dare he presume to tell God how He should rule the universe?

But it doesn't end there. Earlier we noted that Jung considers Satan a "son" of God equal to Christ. In fact, Jung places Satan above God the Father in terms of knowledge, claiming that God "forgot" about His omniscience, that God is:

"...completely uninformed about his son's intentions...that is because he never consults his omniscience." (p. 40, ATJ)

Satan..."knew how to make more frequent and better use of omniscience than did his father." (p. 42, ATJ)

Scripture, to the contrary, informs us of the final destiny of Satan and his demons in the lake of fire, where they will suffer eternal torment. God has not "forgotten" His omniscience!

Jung continues his accusations against God, this time for restraining His judgment:

"Why this wearisome forbearance towards Satan? Why this stubborn projection of evil on man, whom he has made so weak, so faltering, and so stupid that we are quite incapable of resisting his wicked sons? Why not pull up evil by the roots?" (p. 70, ATJ)

"God still hesitates to use force against Satan. Presumably he still does not know how much his own dark side favors the evil angel." (p. 72, ATJ)

Jung basically says, in so many words, that "the devil made me do it." He shifts blame to the father of lies! He also fails to realize that if God did not temporarily restrain the full outpouring of His wrath against the powers of evil...he would not be able to lift a pen to write his blasphemies!

Jung skirts across one of the theological mysteries that we cannot solve in this life:

"The devil was originally created a good being but had been corrupted by his pride...this hypothesis presupposed the evil it was attempting to explain--namely, pride." (p. 62, ATJ)

Frankly, our finite minds don't know why the devil, originally created a good angel, chose to sin against God. We also don't understand why the first man, Adam--also created good and upright--chose to sin. However, Scripture affirms that God's creation was good in its original state. God is sovereign yet He is not the author of sin. Man is fully responsible for his sin, and so are

Satan and the other fallen angels. God will one day overthrow the powers of evil forever. We cannot comprehend why creatures, created in a state of holiness and righteousness, would enter into sin. We can only affirm what Scripture teaches. Jung, on the other hand, fully rejects God's revelation in the Scriptures.

At the time of the incarnation, Jung believes there was a "partial neutralization" of Satan, who could no longer enjoy a confidential relationship with God, now identified with His "light aspect" (p. 48, ATJ). Elsewhere he states that:

"In Christianity, too, this metaphysical split was plainly perpetuated: Satan, who in the Old Testament still belonged to the intimate entourage of Yahweh, now formed the diametrical and eternal opposite of the divine world. He could not be uprooted." (p. 333, MDR)

Jung utterly misunderstands the Old Testament. Never is Satan pictured as belonging to the "intimate entourage of Yahweh," either in Job or in any other book. He is seen, from the very beginning, as the archenemy of God. As early as Genesis 3, God promises to ultimately destroy him. Jung's view of Satan is both bizarre and inconsistent. It certainly has no resemblance to the teachings of the Bible.

Jung's View of Christ

We know we're headed for trouble when we read Jung's statement during his student years that:

"John's Christ was strange to me, but still stranger was the Savior of the other gospels." (p. 87, MDR)

To the Bible believing Christian, however, it is *Jung's* "Christ" who is very, very strange. Mythology, astrology, Gnosticism, alchemy, psychology, and blasphemy are blended into a unique distortion of biblical truth.

A "new" biblical criticism? Again we are reminded of the "gospels criticism" over the past two centuries, where numerous unbiblical theologians have attacked the scriptural account of the life of Jesus Christ and the purpose of His mission. One recent author, in *Jung and the Bible*, insists that Jung offers us a "psychological criticism" of the Bible that transcends the historical and exegetical interpretations of the past, recognizing "the reality of the psyche and of the unconscious" in both biblical authors and readers, along with noting "that many

scriptural motifs and symbols appear to be archetypal in character."² Like Bultmann, to whom this writer compares Jung, the "Christ-event" is divorced from any connection with events in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth. But while Bultmann wanted to maintain a point of contact between Christ and believer in the hearing of the Word, Jung moves this "point of contact" within the individual soul.³ The search for any "historical Jesus" has thus ended, thrusting us into a theological twilight zone where only the reality of internal religious "symbols" is relevant. It is sad that Jung was so insistent on declaring his allegiance to the Christian faith, in view of his radical reconstruction of that faith.

Salvation. It would be difficult to conceive of a more radical reversal of the scriptural doctrine of salvation. Jung's most flagrant error is to view redemption as "reparation for a wrong done by God to man," claiming that "the traditional view of Christ's work of redemption reflects a one-sided way of thinking" (p. 56, ATJ). Jung compares God's creation of man to someone who starts a bacterial culture and later blames and punishes the bacilli when the culture fails (p. 53, ATJ):

"Yahweh's behavior towards his creatures contradicts all the requirements of so-called 'divine' reason whose possession is supposed to distinguish men from animals." (p. 53, ATJ)

Jung arrogantly holds *God* responsible for subjecting man to a "dangerous independence," claiming that He has forgotten "his son Satan" and shouldn't expect anything better from "man with his limited consciousness and imperfect knowledge" (p. 53, ATJ). He further explains that:

"...the creature can disappoint the creator, but it is scarcely credible that he can do him a painful wrong. This lies only in the power of the creator with respect to the powerless creature." (p. 56, ATJ)

Further blasphemies emerge in Jung's warped view of God the Father. Jung dares to accuse God of cruelty in requiring the sacrifice of His Son:

"What kind of father is it who would rather his son were slaughtered than forgive his ill-advised creatures who have been corrupted by his precious Satan?" (p. 56, ATJ)

² *Jung and the Bible*, p. 129.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

"So it comes as a nasty shock when this supremely good God only allowed the purchase of such an act of grace through a human sacrifice, and, what is worse, through the killing of his own son." (p. 68, ATJ)

Although he describes the "old view" in reasonably orthodox terms--man is saved from the coming wrath and Christ's bodily resurrection assures believers of the same--Jung obviously rejects God's biblically revealed plan of salvation:

"A more differentiated consciousness must, sooner or later, find it difficult to love, as a kind father, a God whom on account of his unpredictable fits of wrath, his unreliability, injustice, and cruelty, it has every reason to fear." (p. 57, ATJ)

Scripture clearly views our salvation as being firmly rooted in the love of *God the Father* (John 3:16; Romans 5:8, 8:32ff; 1 John 4:9-10; Ephesians 1:3). Jung totally misses the point:

"God wants to become man, but not quite. The conflict in his nature is so great that the incarnation can only be bought by an expiatory self-sacrifice offered up to the wrath of God's dark side." (p. 94, ATJ)

There are huge errors in these words. It is the "incarnation" that is bought by sacrifice here, rather than man's salvation from sin. The sacrifice is offered to God's "dark side," not *God Himself*. Jung imagines a "conflict" in God's nature which does not exist. Blasphemies and errors multiply ad nauseum in reading Jung.

Jung misunderstands the *results* of Christ's saving work. Again uttering blasphemies, he claims that:

"Man is not so much delivered from his sins...as delivered from the fear of the consequences of sin...the wrath of God.... The belief in a loving father, who has sent his only-begotten son to rescue the human race, has repressed the persistent traces of the old Yahweh and his dangerous affects." (p. 54, ATJ)

It is true that the atonement is a work of propitiation, providing for the removal of God's wrath (Romans 3:25; 1 John 2:2, 4:10). The believer no longer needs to fear the wrath of God, the eternal consequences of his sin. But it is *the love of God the Father*

that is the driving force behind this propitiation. God Himself has provided for the removal of His own wrath. There are no "dangerous affects" in the "old Yahweh." Jung, however, despises and rejects "the expiation wrought by Christ's sacrificial death for the misdemeanors of mankind," stating that:

"It is obvious that such ideas still picture God the father as the dangerous Yahweh who has to be propitiated." (p. 53, ATJ)

Jung calls it a "strange fact that the God of goodness is so unforgiving that he can only be appeased by a human sacrifice." (p. 68, ATJ)

But God, holy and righteous as He is, *does* require propitiation. His justice must be satisfied, and indeed it *is satisfied* in the work of Christ. Jung fails to see that propitiation is *not* inconsistent with God's love and forgiveness. Not only does he deny the holiness of God's character, but he also wants to blot out the gravity of man's sin ("misdemeanors") against a holy, righteous God. The seriousness of that sin, and the perfections of God, necessitate the kind of pure sacrifice that Christ alone could make. Jung clearly denies both.

Jung also twists the believer's union with Christ, presented in Romans 6 and Colossians 3. At this point, instead of envisioning our Lord as a mere "myth," Jung reduces Him to a mere man:

"Yet he was only a man who had died 1860 years ago. Why should a person become one with him? He was called the 'Son of God'--a demigod, therefore, like the Greek heroes: how then could an ordinary person become one with him?" (p. 55, MDR)

Jung's demonic distortions of the truth are legion!

Speaking elsewhere concerning the so-called "myth" of salvation, Jung says of the apostles that:

"...as the twice-born they had their roots in the divinity itself. Their visible, physical life was on this earth; but the invisible inner man had come from and would return to the primordial image of wholeness, to the eternal Father, as the Christian myth of salvation puts it." (p. 333, MDR)

Nowhere does Scripture attribute "roots in the divinity itself" to the apostles, who are mere men. Jung is hopelessly confused about who is human and who is divine! He drags Christ down to the level of fallible man, and exalts man to the level of deity. These reversals are not always consistent, but they are highly unscriptural.

Election. Jung observes a "certain predestinarian tendency" in the teachings of Christ which he advises us to take "psychologically" rather than "literally," in order to fit the framework of the Christian message and to give the believer a "feeling of distinction" (p. 45, ATJ) Jung is evidently ignorant of the teachings of the apostle Paul in Ephesians 1:1-14, Romans 8:28-30, and Romans 9:22-24, concerning the doctrine of election. This is not surprising in view of his deification of man.

Sacerdotalism. Here is another area where Jung expresses sympathies with Catholicism, grossly misunderstanding the Protestant faith. He laments the lack of saving rituals in the latter:

"The Protestant is left to God.... He has to digest his sins alone and he is not too sure of divine grace, which has become unattainable through lack of a suitable ritual." (p. 61, PR)

His position is hardly improved by his notation that the Protestant's conscience is sharpened, causing him to:

"...cross the threshold of the unconscious mind and become aware of those impersonal forces that make him the unconscious instrument of the wholesale murderer of man." (p. 61, PR)

Jung explains that the Protestant is able to "realize sin to a degree hardly attainable by Catholic mentality," insisting that "self-criticism...is indispensable to any attempt to understand one's own psychology" (p. 61, PR).

However, we can *thank God*, as Christians, that we are "left to God alone!" God alone is able to infallibly secure our salvation. Left to our own righteousness, which Scripture calls "filthy rags," not even one soul would have a chance! God uses his own Word, not "self-criticism," to lay bare the inner workings of the heart of man (Hebrews 4:12-13).

Despite some surface similarities to the sacerdotalism found in Roman Catholicism, Jung cannot be said to truly concur even with that view. He has turned the entire doctrine of salvation on its head, and the resulting mutilation cannot be claimed to coincide even with the errors occurring in Catholic, Arminian, and Pelagian theologies. In view of his *identification* of God and man, and other related errors, his system must in the final analysis be one of autosoterism: *man is his own savior*.

The Incarnation. Jung's imagined *reasons* for the incarnation strike at the very core of sound doctrine:

"...acknowledging that the man Job is morally superior to him and that therefore he has to catch up and become human himself.... Yahweh must become man precisely because he has done man a wrong.... Because his creature has surpassed him he must regenerate himself.... The immediate cause of the Incarnation lies in Job's elevation, and its purpose is the differentiation of Yahweh's consciousness." (p. 43, ATJ)

In another place Jung attributes the incarnation to the fact that "God...created the world and its sins;" thus it was necessary for Him to "become Christ in order to suffer the fate of humanity" (p. 216, MDR). Note how God is made the *creator of sin!*

Jung calls the incarnation "a world-shaking transformation of God," explaining that:

"At the time of the Creation he revealed himself in Nature; now he wants to be more specific and become man."
(p. 39, ATJ)

"Sophia" is implicated in this "transformation":

"The approach of Sophia betokens a new creation. But this time it is not the world that is to be changed; rather it is God who intends to change his own nature. Mankind is not, as before, to be destroyed, but saved." (p. 35, ATJ)

To Jung, the "incarnation" is the *identity* of God and man. He specifically states this at various points. For example:

"It was only quite late that we realized (or rather, are beginning to realize) that God is Reality itself and therefore--last but not least--man." (p. 40, ATJ)

It is "...as if Job and Yahweh were combined in a single personality...Yahweh's intention to become man, which resulted from his collision with Job, is fulfilled in Christ's life and suffering." (p. 47, ATJ)

The incarnation is also, to Jung, a blending of contradictions. This is closely related to his view that both good and evil exist within God:

"All opposites are of God...God in his 'oppositeness' has taken possession of him, incarnated himself in him (man)." (p. 54, ATJ)

Scripture clearly reveals a *condescension* on the part of God in becoming man (Philippians 2:7-8; 2 Corinthians 8:9; Isaiah 53:2-3). In his transposition of God and man, Jung demolishes the entire biblical doctrine concerning the incarnation. God is dethroned while man is openly deified:

"God will be begotten in creaturely man.... This implies a tremendous change in man's status, for he is now raised to sonship and almost to the position of a man-god." (p. 69, ATJ)

Jung races even further from the truth in his blasphemous claims:

"Ever since John the apocalypticist experienced for the first time (perhaps unconsciously) the conflict into which Christianity inevitably leads, mankind has groaned under this burden: *God wanted to become man, and still wants to.*" (p. 93, ATJ)

"From the promise of the Paraclete we may conclude that God wants to become *wholly* man; in other words, to reproduce himself in his own dark creature (man not redeemed from original sin)." (p. 94, ATJ)

"Yahweh's decision to become man is a symbol of the development that had to supervene when man becomes conscious of the sort of God-image he is confronted with." (p. 94, ATJ)

Sin entered the world when man desired to attain to the status of God. Jung inverts this truth, believing instead that God desires to attain to the status of man!

Jung considers the Old Testament prophetic activities to be "preparatory events and symptoms of a tendency within God to become man" (p. 40, ATJ). He believes that Abel, "God's successful son," prefigures Christ (p. 37, ATJ), having the advantage of being pleasing to God, "begotten and directly related," although he died early with neither wife nor children (p. 43, ATJ). Jung says that:

"The short, dramatic course of Abel's fate serves as an excellent paradigm for the life and death of a God become man." (p. 44, ATJ)

The Old Testament does contain biblical characters who are said to prefigure Christ. Adam is a "type" of Christ (Romans 5:12). There are also parallels between Moses and Christ, both covenant mediators. Elements in Elisha and Elijah also prefigure Christ. However, Jung's interpretation is a bizarre distortion of real biblical typology, moving into the realm of pagan mythology:

"The young dying god is also well known in the contemporary pagan religions, and so is the fratricide motif.... We shall hardly be wrong in assuming that Abel's fate refers back to a metaphysical event which was played out between Satan and another son of God with a 'light' nature and more devotion to his father." (p. 43, ATJ)

Jung manufactures his own theology as he goes; we would indeed be wrong to *assume* such horrendous distortions of Scripture!

Oddly enough (and inconsistently!), Jung elsewhere states that:

"If God wishes to become man, an incredible kenosis (emptying) is required of Him, in order to reduce His totality to the infinitesimal human scale." (p. 337, MDR)

He then explains that theologians have found it necessary to attribute certain divine qualities (such as the lack of original sin) to Jesus such that He is:

"...at least a god-man or a demigod. The Christian God-image cannot become incarnate in empirical man without contradictions--quite apart from the fact that man with all his external characteristics seems little suited to representing a god." (p. 337, MDR)

Jung's proposal is grounded in his inability to conceive of an incarnate God apart from contradictions. At the same time, he has no appreciation for the *mysteries* of the incarnation. Abundant biblical evidence is flatly rejected (John 1:14; Romans 8:3, 9:5; Colossians 2:9; Hebrews 1:3), not to mention confusion between *kenosis* and *incarnation*. The concept of incarnation undeniably affirms that Christ remained *fully God* during the time of His earthly ministry.

The pre-existence of Christ is yet another doctrine ripped to shreds by Jung's imaginations:

"...no new human beings are to be *created*, but only one, the God-man." The "Second Adam" comes through a human woman rather than "directly from the hand of the Creator."
(p. 35, ATJ, emphasis added)

"Just as Yahweh originally undertook to create a chthonic equivalent of himself in the first man, Adam, so now he intends something similar, but much better." (p. 38, ATJ)

Although Jung states that "...he shall not be, like Adam, a mere copy, but God himself" (p. 38, ATJ), it is clear that he places the Lord within the realm of *created* beings. At the same time, his denial of the *historicity* of salvation events returns to haunt us:

"Although the birth of Christ is an event that occurred but once in history, it has always existed in eternity."
(p. 38, ATJ)

While this second quote might appear to affirm the historicity of the incarnation, and God's foreordination of that event, it clearly must be read in light of Jung's belief that religious ideas are only "psychological" truths, not actual facts. Reflecting on his early years, Jung rejects the importance of *facts* in the life of Christ, complaining that others around him:

"...seemed content with the theory of the historical effect produced by Christ's life. This view seemed to me not only soft-witted but altogether lifeless." (p. 98, MDR)

Some modern theologians, similarly resistant to the affirmation of historical facts, confuse matters with their talk of "revelation" time or "creation" time distinct from "calendar" time. We must not follow Jung, or others, down this road to destruction (1 John 1:1-14, 4:1-3). The "historical effects produced by Christ's

life" are hardly "altogether lifeless," but rather the only source of *eternal life*!

Perhaps the most revealing comments are to be found in Jung's memoirs near the end of his life, where he reduces the "incarnation" to an event wholly within the psyche of man:

Early in Christian history..."the idea of the incarnation had been refined to include the intuition of 'Christ within us.' Thus the unconscious wholeness penetrated into the psychic realm of inner experience, and man was made aware of all that entered into his true configuration. This was a decisive step, not only for man, but also the Creator--Who, in the eyes of those who had been delivered from darkness, cast off His dark qualities and became the *summum bonum*." (p. 328, MDR)

The "myth of the necessary incarnation of God--the essence of the Christian message" is understood by Jung as "man's creative confrontation with the opposites and their synthesis in the self, the wholeness of his personality. The unavoidable internal contradictions in the image of a Creator-god can be reconciled in the unity and wholeness of the self." (p. 338, MDR)

"That psychological fact which is the greatest power in your system is the god, since it is always the overwhelming psychic factor which is called god. As soon as a god ceased to be an overwhelming factor, he becomes a mere name. His essence is dead and his power is gone. Why have the antique gods lost their prestige and their effect upon human souls? It was because the Olympic gods had served their time and a new mystery began: God became man." (p. 98, PR)

"God became man," indeed, but by now Jung has discovered that He is not a mere "psychological fact" projected by the mind of man. He and nineteenth century atheist Feuerbach have shared an illusion, to their eternal detriment.

This bizarre statement is perhaps the best conclusion to our review of Jung's garbled version of the incarnation:

"The whole man is challenged and enters the fray with his total reality. Only then can he become whole and only then can 'God be born,' that is, enter into human reality and associate with man in the form of 'man.' By this act of incarnation man--that is, his ego--is inwardly replaced by

'God,' and God becomes outwardly man, in keeping with the saying of Jesus: 'Who sees me, sees the Father.'" (p. 337, MDR)

The Two Natures of Christ. In one place, Jung's view of *two natures* joined in Christ is a bizarre conjunction borrowed from alchemy, the "union of spiritually alive and physically dead matter." This is the "alchemical concept of Christ," whom Jung calls a "psychological figure" comparable to the *lapis* (stone) central to alchemy (p. 210-211, MDR). The "green gold" of alchemy is the "living quality which the alchemists saw not only in man but also in inorganic nature...an expression of the life-spirit" (p. 211, MDR). This strange union has nothing to do with the two natures of our Lord as revealed in Scripture; He is fully God, and fully man. His two distinct natures, the divine and the human, are united in one Person.

Jung easily attributes deity to man in general, but not to Christ in particular. He readily affirms the "God within...spontaneously produced in the dreams of modern people" symbolically. He considers it prejudicial to locate deity *outside* of man, and credits the "Christian mystics" with insistence on the "essential identity of God and man." This "mystical idea" of inner deity is one that Jung believes is "enforced by the natural tendencies of the unconscious mind" (p. 73, PR). Jung boldly rejects the Christian teaching that Christ alone is the God-man, speaking of a "christification" of all men, regardless of the inevitable collisions occurring among billions of "god-men," and the continuing, unavoidable presence of sin (p. 108, ATJ). Early in his childhood, Jung concluded that:

"Lord Jesus was to me unquestionably a man and therefore a *fallible figure*, or else a mere mouthpiece of the Holy Ghost." (p. 98, MDR, emphasis added)

In fact, Jung has judged it a "display of childish bad temper" when Jesus cursed the fig tree, and His parable of the unjust steward is given a substandard moral rating (p. 332, MDR).

Elsewhere Jung denies the reality of Christ's humanity, insisting that He "will never be a human being, but a god...both mother and son are not real human beings at all, but gods" (p. 37, ATJ). At birth, according to Jung, Christ was "a hero and half-god in the classical sense" (p. 68, ATJ). Summarizing his clearly inconsistent views, he states:

"He is lacking neither in humanity nor in divinity, and for this reason he was long ago characterized by totality symbols, because he was understood to be all-embracing and to unite all opposites." (p. 68, ATJ)

It is important to remember here that for Jung, deity and sin are not incompatible. Thus he can call Christ "divine" while accusing Him of sin. In any event, Jung displays a deplorable lack of consistency concerning the two natures of Christ. He defies the biblical view that Christ is both fully God and fully man. At one point above Christ is not at all human, at another point a "half-god," and finally He is lacking neither humanity nor divinity! One quality that quite obviously Jung denies is the *immutability* of Christ as the conjunction of two natures. Christianity, he claims, is remarkable in that "it anticipates a metamorphosis in the divinity" (p. 327, MDR). But Scripture affirms that God is eternal and unchanging.

Impeccability. The Scriptures affirm the sinlessness of Christ without compromise (John 8:46; Hebrews 4:15, 7:26; 1 Peter 2:22), yet concurrently assure us of the full reality of his sufferings and temptation (Hebrews 2:14-18, 4:14-16). The union of His divine and human natures, in one Person, was such that He triumphed over all temptation to sin. Jung refuses to affirm the sinlessness of the incarnate Lord, insisting in defiance of Scripture that only a *guilty* man is suitable for the task:

"We can, of course, hope for the undeserved grace of God, who hears our prayers. But God, who also does *not* hear our prayers, wants to become man, and for that purpose he has chosen, through the Holy Ghost, the creaturely man filled with darkness.... The guilty man is eminently suitable and is therefore chosen to become the vessel for the continuing incarnation, not the guiltless one who holds aloof from the world and refuses to pay his tribute to life, for in him the dark God would find no room." (p. 98, ATJ)

Jung exhibits utter contempt for the mysteries of the incarnation. In His sinless life and conquering of evil, Christ does not "hold aloof from the world," but has entered into the closest possible union with humanity (Hebrews 2:14-18), in order to effect our salvation. Also, there is no "continuing" incarnation!

The Atonement. Jung mutilates the atonement in every conceivable devious manner. Expressing doubt as to the "immediate finality or universal effectiveness of the work of salvation," he states that:

"Christ's victory over his brother Satan...is not really and truly won." (p. 50, ATJ)

The author of Hebrews lays the ax to such blasphemy, underscoring in no uncertain terms the *completed* nature of Christ's work (Hebrews 1:3; 9:12, 25-28). Plus: Christ and Satan are *not* brothers! Perish the thought!

One key aspect of the atonement is redemption. Believers are "bought at a price" with the precious blood of Christ, redeemed from the penalty and power of sin, and from Satan (Matthew 20:28; Acts 20:28; Ephesians 1:7; Colossians 1:13-14; 1 Peter 1:18-19; Hebrews 9:12; Titus 2:14). Redemption is the payment of a ransom that secures the deliverance of the sinner from bondage. To Jung, however, the state of being "redeemed" is:

"...a state in which opposites violently collide...only through the most extreme and most menacing conflict does the Christian experience deliverance into divinity." (p. 55, ATJ)

Never does the Christian experience "deliverance into divinity." He experiences deliverance from God's wrath, from the eternal penalty for sin, from the enslaving power of sin, from Satan, and ultimately from the bodily impact of sin...but never, never divinity! Furthermore, there is surely no "violent collision of opposites" envisioned in Scripture!

Reconciliation is another aspect of Christ's atoning work that is diabolically distorted in Jung's writings. God reconciles man to Himself, providing for the removal of His own righteous enmity toward sinful man. Jung distorts this precious truth:

"He preserves mankind from loss of communion with God and from getting lost in mere consciousness and rationality." (p. 67, ATJ)

The state of being spiritually *lost* is *not*, as Jung would have it, a matter of "getting lost in mere consciousness and rationality." It is far more serious: eternal separation from God in a state of eternal torment.

To Jung, reconciliation is an event wholly within the psyche of man, rather than the restoration of communion between *God* and man:

"In the experience of the self it is no longer the opposites 'God' and 'man' that are reconciled, as it was before, but rather the opposites within the God-image itself."
(p. 338, MDR)

The biblical evidence to the contrary is abundant (2 Corinthians 5:18-19; Colossians 1:19-22; Romans 5:1-11; Ephesians 2:11-19).

Christ's role as mediator is similarly revised by Jung, who pits God *against* man:

"Christ proves to be a mediator in two ways: he helps men against God and assuages the fear which man feels towards this being." (p. 68, ATJ)

Jung ignores the fact that it is *God* who both initiates and completes the work of salvation. His distortions become even more strange when he places *man* in the role of mediator, saying that he considers man:

"...despite his continuing sinfulness...in the position of the mediator, the unifier of God and creature." (p. 70, ATJ)

Nowhere does Scripture propose that Creator and creature are *unified*. Rather they are *reconciled* while remaining distinct beings. It is the *Man*, Christ, who is Mediator, not "man" in general (1 Timothy 2:5).

Astrology and UFO's!! Here Jung's statements are particularly weird. Jung claims that Christ represents certain "religious content" and that His coming could be "astrologically predicted." Jung intended to show how He could be understood in terms of the "spirit of the age" as well as through the course of 2,000 years of history (p. 211, MDR). Moving further into the realm of astrology, which is forbidden by Scripture, Jung states that:

"A synchronicity exists between the life of Christ and the objective astronomical event, the entrance of the spring equinox into the sign of Pisces. Christ is therefore the 'Fish' (just as Hammurabi before him was the 'Ram'), and comes forth as the ruler of the new aeon." (p. 221, MDR)

According to this bizarre view, of which there is no hint in Scripture, Christ is likely to be outdated at some future point! In fact, Jung specifically predicts such a ridiculous event. He believes us to be at the end of the "aeon of the Fishes," entering

soon into the "aeon of Aquarius," and eventually (in about 2,000 years) the "aeon of Capricorn," the Goat-Fish:

"...symbolizing the mountains and the depths of the sea, a polarity made up of undifferentiated animal elements which have grown together. This strange being could easily be the primordial image of a Creator-god confronting 'man,' the Anthropos." (p. 338-9, MDR)

The second coming of Christ is an event that for Jung is represented by the appearance of UFO's. He notes the political unrest at the time of Christ, believing it comparable to the situation in today's world. Therefore, he concludes, there is "a wave of hope in a reappearance of Christ" which, for Jung, takes the form of a "worldwide distribution of the UFO phenomenon" (p. 212, MDR). Believers know that Christ is indeed going to return and usher in the eternal state, but not aboard a spaceship from Mars!

Communion. This precious remembrance of our Lord's sacrificial work is viewed by Jung with utter contempt:

"What was the purpose of this wretched memorial service with the flat bread and the sour wine? Slowly I came to understand that this communion had been a fatal experience to me. It had proved hollow; more than that, it had proved to be a total loss. I knew that I would never again be able to participate in this ceremony. 'Why, that is not religion at all,' I thought. 'It is an absence of God; the church is a place I should not go to. It is not life which is there, but death.'" (p. 55, MDR)

Jung rejects "the Way, the Truth, and the Life." He rejects the one and only way to receive eternal life. Perhaps communion might be rightly called a "fatal experience" for Jung, since he is condemned by his unbelief.

Conclusions. Jung believes that since Christ is to be a universal savior, rather than merely a national figure, we must therefore look to pagan myths and revelations (p. 44, ATJ)! He claims to have had a vision of Christ, appearing as a bright light at the foot of his bed (p. 210, MDR).

But it is not the Christ of Scripture who appeared to Jung. We know that Satan and his associates appear as "angels of light" to deceive. Jung's view of Christ transcends heresy, moving directly into the realm of utter blasphemy. It is a sad

commentary on the modern church to note that *Christians* find it necessary to borrow from the tangled theological system of this enemy of the gospel, whose own theology has by now been set straight!

Knowing now how Jung views truth, God the Father, and Christ the Son, we can examine the impact of his blasphemies on his view of man. That view is equally opposed to biblical truth.

Jung's View of Man

Although Jung basically exalts man above God, his fundamentally *pessimistic* anthropology emerges at points. He effectively destroys the biblical view of man as God's image-bearer.

Evolution undergirds Jung's system, and as might be expected, this involves a radical denial of God's creation of man for His own specific purposes and glory:

"If the Creator were conscious of Himself, He would not need conscious creatures; nor is it probable that the extremely *indirect methods of creation*, which squander millions of years upon the development of countless species and creatures, are the outcome of *purposeful intention*. Natural history tells us of a *haphazard and casual transformation of species* over hundreds of millions of years of devouring and being devoured. The biological and political history of man is an elaborate repetition of the same thing." (p. 339, MDR, emphasis added)

Jung claims elsewhere that:

"Nothing could persuade me that 'in the image of God' applied only to man." (p. 45, MDR)

Instead, he insists, other parts of creation "far better exemplified the essence of God than men" (p. 45, MDR). Here is the low view Jung held of man's original condition:

"My experiences with human being, too, had taught me anything rather than a belief in man's original goodness and decency. I knew myself well enough to know that I was only gradually, as it were, distinguishing myself from an animal." (p. 69, MDR)

Jung claims that his compassion for animals "rested on the deeper foundation of a primitive attitude of mind--on an unconscious identity with animals" (p. 101, MDR).

Early in Genesis, the creation account refutes Jung. When God completed the creation of the physical world and the animals, His mode of creation changed dramatically, from "let it be" to a personal, direct act. He formed the first man out of the dust of the earth and breathed into his nostrils so that he became a living being (Genesis 2:7). He created man and woman *in His image* (Genesis 1:26-27) to rule over the rest of creation. As God completed each phase of creation, He saw that it was *good*. Man was originally created in righteousness and holiness, with both moral agency and moral excellence. Later he fell into sin of his own free will, from that point forward having an *enslaved* will.

Another distortion occurs when Jung attributes the *image of Satan* to Cain and imposes his distortions on the Bible when he considers the first *woman*:

"If the original father Adam is a copy of the Creator, his son Cain is certainly a copy of God's son Satan." (p. 30, ATJ)

"Just as Yahweh is legitimately united with his wife Israel, but has a feminine pneuma as his intimate playmate from all eternity, so Adam first has Lilith (the daughter or emanation of Satan) to wife, as a Satanic correspondence to Sophia. Eve would then correspond to the people of Israel."
(p. 31, ATJ)

The Bible recognizes even sinful man, after the Fall, as bearing the image of God (at least in a sense--moral agency is retained, while moral excellence is lost but is renewed in the believer.)

Jung's deification of man, in the final analysis, actually degrades man. This degradation comes to light in his comments concerning his psychiatric practice, when he says:

"From the clinical point of view which then prevailed, the human personality of the patient, his individuality, *did not matter at all*." (p. 114, MDR).

It is also degrading to state, as Jung does, that he is only gradually distinguishing from an animal! This is hardly consistent with his equation of man with *God*...or maybe not, since Jung holds such an extremely low view of God!

At this juncture it is critical to note that *any view of man which denies the image of God is doomed to failure and radical distortion*. We cannot trust the counsel of Jung concerning man--his basic nature, his fundamental problems, and how he ought to live.

Deification of man. Jung says of himself that, "like every other being, I am a splinter of the infinite deity" (p. 4, MDR). Judging from his view of God, however, such a statement is highly suspicious! Nevertheless, it is a presumptuous and arrogant statement.

Other such statements contribute to our understanding of Jung, who considers God to be wholly contained within man:

"Since dogma holds that God is wholly present in each of the three Persons, He is also wholly present in each part of the outpoured Holy Spirit; thus every man can partake of the whole of God and hence of the filiation." (p. 334, MDR)

Jung equates both "God" and the "Word of God" with the divinity he believes to be present within man:

"It is not that 'God' is a myth, but that myth is the revelation of a divine life in man. It is not we who invent myth, rather it speaks to us as a Word of God. The Word of God comes to us, and we have no way of distinguishing whether and to what extent it is different from God." (p. 340, MDR)

Scripture, however, certainly distinguishes between genuine revelation from God and man's inner imaginations!

The "incarnation," or rather Jung's warped view of it, is considered evidence of *man's* importance:

"There can be no doubt that man's importance is enormously enhanced if God himself deigns to become one." (p. 48, ATJ)

Jung also considers man's reason "the supreme arbiter who cannot be argued with" (p. 90, ATJ). This statement also blasphemes God, whose thoughts are far *higher* than the thoughts of man.

Jung's analysis of Job takes his view of man to nauseating proportions:

"Job...is set up as a judge over God himself." (p. 23, ATJ)

"Job stands morally higher than Yahweh. In this respect the creature has surpassed the creator." (p. 43, ATJ)

"Without Yahweh's knowledge and contrary to his intentions, the tormented though guiltless Job had secretly been lifted up to a superior knowledge of God which God himself did not possess." (p. 15, ATJ)

Jung sees Job as initially reluctant to accept the blasphemous Jungian view of God as arbitrary and unjust:

"Because, in spite of everything, he cannot give up his faith in divine justice, it is not easy for him to accept the knowledge that divine arbitrariness breaks the law. On the other hand, he has to admit that no one except Yahweh himself is doing him injustice and violence." (p. 7, ATJ)

Job admits *no such thing!*

At the same time, Jung believes that Job recognizes a division within God:

"...he does not doubt the unity of God. He clearly sees that God is at odds with himself--so totally at odds that he, Job, is quite certain of finding in God a helper and 'advocate' against God." (p. 7, ATJ)

Psychoanalyzing poor Job, Jung reinterprets the repentance he demonstrates near the end of the account:

"Shrewdly, Job takes up Yahweh's aggressive words and prostrates himself at his feet as if he were indeed the defeated antagonist." (p. 20, ATJ)

Some of Jung's ungodly "wisdom" in this area is derived from his own dreams, one of which:

"...discloses a thought and a premonition that has long been present in humanity: the idea of the creature that surpasses its creator by a small but decisive factor." (p. 220, MDR)

Neither in Job nor anywhere else does Scripture confirm this Creator-creature reversal! Jung has imposed his bizarre psychology onto the pages of holy Scripture.

Mythology again rears its ugly head in Jung's doctrine of man:

"The mythical character of a life is just what expresses its universal human validity. It is perfectly possible, psychologically, for the unconscious or an archetype to take complete possession of a man and to determine his fate down to the smallest detail." (p. 47, ATJ)

This horrendous determinism is hardly consistent with Jung's deification of man. Note how it conflicts even with Jung's own words within the covers of the same book:

"Everyone now depends on man: immense power of destruction is given into his hand, and the question is whether he can resist the will to use it, and can temper his will with the spirit of love and wisdom." (p. 97, ATJ)

There is a garbled mixture of impersonal determinism and radical autonomy in Jung's unbiblical view of man.

Sexuality. Jung expresses a great interest in sexuality, which he associates with spirituality:

"My main concern has been to investigate, over and above its personal significance and biological function, its spiritual aspects." (p. 168, MD)

He laments the loss of "mythology," the foundation of his views concerning sexuality, in today's world:

"Our modern attitude looks back proudly upon the mists of superstition and of medieval or primitive credulity and entirely forgets that it carries the whole living past in the lower stories of the skyscraper of rational consciousness." (p. 41, PR)

The modern rejection of *miracles* is problematic in certain theologies, such as the view put forth by Rudolph Bultmann in his "demythologization" of the New Testament. But Jung's alternative is biblically unacceptable.

The exact "spiritual" significance of sexuality is something that Jung blasphemously equates with the "dark side" of God:

"Sexuality is of the greatest importance as the expression of the chthonic spirit. That spirit is the 'other face of God,' the dark side of the God-image." (p. 168, MDR)

Jung sees a feminine "anima" within the male person, and a corresponding masculine "animus" within the female. His theories began with the fantasy of a woman's voice within his head:

"'Perhaps my unconscious is forming a personality that is not me, but which is insisting on coming through to expression.' I knew for a certainty that the voice had come from a woman. I recognized it as the voice of a patient, a talented psychopath who had a strong transference to me. She had become a living figure within my mind." (p. 185, MDR)

Jung attributes the existence of the "anima" to:

"...the fact that since time immemorial man in his myths always manifested the idea of a coexistence of male and female in the same body." (p. 34, PR)

Out of his own devilish imaginations, Jung forges ahead in formulating a theory that he applies to *all* mankind:

"I was greatly intrigued by the fact that a woman should interfere with me from within. My conclusion was that she must be the 'soul,' in the primitive sense, and I began to speculate on the reasons why the name 'anima' was given to the soul. Why was it thought of as feminine? Later I came to see that this inner feminine figure plays a typical, or archetypal, role in the unconscious of a man, and I called her the 'anima.' The corresponding figure in the unconscious of woman I called the 'animus.'" (p. 186, MDR)

Jung goes on to conclude that the "unconscious contents" of the human mind must be "personified" in order to strip them of their power, a task he believes difficult because "they always possess a certain degree of autonomy, a separate identity of their own" (p. 187, MDR). Jung claims that the "anima...has a strong historical character," that she/it "goes back into prehistory and embodies the contents of the past" (p. 286, MDR). He also asserts that the "anima...communicates the images of the unconscious to the conscious mind" (p. 187, MDR). Undoubtedly, Jung has once more pushed us into the realm of the demonic.

Scientific?! It is incredible to pause and note that Jung believes his ramblings to be scientific in nature:

"We achieve knowledge of nature only through science, which enlarges consciousness; hence deepened self-knowledge also requires science, that is, psychology." (p. 331, MDR)

"Modern psychological development leads to a much better understanding as to what man really consists of."
(p. 102, PR)

Jung even claims scientific status for his warped "collective unconscious" theory, insisting that *modern research* has shown that:

"...an individual consciousness is based upon and surrounded by an indefinitely extended unconscious psyche." (p. 99, PR)

These claims are the height of absurdity. Jung's theories lay bare only the demented workings of his own imaginations, and the activities of the demons with whom he frequently associated. There is nothing *scientific* about such occultism.

The "Unconscious." Perhaps the chief cornerstone of Jung's distorted anthropology is the emphasis he places on the "unconscious" of man, particularly as revealed in dream material. But it is the darkness within his own mind that comes to light when he recounts one of his many dreams:

"The ground floor stood for the first level of the unconscious. The deeper I went, the more alien and the darker the scene became. In the cave, I discovered remains of a primitive culture, that is, the world of the primitive man within myself--a world which can scarcely be reached or illuminated by consciousness. The primitive psyche of man borders on the life of the animal soul, just as the caves of prehistoric times were usually inhabited by animals before men laid claim to them." (p. 160, MDR)

Jung equates the "unconscious" with man's wholeness or goal in life:

"Whatever man's wholeness, or the self, may mean *per se*, empirically it is an image of the goal of life spontaneously produced by the unconscious, irrespective of the wishes and fears of the conscious mind." (p. 97, ATJ)

Jung enters into the realm of the collective dead (more likely the demonic) as he continues to speculate. As the result of a "house haunting" experience, he theorizes the following:

"...the soul, the anima, establishes the relationship to the unconscious. In a certain sense this is also a relationship to the collectivity of the dead, the land of the ancestors." (p. 191, MDR)

"These conversations with the dead formed a kind of prelude to what I had to communicate to the world about the unconscious: a kind of pattern of order and interpretation of its general contents." (p. 192, MDR)

It chills the spine to realize that so much modern psychology is drawn from such sources.

Jung attributes much religious teaching and practice to defending against the human "unconscious":

"There are any amount of creeds and ceremonies that exist for the sole purpose of forming a defense against the unexpected, dangerous tendencies of the unconscious." (p. 21, PR)

He also rages against resistance to the "unconscious," claiming that the human soul is currently undervalued:

"It is true that our religious teaching speaks of an immortal soul; but it has very few kind words for the actual human psyche, which would go straight to eternal damnation if it were not for a special act of Divine Grace. Those two important factors are largely responsible for the general undervaluation of the psyche, but not entirely. Much older than those relatively recent developments are the primitive fear of and aversion to everything that borders on the unconscious." (p. 19, PR)

Jung errs greatly throughout this statement. He ignores the reality of sin, along with the truth of God's grace, both His *common grace*, which does not save but delays His judgment, and His *saving grace*, extended to believers. The Jungian "unconscious" has no rightful place in a biblical view of the human soul and its eternal destiny.

Strangely enough, Jung actually admits, in at least one place, that the "unconscious" is nothing more than a *theory*. Concerning a "voice" heard in a dream, he says that:

"As a matter of fact the concept of the unconscious mind is a *mere assumption for the sake of convenience*. In reality I am totally unconscious of--in other words, *I do not know at all--where the voice originates.*" (p. 47, PR, emphasis added)

He goes on to state that it would be "presumptuous to call the factor which produces the voice *my mind*" (p. 47, PR). Perhaps it isn't. Perhaps it's a demon!

Jung believes that there are factors which *force* us to assume the existence of the unconscious, in order to explain certain observable facts (p. 48, PR). Scripture turns this upside down. There are factors, namely the things God has created, *which force us to assume the existence of the God revealed in the Bible* (Romans 1:18ff). But men like Jung do not *want* to bow the knee to the Almighty God, so theories like the "unconscious" are put forth to take His rightful place. Jung's equation of God with the "unconscious," noted earlier, is evidence of this fact.

But Jung moves on. The human personality, he speculates, consists of consciousness plus the "unconscious psyche." However:

"...so far as the sum total of human personality is concerned one has to admit the impossibility of a complete description or definition." (p. 47, PR)

Despite such shaky foundations, Jung attributes superior wisdom to this doubtful entity, the "unconscious":

"My psychological experience has shown time and again that certain contents issue from a psyche more complete than consciousness. They often contain a superior analysis or insight or knowledge which consciousness has not been able to produce." (p. 49, PR)

Jung titles this superior insight "intuition." Scripture, by contrast, directs us to the infinitely superior wisdom of God the Creator.

Jung attributes a key role to the "unconscious" in the proper development of man:

"The unconscious is a process...the psyche is transformed or developed by the relationship of the ego to the contents of the unconscious. In individual cases that transformation can be read from dreams and fantasies. In collective life it has

left its deposit principally in the various religious systems and their changing symbols." (p. 209, MDR)

Notice here how Jung equates religious systems with a type of *collective unconscious*, a key Jungian concept.

The "Collective Unconscious." Jung claims that it is "a fatal mistake to consider the human psyche as a merely personal affair" (p. 16, PR). (For Jung, it is an eternally "fatal mistake" to blaspheme God as he does.) Stated simply:

"Our souls as well as our bodies are composed of individual elements which were all already present in the ranks of our ancestors." (p. 235, MDR)

Jung's personal "unconscious," is admittedly speculative--how much more so is his theory of a "collective unconscious." This bizarre entity is one which results in the destruction of personal responsibility, or so Jung would like to imagine. Jung saw "fateful links" between himself and his ancestors, an "impersonal karma within a family" (p. 223, MDR). Thus he concludes that:

"A collective problem, if not recognized as such, always appears as a personal problem." (p. 233, MDR) "The cause of the disturbance is, therefore, not to be sought in the personal surroundings, but rather in the collective situation. Psychotherapy has hitherto taken this matter far too little into account." (p. 234, MDR)

It is difficult to conceive of any true *counseling* occurring in a setting where problems result from such a "collective" situation! Logically, in this system man is a mere pawn in the hands of "fate" or "karma." Yet Jung insisted (inconsistently), following his "ecstatic" death-bed experience, on the affirmation of one's own destiny:

"It was only after the illness that I understood how important it is to affirm one's own destiny. In this way we forge an ego that does not break down when incomprehensible things happen; an ego that endures, that endures the truth, and that is capable of coping with the world and with fate." (p. 297, MDR)

Jung notes here that victory is achieved only if "one does not meddle inquisitively with the workings of fate" (p. 297, MDR). Truthfully, Jung "meddles inquisitively," not with the workings of *fate*, but rather with the purposeful working of the sovereign,

personal God of Scripture. Happily, he cannot thwart the will of God, who works all things according to the counsel of His own will (Ephesians 1:11).

As usual, Jung derives his insights from his own dream material. Regarding one particular dream, he states that it:

"...pointed out that there were further reaches to the state of consciousness I have just described; the long uninhabited ground floor in medieval style, then the Roman cellar, and finally the prehistoric cave. These signified past times and passed stages of consciousness." (p. 161, MDR)

Jung affirms elsewhere that his theory is not only collective in nature, but reaches back in time through innumerable centuries:

"Although we human beings have our own personal life, we are yet in large measure the representatives, the victims and promoters of a collective spirit whose years are counted in centuries." (p. 91, MDR)

Sometimes, the "collective" soul of man represents only a particular nationality, rather than the entire human race. In his travels, Jung visited the American Pueblo Indians and stated that we need "the opportunity to regard our own nation from outside" but to do so requires "sufficient knowledge of the foreign collective psyche" (p. 246, MDR).

Leaving the "collective unconscious," we conclude by showing how this unbiblical concept is another avenue for locating God within the being of man:

"The psyche reaches so far beyond the boundary line of consciousness that the latter could be easily compared to an island in the ocean. While the island is small and narrow, the ocean is immensely wide and deep, so that if it is a question of space, it does not matter *whether the gods are inside or outside.*" (p. 102, PR, emphasis added)

Archetype. Closely related to the "collective unconscious" is the archetype. Modern psychologists often take their counselees on archaeological excursions back to early childhood, but Jung, on another of his foreign excursions, pushes us back even further:

"...there is something in us which does not merely submit passively to the influence of the unconscious, but on the

contrary rushes eagerly to meet it, identifying itself with the shadow. Just as a childhood memory can suddenly take possession of consciousness with so lively an emotion that we feel wholly transported back to the original situation, so these seemingly alien and wholly different Arab surroundings awaken an archetypal memory of an only too well known prehistoric past which apparently we have entirely forgotten." (p. 245, MDR)

Jung acknowledges openly that he has surpassed even *Freud* in this area of theory:

"Of course I had originally held to Freud's view that vestiges of old experiences exist in the unconscious. But dreams like this, and my actual experiences of the unconscious, taught me that such contents are not dead, outmoded forms, but belong to our living being. My work had confirmed this assumption, and in the course of years there developed from it the theory of archetypes." (p. 173, MDR)

Today, many *Christian* psychologists take their counseling clients on unnecessary tours back to early childhood, via the retrieval of supposedly repressed memories. A huge amount of damage has occurred in the lives of individuals and their families. Jung's theory, admittedly derived from his own "incessant stream of fantasies" (p. 176, MDR) and then subjected to nothing more profound or scientific than his own muddled interpretation...is even more dangerous. Yet Jungian psychology is being used by Christians. It is found in "inner healing" therapies, for example. In *Healing Presence*, a 1989 Crossway Book, author Leanne Payne presents an excellent *critique* of Jung's blasphemies, but proceeds to insist that there are valuable discoveries and insights in both Jung and Freud! This is preposterous in the extreme.

One of the disastrous implications of Jung's theory occurs in his explanation of wars:

"As nobody is capable of recognizing where and how much he himself is possessed and unconscious, one simply projects one's own condition upon the neighbor, and thus it becomes a sacred duty to have the biggest guns and the most poisonous gas. The worst of it is that one is quite right. All one's neighbors are ruled by an uncontrolled and uncontrollable fear just like oneself." (p. 60, PR)

Such an approach surely offers no God-honoring solutions!

The Self and the "Mandala." Jung again turns to his dreams for inspiration and wisdom:

"Some years later (in 1927) I obtained confirmation of my ideas about the center and the self by way of a dream."
(p. 197, MDR)

Self is certainly the center of Jung's attention:

"The goal of psychic development is the self. There is no linear evolution; there is only a circumambulation of the self." (p. 196, MDR)

"My life has been permeated and held together by one idea and one goal: namely, to penetrate into the secret of the personality. Everything can be explained from this central point, and all my works relate to this one theme."
(p. 206, MDR)

The "process of individuation" is what Jung considers the "central concept of my psychology" (p. 209, MDR), in contrast to the biblical union of the Christian with Christ and with the body of Christ, the church.

In yet another dream, Jung finds more bizarre insight:

"I understood that the self is the principle and archetype of orientation and meaning. Therein lies its healing function. For me, this insight signified an approach to the center and therefore to the goal. Out of it emerged a first inkling of my personal myth." (p. 199, MDR)

Clearly, *self* has, for Jung, replaced *God*!

Jung also finds knowledge of self in childhood, characterized by "naiveté and unconsciousness" so that "it sketches a more complete picture of the self, of the whole man in his pure individuality, than adulthood" (p. 244, MDR). Remember, however, that the first human being, Adam, was an *adult* male, not a child. Childhood should therefore *not* be made the standard by which to understand the nature of man.

The **mandala** is a concept employed by Jung in the understanding and development of the self. In his memoirs, he describes his daily "mandala drawings" (p. 195, MDR). He referred to these as:

"...cryptograms concerning the state of the self which were presented to me anew each day. In them I saw the self--that is, my whole being--actively at work." (p. 196, MDR)

Jung defines the "mandala" at several points:

"...a circle, more especially a magic circle.... The specifically Christian ones come from the earlier Middle Ages. Most of them show Christ in the center, with the four evangelists, or their symbols, at the cardinal points." (p. 396, MDR)

"In Lamism and Tantric Yoga the mandala is an instrument of contemplation (yantra), seat and birthplace of the gods." (p. 396, MDR)

"...the center...the exponent of all paths...the path to the center, to individuation." (p. 196, MDR)

"...its innermost meaning would simply be the union of the soul with God." (p. 88, PR)

"'Formation, Transformation, Eternal Mind's eternal recreation.' And that is the self, the wholeness of the personality, which if all goes well is harmonious, but which cannot tolerate self-deceptions." (p. 195-6, MDR)

"...an archetypal image whose occurrence is attested throughout the ages. It signifies the *wholeness of the self*. This circular image represents the wholeness of the psychic ground or, to put it in mythic terms, the divinity incarnate in man." (p. 335, MDR)

Again we encounter blasphemy in Jung's view that *man is God*. Most statements concerning the "mandala" are clearly of this nature:

"...the mandala either symbolizes the divine being, hitherto hidden and dormant in the body and now extracted and revived, or it symbolizes the vessel or the room in which the *transformation of man into a divine being* takes place." (p. 112, PR, emphasis added)

Jung compares modern mandalas to ancient versions of the same, but again, man takes the throne of God:

"Since modern mandalas have amazingly close parallels in ancient magic circles, in the center of which we usually find the deity, it is evident that in the modern mandala man--the complete man--*has replaced the deity.*" (p. 106, PR)

"A modern mandala is an involuntary confession of a peculiar mental condition. There is no deity in the mandala, and there is also no submission or reconciliation to a deity. The place of the deity seems to be taken by the wholeness of man." (p. 99, PR)

Peculiar indeed! Truly there is no deity in the "mandala," modern or ancient. Jung goes on to explain the transaction as a reconciliation with self, clearly replacing the biblical reconciliation of God and man. The mandala is conceived of as having "the dignity of a 'reconciling symbol'" like "the reconciliation of God and man is expressed in the symbol of Christ or of the cross" (p. 96, PR). Jung again demonstrates his contempt for Christian truth. Christ is not a reconciling *symbol*, but actually achieved reconciliation through His work on the cross.

Injecting a bit of psychoanalysis, Jung expresses concern over those who are unable to "project" the divine image:

"The experience formulated by the mandala is typical of people who cannot project the divine image any longer. They are in actual danger of inflation and dissociation." (p. 105, PR)

Jung's view of the self, and of the "mandala," bears no resemblance to any biblical truth, but rather are blasphemous in nature.

Secrecy. Jung counsels the maintenance of a "secret" in order to facilitate individuality. He also speaks of primitive *shared* secrets, which serve to bind together a group or tribe of people:

"Secrets on the tribal level constitute a helpful compensation for lack of cohesion in the individual personality, which is constantly relapsing into the original unconscious identity with other members of the group." (p. 342, MDR)

Jung sees the individual's need for a "secret" to be critical:

"The need for such a secret is in many cases so compelling that the individual finds himself involved in ideas and actions for which he is no longer responsible." (p. 344, MDR)

Imposing his strange ideas onto Scripture, Jung claims that Jacob's wrestling with the angel is an example! This is ridiculous, and clearly flies in the face of man's personal responsibility before God.

Responsibility and Morality. Jung's system is one in which responsibility is extremely fuzzy, if it exists at all. Jung blasts the "modern" view that real responsibility exists for one's "psychic" ills:

"If one is suffering from a real cancer, one never believes oneself to be the responsible originator of such an evil, despite the fact that the cancer is in one's own body. But when it comes to the psyche we instantly feel a kind of responsibility, as if we were the makers of our psychical conditions. This prejudice is of relatively recent date. Not very long ago even highly civilized people believed that psychic agencies could influence our mind and feeling. There were ghosts, wizards, witches, demons and angels, *and even gods*, that could produce certain psychological alternations in man." (p. 12, PR, emphasis added)

It is true that God's Holy Spirit produces radical transformation in the human heart, but Jung's view is a horrendous, incompatible distortion that merits no comparison with this biblical truth. Unlike Jung, Scripture *also* affirms man's responsibility before God for his sin.

Jung goes on to describe an imaginary cancer as "a spontaneous growth, originating in that part of the psyche which is not identical with consciousness" (p. 13, PR). Responsibility is also mutilated in Jung's view of the psychological "complex":

"It is just as if the complex were an autonomous being capable of interfering with the intentions of the ego. Complexes indeed behave like secondary or partial personalities in possession of a mental life of their own." (p. 14, PR)

The poor soul troubled by such a "complex," is, according to Jung, a "helpless victim" (p. 14, PR). This is undeniably ludicrous in view of Jung's equation of God and man!

Repression is a concept that Jung credits to Freud but distinguishes from *suppression*:

"Suppression amounts to a conscious moral choice, but repression is a rather immoral 'penchant' for getting rid of disagreeable decisions." (p. 91, PR)

"Suppression may cause worry, conflict and suffering, but never causes a neurosis of one of the usual patterns. Neurosis is a substitute for legitimate suffering."
(p. 92, PR)

But Jung gives us no clear criteria for distinguishing between the two concepts--one magically eradicates responsibility, while the other clearly implies moral responsibility. Jung's system gives no standards for making such judgments; in fact, as we have seen, Jung rejects absolute truth and thus he has *no basis* for any sort of moral evaluations!

Jung describes those who live respectably and "either commit minor sins, if they sin at all, or their sins are concealed even to their consciousness" (p. 92, PR). Note the phrase, "if they sin at all," which is in direct opposition to Scripture. *All* have sinned in the sight of God (Romans 3:23, 5:12, plus many more passages). Jung's view of the "unconscious" is an escape hatch by which the sinner may (or so he thinks) receive a lenient sentence:

"One is rather lenient with sinners unconscious of their sins. Although the law occasionally punishes unconsciousness, the practice of confession in the church is concerned only with deeds which you yourself connect with a feeling of sinfulness. But nature is not at all lenient with unconscious sinners. She punishes them just as severely as if they had committed a conscious offense." (p. 92, PR)

Note that when "nature" is the judge, there is no leniency! But otherwise, it is the *feeling* of sinfulness that Jung uses to establish a moral standard. The person with a hardened heart and/or seared conscience is off the hook (apparently!).

But Jung has his own twisted version of "sin." He declares "highly morally people" to be "unaware of their other side" such that they "develop peculiar irritability and hellish moods which make them insupportable to their relatives" (p. 92, PR). Jung proposes that morality is "a gift like intelligence" (p. 93, PR),

thus masking man's responsibility once again. His view of "sin" is one in which evil is normally buried from conscious awareness:

"...man is, as a whole, less good than he imagines himself or wants to be. Everyone carries a shadow, and the less it is embodied in the individual's conscious life, the blacker and denser it is. If an inferiority is conscious, one always has a chance to correct it.... But if it is repressed and isolated from consciousness, it never gets corrected."
(p. 93, PR)

It also *never gets judged*, or rather, it would not be subject to God's judgment if Jung were right. But he is wrong! Notice also the "no-win" situation presented here; godliness, in Jung's system, is merely a cover for the "shadow" existing inside. Furthermore, he waters down even his own twisted concept of "sin" when he says:

"If the repressed tendencies, the shadow as I call them, were decidedly evil, there would be no problem whatever. But the shadow is merely somewhat inferior, primitive, unadapted, and awkward; not wholly bad." (p. 94-5, PR)

In curing a "neurotic," Jung teaches that it "is necessary to find a way in which man's conscious personality and his shadow can live together" (p. 93, PR). "Sin" is simply tolerated here, coexisting with the "conscious personality." But Scripture instructs the believer to *put off* the "old man" and to *put on* the "new man," created to be like Jesus Christ. Despising such biblical exhortations, obeyed by the power of the indwelling Spirit, Jung places his counselee under a heavy burden:

"We carry our past with us, to wit, the primitive and inferior man with his desires and emotions, and it is only by a considerable effort that we can detach ourselves from this burden." (p. 93, PR)

What a relief it is to know how *wrong* Jung is here. The believer has the wonderful assurance of union with Christ (Romans 6:1-14), recreation in the image of Christ (2 Corinthians 5:17)--truths all too often distorted in today's psychologized church.

Jung's utter rejection of God's righteous standards is transparent when he states that an "unconscious" individual is one who "is constantly and anxiously looking around for external rules" (p. 330, MDR). Jung discourages such seeking, yet

Scripture holds up the eternal, righteous law of God as the external standard by which we are to live our lives.

It is evident that Jung's perspective on responsibility and morality is one that blatantly disregards God's Word. A deceptive neutrality permeates his thinking. So does a practical relativity when working with individuals. Describing the vision of a patient, he says that:

"...in such a case it does not matter at all what *our* impression is or what we think about it. It is *his* experience, and if it has a deeply transforming influence upon his condition there will be no use arguing against it."
(p. 80, PR)

"Every judgment made by an individual is conditioned by his personality type and...every point of view is relative.... This raised the question of the unity which must compensate this diversity, and it led me directly to the Chinese concept of Tao." (p. 207-8, MDR)

Concluding Comments. Jung's anthropology is one which must clearly be rejected as unbiblical and dangerous. To polish off this section, here is a comment Jung makes concerning his observation of baboons:

"They tell the same story: for untold ages men have worshipped the great god who redeems the world by rising out of the darkness as a radiant light in the heavens. At that time I understood that within the soul from its primordial beginnings there has been a desire for light and an irrepressible urge to rise out of the primal darkness."
(p. 269, MDR)

Man is the image of *God*, yet Jung looks to baboons for explanations of man's nature! For centuries, man has been unable to escape the true God, the Creator and Redeemer. Some, like Jung, weave together a web of complex philosophical or psychological lies in order to *suppress* the truth. Jung is an atheist who locates his "god," or rather his *idol*, within the being of man. His views of God, Christ, man, truth, and salvation are highly deceptive, dangerous, and untrustworthy. Let us return to *Scripture* in order to truly know both God and man.

A New Religion?

Throughout this paper, we have witnessed the obviously religious nature of Jung's psychoanalytic theories and methods. In *The Jung Cult*, author Richard Noll piles up evidence to demonstrate that Jung intended to *replace Christianity* with the new religion of psychoanalysis. The book concludes on this ominous note:

"Are we witnessing the birth of another religious movement that will one day develop into ritualized services and even cathedrals a la Emanuel Swedenborg? With the Jungian movement and its merger with the New Age spirituality of the late twentieth century, are we witnessing the incipient stages of a faith based on the apotheosis of Jung as a God-man? Only history will tell if Jung's Nietzschean religion will finally win its Kulturkampf and replace Christianity with its own personal religion of the future."⁴

The New York Times National (Saturday, June 3, 1995) notes that Jung's descendants are disturbed by this book, because Noll exposes Jung's falsification of the publication dates of certain books in order to "prove" his theory of the "collective unconscious." The Jung family's demand that the book be removed from bookshelves has been denied, but the second printing has been delayed. The battle rages on!

But Christians need not despair, either because of Jung's attempt to destroy the faith, or the failure to fully expose his fraudulent practices. We can anticipate such trials in this life. We know that Jung has falsified *Scripture*, whether or not he has also lied about dates. God has given us His truth, to know Him and His plan of redemption, to understand our own nature, and to be assured of eternal salvation. Let us return to that sufficient truth and renounce the "counsel of the ungodly" (Psalm 1:1) that permeates Jung's psychology at every point.

© **1995, Christian Discernment Publications Ministry, Inc.**
www.christiandiscernment.com

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Jung, Carl G. Answer to Job. New Jersey: Princeton University Press (1958).
- Jung, Carl G. Memories, Dreams, Reflections. New York: Vintage Books (1961).
- Jung, Carl G. Psychology and Religion. New Haven and London: Yale University Press (1938).
- J. N. D. Kelley. Early Christian Doctrines. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco (1960).
- Moore, Robert L. and Mechel, Daniel J., editors. Jung and Christianity in Dialogue. New York: Paulist Press (1990).
- Murray, John. Redemption Accomplished and Applied. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans (1955).
- Noll, Richard. The Jung Cult: Origins of a Charismatic Movement. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Rollins, Wayne G. Jung and the Bible. Atlanta: John Knox Press (1961).
- Van Til, Cornelius. In Defense of the Faith, Volume IV: Psychology of Religion. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co. (1971).

⁴ *The Jung Cult*, p. 297.