White Rose Research Online

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk
Universities of Leeds, Sheffield and York

Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/10790/

Article:
Ziemann, Benjamin (2006) The Gospel of Psychology: Therapeutic Concepts and the Scientification of Pastoral Care in the West German Catholic Church, 1945-1980. Central European History, 39 (1). pp. 79-106. ISSN: 0008-9389

DOI:10.1017/S0008938906000070

Reuse
Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown
If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS
University of Sheffield
UNIVERSITY of York

Central European History 39 (2006), 79–106.
Copyright © Conference Group for Central European History of the American Historical Association
DOI: 10.1017/S0008938906000070 Printed in the USA

The Gospel of Psychology: Therapeutic Concepts and the Scientification of Pastoral Care in the West German Catholic Church, 1950–1980

Benjamin Ziemann

As Friedrich Wilhelm Graf has argued, any thorough assessment of religious change in the twentieth century has to pay attention to the interplay between the established churches and social forces in fields of society as different as the media, the economy, the arts, and the sciences.[1] It is the aim of this article to stress both the emergence and the importance of hybrids between organized religion and the human sciences in the decades since the 1950s. I take the Catholic Church in the Federal Republic as a perhaps somewhat unlikely but also illuminating example, although all major Christian denominations both in Germany and in other Western European countries have made ample use of social science methods such as statistics, sociology, and opinion-polling during that period.[2] From the broad range of

Research for this article was undertaken with a fellowship from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation during an academic year at the University of York in 2003–2004. My thanks go to the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation for their generous support, to Richard Bessel and Volker Roelcke for their readiness to discuss the topic of this article with me, and to Greg Eghigian, Thomas Mergel, and Johannes Platz for their perceptive comments on an earlier version of my manuscript.

[1]Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, "Euro-Gott im starken Plural? Einige Fragestellungen für eine europäische Religionsgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts," *Journal of Modern European History* 3, no. 2 (2005): 231–56, 241–2; see also Hans Günter Hockerts, "Brennpunkte, Perspektiven, Desiderata zeitgeschichtlicher Katholizismusforschung," in *Zeitgeschichtliche Katholizismusforschung. Tatsachen—Deutungen—Fragen. Eine Zwischenbilanz*, ed. Karl-Josef Hummel (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2004), 233–245, 242. For the wider debate about the fate of organized religion in the second half of the twentieth century, see, for example, Callum G. Brown, *The Death of Christian Britain: Understanding secularization 1800–2000* (London: Routledge, 2001); Hugh McLeod, "The Religious Crisis of the 1960s," *Journal of Modern European History* 3, no. 2 (2005): 205–30; José Casanova, *Public Religions in the Modern World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, *Die Wiederkehr der Götter. Religion in der modernen Kultur* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2004); Hans-Joachim Höhn, ed., *Krise der Immanenz. Religion an den Grenzen der Moderne* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Verlag, 1996).

[2]This article is part of a larger study of the different aspects and the general context of the scientization of the Catholic Church in the Federal Republic. See my forthcoming book, *Katholische Kirche und Sozialwissenschaften 1945–1975* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007). For the use and

scientific approaches employed by the Catholic Church, the focus of this article is on the use of psychological techniques used for purposes of therapeutic intervention, or, in Anglo-Saxon parlance, counseling. The emerging psychologization of religious topics and pastoral action is seen as merely one example of the immense significance that the "psy disciplines" of psychoanalysis, psychotherapy, and psychology have attained within the forms of knowledge and practice deployed to describe the "Self."[3] This process can also be interpreted as a particularly striking example of the "scientification of the social" in the twentieth century, that is, of the process in which human science concepts have shaped new terms and categories for the description of social contexts and offered forms of practical intervention in social problems.[4]

This article aims to lay bare the historical genesis of the combination, interplay, and fusion of psychology and religion in the Catholic Church in West Germany, how these hybrids have shaped Catholic religion, and their consequences for the Church in the period between 1950 and 1980. The psychologization of Catholic pastoral care was far from a straightforward success story. It was, in fact, fraught with numerous obstacles to reception, particularly with respect to the reception and acceptance of psychoanalysis. The first section, therefore, depicts the state of the discussion of psychoanalytical concepts in the Catholic Church toward the end of the 1950s through examples.[5] The second section shows how psychological models were deeply imbued by psychoanalysis, which explains why the practical application of psychotherapeutic and group dynamic models within pastoral care, increasingly popular from the

---

effects of social sciences in the West German Protestant Churches, see, for example, Joachim Matthes, *Die Emigration der Kirche aus der Gesellschaft* (Hamburg: Furche Verlag, 1964); Pastoralsoziologisches Institut der Evangelischen Fachhochschule Hannover, ed., *"Gesellschaft in die Kirche tragen" oder 30 Jahre Pastoralsoziologie in der hannoverschen Landeskirche* (Hannover: Blumhardt, 2001). For examples in other countries, see Hanneke Westhoff and Jan Roes, "Seelische versus geistliche Fürsorge. Die Rolle der psychohygienischen Bewegung bei der Transformation des niederländischen Katholizismus im 20. Jahrhundert," *Kirchliche Zeitgeschichte* 7, no. 1 (1994): 137–60; Graham Richards, "Psychology and the Churches in England, 1919–39: Symptoms of Conversion," *History of the Human Sciences* 13, no. 2 (2000): 57–84.

[3]Nikolas Rose, *Inventing Our Selves: Psychology, Power, and Personhood* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), quote 11; Sabine Maasen, *Genealogie der Unmoral. Zur Therapeutisierung sexueller Selbste* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1998); Greg Eghigian, "The Psychologization of the Socialist Self. East German Forensic Psychology and its Deviants, 1945–1975," *German History* 22, no. 2 (2004): 181–205; Ruth Rosenberger, "Demokratisierung durch Verwissenschaftlichung? Betriebliche Humanexperten als Akteure des Wandels der betrieblichen Sozialordnung in westdeutschen Unternehmen," *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 44 (2004): 327–55.

[4]Lutz Raphael, "Die Verwissenschaftlichung des Sozialen als methodische und konzeptionelle Herausforderung für eine Sozialgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 22, no. 2 (1996): 165–93.

[5]On the United States, see Jon H. Roberts, "Psychoanalysis and American Christianity, 1900–45," in *When Science and Christianity Meet*, ed. David C. Lindberg and Ronald L. Numbers (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 225–44.

late 1960s on, primarily drew on pastoral and therapeutic concepts from the United States. Finally, in the third section, I discuss the ambivalences arising from the application of therapeutic concepts in Catholic pastoral settings in terms of the anthropological premises of pastoral care and the rationalization of religious communication.

The Reception of Psychoanalysis up to 1960

The Catholic reception of psychoanalysis began in Germany during the First World War. This reception was predominantly negative until the 1950s; attempts to give psychological knowledge practical expression within the Church were blocked because psychology as a science was largely identified with the method of analysis established by Sigmund Freud. Three factors were crucial to the rejection of psychoanalysis until after the establishment of the Federal Republic.[6] First, Catholic theologians criticized the determinism anchored in the drives-based model of the human psyche, which clashed with the axiom of individual moral freedom promulgated within Catholic doctrine. The "pan-sexualism" of which Freud was accused also raised hackles; Catholic authors assumed that for Freud, all cultural achievements, including religion, were based on the "omnipotence of a shadowy instinctual life."[7] The most serious accusation made against Freud was that he was an "atheist" and aggressively hostile to religion, particularly after he had laid bare the anti-religious core of his theory with the publication of *The Future of an Illusion* in 1927. Even a pastoral theologian such as Linus Bopp, who was quick to encourage a positive reception of psychoanalysis in numerous publications, concluded that Freud and his school had "soiled every domain of values" and "psychologized and relativized everything."[8]

The Catholic rejection of psychoanalysis persisted until well into the 1950s. It was, however, supplemented and increasingly thwarted by efforts to appropriate psychoanalytic ideas productively. The negative elements mentioned above were neutralized by a distinction between "therapy" and "worldview"; Freud's theory of culture was rejected so that elements of his thought could be adapted to the care of souls and therapeutic treatment of the mentally ill.[9]

[6]Compare the sources in Stefan Andreae, *Pastoraltheologische Aspekte der Lehre Sigmund Freuds von der Sublimierung der Sexualität* (Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1974); and Kasimir Birk, *Sigmund Freud und die Religion* (Münsterschwarzach: Vier Türme Verlag, 1970).

[7]Nikolaus Gengler, "Psychotherapie," *Klerusblatt* 13 (1932): 469–71, 488–91, quote 470. Freud's concept of sexuality was, in fact, much more complicated and nuanced. See Bernd Nitzschke, "Die Bedeutung der Sexualität im Werk Sigmund Freuds," in Bernd Nitzschke, *Sexualität und Männlichkeit. Zwischen Symbiosewunsch und Gewalt* (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1988), 282–346.

[8]Linus Bopp, "Sigmund Freuds Lebenswerk im Gericht der Zeit," *Schönere Zukunft* 7 (1931): 100–1, 132–3, 153–5, quote 154–5. Compare Peter Gay, *A Godless Jew: Freud, Atheism, and the Making of Psychoanalysis* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987).

[9]Gengler, "Psychotherapie," 470.

As early as the 1920s and 1930s, it was not only theologians such as Linus Bopp and Josef Goldbrunner who were interested in psychoanalytic ideas and deployed them within pastoral care, but also doctors such as Rhaban Liertz who worked with them on a practical level. "A fair number" of Liertz's works on using psychoanalysis to treat mental problems found themselves "in the hands of clergy," and bishops and other providers of pastoral care asked him to examine the mentally ill.[10] The Catholic clergy was particularly attracted to the work of Carl Gustav Jung, since his analytical approach stressed the psychological importance of faith and religion.[11] All attempts made to reconcile psychotherapy and pastoral care from the early 1930s until into the 1950s remained overshadowed by the discursive front against Freud's concept of the person. It was, however, no longer the dispute over concepts and their interpretation that stood center stage, but a practical interest in the new potential for leadership and the formation of the person opened up by psychoanalysis and other therapeutic methods.[12]

As a result, it was no longer Christian anthropology that provided the yardstick for the assessment of psychological concepts. In the 1950s, the key issue was in what form and in which institutional context psychoanalytic knowledge regarding the therapeutic clarification of psychological problems could be applied by Catholic doctors and pastors. It was, however, not solely the practical work and the publications of a growing number of theologians that helped to neutralize criticisms of psychoanalysis. The supreme doctrinal authority of the pope was increasingly restrained in its judgments in the 1950s and thus effectively cleared the way for discussion. In three addresses to international conferences of doctors and psychologists, in 1952, 1953, and 1958, Pope Pius XII expressed his views on psychotherapy. The first rounded unambiguously on the "pansexual method" of a "certain" psychoanalytic school and decisively opposed the view, "all too often" heard, that neglect of this method had

[10]Johannes Chrysostomus Schulte, *Zwischen zwei geistigen Welten. Erlebnisse und Bekenntnisse* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1940), quote 325–6; compare Linus Bopp, "Katholizismus und Psychoanalyse," in *Der Katholizismus als Lösung großer Menscheitsfragen* (Innsbruck, Vienna, and Munich: Verlags-Anstalt Tyrolia, 1925), 47–93; Rhaban Liertz, *Über Seelenaufschließung. Ein Weg zum Erforschen des Seelenlebens* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1926).

[11]Compare, for example, Josef Goldbrunner, *Die Tiefenpsychologie von Carl Gustav Jung und christliche Lebensgestaltung. Eine moraltheologische Untersuchung* (theol. diss., Freiburg im Breisgau, 1939); Gratian Gruber, OFMCap., "Seelsorge und Psychotherapie," *Anima* 4 (1949): 34–40.

[12]The term "Menschenführung" refers to Michel Foucault's concept of "governmentality," i.e., techniques of methodic influence on the behavior of other human beings and oneself. See Ulrich Bröckling, "Technologie der Befriedung. Über Mediation," in *Perspektiven der Historischen Friedensforschung*, ed. Benjamin Ziemann (Essen: Klartext, 2002), 229–49, quote 232; Michel Foucault, "Governmentality," in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, ed. Graham Burchell et al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 87–104.

seriously hampered the development of pastoral care.[13] In his second intervention, the Pope merely warned in a qualified manner of "limitless" sexual education that left "nothing to the imagination."[14] The third ignored the topic of sexuality entirely and focused on the concept of the "person." With a clear sideswipe against non-psychoanalysic methods of experimental psychology, such as tests and the lie detector, and the psychiatric use of mind-altering drugs, the Pope insisted that the "true center of the person" is and must remain a secret.[15]

Until the late 1950s, it was nonetheless an open question whether and how the attitude of Catholic clergy, theologians, and academics toward psychoanalysis, which fluctuated between increasing acceptance and persistent rejection, would lead to its institutional application. The disputes over the foundation of a psychotherapeutic institute for the Catholic Church cast useful light on the state of reception at the time. Prelate Wilhelm Böhler, who as leader of the *Katholisches Büro* in Bonn was the most influential advisor to the German bishops, provided the initial impetus.[16] In May 1957, he invited the theologian Johannes B. Hirschmann, SJ, and the psychoanalyst Albert Görres to discuss the possibility of educating Catholic psychotherapists. Görres (1918–1996), who taught in Mainz, became widely known in Catholic circles by 1958 at the latest, when his book on the *Method and Experiences of Psychoanalysis* appeared, the first serious and sober introduction to Freud's analytical methods designed for a Catholic audience.[17] Görres consequently developed a plan for a research and teaching center in Munich. Following Böhler's death in July 1958, the Bishop of Limburg, Wilhelm Kempf, took up the plan, discussed it with the bishops of Paderborn and Munich, who gave their consent, and finally presented it to the Fulda Bishops' Conference. As early as autumn 1958, the Bavarian bishops had passed a resolution supporting the concept.[18]

While the Fulda Bishops' Conference had initially signalled its support, the plan was not ultimately put into practice. Instead, the Conference decided at an extraordinary session in Bühl in March 1960 to establish a "working group" on issues relating to psychotherapy and to provide it with 50,000

[13]Quoted in Joachim Scharfenberg, "Die Rezeption der Psychoanalyse in der Theologie," in *Die Rezeption der Psychoanalyse in der Soziologie. Psychologie und Theologie im deutschsprachigen Raum bis 1940*, ed. Johannes Cremerius (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1981), 255–338, 296.

[14]"Über die Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Psychotherapeutik," *Herder-Korrespondenz* (hereafter HK) 7 (1952/53): 353–7, 355–6.

[15]"Über Probleme der Moral in der angewandten Psychologie," *HK* 12 (1957/58): 512–8.

[16]Compare Burckhard van Schewick, "Wilhelm Böhler (1891–1958)," in *Zeitgeschichte in Lebensbildern*, vol. 4, ed. Jürgen Aretz et al. (Mainz: Mathias Grünewald, 1980), 197–207.

[17]Albert Görres, *Methode und Erfahrungen der Psychoanalyse* (Munich: Kösel, 1958).

[18]Wilhelm Kempf, "Zum Plan eines Instituts für medizinische Psychologie und Psychotherapie," n.d.; memo Heinrich Tenhumberg, March 2, 1960; both in Bistumsarchiv Münster (hereafter BAM), GV NA, A-0-805.

marks in funding.[19] An important factor in this rejection was the opposition of the influential bishop Michael Keller from Münster. In his view, it was impossible for the bishops to publicly back one of the psychoanalytic currents, even if it was "advocated [by the] most excellent of Catholics." The spiritual director of the Central Committee of German Catholics, Bernhard Hanssler, and Professor Victor-Emil von Gebsattel, who enjoyed substantial influence within the academic circles of the Catholic Church as chairman of the section for psychology and psychotherapy of the Görres Society, also rejected the plan.[20] Gebsattel, like other medical doctors teaching psychiatry, was concerned about the disciplinary competition between medicine and psychological psychotherapy, whose efforts to gain a foothold in the universities and other institutions were being watched with irritation.[21]

The responses to Böhler's initiative lay bare the opportunities for the practical application of psychoanalysis within the Catholic Church and the limits to these at the end of the 1950s. Among the experts, only the head of the Clemens-August Clinic in Oldenburg, Dr. Franz Rudolf Faber, consulted by Bishop Michael Keller, was fundamentally opposed to psychoanalysis. He based his rejection of a psychoanalytically oriented research institute on the remarks of Pope Pius XII cited above. Faber, too, considered the insights of psychoanalysis theoretically indispensable, though he thought it "difficult" for Freudians such as Albert Görres to avoid the "danger of a naturalistic psychologism." His "doubts" chiefly revolved around viewing psychoanalytic methods as the "practically most important, most successful, or even the only" form of psychotherapeutic treatment. He thus called for the establishment of a specialist ward mainly intended to instruct Catholic doctors in the treatment of psychotic illnesses rather than to provide a full course of study in psychoanalysis, concluding with analysis of the students themselves.[22]

A commission set up by the Fulda Bishops' Conference to advise on the institutional plans nonetheless made it clear right from the start, in respect of theological evaluation, that the critique made by Pius XII of certain psychotherapeutic methods by no means applied to depth psychology and psychotherapy as a whole. Those participating in this group, which included specialist advisers and the bishops of Paderborn, Limburg, Bamberg, and Rottenburg and the

[19]Memo Heinrich Tenhumberg, March 2, 1960, BAM, GV NA, A-0–805; Wilhelm Kempf May 31, 1960, to Josef Frings, Diözesanarchiv Limburg (hereafter DAL), NL Kempf 282.

[20]Quote: Michael Keller to Cardinal Wendel, October 25, 1959, BAM, GV NA, A-0-805; compare Lorenz Jaeger, February 29, 1960, to Wilhelm Kempf and Albert Görres, February 26, 1960, to Wilhelm Kemp, DAL, NL Kempf 282.

[21]See Volker Roelcke, "Psychotherapy between Medicine, Psychoanalysis, and Politics: Concepts, Practices, and Institutions in Germany, c. 1945–1992," *Medical History* 48, no. 4 (2004): 473–92, 481, 484.

[22]Franz Rudolf Faber to Michael Keller, June 8, 1959; Franz Rudolf Faber, "Denkschrift zur Errichtung eines psychotherapeutischen Instituts," April 29, 1959, BAM, GV NA, A-0-805.

theologians Richard Egenter and Johannes B. Hirschmann, instead agreed that the new branch of "empirical psychology [must] not simply be left to the secularized religious forces." Albert Görres explained that a research institute was necessary because psychology had attained a significant place within "pastoral-like" fields such as marriage and family and child guidance, and the Catholic specialists dealing with such issues had hitherto been helpless in the face of this influence.[23]

Apart from helping Catholics come to terms with a research trend still new to them and the practical need for educated specialists, an institute was claimed to be necessary because Alexander Mitscherlich, the most influential psychoanalyst in the early Federal Republic as far as public perception was concerned, had been running his own institute and teaching center for psychoanalysis since 1960 in Frankfurt am Main. From a Catholic point of view, this appeared to entail not only the "ascendancy" of an "unambiguous 'Enlightenment-oriented' tendency," but also an orthodox Freudian species of psychoanalysis within the field of psychotherapy. This was another key reason that the plan for a Catholic research institute seemed increasingly urgent not only to Bishop Kempf of Limburg, responsible for the bishopric in which Mitscherlich's institute was resident, but was thought "very important" by other members of the commission, too.[24]

It was, however, not only academic politics that boosted the cause of those advocating a new institute. Interest in the new potential for leadership that the categories and techniques of psychological discourse appeared to open up was also significant. The Fulda moral theologian Franz Scholz lamented the lack of psychological education in priests' training as a "severe" lacuna, and not only with respect to the personal crises of clergy and candidates for the priesthood. It was, he suggested, also vital to pastoral care to supplement methods privileging objective norms with a realistic "view of people" and their often highly circumscribed room for manoeuvre.[25] Depth psychology was thus plainly ascribed the task of articulating the pastoral interest in a way out of a practice that strictly insisted upon adherence to the dogmas of moral

[23]Privatdozent Dr. Ludwig Baumer, director of the municipal mental hospital in Bamberg, worked as a professional referee alongside Faber and Görres. Minutes of the committee meeting, October 22, 1959, BAM, GV NA, A-0-805.

[24]See ibid.; quote: Kempf, "Zum Plan eines Instituts"; Albert Görres to Archbishop Lorenz Jaeger, April 18, 1959, DAL, NL Kempf 282; compare Michael Schröter, "Zurück ins Weite: Die Internationalisierung der deutschen Psychoanalyse nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg," in *Westbindungen: Amerika in der Bundesrepublik*, ed. Heinz Bude and Bernd Greiner (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 1999), 93–118, 97–9, 101; Thomas Müller and Désirée Ricken, "Alexander Mitscherlichs 'politische' Psychoanalyse, seine Beziehungen zur Humanmedizin und die Wahrnehmung der bundesdeutschen Öffentlichkeit," *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für deutsche Geschichte* 32 (2004): 219–57, 233–4, 250–1.

[25]Franz Scholz to Franz Rudolf Faber, October 30, 1959, BAM, GV NA, A-0-805.

theology and which was gripped by crisis for precisely this reason.[26] Rather than forcing people to uphold unrealisable norms, pastoral care must concern itself with enriching the conscience of the faithful and helping them develop the capacity for independent moral judgment.

The practical application of psychotherapy by Catholic doctors and pastors was still in its infancy when some began to reflect critically upon its possible consequences. The doctor and psychologist Ludwig Baumer was keen to distinguish between the neurological-therapeutic application of psychotherapy and its use as a means of coping with "personal" or, to use the jargon of the 1950s, "existential" crises. The head of the Bamberg Neurological Clinic, Baumer tended toward skepticism about the success of the first of these forms of psychotherapy. As a means of solving personal crises, it was becoming "secularized pastoral care in many places." Even if many of those undergoing therapy no longer found their way to their pastor, it was right to be skeptical about psychoanalysis as "ersatz religion."[27] Other opinions were also marked by this anticipation of the possible consequences of the psychoanalytic scientification of pastoral work. This process of scientification was based on psychoanalytic practices in the United States, where these methods had assumed the status of "ersatz religion and philosophy" that must be avoided at all costs in Germany, in the opinion of Catholic and many other observers.[28] This confirms a general feature of the reception of psychoanalysis. At the very moment when doctors and psychologists were engaging in highly specialized discussions on the appropriate way to institutionalize psychotherapeutic work, the ideas of Freud penetrated a broad public keenly interested in them.[29]

Around 1960, beyond all the differences and ambivalences regarding the psychoanalytic system of categorization, it thus became widely accepted that psychology could contribute knowledge useful to establishing the truth of the self, in a way that the traditional, morally informed pastoral discourse could not. The forms of psychological knowledge promised a truth effect that could, in the view of a number of observers, contribute to dealing with pastoral problems. When this practical application of psychological knowledge was advancing across a broad front from the late 1960s on, psychoanalysis itself was being used only at the margins. It had decisively determined the Catholic

[26]See the early data on the massive discrepancy between Catholic teaching and practices among Catholics in sexual matters in Ludwig v. Friedeburg, *Die Umfrage in der Intimsphäre* (Stuttgart: Enke, 1953), 1–8, 45–54, 76–84.

[27]Ludwig Baumer, "Stellungnahme zu dem Plan der Errichtung eines psychotherapeutischen Instituts," August 5, 1959, BAM, GV NA, A-0-805.

[28]A point made by the psychiatrist Hanns Ruffin, who taught in Freiburg: minutes of a meeting on the "Forschungsinstitut für medizinische Psychologie und Psychotherapie," February 29, 1960; ibid.

[29]This point is stressed by John C. Burnham, "The Reception of Psychoanalysis in Western Cultures: An Afterword on its Comparative History," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 24, no. 4 (1982): 603–10, 606.

discussion of the meaning and form of the adoption of psychology over several decades. Yet, only a few years after it had at last achieved broad recognition in church circles, other therapeutic methods entered the market that were much easier to learn and apply and that fit seamlessly into the pastoral practice of the late 1960s and 1970s in terms of their concept of the person.

Strategies for "Personal Growth": Group Dynamics and Pastoral Counseling in the Early 1970s

The breakthrough that saw the large-scale, concrete application of psychological concepts in the Catholic Church from the late 1960s on no longer focused primarily on individual psychological problems but instead privileged the group.[30] Psychology was now practiced above all in terms of group therapy and group dynamics; the boundaries between approaches drawn from group pedagogy and group-based social work were, however, blurred. The common objective of the approaches applied here involved the stimulation and steering of interaction among those co-present in a room and shaping the learning processes taking place within these interactions. This clear shift of focus within psychological practice away from psychoanalysis corresponded to a general trend in the Catholic Church, a consequence of the wave of politicization and attempts to reform church structures following the Essen *Katholikentag* (General Assembly of German Catholics) in the autumn of 1968.[31] This led to two linked developments, both of which dramatically increased the need for group dynamic techniques and forms of knowledge.

The first consisted in the tendency to detach the diverse formal and informal activities within parishes from the higher aims and attempts to manage events pursued by the church hierarchy. Such attempts to intensify autonomous activities and re-establish faith through the "base" of the church in family groups, third-world working groups, discussion groups, and youth groups were described through the term "community church" in contemporary theological discussions. This was fundamentally about establishing, in the interactions of small groups of Catholics, a new form of religious community, replacing the hierarchical and anonymous bureaucratic structures of the *Volkskirche* with egalitarian and emotionally intensive forms of interpersonal communication.[32] This was bound up with a second development, the rise of lay people within pastoral

[30]For a similar observation and chronology, see Klaus Volker Schütz, *Gruppenarbeit in der Kirche. Methoden angewandter Sozialpsychologie in Seelsorge, Religionspädagogik und Erwachsenenbildung* (Mainz: Matthias Grünewald, 1989), 221–3.

[31]See Ziemann, *Sozialwissenschaften,* chapter four.

[32]Norbert Greinacher, "Realutopie Gemeindekirche," *Lebendige Seelsorge* (hereafter LS) 18 (1967): 177–85; see Benjamin Ziemann, "Zwischen sozialer Bewegung und Dienstleistung am Individuum. Katholiken und katholische Kirche im therapeutischen Jahrzehnt," *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 44 (2004): 357–93, esp. 388–92.

professions, the response of the episcopal leadership to the growing lack of priests. Apart from teachers of religious education, these were mainly pastoral advisers and parish assistants, who had been educated at a technical college (*Fachhochschule*) and had already come into contact with approaches from sociology and psychology during their studies.[33] These pastoral professionals' diverse range of tasks was not limited to intensive contact with lay people. They also tended to be the most willing to assimilate and implement approaches drawn from the human sciences. For these reasons, the "project-oriented education" in pastoral care promoted in the bishopric of Münster from 1971, for example, concentrated on pastoral assistants and deacons. Some of the methods taught in the *Blockseminare* were, for example, "pastoral community work," "pastoral counseling, casework, non-directive conversation" and finally "group pedagogy." The curriculum was supplemented by supervision and "sensitivity training" to guarantee the "sensitization" vital to ensuring "optimal pastoral 'input.'"[34]

While these semantic forms themselves elucidate the shift in style toward the subject-oriented and non-hierarchical types of pastoral care, the frequent use of English terms to describe courses reveals the origins of the concepts drawn from group dynamics and group therapy used within the Catholic Church. Of the plethora of group dynamic and therapeutic options and concepts, two found particular practical application within the Catholic Church up to the mid-1960s. The first was the non-directive talking therapy based on the work of Carl Rogers (1902–1987); this captured the attention of Catholic pastors and therapists more than any other technique.[35] It could also be applied as a group therapeutic and group dynamic concept.[36] One important reason for this preference was that client-centered methods had already been deeply rooted in American pastoral counseling for decades, and thus in a church context. Since the mid-1940s in the United States, Rogers' publications had been used as a means to resolve the pastor's "role insecurity," prominent in encounters with the ill. Central to this was his method of non-directive conversation that tasked the therapist with refraining from giving the client authoritative advice, instead helping him to unfold and "actualize" his own personality. Pastoral care as "crisis support" through "loving understanding, listening,

[33]Ziemann, *Dienstleistung*, 389–90.

[34]Seelsorgeamt Münster, "Entwurf eines Ausbildungsvorschlages für eine berufsbegleitende pastoral-theologische Ausbildung, Schulung B," April 28, 1971, BAM, GV NA, A-201-357. The English terms "counseling," "casework," and "sensitivity-training" were used in the German text.

[35]See, for example, Arnold Mente to Heinrich Tenhumberg, October 3, 1975, BAM, GV NA, A-0-639; Seelsorgeamt Münster, "Entwurf eines Ausbildungsvorschlages," April 28, 1971, ibid., A-201-357.

[36]Kurt W. Back, *Beyond Words: The Story of Sensitivity Training and the Encounter Movement* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1972), 67, 101–2.

clarifying, verifying, and coping together" was the conception of pastoral counseling anchored in Rogers' model. Knowledge of Rogers's work and personal contact with him had a particular influence on the work of the evangelical pastoral theologian Seward Hiltner, who produced *Pastoral Counseling* in 1949, one of the foundational texts of the pastoral movement. Practical pastoral education in the techniques of conversation, for which Rogers had made use of tape recordings of therapeutic sessions for the first time, also drew on his working methods.[37] In the form of a subsequently compiled "verbatim" record and deployed within group supervision, this technique was accepted as part of the therapeutic education of Catholic pastors.[38]

While pastoral counseling in the United States was mainly promulgated by pastors from the various Protestant churches, it had an ecumenical character from the very beginning in Germany, which made Catholic reception easier. One indication is the founding of the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Pastoralpsychologie* (German Society for Pastoral Psychology, DGPT) in 1972, which comprised both Catholic and Protestant priests, ministers, and psychologists from a variety of different academic schools and currents. The association, which at the time had about 600 members, also provided an important context for promoting attempts to institutionalize counseling in the churches and to standardize curricula and professional education in the field.[39] A second key reason for the wide reception of non-directive counseling in Catholic pastoral care must be sought in its content. The reception of Rogers' approach was not only due to its being relatively easy to learn. Unlike the psychoanalysis of Freud, it did not, at first glance, obligate the pastor to adopt a "specific worldview and notion of the person." The therapist's basic attitude, as postulated by Rogers as a prerequisite for a successful dialogue, moreover, appeared to stand in "close proximity" to a number of "basic pastoral instructions" in the Holy Scriptures. The principle of truth as liberating and the "warmth and esteem"

[37]Seward Hiltner, *Pastoral Counseling* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949), 29–30. For a widely read German account, see Dietrich Stollberg, *Therapeutische Seelsorge. Die amerikanische Seelsorgebewegung. Darstellung und Kritik* (Munich: Kaiser, 1969), 36–59, quote 37; compare Heinrich Pompey, "Seelsorge in den Krisen des Lebens," in *Seelsorge ohne Priester? Zur Problematik von Beratung und Psychotherapie in der Pastoral*, ed. Josef Maria Reuß (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1976), 29–72, 50–2; on the techniques of client-centered therapy, see Carl R. Rogers, *Counseling and Psychotherapy* (Boston: Mifflin, 1942); Brian Thorne, *Carl Rogers* (London: Sage, 2003), 44–64.

[38]W. Berger and H. Andrissen, "Das amerikanische Phänomen 'Pastoral Counseling' und seine Bedeutung für die Pastoraltheologie," in *Handbuch der Pastoraltheologie. Praktische Theologie der Kirche in ihrer Gegenwart*, vol. III, ed. Franz-Xaver Arnold et al. (Freiburg: Herder, 1968), 570–85, 581–2.

[39]Stollberg, *Therapeutische Seelsorge*, 56; see Deutsche Gesellschaft für Pastoralpsychologie (DGPT), Nürnberg, file "Unterlagen zur Gründung." My thanks go to Elisabeth Hölscher (Bochum) for providing me access to the files of the DGPT. Compare also http://www.pastoralpsychologie.de (October 10, 2005).

with which Jesus accepted sinners and publicans were, for instance, counted among these.[40]

In view of the principles of "genuineness, esteem, and empathy" postulated by Rogers, it even appeared as if Catholic pastoral care was being "so to speak [reminded of] its own virtues from outside." They were, in any event, ascribed a "high degree of implicit Christianity," on account of which Catholic psychologists and theologians viewed client-centered therapy as particularly suitable for application within pastoral care and counseling.[41] The concept of human nature in this therapy thus even transcended the narrow framework of a psychological-scientific methodology for guiding conversation. "Genuineness and self congruency" as key features of the therapeutically engaged pastor's work were thought to lead to his "not acting as counsellor and therapist in a purely immanent sense," but to enable him to stand firm in his "identity as pastor."[42] The reception of Carl Rogers' therapeutic approach within Catholic pastoral care can thus be described through the paradigm of "*Fremdprophetie*" as one of the models for importing human science concepts into practical theology. This term seeks to capture how reception within the Church assimilates a form of knowledge that brings to light central but "forgotten components" of its own tradition and can thus be understood as a rediscovery of the Church's roots inspired from outside.[43]

The German-American psychotherapist Ruth Cohn can also be counted among these prophets, whose models were often regarded—and welcomed—within the church as a rediscovery of a buried tradition. Cohn had, since the mid-1960s, developed and practically applied the concept of topic-centered interaction (TZI), intended to help to get interactional processes up and running, and intensify and steer them, in order to ensure "living learning."[44] The topic-centered element made it possible to introduce the specific concerns of particular professional groups or learning situations into the group dynamic process. Moreover, TZI could not only be deployed in "laboratory conditions," but also in the "natural social field," that is, in the participants' normal social environment. This also made the "back home situation" easier, enabling

[40]Pompey, "Seelsorge," 66; see Peter F. Schmid, *Personale Begegnung. Der personzentrierte Ansatz in Psychotherapie, Beratung, Gruppenarbeit und Seelsorge* (Würzburg: Echter, 1989), 213.

[41]Isidor Baumgartner, *Pastoralpsychologie. Einführung in die Praxis heilender Seelsorge*, 2nd ed. (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1997), 474–78, quote 474.

[42]Alwin J. Hammers, "Die Bedeutung der Psychologie in der pastoralen Praxis," *Seminarium* 30 (1978): 460–87, quote 477–8; see Konrad Baumgartner and Wunibald Müller, eds., *Beraten und Begleiten. Handbuch für das seelsorgerliche Gespräch* (Freiburg: Herder, 1990), 74–82, 76.

[43]Norbert Mette and Hermann Steinkamp, *Sozialwissenschaften und Praktische Theologie* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1983), 166–9, quote 168–9.

[44]Matthias Kroeger, *Themenzentrierte Seelsorge. Über die Kombination klientzentrierter und themenzentrierter Arbeit nach Carl R. Rogers and Ruth C. Cohn in der Theologie* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973), 157–222, quote 158; see Ruth C. Cohn, *Von der Psychoanalyse zur themenzentrierten Interaktion. Von der Behandlung einzelner zu einer Pädagogik für alle* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1975), 110–215.

people to carry across that which had been learned into normal everyday professional or private life. Within church circles, TZI was also considered to possess another positive characteristic: It was expressly conceived as "reducing fear." It thus countered the danger, often lamented in relation to group dynamic methods, that neuroses or other psychological problems could be, as it were, artificially generated through the dynamics of the interaction.[45]

Both diocesan and religious order priests who had participated in group dynamic TZI courses, described "practice in immediacy" as one of their most important learning experiences. It was only through group therapeutic work that they rediscovered the principle that Christian witness can only occur on the basis of "that which one has experienced oneself"; only in this way can the preaching of the faith be realistic. Through work in small groups or the participation of religious superiors in courses, many religious-order priests felt that via TZI, issues of living together in a community, long "hidden" under rituals grown overly formal, took on new force "in a new guise and with new dynamism."[46] According to P. Karl Siepen, CSsR, the general secretary of the association of German religious superiors, in 1972, there were "sometimes hysterical expectations" about the possible value of group dynamic approaches to a reform of life in holy orders.[47] The concept of topic-centered interaction was, however, also deployed in many church educational institutions. Some priests adopted this "mental attitude" in their daily work in order to break away from "thinking in terms of power and calculating speech" and thus from communicative postures that they increasingly perceived as a hindrance to productive parish work. "What you are doing is truly Christian." The newspaper of the bishopric of Münster quoted the words of priest Bernhard Honsel from Ibbenbüren, who had regularly used TZI since 1974 in group work on the initiative of a woman working as a religious educator (*Religionspädagogin*) in the community, and indeed particularly in the pastoral conference of the *Pfarrverband* (a loose association of several parishes).[48] Honsel had first initiated education in the methods of group dynamics in 1970, in which, along with a few lay people, Catholic priests and a lay theologian, five Protestant priests, and deacons from the town of Ibbenbüren took part.[49]

[45]Sigrun Polzien, "TZI-Kurse mit Ordensleuten und Weltpriestern," in *Gruppendynamik in der kirchlichen Praxis. Erfahrungsberichte*, ed. Karl Wilhelm Dahm and Hermann Stenger (Munich: Matthias Grünewald, 1974), 178–190, 178–9.

[46]Ibid., 185, 187, 189.

[47]Antonia Leugers, *Interessenpolitik und Solidarität. 100 Jahre Superioren-Konferenz—Vereinigung Deutscher Ordensobern* (Frankfurt am Main: Knecht, 1999), 325–6.

[48]Quotes: "Diskutieren mit Herz und Verstand. In Ibbenbüren wird ein neues Kommunikations-Modell mit Erfolg erprobt," *Kirche und Leben. Bistumszeitung für das Bistum Münster*, May 8, 1977; Bernhard Honsel, *Der rote Punkt. Eine Gemeinde unterwegs* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1983), 94–101.

[49]Bernhard Honsel to Reinhard Lettmann, November 19, 1970, BAM, GV NA, A-101-283.

Since 1970, many pastors and lay people believed that they had found in the methods of group work and group therapy à la Rogers and Cohn a "magic formula," "capable of solving all pastoral problems with an 'open sesame.'" For them, the special advantages of group dynamics included not only its promise of both intensification and self-control of individual conscience and mental attitudes, but also the practice of social "roles and virtues" that enhanced the individual's social competence and behavior within the group process. In the group, the individual was to undergo "basic" human experiences, such as "affirmation, security, accepting oneself, handling one's own feelings, finding one's own identity" and more besides.[50] This strategy within the group dynamic model diverged from the specifically German and Catholic traditions of describing the social order, a divergence that required specific explanation in the early stages of the new approach's advance. From the modern "small group research," there was "no direct route" leading back to Tönnies' "famous" distinction between community and society.[51] Group dynamic behavior did not mean that the individual melted into the community in a *unio mystica*. It was rather a matter of thinking carefully about oneself and one's own self-perception in order to "contribute" to the group process on this basis. Only by focusing upon the ego in this way could one create the conditions for "effective methodological action" in small groups, which was then systematically taught and transmitted on the basis of "recognition of, and capacity to describe, phenomena within small social systems."[52]

These conceptual premises of group dynamic work also gave rise to its first principle. Perhaps the most sought-after effect of such work consisted of "ego-strengthening" and the "self-realization" of the individual that this involved.[53] This goal found expression in a number of ways in the models of Ruth Cohn and Carl Rogers. In TZI, one of the first rules to be remembered in interaction ran, "Do not say 'one' or 'we,' but 'I.'" In relation, for example, to a topic much discussed around 1970, this meant not to ask, "What are the limits to democratization in the church?" but rather "What do I want to do to democratize the church?"[54] It was this principle that was emphasized in the practical application of topic-centered interaction within the parishes. Those forms of speech, typical of the Catholic Church, were to be opposed that do "nothing

[50]Ulrich Krömer, "Methodische Gruppenarbeit—Chance für die Pastoral?," *LS* 23 (1972): 156–60, 159; see Karl Frielingsdorf, "Berufsbezogene Gruppendynamik in der Priesterfortbildung," *Diakonia* 2 (1971): 382–96, 390.

[51]Hermann Steinkamp, *Gruppendynamik und Demokratisierung* (Mainz, Munich: Kaiser, 1973), 24.

[52]Gerhard Leuschner, director of the "Akademie für Jugendfragen" in Münster, to Hermann Josef Spital, December 15, 1971, BAM, GV NA, A-201-357.

[53]Frielingsdorf, "Priesterfortbildung," 386; quote: Theresia Hauser, "Aspekte der Supervision für Praktiker in Gemeinde und Institution," in *Gruppendynamik*, ed. Dahm and Stenger, 213–231, 226.

[54]Kroeger, *Themenzentrierte Seelsorge*, 159–60, 194; compare Cohn, *Interaktion*, 116, 124.

but obscure the subjectivity of a statement."[55] TZI thus contributed to allowing the subject and subjectivity a legitimate place in internal church communication and disrupting the impersonal forms of church discourse that displaced the subject.

Other models of therapy and group dynamics also used an organic metaphor to convey the aim of "ego-strengthening," that of "personal growth."[56] Carl Rogers also used the metaphor of the "growth" of the personality or of the Self in this connection. The potential for the smooth realization of such growth arose from the key Hegelian notion on the basis of which Rogers assumed a "fundamental tendency toward maintenance and elevation of the organism." This tendency, postulated by Rogers as an entelechy, can achieve its pregiven aim through the phase of alienation between the person's sensory experiences and his imagined, value-laden "concept of self" that precedes the therapeutic process.[57] Only by taking into account this thoroughly somatically conceived tendency of the person toward self-actualization can one grasp why Rogers' self-restraining, almost maieutic therapeutic technique was thought to lead to a successful outcome. The "fully functioning person" that the process of therapy aimed to achieve was marked by a strengthened Self that is "self-confident" and "self-directing." After successful therapy, the client no longer has to concentrate upon being self-aware, but can simply be himself.[58] Who would have wished to refuse such an optimistic metaphor in the growth society of the 1960s and early 1970s, which promised a dynamic not only of economic growth but of self-growth?[59] The reception of this theory within the church in the sense of a "Fremdprophetie" also drew on numerous parables involving growth, particularly in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew (Mk 4: 1–9; Mt 13: 24–30). These would, together with Carl Rogers, help the pastor attain self-understanding after he helped to "remove the weeds" and reap "for his Lord."[60]

[55]"Diskutieren mit Herz und Verstand," *Kirche und Leben. Bistumszeitung für das Bistum Münster*, May 8, 1977; see Hermann Stenger, "Lebendiges Lernen in Religionslehrerkursen," in *Gruppendynamik*, ed. Dahm and Stenger, 99–112, 107.

[56]Frielingsdorf, "Priesterfortbildung," 386. "Spiritual growth" was a key metaphor of pastoral counseling in the United States. See Stollberg, *Therapeutische Seelsorge*, 136–7.

[57]Carl R. Rogers, *Client-Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implications, and Theory* (Cambridge, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), 195 (quote), 524–532.

[58]Carl R. Rogers, *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy* (Boston: Mifflin, 1961), quotes 183, 36; see Carl R. Rogers, *Client-Centered Therapy*, 129, 136–39, 488, and 523; Roy José DeCarvalho, *The Founders of Humanistic Psychology* (New York: Praeger, 1991), 97–9.

[59]On the importance of metaphors for processes of scientification, see Sabine Maasen and Peter Weingart, "'Metaphors'—Messengers of Meaning: A Contribution to an Evolutionary Sociology of Science," *Science Communication* 17, no. 1 (1995/96): 9–31.

[60]Heinrich Pompey, "Theologisch-psychologische Grundbedingungen der seelsorglichen Beratung," in *Christliches ABC heute und morgen. Handbuch für Lebensfragen und kirchliche Erwachsenenbildung*, ed. Eckard Lade (Bad Homburg: Verlag H. Schäfer, 1986), no. 6, 179–209, 188, 204–5 (quote).

A further key principle and aim of group dynamics, alongside ego-strengthening, was to generate credibility for those in service roles, such as priests, catechists, and teachers of religious education and all those who dealt with lay people in the context of pastoral care and preaching, and who thus represented the church as an organization. This first of all involved becoming aware of the "needs of the interlocutor" within the interaction. The attitude and conversational technique necessary to achieve this are illuminated in paradigmatic fashion in the possible answers discussed in a course on parish leadership in Munich in 1976. The idea was to respond appropriately to the following statement by a boy in the religious education class: "Chaplain, what you're saying sounds great, but do you believe it yourself? It's like when a shopkeeper says his sausages are really good." An example answer was provided: "There are shopkeepers with good stuff to sell; should they pretend it's bad just because of a statement like that? And I believe our stuff is good!" The course participants' suggested answers were then discussed. "Do you think I would stand here in front of you for hours and talk if I didn't?" was "authoritarian" and "foreclosed" further discussion and was thus out of the question. "That is my conviction, otherwise I could just take up another more rewarding profession" was believable, but also "unrealistic," because a priest would hardly take up another profession. "I wouldn't have sat down to study at a school desk at the age of twenty-two as someone who found his calling late in life" also sounded believable, but perhaps placed too much emphasis on one's own "life decision." "You ask me whether I believe it myself? I'm happy to talk to you about that if you're really interested."[61] This answer included, above all, an invitation to further dialogue and was the personal approach that was supposed to be encouraged in such courses.

The key concept molded by Carl Rogers and informing the attitude of the therapist and other professional service providers at a personal level was being "genuine." This maxim echoed widely in the corresponding behavioral maxims underlying group dynamic practices within the church:

> 1. The pastor must be in tune with himself; he must be genuine. Be present, show others your feelings, don't just be an official or play a role. Treat others as individuals. Use first names. . . 2. Unconditional acceptance: positive regard, affirmation of interlocutor as person (more important than all techniques!).[62]

The maxim of "unconditional positive regard" was also taken from Rogers.[63] Another basic attitude of vital significance to the group dynamic and therapeutic

[61]"Programm des Kurses für Gemeindeleitung vom 25.-30.7.1976"; handwritten notes, n.a., n.d.: Erzbischöfliches Ordinariat München (EOM), Pastorale Planungsstelle, file P. Wesel, "Gemeindeleitung"; see Kroeger, *Themenzentrierte Seelsorge*, 43–5.

[62]"Arbeitseinheit Gesprächsanalyse," n.d.: EOM, Pastorale Planungsstelle, file P. Wesel, "Gemeindeleitung"; see Gity and Cornelius Wieringa, "Gruppenarbeit und Seelsorge—Der Seelsorger in der Gruppe," *LS* 23 (1972): 146–49, 148.

[63]Rogers, *Person*, 62.

setting was empathy. This concept, particularly decisive for Rogers, but which also informed the literature on counseling as a whole, was preferred to the alternative terms of sympathy or rapport, which were perceived as overly emotional or too vague.[64] Its underpinnings within the Christian tradition were rather obscure. Only one section of the Holy Scriptures was regularly referred to in order to justify interaction based on empathy programmatically:

> Be empathetic because, after all, I myself am thoroughly weak. Imagine myself as the other, put myself in his place, the precondition for empathy in others is the capacity for empathy within myself: so observe my feelings, assumptions and experience of my own "baggage," my own Shadow (Jung). If I identify totally with someone else, then I can't help him (Metriopathy, Hebr 5: 2). I must combine tact, contact, distance at the same time.[65]

This formulation shows a certain relativization and alteration of the emphasis on the therapist's empathetic attitude in comparison with Carl Rogers' formulation. For Rogers, the therapist tried, to some extent, "to get inside the skin of his client." An "empathic understanding" meant an "immediate sensitivity" to the other's inner world, "as if it were the therapist's own." In the adaptation of this agenda quoted above, in contrast, it is not only the therapist's capacity for self-reflection, but also the distance necessary for understanding that takes center stage. For Rogers, though, understanding was conceived as a further extension of the outstanding achievements of classical hermeneutics. This attempted to infer, on the basis of verbal and written expression, the meaningful content and traces of awareness behind the "slag of the letter." The therapist had to master the art not only of grasping those aspects of the client's statements of which he himself was "fully aware," but also "the hazy areas at the edge of awareness."[66] The therapist was to enable the client to understand himself better by helping him verbalize his own unconscious stock of experience and emotions, even, indeed, when confronted with a "confused, inarticulate, or bizarre individual."[67] Within pastoral work, the basic attitude bound up with the concept of empathy led to the conclusion that the crucial thing was no longer the "what," but the "how" of religious and pastoral dialogue. This shift away

[64]Felix P. Biestek, S.J., *The Casework Relationship* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1961), 7–11; Maurice North, *The Secular Priests* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1972), 66.

[65]The Greek verb *metriopathein*, which appears only in the Letter to the Hebrews, means "to deal with patiently." "Programm des Kurses für Gemeindeleitung vom 25.–30.7.1976; see Baumgartner, *Pastoralpsychologie*, 538–40.

[66]Rogers, *Client-Centered Psychotherapy*, 1832–3.

[67]Carl R. Rogers, "The Interpersonal Relationship: The Core of Guidance," *Harvard Educational Review* 32, no. 4 (1962), 416–29, 420.

from a model of preaching conceived as informing people is summed up in the catchphrase "relationship is preaching."[68]

Apart from these basic attitudes, group dynamic work had three other far from insignificant effects for pastoral practice. The first involved the expectation that group dynamic experiences could help one deal with conflicts in interactive contexts, an everyday occurrence in parishes. The typical way of putting this into practice was role-play in its diverse forms, through which one was to learn to adopt the other's perspective mentally and anticipate his views and interests. The ultimate aim of such exercises emerged as the ideal of the "team player," well-practiced in cooperative behavior. This figure of the team player was the underlying premise of the concepts drawn from organizational sociology that aimed to reform church structures at the end of the 1960s, but these concepts had been unable to create such individuals, considered vital to reform.[69] This very conflict-solving function of group dynamics, however, provoked criticism of the plan among young chaplains and theology students in the early 1960s, who attacked this technique for "stabilizing the system" and "tolerating repression."[70]

Two further intended effects of group dynamics consisted of overcoming motivational crises and awakening creativity. If conflicts and "ambiguities" could not, for the moment, be sufficiently dealt with even by application of group dynamics, this technique helped one attain "distance from one's own role" and thus from one's own "wishes and expectations." This helped in situations that one was "unable to solve for the time being," that one "must put up with, without being defeated by them." One could thus protect the Self from becoming "rigid" or "languishing."[71] Technically speaking, this was a matter of "expanding one's capacity to tolerate frustration."[72] This quality was especially crucial when church attendance fell further while "resignation" and "apathy" continued to grow; it was vital to make up for the "loss of strength" that this caused.[73]

[68]Hermann Stenger, "Beziehung als Verkündigung," in *Seelsorge ohne Priester?*, ed. Reuß, 73–90, 73 (quote), 80–1.

[69]Frielingsdorf, "Priesterfortbildung," 391–2; as "Hot-Chair-Spiel" in "Programm des Kurses für Gemeindeleitung vom 25.–30.7.1976"; compare Ziemann, *Sozialwissenschaften*, chapter four.

[70]Karl-Wilhelm Dahm, "Gruppendynamik und kirchliche Praxis. Versuch einer Beziehungsklärung," in *Gruppendynamik*, ed. Dahm and Stenger, 11–47, 18–20, quotes 20.

[71]Quotes: "Programm des Kurses für Gemeindeleitung vom 25.–30.7.1976"; see Mette and Steinkamp, *Sozialwissenschaften*, 114–16.

[72]Hubert Recktenwald, "Gruppendynamische Erkenntnisse und ihre pädagogische und politische Relevanz," *LS* 23 (1972), 150–53, 151.

[73]This was the aim of the "Projektgruppe Teamarbeit" of the Freckenhorster Kreis, a Münster-based group of progressive priests. See *fk-Information* no. 1 (1974): 7. On the "Freckenhorster Kreis," see Thomas Großbölting, *"Wie ist Christsein heute möglich?" Suchbewegungen des nachkonziliaren Katholizismus im Spiegel des Freckenhorster Kreises* (Altenberge: Oros, 1997).

Group dynamics, however, not only helped to maintain the most important resource available within the context of everyday pastoral work in the parishes since the crisis of the church in the late 1960s, namely the motivation of full-time and voluntary workers. It also promised to add much value to this resource, on the premise that one could enhance the potential of the individuals within the group. In particular, topic-centered interaction conceived "living learning" in the group as "creative behavior" that brought out to optimal effect the talent and strengths of the individual by binding him into the group in a "creative and cooperative" fashion.[74] The "metaphysical concept" of creativity thus made its arrival within church group work, promising to enable "*creatio ex nihilo*" as a "divine act."[75] The understanding of the term within the Church was open to connotations of play and artistic talent. Ultimately, however, this involved the introduction into the Catholic Church of a semantics whose home since the 1970s has generally been the world of management courses and economic innovation. This compels individuals to act creatively, implying a logic of permanent increase and attempts to outdo oneself. Once again, group dynamics showed itself to be a methodologically modified continuation of the organizational reform agenda, which had made but little headway within the Catholic Church through the application of organizational sociology.

The introduction of group dynamics into pastoral work owed much to the "primary humanization" agenda.[76] This notion can be understood in two ways. First, as an attempt to end the supremacy of the hierarchical-bureaucratic structures within the Catholic Church and replace them with more realistic, lively models of socialization capable of meeting the need for a rationally and emotionally attractive and up-to-date and cooperative form of interaction. If we turn the spotlight on the humanization of the person taking part in such interaction, however, a variant of the agenda of modern leadership emerges that assimilated and deployed group dynamics, turning it into a new form of managing human behavior. It is doubtful that this finally resulted in the individual "becoming a subject," because the language employed to describe the effects of therapy was rather mechanistic.[77] The goal with which this notion was bound up is, in fact, visible in the vision of a "good life," as Carl Rogers outlined it for the "fully functioning person," a person he claimed therapy could produce. The key traits of such a person are increasing "openness to experience," "trust in his organism," "creativity," reduction of fear, and an increased capacity to use and

[74]Marta Fehlker, "AG Projektorientierte Bildung, Ausschreibung Sozialwissenschaftlich-pastoralpsychologischer Grundkurs," March 11, 1976 (quotes), BAM, GV NA, A-201-357; Stenger, "Lebendiges Lernen," 109.

[75]Ulrich Bröckling, "Kreativität. Ein Brainstorming," in *Vernunft—Entwicklung—Leben. Schlüsselbegriffe der Moderne*, ed. Ulrich Bröckling et al. (Munich: Fink, 2004), 235–44, 235.

[76]Frielingsdorf, "Priesterfortbildung," 395–6.

[77]Quote: Mette and Steinkamp, *Sozialwissenschaften*, 112.

process the mass of information bombarding him in appropriate fashion. Aware of the dangers of this analogy, Rogers compared this fully functioning person with a huge electronic calculator, capable of calculating the action necessary to achieve "need satisfaction" as economically as possible in a matter of moments from an enormous quantity of data.[78] The ambivalence of the drive for "humanization" through group dynamics can scarcely be brought more clearly into relief than through this metaphor from the world of machines. The consensus has long held that the true effects of group dynamic work are more or less impossible to gauge.[79] We are dealing here not with an objective method, but ultimately with a form of autosuggestion.

Rationalization and Verbalization: Ambivalences of Therapeutic Pastoral Care

Every process of scientification proceeds under the banner of modernization and rationalization. Experts from the human sciences promise to help solve social problems, sweep away outdated models of societalization and organization, and thus make social communication more rational. The historical analysis of the psychologization of Catholic pastoral care must, however, scrutinize not only the goals of therapeutic concepts but also their ambivalences and unintended side effects. This section is devoted to this end. The first consequence of the spread of therapeutic concepts within the Catholic Church was the tension they generated between greater individual self-realization and that of the group, as well as greater self-control within the new room for manoeuvre that therapy opened up and expanded. Here, therapy proved to be a leadership technique bound up with the modern process of individualization, capable of cushioning the impact of this very process yet also of building upon it. Compared with the traditional liturgical techniques that worked with set patterns of ritualization and symbolically loaded communication, therapy appeared superior precisely because it offered a far more differentiated set of tools, capable of flexible deployment, with which one could respond to and ultimately satisfy the personal need to discuss oneself and create meaning.[80] It is a hallmark of the "age of therapy" that concern for oneself was no longer seen, even in the Catholic Church, as "improper" but as a "top priority."[81]

[78]Rogers, *Person*, 183–96, quotes 183, 187, 189, 193.

[79]Back, *Beyond Words*, 189–97.

[80]See Alois Hahn and Herbert Willems, "Schuld und Bekenntnis in Beichte und Therapie," in *Religion und Kultur*, ed. Jörg Bergmann et al. (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1993), 309–30, 321, 324; on the goal of self-actualization in pastoral psychology, see, for example, Baumgartner and Müller, *Beraten und Begleiten*, 53.

[81]Jürgen Blattner et al., eds., *Handbuch der Psychologie für die Seelsorge*, vol. 2, (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1992), 480.

A number of skeptical or critical observers, however, were suspicious of the centrifugal tendencies that this effect might entail for the Catholic Church. At a conference of deans in 1975 where the methodological issues involved in dialogue were discussed, the Bishop of Münster, Heinrich Tenhumberg, for example, minced no words, stating that the "great gathering of the Church" was no "democratic self-help organization." The Church must not become so "plural" that it no longer knew what it was, and the "ideology of self-realization" must be "unmasked." Particularly in connection with group dynamics, some feared that the groups involved would be seen merely as a means of "finding oneself" and would no longer be amenable to integration into the "Church as a whole."[82]

Discussing church counseling services, the psychoanalyst Albert Görres addressed another aspect of this problem. He expressed reservations about a psychological practice that might be misused as a "school of ruthless self-realization." He contrasted this with the ascetic ideals of the Christian tradition, according to which every form of self-realization must always be fused with "self-denial." In this sense, psychotherapy could be best compared with the human self-development long practiced in spiritual exercises. Neither technique, Görres suggested, opened up "fundamentally new" insights into the human being, but both could assist him, as Ignatius von Loyola had put it, "to rid himself of disorderly tendencies."[83]

Second, the application of therapeutic techniques in church contexts was linked to the creeping displacement of the anthropological premises of church action. This phenomena was first noted in the early 1970s in the context of the reform of the Sacrament of Penance, as people tried to identify the causes of the rapid decline of the code of guilt/merciful forgiveness used in the oral confession. Human science discourses, particularly psychoanalysis, immediately came under suspicion. They were accused of obscuring people's sense of the meaning of guilt and of the vertical nature of the relationship with God through their categorizing systems. Had not the notion of "sin" itself, however, laid bare the "divine influence" upon the human being? Must this not lead to "thankfulness for God's forgiveness" rather than a search for social causes? Such considerations suggested that "the word 'forgiveness'" must again be clearly heard, to counter the "psychoanalytic 'diagnosis'" of the sense of guilt.[84] At the same time, other Catholic observers also noted an ever "more clearly expressed tendency," also found in church circles, to "assess and

[82]"Bericht über die Dechantenkonferenz vom 16.9.1975," BAM, GV NA, A-101-383.

[83]Albert Görres, "Kirchliche Beratung—eine dringende Antwort auf Symptome und Ursachen seelischer Krisen?," in *Kirchliche Beratungsdienste*, ed. Sekretariat der DBK (Bonn: Deutsche Bischofskonferenz, 1987), 5–31, 14, 29; see Hahn and Willems, "Schuld," 324.

[84]Hans Gödan, "Vertreibt die Psychoanalyse die Sünde? Die Behandlung auf der Couch löst nicht alle Probleme," *Christ und Welt*, January 15, 1971.

thus relativize" human guilt as a "socially embedded complex." Through application of the categories of psychological discourse, the "responsibility of the guilty human being" was "dissolved" into an "illness." This obscuring of human sinfulness through the human sciences appeared to be just one of many attempts "to replace faith in God by worldliness, transcendence by materialism, and redemption by solidarity."[85]

In these formulations, the relativization of the anthropological premises of Christianity, with its psychological forms of expression, still figured as an intervention from outside working against the teachings of the Church and the conscience of the faithful. This changed dramatically as soon as certain psychological assumptions about the nature of the human being had become firm components of the Church program for pastoral care, and of therapy and counseling in Catholic institutions. This situation came about, above all, because the client-centered talking therapy of Carl Rogers had become a more or less standard tool in church contexts and was deployed, for example, in almost all centers for pastoral care by telephone to train those manning the phones.[86] The optimistic assertion made by this therapeutic school, that personal problems and crises could be resolved through strengthening the client's ego within a reasonable period of time, cannot, however, be detached from Rogers' optimistic anthropology, which he explicitly formulated against the Christian assumption of the human "burden of original sin."[87]

Rogers thus turned away both from the religious view of the human being's sinful nature and Freud's skeptical premises of the genuinely aggressive and destructive tendencies of the human libido. The co-founder of humanistic psychology countered this with his conviction that the human being, in the depths of his personality, is "positive in nature," and thus "forward-moving, rational, and realistic."[88] Not all Catholic theologians and pastoral psychologists agreed that "Christian pastoral care" must consent to this "positive and optimistic view of the human being" without further ado because otherwise there would be no "hope" of contributing to the "healing" of the human being and all religious education would be a "hopeless endeavor."[89] The reception of client-centered therapy within pastoral psychology was, in fact, marked early on by concern about its "individualistic doctrine of redemption." All such criticisms, however, faced a dilemma: They risked making "outdated,

[85]"Trendanalyse zur Verwaltung des Bußsakramentes," Katholische Arbeitsstelle Rhein-Ruhr to Reinhard Lettmann, April 2, 1971, BAM, GV NA, A-201-290; see Georg Kamphausen, *Hüter des Gewissens? Zum Einfluß sozialwissenschaftlichen Denkens in Theologie und Kirche* (Berlin: Reimer, 1986), 208–18.

[86]Mette and Steinkamp, *Sozialwissenschaften*, 151.

[87]Quote from the Catholic theologian Arthur-Fridolin Utz, in Steinkamp, *Gruppendynamik*, 181.

[88]Rogers, *Person*, 91; see DeCarvalho, *Founders*, 88–9.

[89]Heinrich Pompey, "Das seelsorgliche Gespräch und die Methode des Pastoral Counseling," *Diakonia* 5 (1974): 5–16, 10.

sweeping generalizations" about psychology newly presentable, which would have undermined the key aim of adapting practicable therapeutic techniques to serve the aims of the Church.[90]

If the relevant handbooks of pastoral psychology can be interpreted as indicative of how these problems were dealt with, the problem of "anthropological optimism" was either no longer seen as such in the recent past,[91] or attempts have been made to place more emphasis on Christian "optimism of salvation" in order to play down the undeniable differences in the concept of the person.[92] It is, in any event, questionable whether such theological reflections can function as an effective corrective to the agenda expressed daily within the processes of therapy and counseling. Non-directive counseling replaced the traditional Catholic duality of sin/forgiveness, which made individual redemption dependent on the sacramental blessing of the established church, by focusing on the lack of fit between self-image and the individual's subjective experiences and making this the starting point for talking therapy.[93] The code underpinning this therapy can therefore be described as the application of the distinction self-alienation/congruence, in which the therapist's task is to liberate and fortify the client's innate strengths, so that he can reach the pregiven goal: achieving, through his own efforts, the greatest possible degree of coherence in both his personal self-image and his own experiences. The routine deployment of this communicative code in church bodies has made it de facto impossible to bring to bear the Christian view of the sinful nature of the human being in anything other than a highly circumscribed fashion.

A third characteristic consequence of the presence of psychological discourses in the Catholic Church was an increasing rationalization of pastoral communication. This effect was closely bound up with the march of therapeutic methods, which increasingly involved linking the constitution of the self with the completion of therapeutic phases. In this regard, psychoanalysis had already introduced a "hermeneutic imperative" in the shape of dream interpretation, according to which nothing can be seen as meaningless and even the smallest detail of the manifest content of the dream requires interpretation and is accessible.[94] As Albert Görres declared in his assessment of psychoanalysis published in 1958, this basic attitude leads to an exceedingly sensitive "attention to the details of everyday life" and the client's spontaneous thoughts and associations.

[90]Hildegard Maier-Kuhn, *Utopischer Individualismus als personales und säkulares Heilsangebot. Eine ideologiekritische und sozialethische Untersuchung der Gesprächspsychotherapie von Carl R. Rogers unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihrer Adaption durch die Pastoralpsychologie* (Theol. diss., Würzburg, 1979), quote 260; see Mette and Steinkamp, *Sozialwissenschaften*, 151; Thorne, *Carl Rogers*, 67–70.

[91]Blattner et. al., *Handbuch*, vol. 2, 485.

[92]Baumgartner, *Pastoralpsychologie*, 478–82, 479.

[93]See Carl R. Rogers, *Die klientenzentrierte Gesprächspsychotherapie* (Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, 1983), 418–57; on "congruence," see Rogers, *Person*, 339–42.

[94]Maasen, *Genealogie*, 451–53, quote 453.

This ultimately implied a universalization of suspicion regarding motives, which could be applied to all human expression and which could be evaluated as an indication of an individual's need for therapy. Yet this possibility was primarily bound up with the client's capacity to verbalize his state of consciousness, emotions, and affects—all vital underpinnings of successful therapy. Only the "mirror of one's own words," the "verbal commitment" provides the communicative medium to which the psychoanalytic approach can link the symbolic interpretation of dreams and associations.[95]

Much the same can be said of group dynamic approaches. Non-verbal exercises such as games involving movement, dance, music, and deliberate, quiet pauses were indeed regularly used to get the group process up and running and "unfreeze" the behavioral disposition of those taking part. A glance at the working schedule of group dynamic courses, however, reveals that all these techniques ultimately served systematically to raise the potential for verbal expression and underpin efforts to comprehend spoken utterances within group interaction. An important maxim as well as criterion for the success of such courses held that the participants should be able to say at the end, "everything was discussed."[96] It was nothing less than central to the therapeutic agenda to view the willingness and capacity to talk about everything, through which even the most hidden aspects of the human personality were to be made accessible, as synonymous with the "dismantling of taboos" governing personal problems and "sensitization" to the problems of interpersonal interaction.[97]

That the spread of therapeutic methods within pastoral care can almost be understood as a synonym for its verbalization becomes particularly clear in the context of client-centered talking therapy. For the therapist trained on the basis of Carl Rogers' work, it was a key task to enable the patient to verbalize his emotions and experiences and then to make further verbal observations on the basis of the client's statements. The therapeutic process consisted largely of the search for words to convey feelings. When the final stage of empathetic understanding of the client had been attained, the therapist should be able to express the client's experience "more deeply" than he could himself, through spoken "utterances."[98] One of the metaphors used within the Catholic Church described this moment, in which a rush of seemingly autonomous, unexpected insights into the client's problems was supposed to enter the counsellor's mind, as a kind of inner enlightenment through a "light that glides into [one's mind]."[99]

[95]Görres, *Methode*, 269.

[96]Stenger, "Lebendiges Lernen," 100–10, quote 103; Karl Frielingsdorf, "Gruppendynamische Arbeit mit Theologiestudenten," in *Gruppendynamik in der Kirche. Erfahrungsberichte*, ed. Karl W. Dahm, (Munich: Kaiser, 1974), 51–67, here 54–9; Back, *Beyond Words*, 79–80.

[97]See the annual report for 1979 of the "Psychologische Ausbildungsstelle Freiburg," quoted in Kamphausen, *Hüter*, 299; Schmid, *Personale Begegnung*, 249–50.

[98]Rogers, *Person*, 78–80; Hammers, "Bedeutung," 480–1; DeCarvalho, *Founders*, 120–1; Baumgartner, *Pastoralpsychologie*, quote 459.

In terms of attitude, this entailed the capacity to practice the paradoxical "active listening," to establish the inner foundations of this process of verbalization. Within Catholic counseling, this methodological proposal on how the therapist should proceed was expanded upon, the idea being that he embodied a general model for accessing the world in which we live. The premise that "the full reality of human life is gradually revealed only through dialogue" caused verbalization to be extolled as a strategy for increasing openness and realism. This had corresponding consequences for the understanding of pastoral care, which was conceived in this light as a "communicative service" contributing to "the human being finding his humanity within a context of faith."[100]

The consequences of this imperative to verbalize inner experience are best understood, first and above all, in respect to the exclusionary effects it entailed. Pastoral-therapeutic counseling and group dynamic practices, primarily aimed at providing a foundation upon which spoken utterances could resonate and which focused on discussing these utterances, advantaged those social groups who enjoyed a similarly developed capacity—and who felt the need—for a sophisticated form of verbal communication. The entire apparatus of psychotherapeutic pastoral care was thus of little use to "work with the lower classes," among whom such an elaborated code could not always be assumed.[101] The method of non-directive counseling was knowingly limited to a "specific group of intelligent clients with a relatively highly developed capacity to respond."[102]

The consequences of this project privileging the verbalization of pastoral communication went beyond the tendency to favor the middle and upper classes. The increasing proportion of verbal elements within pastoral care sped up the purging of the materiality and ritual expression in spiritual communication within the Catholic Church.[103] The prodigious extent of nonverbal communication through rituals, not only in the diverse liturgical forms of Mass, but also within the context of penance and other sacraments, was characteristic of the preconciliar Catholic Church. The psychoanalyst Alfred Lorenzer has analysed in a forceful polemic the "destruction of sensualism" achieved with the spread of didacticism and the primacy of "verbalism" in the Holy Mass as part and parcel of the liturgical reform implemented by the Second Vatican Council. The numinous, sensory, and mystical elements of the traditional

[99]Görres, "Beratung," 23.

[100]Baumgartner and Müller, *Beraten und Begleiten*, 53–7, quote 53; see Thomas Henke, *Seelsorge und Lebenswelt. Auf dem Weg zu einer Seelsorgetheorie in Auseinandersetzung mit soziologischen und sozialphilosophischen Lebensweltkonzeptionen* (Würzburg: Echter, 1994), 63–5.

[101]Steinkamp, *Gruppendynamik*, 187–8.

[102]Stollberg, *Therapeutische Seelsorge*, 137.

[103]Hiltner argued that even Communion might profit from verbal "interpretation and consideration." Hiltner, *Pastoral Counseling*, 225.

mass ritual were severely repressed following the reform.[104] This process reflected the notion, widespread in the wake of the Council, that only ridding the Catholic Church of "liturgical forms" perceived as "boring, incomprehensible, and strange" by "modern people" would make it possible to win back those "alienated" from the Church.[105] As early as 1969, the writer Ida-Friederike Görres described these tendencies as an attempt to de-feminize the church. These trends were said to be marked by "rationalization" and "objectification," a "reduction in silence, keeping quiet, and prayer in favor of speech and immediate effect," the "cleansing" of the operations of the Church "of all 'dark' areas." For Görres, this very "tradition" embodied the "feminine" side of the Church, the "bosom" of the Church as "place" and "element" of the much-ridiculed "introspection" and "mysticism," now to be repressed or purged by "abstractions, verbal edifices, and agendas."[106]

It would be misleading to conceptualize the psychologization of pastoral care in the Catholic Church primarily in terms of the strategies of the parish clergy or of those priests working in the higher echelons of the diocesan bureaucracy. Both early proponents of the pastoral use of psychology like Albert Görres or Wilhelm Kempf and later key figures for the implementation of humanistic psychology like Heinrich Pompey and Isidor Baumgartner were quite aware that the Catholic Church could look back on a long and established tradition of taking care of the "souls" of their flock.[107] But whatever the individual preferences for a particular psychological approach and the hopes accompanying its use might have been, the context for this process should not be described in terms of "push" factors, but rather as a "pull" toward therapeutic pastoral care. This pull came from the effects of the ongoing process of functional differentiation on religion. In contrast to erstwhile patterns of hierarchical differentiation in the early modern period, which had placed either religion or politics at the top of society, this implied the preponderance of a variety of disparate but coequal societal subsystems following their own basic codes (for example true/false in science, just/unjust in the legal system) and programs. For the churches, this implied a relative weakening of the genuine function of religion, which is to make the undeterminable—as one aspect of every meaningful communication—determinable.[108]

[104]Alfred Lorenzer, *Das Konzil der Buchhalter. Die Zerstörung der Sinnlichkeit. Eine Religionskritik* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1984), 179–212, quote 235.

[105]"Die Sorge um die der Kirche Entfremdeten. Stellungnahme des Seelsorgerates im Bistum Münster," n.d. [November 1968], BAM, GV NA, A-101-376.

[106]Ida-Friederike Görres, "Flucht vor der 'Mutter' Kirche," *Rheinischer Merkur*, July 11, 1969.

[107]A common way to invoke this old tradition of a "healing pastoral care" was a reference to the story of the two disciples on their way to Emmaus (Luke 24: 13–35). See, for example, Baumgartner, *Pastoralpsychologie*, 92–142.

[108]For the theory of functional differentiation, see Niklas Luhmann, *The Differentiation of Society* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982); with particular reference to religion, see Niklas Luhmann, *Funktion der Religion* (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 1977).

Hence the "problem of conveying" religion was posed in a different way from the way it was in the traditional "hierarchically ordered societies," since all religious and theological problems were now "connected with the social position of the client," but no longer "pre- or superordinate" to that position.[109] One of the reactions of the Catholic Church vis-à-vis this development was a significant shift away from the orientation as the primary function of religion toward a secondary field of services for individuals. This is reflected not only in the growing readiness to practice elaborate techniques of pastoral counseling, but also in the parallel growth of the *Caritas*-organization, which became the single largest private provider for social services in Western Europe during the 1970s.[110]

The historical evaluation of the psychologization of Catholic pastoral care, which took place from 1950 until the 1970s through the reception of first psychoanalytic and later, above all, group dynamic-therapeutic concepts, thus remains ambivalent. On the one hand, these approaches have made it possible to respond more flexibly and more precisely to the demands and problems involved in the investigation of the individual Self and the uncertainty that marks individuals' conception of the meaning of their lives. It has thus made the communicative potential of the Catholic faith newly plausible and facilitated its dissemination. On the other hand, the anthropological premises of these psychological concepts have made it difficult to communicate the distinction between sin and forgiveness within pastoral care. One of the most important forms in which the religious code immanent/transcendent had found expression in the modern world was thus swept from the table, even within the context of pastoral activities.[111] The application of therapeutic concepts thus proved less a necessary step in the modernization of Catholic pastoral care than a step into a "dangerous modernity," in which all pastoral decisions inevitably involved ambivalence and unintended side-effects.[112]

Seen from this perspective, it is a striking fact that in many recent narratives of the history of the Federal Republic, not only the Catholic Church, but also faith and religion in general are almost absent. Many textbooks and general interpretations seem to be satisfied with the statement that at least since the late 1950s, the "salience of religion in everyday life declined for many people." Recent

[109]Key formulation in one of the aide memoirs for the foundation of the DGPT. Liesel-Lotte Herkenrath, "Überlegungen zum Thema Kirche und Tiefenpsychologie," n.d. [1971]: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Pastoralpsychologie, Nürnberg, file "Unterlagen zur Gründung."

[110]See Ziemann, *Dienstleistung*, 379–82. One of the side-effects of this shift was, however, a growing "wall of silence" between the proponents of counseling and other services for individuals and those priests sticking to a more traditional agenda of pastoral care. See ibid., quote 381.

[111]See Benjamin Ziemann, "Codierung von Transzendenz im Zeitalter der Privatisierung. Die Suche nach Vergemeinschaftung in der katholischen Kirche, 1945–1980," in *Die Gegenwart Gottes in der modernen Gesellschaft. Religiöse Vergemeinschaftung und Transzendenz in Deutschland*, ed. Michael Geyer and Lucian Hölscher (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2006), 374–397.

[112]Peter Fuchs, "Gefährliche Modernität. Das zweite vatikanische Konzil und die Veränderung des Messeritus," *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 44, no. 1 (1992), 1–11.

interpretations of "liberalization" as a general trend in the political culture of the Federal Republic first tend to exaggerate the extent of a religious revival in the early 1950s, but then lose religion and also the possibility of liberalization within the churches from sight.[113] Remarkable is also the fact that organized religion is not incorporated into the growing number of recent studies about the late 1960s and the events of 1968 in particular as a caesura both in terms of popular contention and a culture favoring the claims of participatory democracy.[114] This omission is even more puzzling since at least some of these accounts highlight the general importance of interaction in small groups and its "therapeutic" qualities for the protesters of 1968. And as we have seen, 1968 was indeed also a caesura for the breakthrough of psychological concepts in the Catholic Church.[115] Hence the impact of counseling on the Catholic Church since the 1950s can serve to highlight the persistent relevance of new, hybrid forms of religion for the history of the Federal Republic. But to come to this conclusion, we have to replace straightforward notions of modernization and liberalization with the more ambivalent concept of "dangerous modernity" and its focus on the effects of functional differentiation.

UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD

[113]See, for example, Mary Fulbrook, *Interpretations of the Two Germanies, 1945–1990* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000), 70 (quote); Mary Fulbrook, *The Divided Nation: A History of Germany 1918–1990*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwells, 2002), 253; Ulrich Herbert, "Liberalisierung als Lernprozeß. Die Bundesrepublik in der deutschen Geschichte—eine Skizze," in *Wandlungsprozesse in Westdeutschland. Belastung, Integration, Liberalisierung 1945–1980*, ed. Ulrich Herbert (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2002), 7–49, 21.

[114]Matthias Frese and Julia Paulus, "Geschwindigkeiten und Faktoren des Wandels—die 1960er Jahre in der Bundesrepublik," in *Demokratisierung und gesellschaftlicher Aufbruch. Die sechziger Jahre als Wendezeit der Bundesrepublik*, ed. Matthias Frese, Julia Paulus, and Karl Teppe (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2003), 1–23; Thomas Etzemüller, *1968—Ein Riss in der Geschichte? Gesellschaftlicher Umbruch und 68er-Bewegungen in Westdeutschland und Schweden* (Konstanz: UVK, 2005); for an alternative view, see Benjamin Ziemann, "Opinion Polls and the Dynamics of the Public Sphere: The Catholic Church in the Federal Republic after 1968," *German History* 24, no. 1 (2006).

[115]Kristina Schulz, *Der lange Atem der Provokation. Die Frauenbewegung in der Bundesrepublik und in Frankreich 1968–1976* (Frankfurt and New York: Campus, 2002), 117, 160–1; Wilfried Mausbach, "The Present's Past: Recent Perspectives on Peace and Protest in Germany, 1945–1973," in *Peace Movements in Western Europe, Japan, and USA since 1945: Historiographical Reviews and Theoretical Perspectives*, ed. Benjamin Ziemann (Essen: Klartext, 2004), 67–98, 88.