

NEEDED—A SUBSTITUTE FOR SALVATION.

BY T. V. SMITH.

CHRISTIANITY, like other great religions, arose as a doctrine of salvation, as a method of escape. The early church was, accordingly, solicitous not so much about the quantity of its membership as about its quality. Jesus himself laid the basis for the view that salvation is a prerequisite for membership in the divine community in calling upon men to make ready for the approaching kingdom. "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." "Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted. . . ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Proceeding upon this basis, the first organized Christian community admitted to its membership only "those who were being saved". Once within the fold, God and the church would provide for man's future; but let him who would flee the wrath to come see to it that he is purified upon entrance into the fold. It is useless for man to start unless he can really start new: only out of a purged past can grow a purified future. And so "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God". It is this insistence upon attending to the past, upon a genuinely new beginning, that has helped traditionally to set off the Christian church from other institutions devoted to human welfare.

Since, however, man himself has no available means of radically rectifying his past, of squaring his dead deeds with his living hopes, he must let God help him. Conversion becomes the mystic point of contact between God and man, the process through which man's extremity is made God's opportunity. The precise method by which this meeting of the human and the divine comes about has been ever obscure. Mystic experiences of similar great and unexpected perturbations of human nature have been the forms that have attracted most attention as avenues of grace. The church has never, it is true, been at one in the belief that such are the only

modes through which genuine conversion takes place; but because of the intrinsic mystery of such phenomena and the compelling conviction which they have left both upon those who witness and upon those who experience them, it is from these that conversion has derived its more or less standard form. John Wesley was truly representative in his conviction, arrived at through a rather careful survey of what he regarded as genuine cases of salvation, that "Sanctification is commonly, if not always, an instantaneous work". Even if such forms of religious experience had not from their mystery fixed themselves as norms, they would have done so from their priority. The founders of religions are usually either genuine mystics or persons of such temperament as makes them the subjects of experiences out of the ordinary. As Horace M. Kallen has observed: "Much of the authority of religion depends on the testimony of persons who have seen God *in propria persona*, in a direct intuition or perception, just as we ordinarily see chairs and the rest of the environment. Medicine-men, priests, prophets, saints, and mystics are the support. . . of human faith in the religious object, and the mystical experience is the *fons et origo* of the life of religious faith." Christianity, of course, is quite true to type in this regard, both as to the character of its founder and of its chief propagandist.

Adding, then, to its innate mystery its priority, one easily sees how the mystic or instantaneous type of religious experience comes to be regarded as the norm of conversion. The actual procedure through which this occurs has been so well described by Jonathan Edwards that I may quote his own words.

"A rule received and established by common consent has a very great, though to many persons an insensible influence in forming their notions of the process of their own experience. I know very well how they proceed as to this matter, for I have had frequent opportunities of observing their conduct. Very often their experience at first appears like a confused chaos, but then those parts are selected which bear the nearest resemblance to such particular steps as are insisted on; and these are dwelt upon in their thoughts, and spoken of from time to time, till they grow more and more conspicuous in their view, and other parts which are neglected grow more and more obscure. Thus what they have experienced is insensibly strained, so as to bring it to an exact conformity to the scheme already established in their minds. And it becomes natural also for ministers, who have to deal with those who insist

upon distinctness and clearness of method, to do so too." In this thoroughly intelligible way a very genuine, but very rare kind of experience early became the pattern of Christian salvation. The fixing of this pattern as to the *modus operandi* of God's initial and supreme grace has had three outstanding effects upon the nature and the growth of the Christian community.

First, it has lessened the membership of the church by putting as an indispensable test an experience that many have not had and that many apparently cannot have. That there are very few genuine mystics the novelty of them, when they do appear, fully attests. Psychologists are at one in believing, with James, that,—

"Some persons, for instance never are, and possibly never under any circumstances could be, converted. Religious ideas cannot become the centre of their spiritual energy. They may be excellent persons, servants of God in practical ways, but they are not children of his kingdom." Not only is it true that such a test of entrance excludes many individuals scattered here and there in every group, but it sometimes works to exclude certain entire groups. Consider, for instance, the mutual antipathy between St. Paul and the Greeks whom he met at Athens. St. Paul's own biographer indicates that the Greeks did not form any noticeable attachment either for St. Paul or for his doctrine. On the other hand, St. Paul shows unmistakably throughout his epistles by allusions to the Greeks as a class and to their philosophy that, while they had made an indelible impression upon him, it was not a cordial impression. Paul was proclaiming to the Greeks a way of life based upon and conditioned by a type of moral experience—initiated on the road to Damascus—that the wise disputative Athenians of St. Paul's day were not capable of having. The Greeks as a class were neither neurotic nor mystic by temperament. But one does not have to seek classes nor go as far as Athens to see the truthfulness of the contention that, if salvation must come through some sort of cataclysmic perturbation, there are men on every hand who will never become actual Christians, for the simple reason that nature has not made them potential Christians. Such men are found in every community, known and marked by all observers. Thomas Hardy, in his poem "The Impercipient", has eloquently voiced the protest that must rise up in the heart of this man, who has ever been noted only to be misjudged,—the man who is temperamentally unfitted for salvation.

“Yet I would bear my shortcomings
with meet tranquility,
But for the charge that blessed things
I’d liefer have unbe.”

Remembering then how but yesterday in our own religious history many a man has suffered by having his utter incapacity so to be saved counted as downright unwillingness to be saved, well does Hardy at the close of the stanza, inquire:

“O, doth a bird deprived of wings,
go earth-bound wilfully?”

Secondly, the standardizing of conversion upon such a pattern has not only excluded many, but has tended to make of one kind those who have found membership in the church. On the whole, those who have found Christianity most congenial have been those who, like Jesus, tend to look away from earth and time for the values that invest life with meaning; not so much that the church has uniformly demanded other worldliness as that this standardized form of conversion itself has guaranteed easiest access to those who never feel fully at home in the world. The membership has tended rather strongly to be homogeneous. A selective conversion has worked to make this inevitable. Not only has the fact been true and been granted, but it is a fact in which the church has, in less commercial and intellectual times, found cause for genuine rejoicing: Jesus, that the religious treasures have been “hid from the wise and prudent, and . . . revealed. . . unto babes”; and St. Paul, that “not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called”.

Thirdly, the peculiar restriction that the form of conversion put upon membership has at times tended to make ambitious seekers belie their own experience. I do not for a moment mean to insinuate that hypocrisy has been often practiced as a means of admission to the church. But it is an undeniable fact (the technique of which is explained in the foregoing quotation from Jonathan Edwards) that if one wishes membership, he tends to force his experience to fit the standard of admission. If one be urged either by strong enough love of the holiness within the church or by fearful enough terror at the wrath without, to seek shelter within the sheepfold, he will, if the front door be too straight for him, climb up some other way; and yet he might conceivably be neither a thief nor a robber. There have been times in the history of the Chris-

tian church when men believed so vividly in the horrors of eternal retribution, for instance, that, since the church was held up to them as being the only available insurance, they would have taken the kingdom by force rather than be perpetually damned. Under such compulsion men have not infrequently *forced* their experience to fit that prescribed for admission. This prudent stretching of one's own experience to fit the model is not dishonesty; but it is perhaps not just the sort of honesty from which the church would most profit. The consequence of such indirection in admission has been that at any time in the church's history there have been a surprising number in the fold who did not feel entirely at home. The scriptures read to them talked in terms of a rapturous experience or a mystic appreciation of persons and processes that either dulled their ears through unfamiliarity or, what is more likely, let them see that they were not at heart nor had they ever been at heart what the apostles and prophets and saints before them had been. Moreover the equally highflown mystic color of the hymns and ritual so obviously connoted a disparity between their hearts and the heart of Christianity that a sort of divided spiritual self ensued. Such members sought admission to get the heavenly loaves and fishes or, what is perhaps more usual, to escape the horrors of the sulphurous flames of the fiery deep. They are afraid to get out; but they are not at ease within. And so, while this unhappy state may not lead to a real separation of the incompatibles, yet an invisible divorce is consummated in their hearts to render permanently impossible a wholehearted devotion to the Christian community. This load, like so much dead luggage, has also hindered the church itself; indeed it has at times rendered practically impotent what otherwise might have been a conquering church. But the situation has grown up from the fact that what the church has declared to be objectively true has been accepted as true by those who were temperamentally, if not congenitally, excluded from wholehearted membership by the standardized form of salvation on which the church unwittingly insisted.

The situation reflecting this threefold effect upon the church of its standardized form of salvation has perhaps become more acute in recent times than ever before. The prevailing symptoms may be summarized as (1) a static, if not actually declining, membership, (2) composed of a disproportion of women and a much smaller number of relatively otherworldly men, and (3) an unknown pro-

portion of both of whom have growing a feeling that they do not belong where they are.

How far the last symptom prevails, it is difficult to say; but it certainly is true that the interrogative form of the title "Shall we stay with the church", of a recent article in the *Hibbert Journal* by Professor Durant Drake, is indicative of the way the problem is being put by many men within the church. The problem suggested by the second symptom is widespread and everywhere noticeable. It is now admitted to be far easier to get money with which to do church work than it is to get men who will and can do the work for the church. Undeniably too a growing class of intelligent women, largely of the forward-looking type, are joining the men in their dereliction. Furthermore, the situation covered by the first symptom is truly alarming. Even in the most Christian countries a challenging majority of the adults are outside the church, and the majority is generally increasing.

Instead of facing this critical threefold problem rationally and making clearly thought out adjustments, the church has unwittingly floundered a long way from her ancient course in a blind effort to meet the unanalyzed demand made upon her. It is not always clearly recognized how far she has gone in this instinctive effort to adapt herself. Briefly, she has radically modified, if not tacitly renounced, both the content and the form of her fundamental doctrine of salvation. As to content, she has ceased unequivocally to declare that salvation is from a future fiery hell and its earthly counterpart, sin. That this is so, is clearly stated by the Reverend Henry Preserved Smith, an eminent Christian scholar and teacher, in a recent article in the *Hibbert Journal*, entitled "Religion and the Churches." He declares that though "the solemnly and officially declared end for which churches exist is the salvation of men from eternal damnation", nevertheless, under the pressure of such un-toward times as this, "by its own profession the church invites men to accept salvation, yet all the while declines to point out the fate from which they need to be saved". And as to the form of salvation, the church strongly tends to leave the method elective by which men shall now enter her.

This is to say that the church, finding itself in the business of wholesaling a commodity for which there is a declining retail demand, began to do as other wholesale dealers and say to men everywhere: Since you will not buy upon our terms, we will sell upon yours. But what capitulation could the church make, even though

she were in the price-cutting mood? She had always repeated openly (and perhaps somewhat blankly) that salvation is free. Nothing can be reduced that is already free unless the conditions of getting to the free article be made easier. And this is what the church in recent years has proceeded to do, both as to the content and the form of salvation. Once even those who were eager enough to buy her wares to come to Jesus by night, were sternly rebuffed with the demand that they be born again. But now the church is frankly at sea as to a sincere answer to the question, What does your salvation save me from? and her answer to the question, How may I know my salvation (from whatever it may be) to be genuine? is too discursive to be intelligible. Social purposes for the future have usurped the early emphasis upon a rectified background, a new and holy foundation from which to proceed. In her dire need for children, the church has tended avidly to take all who would come, just as they are without one plea. She has gone out into the highways and byways of this rushing life to stop the financially prosperous and the intellectually aspiring in order to assure them that the purpose whereby they prosper and the spirit which they aspire are genuinely Christian save only in name. The Reverend Henry Preserved Smith has articulated this attitude of the modern church in accurate fashion. Says he: "Although some men decline to use the name of Jesus, they are in fact working out the grace and truth which has its fullest expression in him". Surprising as this announcement sometimes is to men outside the church, they nevertheless are assured that since they are already Christians at heart, only one thing they lack; i.e., come and ally themselves in form with the church to which they already at heart belong.

In dealing, then, with adults, the church has sought to recoup her increasing losses through making her salvation more attractive by dissociating it from the fiery fumes of an earlier period and by making access to it thoroughly easy. While doing this, however, she has, as a surer means of recruiting her ranks, turned increasingly to the education of children before they reach the apathetic years. The beauty of a quiet gradual growth into the kingdom rather than entrance through a catastrophic convulsion called conversion is emphasized. Children are from an early age subjected (in actual practice usually once a week or less) to rigorous training. If they ever become Christians, they do not know how or when. And many of them, like some of the adults, never come to feel at home even if they find themselves in the church; for those who wrote

the scriptures and the ritual and the hymns do not talk in terms that only once-born men fully understand. No system of pedagogy yet tried by the church can substitute for conversion. Indeed every method so far tried, instead of supplanting conversion, tends to make it imperative, if membership is to be conditioned by a genuinely changed heart.

The upshot of the matter is that at last the line drawn so deep by the early Christian apostles between the church and the world is almost entirely obliterated. Most of those outside the church are, according to those in authority inside the church, Christians, but do not know it; whereas most of those inside the church are, according to those outside the church, just like the latter but do not know it. And so it threatens to turn out according to the words of him to whom the church is pledged to pay heed that "whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it". Through seeking to save itself in the modern world, the church has become indistinguishable except in name from the world itself. The church seems face to face with a problem that may be put in this dilemma: If it insists that salvation means a wonderful and arduous release from devouring Sin and fiery Hell, it loses the world; for to the world, Sin is obsolescent and Hell is obsolete. If it does not so insist, it loses itself in the world. And whether the church lose itself by losing the world or lose the world by losing itself, does not materially differ; the loss is loss either way.

Needed, then, a substitute for salvation. It hardly seems likely that for so many centuries the church has wholly misread human nature and has completely misinterpreted human need. If it can be granted that there is a genuinely human need at which the church, however poorly, has aimed, then both for those who confess no need for such salvation as the church has to offer and for those who confess a need but cannot seem to lay hold upon the salvation, there is desperately needed an available equivalent or, if possible, a scientific substitute for salvation. But where shall we seek it, and what shall this equivalent be?

Let us first seek to understand the nature of the human need that conversion has served. So far as the actual human data are concerned, there is general agreement here among both theologians and psychologists: the need of conversion has arisen from a divided condition of the self. One set of impulses—variously designated in the aggregate as the lower nature, the carnal man, the flesh—

is so fundamentally contradictory to another set of impulses—variously called the better self, the spiritual nature, the inner man—as to make the soul a battleground of incessant internecine strife. Anything that either set of impulses points, the other forbids. Each wastes its energy pricking against the goads of the other. The unfortunate soul thus suffers division of its sovereignty among two mutually incompatible rulers, each bent upon thwarting the other to the unutterable woe of the soul. The greater the effort of one to act, the greater the effort of the other to obstruct action. The soul, becoming paralyzed by this unbroken impasse, calls out by day and by night: "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death"?

Pitiable as is this state of the soul divided against itself, it is a condition that is completely authenticated and one that is widely prevalent. The inner division may only breed inefficiency and unhappiness, or it may become so pathological as to objectify itself into the world, incapacitating the person and leaving him either a neurotic or a lunatic. But whether it displays the more serious or the less serious form, here is an all too general human situation that cries to heaven for relief; for whether or no the dualism resulting from the hiatus of the self be but a microcosmic representation of the great cosmic gulf bordered by heaven on the one side and by hell on the other, there exists here and now a state well worthy of these words from one who has been initiated into the tragic meaning of such a condition.

"When I tried to be a god, Earth struck me down,
And now that I try to be Earth, it is a god that betrays me."

"The real sin is in being divided against yourself:
In wanting one thing and doing another."

Upon the reality of such a tragic human condition and upon its crying need for amelioration, the most conservative churchman and the most radical psychologist can agree. There seem to be so far but two general methods of attempting a cure for the divided soul.

The first is the traditional method of the church. We can well afford to steer clear of the cosmic significance that the church has historically affixed to the process. We can the better afford it since the church itself, being no longer certain of the verity of its ancient cosmic dualism, shows a growing desire to regard both heaven and hell as indigenous to earth and time. Caught in this

mood the church can the more readily agree with the psychologist that, be the future as it may, any relief here and now from the divided self would be a great salvation with most gracious immediate fruits of joy and peace and efficiency. Whatever more ulterior the church has actually saved men from heretofore it has sometimes saved them from this precarious condition of their own inner lives. In countless cases, when the soul had reached the end of its rope, in a moment of unreserved despair it has thrown itself back upon itself and in a mysterious manner more appreciated than understood, has come forth a united whole, a saved soul. The mystery of precisely what happens in this sudden relief of a divided self, traditional religion has not sought diligently to understand. It has found it more satisfactory to adore than to comprehend the process; and so it has covered a multitude of questions by simply saying that the process is the beneficent work of the Holy Ghost, directed by God, who moves in mysterious ways His wonders to perform.

That this method of treating a sick soul is often of therapeutic value no one will deny. Conversion has enabled more than one Jerry McAuley to leap in a single night from the gutter of habitual drunkenness to the highway of holiness. Beneficent though the method be, there is good reason for thinking that it works by repression and so does not achieve real unity of the divided self. Repression is the process through which an emotional idea is forced out of consciousness and pushed beyond the pale of memory because it does not harmonize with the dictates of the better self. Nietzsche, that keen student of humanity, was thinking of the fact when he said: "‘That have I done’, says my memory. ‘That have I not done’, says my pride and remains inexorable. Finally memory yields." The reason for suspecting that conversion operates by means of repression will appear as we proceed. Let us think of conversions as being either temporary or permanent. The frequency of back-sliding following revivalism attests what a large proportion of conversions are of the temporary kind. Why do so many saved people backslide? It is because the salvation was a supplanting of oneself by another rather a welding of the two. The conversion method but supplants the lower self by a higher. Now psychologists well know that the dethroned self is not destroyed, but that, retiring to where the good self has been kept in subjection, it merely awaits the time when it may sally forth with its progeny bred in the darkness of outlawry, to reclaim its dom-

inance. In the bold imagery of Jesus, the evil self brings back with it seven spirits more desperate than itself to occupy the swept and garnished house. No wonder that the last state of such a man is worse than the first. As soon as the moral fervor by whose reinforcement the good self gained conquering strength somewhat wears itself out against the hardships of the world and the tiresome attempt to form new habits, the old self returns in a moment of temptation, and the saved man has backslidden. Jesus himself has beautifully referred to such a phenomenon in another figure: "And some (seed) fell among thorns; and the thorns sprang up, and choked them." The old impulses, though hidden, are still there and are veritable thorns ready to spring up and choke the plant of goodness. As long as both sets of impulses are carried in stock, it is not any tremendous gain to exchange, even though it be the better for the worse, for as soon as the stimulus is gone, the trade may be reversed. Conversion works both ways.

But not all those who find salvation through conversion thus fall away; for verily some seed fall into better ground and bring forth fruit, "some an hundredfold, some sixtyfold, and some thirtyfold." Even upon the insecure foundation of repression one may, by constant repair, maintain a permanent habitation. But the process is costly and precarious, and the habitation, even if it remain, is not what one would desire. Even of those manifold cases of conversion that are permanent and continually bring forth good fruit to the end of life, there is pitiable proof that it is not usually the fruit of a self so united that it can throw itself with unreserved unity of front against the outer obstacles. Sad to say, there is both the outer obstacle to conquer and a hostile outpost within the very soul itself, of which enemies the latter is the worse. The self of repressed impulses may be but the "thorn in the flesh" of a St. Paul or it may be the demons that continually tempted the souls of the medieval saints or it may be something even worse than either of these. But such a prominent part does this struggle play in the autobiography of most of those who have not only been saved but who stay saved till the end of life, that the biography of saints, unless it be carefully expurgated, does not make the most wholesome reading available. It was from a man permanently saved that there issued first that memorable cry: "For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do." And while all the Christian saints have been able to join this original one in thanking "God through Jesus Christ our Lord" that

“with the mind” they could “serve the law of God”, they have also been at one in bemoaning the fact that at the same time “with the flesh” they have either continually served or have continually been beset with the wish to serve “the law of sin.”

As tragic as is this truth, it certainly is not strange when one once understands the data involved. A typical conversion is a sudden supplanting of one set of impulses by another. As James says, “You must be nailed on the cross of natural despair and agony, and then in the twinkling of an eye be miraculously released.” Whether this release prove temporary or permanent, it is actually attained by a process too easy to be sound. The impulses that form the bad self are no less genuine and no less elemental than those that form the good self. Instincts, crushed down, will rise again. The racial past has been too long and too important to be slapped out of existence in the twinkling of an eye. The race has worked too long and slaved too hard for its salvation to permit the individual to attain his unification by any royal road. It is easy to love and easy to hate, but not so easy to understand. But why trifle with understanding anyway, says religion, impatient at the slow way: simply identify yourself with what you love and as simply destroy what you hate. But hold! to murder is not always to obliterate. A set of impulses cast out of human nature by violence will, like the shade of Banquo, come back to plague the king. If the king rule ever with an iron hand, the ghosts of murdered selves may be able to work their plague only in troublous dreams which the pious usurper misunderstands; but let the tiresome watch be discontinued but for a moment,—few saints can be eternally vigilant,—and in will troop the murdered but living ghosts to expel and repossess. Even in salvation, nature sees to it that might does not make right. If love and hate were the only means, then must the bad impulses be taken by force. But between even love and hate there is mediation, the mediation of cool understanding. If, however, we ignore the long tedious way of intelligent unification and choose the shorter way of repression, we may produce a good man; but if so, he will be good through a constant ordeal so terrible as to be universally described in religious literature as a daily crucifixion.

Praise as much as we will the heroism of one who struggles against his besetting infirmity—and it has always been counted worthy of praise—we must admit that it is not ideal. The soul divided against itself cannot stand against its foes; it cannot even

successfully stand alone. Moreover, there is something both morbid and morally ugly in the picture of sainthood perpetually struggling against satanhood in the person of a single man. A constant terrible struggle between the flesh and the spirit seems to indicate that some one has bungled in dealing either with the flesh or with the spirit.

"Let us not always say
 'Spite of this flesh today
 I strove, made head, gained ground upon the whole!
 As the bird wings and sings,
 Let us cry 'All good things
 Are ours, nor soul helps flesh more now, than flesh helps soul.'"

The second method, then, of dealing with the divided self is, as Browning suggests, the method of unifying through a just organization one's total asset of impulses. It must proceed upon the ground that no human impulse is evil in itself; and it must see to it that the total organization called the self is of such a nature as to give healthful expression to all impulses. This is, of course, a difficult task; but it is precisely the task that analytic psychologists have not only undertaken but have been performing in recent years with marvelous results. The technical process is called Psychoanalysis. I cannot seek clearly to explain nor at all to justify psychoanalysis in this brief study. If there be among my readers those who still confuse psychoanalysis with hypnotism or any other form of suggestion, I can only beg them to inform themselves better before passing final judgment upon this paper. The increasing stream of scholarly books issuing from the press each year put explanation of psychoanalysis within reach of all. My purpose here is merely to indicate that insofar as salvation is from anything that the modern man understands or appreciates, it is conversion from the unhappiness and social inefficiency that grows out of a divided condition of the inner life. This condition psychology is coming to understand, and psychoanalysis is the method through which psychology is bringing all the technical information it possesses to bear upon the amelioration of such tragic conditions. The work so far done has put analytic psychology to its severest test, because in the main it has dealt with cases in which the divided self had become pathological. And yet in Morton Prince's classic of the inner life, *Miss Beauchamp*, who is possessed of more than five personalities, distinct and separate, is by his careful and patient art

made whole again. There seems no room for reasonable doubt that religion may learn something of vital importance from this new psychology.

At any rate while the church is not thoroughly certain which way to turn, it could hardly be amiss to investigate the claims that are being put forward by the analytic psychologist. "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." In this spirit let the church choose its strongest men and send them to scientific schools to master the principles of psychology and the technique of psychotherapy. Let these men give to this healing art all the sympathy for which the church has become honorably noted. Let them bring to the technical perfection of science the completing counterpart of a universal benevolence, and with this equipment harmonized and completely unified by several years' study and internship let these men go out to become co-pastors with those who already minister in the churches. Let them minister to the youth in the name of religion such timely salvation as Walter Healy has given in the name of law to the youth of Chicago; let them give to young and old alike such attention as Pastor Oskar Pfister (through combining with his technically religious ministry his scientific therapy) has for years been giving his German parishioners. Let them furnish the best advice and treatment that the modern science of psychology can provide those whose mental conflicts are constantly leading to misconduct, to inefficiency, and to poignant unhappiness.

The church can ill-afford to neglect a thoroughgoing examination of any endeavor that claims such an intimate connection with suffering men. If the claims of psychoanalysis prove well-founded, it would be lamentable for the church later to have to recognize them after having withstood them as long as possible. Even if they prove futile, the church will in the meantime need a thorough knowledge of their ground for defensive and apologetic reasons, if for no other. This need is all the more pressing if the prediction made by Cyril E. Hudson in the July (1921) issue of *The Pilgrim* be true. Says he: "I do not think it possible to doubt that a great attack on the specifically Christian view of life is coming—and coming soon—from psychoanalysis (in the philosophic, not the therapeutic sense) and herd psychology. Out of an interest in apologetics, then, at any rate the church can well afford to pay heed to the perturbed words of the Anglican dignity (cited by Mr. Hudson in the same article), who, after a discussion of psychoanalysis

at Oxford, exclaimed, 'We shall all have to set up confessionals, else every one will be going to these doctors!'

There are two current tendencies in American Protestantism that prevent this proposal from being a radical one in any sense. The first is a tendency to revive the healing ministry of the church, and the second is the apparently growing friendly envy that Protestants hold for the Catholic confessional.

At different stages the Christian church has made pretensions to a healing ministry. Why this interest in the healing art has been intermittent is a question too intricate and complex to tackle in this paper; but it is enough here to note that now the interest is returning. No more concrete proof of this assertion is needed than the fact that a church that traditionally has tended to hold aloof from such matters has recently held under its auspices throughout America healing missions by a noted English churchman. The response to these missions has been so great and the results so satisfactory that the missions have been continued by local forces under church auspices after the original healer has gone on. Be the results of such efforts what they may, there is in the healing ministry a religious interest so large at the present time that organized attention is being paid to it. There have, on the other hand, always been Protestants who felt that the Catholic church has much beneficent influence through the confessional; and the Roman church by holding on to such a means of grace at considerable inconvenience to its priesthood shows its abiding faith in the service that is rendered through it. Every form of religion makes provision for the purging effects of confession in one way or another. And Protestant ministers (some of them openly) have now and again in modern times expressed a need for the formal confessional in their work.

Psychoanalysis is but the scientific method of putting into one the means for satisfying both of those felt needs in Protestant churches; for it has duly demonstrated its ability to produce rationally the same healing results that the church has at different times produced mysteriously; and it has equally demonstrated its ability to bring under technical and scientific guidance the balm to minds distressed that for so many centuries the Catholic confessional and Protestant imitations of it, have brought. Psychoanalysis offers, therefore, to the church a peculiarly attractive opportunity, through the time-honored custom of confession, to bring genuinely 'lost' men to spiritual health.

The church should certainly not be deterred from appropriating to itself this new technique by any fear of having thrust upon it gratuitously an alien metaphysics. It is true that some have from the beginning looked critically askance at psychoanalysis because of their aversion to Freudian theories; but only those have continued to do so that have shut their eyes to the merit of the new technique as a means of beneficent social and moral control. Many who have come to scoff at the Freudian metaphysics have remained to apply to human need the art, supplying whatever theories they themselves desired. According to the church, a tree is to be known by its fruits, not by its roots. Finding the fruits of psychoanalysis good, the church can supply whatever hypothetical roots satisfy it. There is no apparent reason why even the traditional terminology of the church cannot be used, if the church feels the necessity of thus assuring historical continuity. Surely the Holy Ghost who has often deigned to use the humble mourners' bench as a means of grace will not hesitate to make use of the wondrous mind of man. But no further suggestion is needed. For a church that has shown facile ingenuity in adapting itself to a round world after having been made for a flat one, or to a dynamic world after having been made for a static one, or to the service of man-the-product-of-evolution after having been made to serve man the center of the universe and the excuse for its existence,—such a dynamic institution as the Christian church has proved itself to be has, fear not, ample grace remaining for all future adaptation.