

PSYCHOLOGISTS ARE GETTING RELIGION

By WILLIAM H. ROBERTS

AN astronomer may be a deacon in a church. His fellow astronomers will not hold that against him. A physicist may serve as superintendent of a Sunday School. That will not diminish his standing as a scientist. A chemist may teach a Bible class or even preach an occasional sermon without endangering his reputation. A psychologist who is suspected of being religious is at once under suspicion of scientific incompetence.

Yet as psychologists undertake to deal with men, women and children as creatures who *want*, and who experience happiness or misery, they find themselves driven to take over some of the functions of the priest or the minister. As they endeavor to carry out their duties, they find themselves confronting the same problems that priests and ministers have been confronting ever since there were priests or ministers. Somewhat to their surprise, perhaps even a little to their dismay, psychologists are becoming aware that some of the solutions they have been offering as the latest discoveries of science are strangely like those for which preachers and theologians have been contending for nearly twenty centuries. The resemblance grows as insight into human needs and possibilities deepens. A logic immanent in the facts of human suffering and joy, more powerful than the logic of theories which for a time drove psychologists away from religion, is now driving them back to it.

A particularly striking example of the translation of ancient doctrine into the language of contemporary science is the re-discovery of *original sin*. SIN, whether "original" or incurred had all but disappeared from the preaching of liberal Protestant ministers when Freud horrified the western world with his account of the *unconscious* and the sexuality of little children. No grim Puritan divine, no militant Father of the Church, ever described human nature in the raw in more horrific terms. Which of them, we may pause to ask, described the impulses of a baby as "polymorphous perversity"?

Partly as a result of the "new psychology" the intellectual and emotional atmosphere today is very different from that which prevailed at the beginning of the century. We are no longer confident of progress. Instead we are building shelters to protect us from atomic bombs. It is sophistication today to doubt the reality, even the possibility, of virtue. We are taught

to suspect selfish motives behind even those actions that seem most unselfish or heroic. We can no longer permit ourselves even the enjoyment of a "good conscience." If it happens that we can find nothing in our outward behavior or in our thoughts with which to reproach ourselves, we are nevertheless sure that the *unconscious* of even the best of us is a hideous underworld in which horrible monsters, like the devils in hell, ceaselessly plot assaults upon every form of decency. From that underworld, we may add, they make their way out in disguises that only the specially trained can penetrate.

Was it a subtle *irony* that prompted God to send a savagely anti-religious Jew to remind Christians of one of the central doctrines of their faith? Was it another instance of divine irony that sent another savagely anti-religious Jew, Karl Marx, to point out that an economic order based solely on greed was not only morally revolting but practically unworkable, and would inevitably destroy itself?

Of these modern prophets of Israel, Freud is by far the sterner and gloomier. Marx looked forward to men's return from the captivity into which the blindness of the masses and the selfish cunning of their leaders had brought them. When the capitalist Babylon has fallen, the Chosen People (the Proletariat) will build a New Jerusalem (the classless society). From the new Zion streams of healing will flow through all the world for all the ills to which man is subject. All of this will be brought about, not by deliberate planning, but by the irresistible working of a *dialectic*. Oddly, Marx failed to see that his *dialectic* was only a new and uncouth name for God.

Freud denied the reality of God under any name at all. There could be no release from captivity. Our human nature had its origin in, and was shaped beyond the possibility of basic change by, a brutal struggle for existence. Sublimation of our worst impulses is possible, to be sure, but our capacity for it is limited. We are wholly incapable of building a society in which we can find satisfaction or happiness. The increasing complexity of civilization must impose ever more burdensome demands for self denial. The result must be an ever increasing incidence of neuroses. In the end civilization itself must collapse in one gigantic collective neurosis! Here, we may well note, is a twentieth century version of The Day of Judgment and the Hell of Fire—but there is no Heaven.

The results of our rediscovery of sin are not matters for leisurely speculation. They are hard and terrible facts—hard as the hearts of Nazi torturers or Communist officials, terrible

as the massacre at Lidice or the long agonies of Siberian working camps. If men are not ruled by reason and good will but by greed, fear, lust and cruelty, democracy must be the worst of all forms of government. No people can be trusted with freedom. The state is under no obligation to concern itself with the welfare of its individual citizens. Resistance to its will must be crushed by ruthless force. Important questions must be decided, to paraphrase Robert Ingersoll, not by discussion but by concussion.

Whether it calls itself Freudian or "scientific," psychology agrees with religion in its emphasis upon the ravages of guilt and the necessity for release. The psychotherapeutic procedure presents a number of parallels with the practice of confession. (That is *not* to say that the two are identical.) The therapist may practice the self-effacement of the psychoanalyst, the "permissiveness" of "non-directive" therapy, or the re-assuring calm of the eclectic. All of these encourage complete confession and hold out the promise of absolution. When the therapist and the patient together have done their work well, the burden of guilt "rolls away." The patient leaves with a sense of freedom and cleanness and with new hope and courage. The revivalist war whoop, "I'm saved, *saved*, SAVED!" is scarcely more exuberant than the expressions of those who have been "saved" by scientific techniques.¹

At its best the psychotherapeutic interview re-enacts, as Professor Paul Tillich has so strikingly pointed out, one of the central Christian mysteries—the mystery of "justification by faith."² The patient comes to the therapist, principally because he cannot accept himself. He finds himself accepted, though he is convinced that he is unacceptable. He is accepted not because he is good or loveable, but in spite of the fact that he is bad and repulsive.

Lucy Freeman supplies details.

It is as though he pleads, "Please believe in me—no one else ever has. Please trust me—no one else ever has. Please love me—no one else ever has!" He seeks a love that will forgive him his anger and hate, recognizing it as the only way he knew to fight his fear. He seeks for a love that will allow him to lose his loneliness. He searches for someone who will care enough about him so he may care for and trust himself.³

The therapist's questions are unsparing. They anticipate

1. For a really delightful account of release obtained from scientific counseling read the letter quoted in Seabury's *How Jesus Heals our Minds Today*, p. 67-68.

2. In the concluding chapter of his book, *The Courage to Be*. Yale University Press, 1952.

3. Freeman, Lucy, *Hope for the Troubled*, p. 49 Crown Publishers, inc., 1953.

and frustrate every evasion. They break down every defense. They expose every deception. Yet the object is never condemnation. There is only encouragement to face realities, to acknowledge error, limitation and guilt. Again Lucy Freeman has stated the matter with admirable lucidity.

He does not want me to think in terms of what I "should" or "should not" do but what I feel like doing. For unless I do, I shall be unable to build a life based on purpose instead of deceit.¹

Acknowledgement of failure and sin is not permitted to end in despair. The patient gains courage to accept himself. When one has fully faced the worst in oneself, and no longer tries to deny or conceal it, one may begin to build a new life. That new life will be healthier, stronger, more useful, and happier than the one which was based on evasion and pretense.

"Only the priestly man," Professor Tillich has warned, "can be a complete psychiatrist. One who undertakes to deal with guilt and shame, fear and hate, lust, greed and cruelty, or with love, joy, courage and hope less seriously, on any lower plane, or from any inferior motivation, can give only superficial relief and may do serious harm."

Though some psychoanalysts and psychiatrists may be shocked at the suggestion that they are in any way "priestly," their training is deliberately designed to develop just those qualities of mind and heart—or of intellect and emotion—that have always characterized priests and ministers at their best. To minister to human suffering and need, to awaken hope, to call forth courage and to strengthen resolution, priest and psychiatrist must both develop a thoroughgoing and unflinching realism. They must be able to confront the most repulsive and hideous facts of human wrongdoing without revulsion or dismay. Compassion must swallow up horror or disgust. Both must have a deep faith in human beings, and must be able to see clearly the possibilities of health, happiness and beauty that lie within even those human beings that seem most unpromising. They must be able to speak with confidence—born of their own victories over confusion, doubt and weakness. Both must be acquainted with the sources from which men, women and children can draw guidance, courage and cheer. Both, finally, must be dedicated persons, seeking first of all to lighten the burdens that press so heavily upon mankind.

Almost innumerable passages from the Psalms, from Christian confession and prayer throughout the centuries and from

1. Freeman, Lucy, *Fight Against Fears*, p. 106. Crown Publishers, Inc., 1951.

hymns can easily be re-phrased in the language of our contemporary psychotherapy. The 139th Psalm is not too long to quote in full. Note in what detail it describes the process of therapy—with God as the therapist.

O LORD, thou hast searched me and known me.
 Thou knowest my downsitting and mine uprising;
 Thou understandest my thought afar off.
 Thou compasseth my path and my lying down,
 Thou art acquainted with all my ways.
 For there is not a word in my tongue,
 But lo, O LORD, thou knowest it altogether.
 Thou hast beset me behind and before,
 And laid thine hand upon me.

Of a patient today we would say that he soon realizes that the probing will not stop until every secret shame or regret or longing is laid bare.

The first reaction is one of repulsion, fear, flight, or resistance. The figures of the poetry are those of three thousand years ago and a culture very different from our own. The experience is very like that of great numbers of men and women today.

Such knowledge is too wonderful for me;
 It is high, I cannot attain unto it.
 Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?
 Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?
 If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there;
 If I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there.
 If I take the wings of the morning,
 And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;
 Even there shall thy hand lead me,
 And thy right hand shall cover me.
 If I say, Surely the darkness shall cover me;
 Even the night shall be light about me.
 Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee;
 The darkness and the light are both alike to thee.
 For thou hast possessed my reins;
 Thou hast covered me in my mother's womb.

Little by little the resistance breaks down before the relentless but kindly and strangely comforting probing. Wonder is born, and with wonder a new hope.

I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made

Marvellous are Thy works;
 And that my soul knoweth right well.

My substance was not hid from Thee
 When I was made in secret,
 And curiously wrought in the lowest part of the earth.
 Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being imperfect;
 And in Thy Book all my members were written,
 Which in continuance were fashioned,
 When as yet there was none of them.
 How precious also are Thy thoughts unto me, O God:
 How great is the sum of them!
 If I should count them, they are more in number
 than the sand;
 When I awake, I am still with Thee.

Now resistance, flight and evasion turn to rapturous identification. At first it is *too* exuberant. Again we must remember the time and the cultural background from which the Psalmist wrote.

Surely Thou wilt slay the wicked, O God;
 Depart from me therefore, ye bloody men.
 For they speak against Thee wickedly,
 And Thine enemies take Thy name in vain.
 Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate Thee?
 And am not I grieved with those that rise up against
 Thee?
 I hate them with perfect hatred;
 I count them mine enemies.

In the end the patient joins with the divine Therapist, first in the work of analysis—

Search me, O God, and know my heart:
 Try me and know my thoughts:
 And see if there be any wicked way in me,
 and lastly in the planning of a new way of life—
 And lead me in the way everlasting.

Psychology agrees with Christian thinking in tracing sin to crude selfishness and ego-centricity. Psychology and religion agree, too, in affirming the need for conversion. Freud, indeed, demanded *two* conversions. To attain the psychological stature of a normal adult every individual must be converted from the pleasure principle to the fact or reality principle, and from self love to object love. Some would want to add a third—from ego-centricity to cooperation. Failure to undergo such a conversion results in a neurotic or psychopathic personality.

The changes may be gradual or abrupt. That abrupt and extensive changes of behavior patterns do occur is, of

course, firmly established. Saint Paul stated the matter succinctly. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold all things are become new." (II Corinthians, 5: 17). John Masefield wrote in greater detail:

I did not think, I did not strive,
The deep peace burnt my me alive;
The bolted door had broken in,
I knew that I was dead to sin.
I knew that Christ had given me birth
To brother all the souls on earth,
And every bird and every beast
Should share the crumbs broke at the feast.¹

The transition from primitive Narcissism and egocentricity to object love and cooperation with one's fellows is affected through *identification*. The word is a particularly happy selection. The importance of *right* identifications is obviously immense. Christianity and Buddhism have insisted upon identification with all mankind, as wide as human need and deeper than even the natural craving for life and security.² Vincent Sheean found a saint among the Communists.

Rayna Prohme felt a genuine relationship to all forms of human life. That was the essence of it. To her the Chinese coolie was another part of the whole life, rich, various, cruel and immense, that she shared to the extent of her limits in space and time. She could not see a Chinese coolie beaten and half starved, reduced to the level of the beasts, without feeling herself also beaten and half starved, degraded and oppressed; and the part of her that rebelled against this horror (her mind and spirit) was inflexibly resolved by now never to lie down under the monstrous system of the world. Man's inhumanity to man seemed to her a great deal more than that; it was an inhumanity of one part of the same body to another. The Shanghai entrepreneurs who employed thousands of Chinese men, women and children at starvation wages for twelve and fourteen hours a day were, to her, like the hands of a body cutting off its legs.³ In its saints, martyrs, prophets, heroes and adventurers

1. Masefield, John, *The Everlasting Mercy*. P. 118 in the complete edition of his poems. Macmillan 1935.

2. Is the Doctrine of the Atonement the teaching that the Son of God so identified Himself with men that their sins became His? Does the new term add anything to the understanding of the central mystery in Christianity?

3. Sheean, Vincent, *Personal History*, p. 270. Doubleday Doan, 1935.

religion offers a vast array of personalities of great beauty and power. Identification with such figures cannot fail to enrich life and render it productive. "The communion of saints," the realization that one belongs to a great and glorious church, world-wide and eternal in its membership and ministry, is a sustaining power. Even patriotism falls short of it in breadth and richness.

The mystics' experience of "union" may appear a little more plausible, and perhaps a little more attractive to modern men and women, if we think of it as "identification." One may "identify" with the whole cosmos. Marcus Aurelius voiced such identification in the dignified language befitting a Roman emperor and a Stoic—

Everything harmonizes with me which is harmonious to Thee, O Universe. Nothing for me is too early or too late, which is in time for Thee. Everything is fruit for me which Thy seasons bring, O Nature: from Thee are all things, in Thee are all things, to Thee all things return.¹

Thomas Traherne, an English mystic of the 17th century, became lyrical—

You never enjoy the world aright till the sea itself flows in your veins, till you are clothed with the heavens and crowned with the stars.²

At the height of such experience all feeling of separateness is dissolved. All conflict is quieted. One is at rest yet charged with tremendous energy. The mystics' identification with God, even more than the patriot's with his country, derives reinforcement and intensification from a vision of "a splendor so overwhelming that all considerations of safety are driven from the mind."³

When safety can be forgotten, security is won.

There are two kinds of security: One when the future is guaranteed; the other when the present is right. . . . This latter is the sense of religious freedom and religious security: Freedom, because one knows that one's own personality is ultimately unimportant; security, because one knows that the Kingdom of Love is the only thing worth living for, worth suffering for, if need be, worth dying for.⁴

Were it not for the vision of splendor, the realization of

1. Aurelius Antoninus, *Marcus, Meditations*, IV, 23. Long's translation.
 2. Traherne, Thomas (1637-1674), *Essentials of Meditations*.
 3. Heard, Gerald, *Prayers and Meditations*, p. 26. Harrow and Brothers, 1949.
 4. Vlastos, Gregory, *The Religious Person in the World Today*. Quoted in Phillips, Dorothy Berkeley, *The Choice is Always Ours*, pp. 438-439. Richard R. Smith, 1948.

one's personal insignificance would be devastating. The mystic finds it liberating and uplifting. Empty of self, he is gloriously filled with that which is immeasurably more satisfying than even the most complete realization of his merely selfish or natural aims. Losing his very life, he really begins to live.

The old, old paradox is not just a religious oracle. It is a central principle of psychotherapy. Mental disorders, so far as they are not the result of bodily infection or injury, have their origin for the most part in a petty concern for self. The cure, when that is achieved, consists almost wholly in persuading the patient to take an interest in something else, or in other persons. A simple distraction may be sufficient to effect a tolerable adjustment to ordinary situations. I have been told of a man who saved himself from "nervous breakdown" by making a collection of the tops from milk bottles. While we must congratulate him upon such an easy way out of his difficulties, we may well wonder whether a thoroughgoing identification with some larger object or some urgent "cause" might not have effected a deeper, more comprehensive integration and one more likely to prove productive.

Prayer is obviously related to auto-suggestion. The beneficial effects of "good" and persistent auto-suggestion are generally acknowledged. All this is not to say that prayer is *only* auto-suggestion. *Disbelief* in prayer is also often the result of auto-suggestion, of continually suggesting to ourselves that the universe is a vast but purposeless mechanism. There is no way to escape auto-suggestion. We can only choose the suggestions.

There is no reason why prayer cannot be *both* auto-suggestion and a true communion with a genuine Reality. If there is such a Being as those who pray believe there is, we should still have to approach Him with certain preliminaries, to cultivate a sensitiveness to such communications as He may grant to us, and to fixate new insights and resolves by reiteration. It is possible to write all these off as only auto-suggestion; but that may not be the most accurate accounting. They may also be conditions for an experience of reality and truth open to any who will undertake the venture.

From the stilling of all conflicts, the quieting of clamorous desires, and the direction of thought to sublime objects with which men can readily identify themselves, freedom and peace do result. Extraordinary insights are won, that prove themselves of the greatest practical worth. New energy, joy and refreshment are other rewards.

Frequently the gains are of great importance for society. The life of prayer and the life of active service are like two oars of a boat. To pull either alone is to spin in a circle of futility. If there is to be progress, the two must work together in proper balance.

The convergence of psychology and religion is ground for high hope that each will enrich the other. Psychology can serve religion by clarifying certain religious ideas. Thus religion asserts, "The wages of sin is death." (Romans 6: 23). Psychology can document the statement that very few of us are fully alive. We fail to win happiness or peace, because we carry about with us burdens of guilt, shame, hate, envy and fear. Because we cannot fully identify ourselves with our fellows or strive for what Adler has so happily called "true goals," we live in fear of one another. The witches' broth of fears, hatreds and greeds forces great nations into ever more devastating wars, and within nations sets class against class. Psychology can aid the preacher or the revivalist in awakening a deep and terrifying "conviction of sin."

The text just quoted concludes, "but the gift of God is eternal life." Psychology cannot promise *eternal* life, at least not yet. It can provide pointers along the way to *fulness* of life. It confirms religion's insight that love is salvation. Thus Erich Fromm has written—

There is no more convincing proof that the injunction "Love thy neighbor as thyself" is the most important norm of living and that its violation is the basic cause of unhappiness and mental illness than the evidence gathered by the psychoanalyst. Whatever complaints the neurotic patient, may have, whatever symptoms he may present are rooted in his inability to love. . . . *Analytic therapy is essentially an attempt to help the patient regain his capacity for love.* If this aim is not fulfilled, nothing but surface changes can be effected.¹

Is this more than a commentary upon St. John's compact utterance, "We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren"? (I John, 3: 15). Through its detailed study of man's need for love, moreover, and of the obstacles love must overcome and the pitfalls it must avoid, psychology can corroborate and enrich Saint Paul's great hymn to love.

As psychology clarifies many of the ideas with which reli-

1. Fromm, Erich, *Psychoanalysis and Religion*, pp. 86-87. (Terry Lectures). Yale University Press, 1950. Italics mine.

gion is concerned, we can confidently expect that it will correct exaggerations and misplaced emphases. Psychology can aid religion also in providing techniques by which religious individuals and groups can achieve the goals toward which they are striving. The recent developments of procedures for measuring group opinion and attitudes, for advertising and propaganda, and for the management of large groups opens up exciting opportunities and arouses even more exciting hopes.

Religion needs such techniques today. So do democracy and liberalism. Up till now, the Communists are far in advance of us. They have reduced trouble-making almost to a science. They have made a much more detailed and intensive study of methods for developing and aggravating social tensions than the rest of us have for promoting good will. They operate numerous schools in which young people are trained to become professional revolutionaries. All this makes it imperative that we should take prompt and vigorous counter measures.

Religion can contribute as much to psychology as psychology can to religion. It is immensely to the credit of religion that it has insisted that human motivation is far more complex than biologically oriented thinkers have been inclined to allow. "Man does not live by bread alone," is a profound religious insight. It is also verified scientific fact. Even if we add the sex urge to the hunger drive, we are still far from any adequate analysis or description of human motives.¹

An increasingly realistic and more nearly complete knowledge of human motivation brings to light powerful compulsions that at least *seem* very different from the merely biologic drives that psychologists first discovered (for the simple reason, indeed, that they could hardly miss them), and which they too quickly took to be the only demands to which men needed to adjust. W. MacNeile Dixon's language verges on poetry, but he stated sober fact—as sober, that is, as any facts can be in the fantastic and all but incredible world that modern science presents for our contemplation,—when he wrote:

The astonishing thing about the human being is not so much his intellect and bodily structure, profoundly mysterious as they are. The astonishing and least comprehensible thing about him is his range of vision; his gaze into the infinite distance; his lonely passion for ideas and ideals, far removed from his material surroundings and

1. Is the better approach to psychology the study of biology and the behavior of animals or an acquaintance as extensive as possible with the characteristics and achievements that distinguish human beings from other animals? On the other hand, does it not seem likely that "or" is not the right word? Do we not actually need both approaches?

animal activities, and in no way suggested by them, yet for which, such is his affection, he is willing to endure toils and privations, to sacrifice pleasures, to disdain griefs and frustrations, and for which in rating them above his own life, he will stand until he dies; the profound conviction that if nothing be worth dying for, nothing is worth living for.

The inner truth is that every man is himself a creator, by birth and nature an artist, an architect and fashioner of worlds. If this be madness—and if the universe be the machine some think it, a very ecstasy of madness it most manifestly is—none the less it is the lunacy in which consists the romance of life, in which lies our chief glory and our only hope.¹

Such idealistic or spiritual motives are doubtless in some way rooted in, or derived from, or related to, the biologic urges. The end results are very different, however, from the beginnings; and the "some way" by which they are derived is certainly long, intricate and obscure. The necessity for a spiritual superstructure upon the biologic basement has been well expressed by the Reverend Bernard Iddings Bell—

There will be no recovery of serenity, no mutual patience sufficient for fraternity, until we learn ourselves and teach our boys and girls that unless human beings become creative artists they remain petulant children, dangerous, predatory. . . . To be artist and lover, that is the destined end of man.²

Because we are not artists or lovers, we find ourselves facing the responsibility, almost the probability, that mankind will destroy itself. The cellar of biological motivation, necessary as it is, is cramped, damp and gloomy. We can never achieve a healthy maturity, until we come up out of it into the fresh air and sunshine of *spiritual* life. We must remain "petulant, dangerous, predatory" until we succeed in building true homes for man's spirit. In these days of hydrogen bombs and even more frightful weapons, such structures are no longer luxuries we can get along without, if we must. They are *necessities*, if we are to survive—even as animals.

Science, philosophy and religion work together most effectively, when each serves as a bad conscience for the other two. Each is the expression of a basic human need. Science is man's struggle to free himself from wishful thinking and speculation

1. Dixon, W. MacNelle, *The Human Situation*, p. 102. Longmans Green and Company, 1937.

2. Bell, Bernard Iddings, *The Crisis in Education*, p. Whittelsey House, 1940.

that strays too far from its base in experience. In that it is a struggle against human finitude, it is a witness to man's yearning for infinity. Philosophy is the reminder that all knowledge is only "in part." It is the persistent protest that nothing whatever is so simple as common belief, or science, or religion supposes. Religion keeps alive the flame of discontent with all actual achievement, whether of knowledge, or artistic creation, or conduct—yet never permits that discontent to sink into despair.

Psychologists have done excellent work, along with physiologists, in describing human *needs*: for food, water, air, elimination, sex satisfaction, and so on. They have done well, too, in analyzing human *desires*. They have dealt less adequately with *capacities*.

There are possibilities within all human beings of which they may never become aware, but which, once they are called into activity, may yield the deepest and most intense satisfaction. Psychotherapy in any form, or simple counseling, is largely an attempt to lead patients into experiences of satisfactions which the patients do not know exist or are possible. Sometimes the attempt to do that encounters strong resistances from entrenched beliefs and conscious desires.

Religion evokes extraordinary behavior and experiences. In doing so it brings to light capacities that in all probability would otherwise never be suspected. This enriches our understanding of human nature and enlarges the field of psychology.

Religion voices its protest also against immature and oversimplified programs for integrating activity around inadequate projects or principles. It stands invincibly against complete identification with any ideal or cause short of the very highest. Even patriotism, as Edith Cavell so splendidly said, "is not enough." Much less worthy of devotion are such ideals as those of a master race, an economic or social class, or a *fuehrer*. Even "the American way of life" is not enough.

Nothing short of the establishment in all the world of the Kingdom of Heaven, and making God glorious in the eyes of all men and women can resolve the dissonances of individual and social conflict. Men and women will continue to feel a deficit, vaguely, as they might feel the lack of some unknown but essential vitamin, until they have given themselves without reserve to that which is so glorious that it deserves everything man can give.

From the mutually enriching interaction of psychology and religion we may confidently expect new and important

philosophical insights. The more understanding we achieve of human personality, the more apparent it becomes that a universe which has produced personalities and can be counted upon to continue producing them must be a very different kind of a universe from one which would have stopped short at oceans and continents, or even at chimpanzees.

New insights will arise also because our cosmology, our view of the universe, is affected or colored by our emotional reactions. Children from poor families, there is reason to believe, see coins as *larger* than do children from families in which the same coins are not so highly valued. So philosophers, and the rest of us who are not philosophers, project our feelings into our world views. We tend to see the kind of a universe we *feel* we must have.

Under the devilish spell of Adam Smith and Charles Darwin we have learned to view the universe as a heartless, purposeless, meaningless mechanism. There are grounds to suspect that this view is not the product of science alone, but is to some extent a projection and rationalization of our primitive selfishness. A realization that happiness, blessedness, salvation is at least possible, if that ever wins wide acceptance, will certainly warm the harsh outlines of the universe our science pictures today. It may even be that the majestic lineaments of GOD will be seen again, as though they had been there all the time, drawn in invisible ink, waiting only to be warmed by hope and love.