

JAN 23 1918

BL

2780

.S38

HOURS WITH A REVIVALIST

A REPORT FROM THE PSYCHOLOGIC
VIEWPOINT

THEODORE^{Albert} SCHROEDER

WITH BIBLIOGRAPHY OF AUTHOR'S ESSAYS
ON THE EROTOGENESIS OF RELIGION.

TRUTH SEEKER CO.
62 VESEY STREET
NEW YORK
1917

BL
2720
.S38

This essay somewhat abridged first appeared in *The Seven Arts*, September 1917, pp. 646-658. In its present and more complete form it was published in *The Truth Seeker* September 15, 1917; v. 44, pp. 577-579.

HOURS WITH A REVIVALIST

ON THE outside of the church a revival was advertised. That tempted me, as it was designed to do. Recently I had attended a negro church, there witnessing the only revival I had seen since my boyhood. Except for presence at a few meetings of the colored folk, many years had passed since I had been inside of a church. Perhaps I could get a new sensation. The thought also occurred to me that it would be interesting to compare the black man's and the white man's "spirituality." I had read several accounts of that "great awakening," the New England revival, which is credited to Jonathan Edwards, and I had seen those extravagant performances duplicated under the stimulation of one of the tribe known as "the colored Billy Sunday." Now, I thought, I might see at a white man's Methodist church a repetition of this extraordinary exhibition. Thus my curiosity was increased. However, the meetings and the subsequent events were so different from my anticipations that I am impelled to record the facts. I believe that they illustrate in a forceful manner that the church has lost its influence, because religion itself is disappearing. If you have the patience to read to the end I will show you what is lacking, never to be regained.

The church had a seating capacity approaching six hundred, and the seats were mostly occupied. In the pulpit was a young man perhaps thirty-five years of age, well built and over six feet tall. He had a large, square face, rather characterless, I thought, set upon a large neck supported upon large, broad, square shoulders. He must have weighed nearly two hundred and fifty pounds. Reared in Podunk, he would have become the ideal village blacksmith. In Milwaukee his build would have qualified him for the job of 'Rausschmeiser. However, a mother's sentimentalism and an education probably combined to make him a Methodist parson. Education, without the mother, might have made him a country lawyer or a village doctor. But unconscious processes, the subjection to the maternal dreams, or something similar, impelled him to stay on the pul-

piteering job, though with an evident conflict between intellectual attainments and emotional compulsion.

When pleading with the audience to come to the mourners' bench, at times it almost seemed to me as if he expected us to express an emotional appreciation of divine love, just because he considered that a perfectly logical thing to do. Then, again, it was as though we should come forward merely as a personal favor to God, or as a matter of living up to somebody's conception of good manners. Nothing was said or done to induce the conviction or stimulate the feeling that it was of any great consequence *to us* either that we or he accept God. It was as if it were all for God's sake. Doubtless he was quite unconscious of all this, probably because his impulses were neither strongly religious nor co-ordinated with the needs of his audience. Of course, the thought came to me that his religion had never acquired real meaning to him in the sense in which religion had meaning to Jonathan Edwards or to "the colored Billy Sunday."

In sermon and prayer he told us what fine fellows were God and Jesus. In fact, he recommended them both very highly. Yet, while he bestowed much verbal flattery on God, there was never a fervent appeal for his help to sinners. It was as if the parson didn't need help or, never having received any from God, perhaps had no confidence in the efficacy of prayer. This was all so contrary to what I had heard in boyhood, or had recently seen at negro revivals, that I marveled thereat and became interested in observing more closely its effect upon others.

There was a sing-song, drawling, yet loud, way of saying things, just as though he were consciously striving to be impressive. It seemed to me that one who really *felt* that his message was vital could not exhibit so many signs of an amateur elocutionist.

One might gather the impression that the parson really desired others to identify him with God's work, and so, as an added means to greater self-exaltation, it was expedient for him to extol the master. In trying desperately to persuade himself that the Methodist God is really omniscient and omnipotent, he succeeded only in assuring his audience that God was "worth while."

There was none of the confident assumption of one who *knows* that he has God on his side, and that therefore he can point the way for others, com-

selling their assent to the need of salvation and to belief in his authority to offer it. It would not have been different if confessedly the exhibition had been that of a man defending himself against his own doubts, not claiming to be a confidence-inspiring leader of other doubters.

He told us that "we *really* ought to do" this and "we hope" that; and "we cannot afford to take the position" of some persons. He told how faith in the son of God was "reported" to have saved others, but gave no assurance that he considered himself saved. He told us how the Bible "reports" what Christ is said to have done for the sinning woman two thousand years ago, but expressed no confidence in any such service rendered in more recent times. He had many sorrows over the demons of lust, of drink, of covetousness, cards and dancing, but not a word of rebuke for the sin of unbelief, blasphemy or hypocrisy.

In short, he spake not as one having authority, but rather as a hired man, too modest or too indifferent to use the personal pronoun or to claim the authority of a true believer who has felt the "inspiration" of the Holy Ghost. Once he half closed his eyes as he spoke in slow measure. I felt that he was more concerned to have us believe in *his* earnestness and his nearness to God than that we ourselves should become earnest, as seekers after God. Although, occasionally, he pulled the tremolo stop to his voice, and once or twice evinced great lung power on the basso profundo, yet it all seemed dead. The exhortation was drawing to a close and none had come to the mourners' bench.

On the first evening of my attendance he had requested especially the parents and teachers to see that the Sunday school pupils should be in attendance. For once he warmed up in good form. Manifestly he really and truly felt that religion was of great importance to children. And yet none came to the mourners' bench. The revival season of a month was about to close, and from the large audience in regular attendance, during the whole month, only about a score had consecrated themselves to God. With pitiful humility he begged us to come forward, but none moved, and it really seemed a shame for us to withhold that satisfaction. In deepest pleading tones he concluded with: "I need your prayers. Don't forget *me*." He mopped his massive brow, and the choir began its solemn function. This was Friday, the last night of the revival season. The next Sunday morning service

would see the end of the present series of invitations to accept salvation. Then would come baptisms and receptions into the church.

I waited at the door for the pastor to emerge. Many detained him, as if to show their friendliness or even silently to express their apologies for disappointing him by absence from the mourners' bench. At last he came out from the building and seemed pleased that I wished to walk and talk with him. Evidently he had derived some comfort from what others had said to him on his way out. Wondering if I would prove a painful antidote, I proceeded directly to the subject of my desire.

In reply to my first question he admitted his disappointment as to the fruits of his revival effort. When asked how he accounted for his failure, he spoke hesitatingly and half absent-mindedly of the power of evil and Satan, the stiffneckedness and pride of the people, and other such religious commonplaces. I expressed doubt as to this being the explanation of his failure, and then he turned my question back upon me. Now it was up to me, and I delivered myself about as follows:

It seemed to me that his audience was a fair average of religious audiences; just such an audience as Jonathan Edwards or the Rev. Charles G. Finney would have gotten great results from. More than half were women over forty-five years of age, with sad and troubled faces. Roughly estimated, fifteen per cent were young women under twenty-three; there were a few old men and fewer young men. Aside from the choir members and the ushers, there were scarcely any vigorous, contented, healthy appearing persons of middle age in the entire crowd. Manifestly these troubled souls were humble and distressed, and came there for help and consolation, but did not receive the spiritual uplift they needed and desired. Manifestly, also, their craving for the "true spirit" and their conscious need of salvation was as great as in any average gathering of Methodists. A few nights back, when all were waiting for some "hungry spirit" to go to the mourners' bench, an old man arose, near the right front, and in a few vehement sentences exhorted sinners to repent and accept Jesus. Twenty-five *Amens* answered to his appealing voice. I said to the pastor: "Great possibilities were manifested in this little outburst of enthusiasm, which you never once elicited. Had your entire sermon been shaped and delivered with the fervid spirit of that old man, I believe you would have had abundant results from

your effort. When you think upon this, don't you see that, after all, this was an average audience 'ripe for the harvest'?"

The parson hesitated a moment and then slowly said: "Well, I don't know but that you are right." I persisted in my quest: "If the cause of failure in this revival is not in the special character of your audiences, then where are we to look for an explanation?" After a pause he said: "I don't know. I wish that you would tell me what you think about it?"

I reminded him that I was a stranger and therefore might not be pardoned for saying that which an intimate friend might take a chance upon, and my view of the situation might not furnish an agreeable form of conversation between us. However, he assured me that he was much concerned, would really like some light upon the situation, and thought he could stand anything I would be inclined to say. I accepted the invitation.

"The first evenings of my attendance I studied the audiences and your effect upon them." So I began. "When I saw that the effects were negligible, I proceeded to study you. I began by listening to what you did not say, and this is what I heard: During my attendance upon your meetings you never made one statement about salvation on the basis of your own religious experiences. You quoted St. Paul or Jesus just as one might quote Wilson or Roosevelt. You added nothing of your personal religious experience by way of reinforcement or to impress us with the value of your authorities. So impersonal was your discourse, even in form, that a mere Agnostic could have delivered your sermon without doing much violence to his convictions. He, too, could say that 'the apostle Paul informs us,' or 'Jesus is reported to have said'; and under his breath he might have added, 'What of it?'"

Then I commented upon his want of zeal and enthusiasm. I pointed out that his hymns were all like dirges, when they should be of the rousing, thumping, rhythmic, Onward-Christian-Soldier sort if they were meant to aid the revival spirit. The parson evidently was not selecting his music, any more than his sermon, with a conscious view to the emotional craving of his audience. All was too manifestly the unconscious choice of a temperament probably made morose by emotional conflicts within. If this conflict concerned doubt as to his efficiency or fitness for the preacher's task, it might explain

much. Thus the character of his sermons might be determined by the unconscious urge to find rationalistic justification, by a special plea, for his presence in the pulpit. This same relative obsession, with the internal conflict, may have compelled him to ignore the emotional needs and "spiritual hunger" of his audience. I expatiated on these psychologic aspects of his character and advised him to study his half-conscious and unexpressed moods to discover if he might not be much happier outside the pulpit and church. He protested mildly against my conclusion, and thanked me for my frankness. We had reached his home and now said good-night.



On Sunday morning I went to the same church to see the effect, if any, that my talk might have had. After the service I again waited at the door and asked the parson if he would allow me to walk home with him.

He really seemed pleased that I had been there. Perhaps he thought that he had redeemed himself in my estimate of his orthodoxy. As soon as we had extricated ourselves from the crowd he asked me, with an air of confidence, what I thought of the sermon. I told him I concluded that I had irritated and stimulated him. He admitted that I had done him some good in making him more conscious of his privileges and duty.

"Yes," I said, "in the substance of your sermon you were nearer 'right with God.' Also you put a little more ginger into it; but," I continued, "there were no new-comers to the mourners' bench, so evidently you were no nearer right with your audience than before. Perhaps you were preaching at me and again forgetting the needs of the great crowd. Perhaps you were making a new kind of defense for your own doubt, instead of concentrating your effort on the process of entrancing others. Where formerly you were defending yourself to yourself, to-day you seemed to be defending yourself to me. Intellectually and emotionally I am very unlike your audience, and so once more you were inefficient in the matter of answering to *their* 'spiritual needs.'"

He demurred, but could give no better explanation of his failure to induce anyone to "hit the trail." This phrase of the Rev. Billy Sunday reminded me that my parson was one of a committee to invite Billy to come to his city and revive the unregenerate.

Incidentally the parson had expressed to me some disapproval of the Rev. Billy's methods, but thought that, on the whole, his large results were ample justification. I returned to the justification of my diagnosis of his troubles. I reminded him that in this sermon he made emphatically two statements on his own responsibility. After the first he paused a moment, and then in an earnest voice, with measured deliberation, he said to the congregation: "And this is not mere cant, but is said out of the fulness of my own heart." I asked him to focus his attention for a moment upon the probable effect of this statement upon his congregation, to estimate how many of them might have experienced a mild shock which, had it become conscious and articulate, might have found expression in the question: "I wonder why the parson thought it necessary to defend his sincerity?"

He silently nodded his assent, showing me that he saw the point. Furthermore, he seemed more interested than offended, and this gave me courage to proceed with my analysis in an effort to help the man to a better understanding of his own psychology and the possible solving of a conflict which, after all, was largely far below the surface of consciousness. Had the parson been a conscious hypocrite, he could not possibly have maintained a calm interest through the criticisms which I am reporting in condensed form. He was honestly interested in the self-revelation, as he was honestly unconscious of the mental and emotional processes involved in his religious conflict. I believe he was quite unaware that he possessed but a minimum of that which I would call the differential essence of religion, which is a subjective experience. My parson had only an objectively derived conviction about some theologic formulas.

I proceeded thus: "When making the second statement on your own responsibility, your eyes unconsciously wandered over toward me, and when your gaze met mine you stuttered. I have been taught to believe that this signifies that upon seeing me your subconscious doubt about the statement you were then making was crowding toward the surface for recognition and expression. In other words, at that precise moment you were desperately near to a consciousness of your internal conflict. The stuttering was the product of an unconscious automatic effort to get time in which to dispel your doubt and decide what was really true for you. In

other words, that stutter, in the light of our prior conversation, convinced me that you are not fully at peace with yourself in the matter of your preaching."

I ignored another mild protest and continued my analysis by reminding him that in his opening prayer he had uttered some fervent appeal for the skeptics, telling God that perhaps during the past week some in that very congregation had been grieved and perplexed by their doubts and fears. I suggested that it seemed to me as though he had in mind his own doubts, perplexities and fears, and that he was really uttering that prayer for himself and not for the congregation.

Here came another protest, with the explanation that a religious minister always has poured into his ears the troubles of those who are sad and depressed, and he thought such experiences adequately accounted for the prayer and that therefore my inference was unfair. I waived the fact that even now he did not claim to have had any specific tale of doubt poured into his ears during the past week, and that probably he was only attempting an intellectual mode of suggesting to me an objective fact, the reality of which his conscience would not allow him to assert positively.

Instead, I proceeded with my analytic process as follows: "Allow me to give you an added reason why your explanation does not explain. In your opening prayer you knelt on your left knee. Your right knee supported your right elbow, while your right hand covered your face from the eyes down. Your left forearm rested on the pulpit. Your left hand hung unsupported over the front of the Bible. In your prayer you implored the Almighty to restore peace in Europe. Here your voice was calm, your brow placid and the disengaged hand hung lifelessly. When you reached that part of your prayer where you implored God to aid doubters, your brow was wrinkled and the left hand was raised almost to a straight line with your forearm and opened and closed several times, convulsively clutching at the atmosphere. These changes in face and hand evidenced an excitement within which did not exist when you were praying for peace in Europe. There, perhaps, more than one hundred thousand had been killed or maimed during the week. If the inner excitement had been objectively conditioned, then it seems inevitable that it should have been more conspicuous over the war slaughter of many who had

not yet accepted salvation than over two or three doubting Thomases, who had told you of their troubles during the week. Only your personal afflictions are likely to outweigh the sorrows of the war. Therefore it seems to me that the excitement, unconsciously manifested, did not originate in other people's troubles, but was occasioned by your own half-conscious conflicts and doubts." I saw that this struck home. Then I tried to show him how to deal with such a matter by allowing himself to become conscious of its submerged elements and then to resolve the conflict by working toward a decision upon the basis of its objective factors.



By this time we had reached the parson's residence. I had never been censorious in my manner, had never thought, felt, or implied any reproach. I had not discussed the truth or falsity of any tenet of his religion. I contented myself with trying to illuminate his understanding as to his own psychology; that is, as to the behavior of the forces within himself. I was really trying to help the man, and he seemed equally willing to look squarely in the face his subconscious impulses and his conflicts. Hence there was never a moment of friction, never a particle of resentment on his part. Had he been a conscious hypocrite he would scarcely have been able to listen calmly. His conscious desires were really functioning on a pretty high evolutionary level, and his desires to know the truth, even about his own emotions, was strong enough to preclude the aversion which is often felt by less highly evolved persons. Quite in consonance with this estimate of him was his invitation to have Sunday dinner with him, which I accepted.

After dinner the psychological study was resumed in his library. We covered a wide range, but finally got back to his failure as a revivalist, when he asked me what he could do to increase his efficiency in that part of his work. Again I replied that a free expression might not be polite. But he insisted that he wanted to know the truth, and on his past record he thought I should feel secure in speaking frankly. First I told him of the erotogenetic interpretation of religion. I explained at some length (as I have done in over a dozen of published essays) how I believed all religion, in the sense of internal experiences, to be a mere misinterpretation of sex-ecstasy, usually unrecognized as such. After some elabora-

tion of this theme I returned to the matter of his meetings and expressed myself about as follows:

"Those elderly women of your congregation showed in their sad faces the disappointment of mis-spent lives, disappointments produced by and in turn accentuating emotional conflicts. According to that school of psychologists whose theories are most convincing to me, I quite believe that practically all of these emotional conflicts have their origin in disturbed sexual emotions. In short, we all have sexual desires, phantasies or ~~experiences~~, which are more or less shameful secrets with us. Just as the feeling of shame is great, its conflict with desire is intense and our resulting anxiety keen. This anxiety about sexual sinning and suppressed desire, or unintelligent sexual expression, is the condition and dynamics upon which the revivalist must play if he wishes to succeed. So, then, your task is one of playing upon the guilty consciences of these disappointed older people, and a like guilty conscience of the adolescent victims of sex-suppression, who have not yet lost all the hope of realizing their desire. — Preach a hot sermon on the sins of the flesh, the satanic machinations through the lusts of the body. Repeat this in various insinuating forms until every suppressed or shameful desire and experience has become a vivid conscious phantasy. Then portray the penalty of these sins in terms of eternal torment in the lurid gloom of hell. Above all things, make the picture graphic, and in swift, loud, excited speech suggest the agonizing shrieks of the damned, until the hearers' guilty imaginations are filled with pictures of themselves crying aloud in pain, writhing amid the loathsome fumes of fire and brimstone, and they can feel the very flames already consuming their clothes and scorching their limbs. Now they actually cry aloud in agony over their own degradation. You have induced 'the conviction of sin,' which the church recognizes as the first step toward salvation. Then comes the 'change of heart.'

"Then tell these love-sick sinners of the infinite love of God, who sent his only begotten son to redeem a sinning world; how he took on flesh, was cruelly crucified, suffered and died that *their* souls might be saved from the torments of hell. Picture him on the cross, his naked limbs exposed to the scoffers' gaze, with the bleeding side and sad, forgiving face of a near-adolescent or early middle-aged divine man, in whom alone love is guiltless.

When this portrait of the sweet agony of the divine lover has been so drawn as to create upon their already sensitized erotic imagination a corresponding vivid phantasy almost as clear and insistent as would be the living presence, then woo them with mellow pleading and cooing voice, and with outstretched hands ask them to embrace the gospel by coming to the loving arms of Jesus and accepting his gracious pardon and salvation without price, though purchased by his precious blood. When you can do that efficiently they will come to the mourners' bench even over the tops of the seats. Don't you think so?"

I had put considerable life into my narrative of the revival process, and now paused for a reply. Presently he said: "But I don't know that I am willing to do that."

That sentence, in the light of what had preceded, tells the whole story of the decline in the influence of religion.



I have given you a picture mainly of the more obvious factors of the parson's psychologic difficulties. However, we have considered these as isolated phenomena. Now let me retell what I see in this story when its facts are co-ordinated to the religion of the past. Formerly religion depended upon faith—inducing a conscious experience of the "indwelling God." In the pastor, whose story I have told, religion was a conclusion of reason, not an act of faith. Where formerly men "*knew* God," this man only *believed* in God.

The difference between infallible personal knowledge and an opinion about the preponderance of the evidence makes all the difference between religion and science.

Where others accepted God through the inward miracle of grace, our preacher accepted God because of a crude adaptation of the scientific method to his experience with outward physical nature.

The older process of acquiring knowledge, from the vantage ground of more mature methods, has been aptly described by the formula: "They know because they feel, and are firmly convinced because strongly agitated."

With the maturer person a reversal of this process takes place and the tendency is to feel because we know. In other words, the point of emphasis has changed. Formerly our knowledge was acquired more by unconscious processes, and therefore

ascribed to God as the source of all wisdom. To-day the more intelligent ones consciously supervise much of the processes involved in acquiring knowledge, and God is not as generally accepted as an efficient educator. Instead of having human feelings precede and human desires determine the character of our convictions, the direction of feelings is now being more and more determined by and attached to the scientific method and its fruits. In other words, the unconscious feeling-mode of arriving at convictions is being integrated with and subordinated to the scientific method. Where the former religious or infantile method of arriving at conclusions depended upon experiences which were preponderantly subjective and emotional, the maturer mental processes depend progressively more upon experience in conscious relation with objectives. That is to say, the scientific method, rather than its resultant formulas, is influencing us all more or less as a check upon those mysterious impulses which in immature stages of development we usually intellectualize as transcendental experiences certifying by superhuman authority to superphysical facts. The more consciously and thoroughly these checks are applied, the more completely does mysticism of every brand tend to disappear. The direct attack upon religion is little more than the symptom of its going, and only in small degree the cause of it.

Once the relative merits of "faith" and "works" were subjects of hot debates. Now by silent processes "acts of faith" have become of little account in judging a man. We desire to know what he is actually doing to make this world a better place to live in. Where formerly great universities, like Yale and Harvard, reported, boasting, on the number of converts and ministers they had produced, they are now silent upon this subject and seem to take more pride in the successful politicians and money-grabbers counted among their graduates. Where formerly the church was proud of its "ghostly" exercises, it now vaunts its gymnasiums. "Spiritual" food has been supplanted by having the rural Y. M. C. A. justify its existence by teaching the farmer's son scientific agriculture. In short, the religious person, like others, is yielding to the slow and unconscious advance of the scientific method. The church is becoming secularized.



This process of secularization is going on even in the domain of morals. Intelligent persons no longer

accept the ten commandments as from God, nor believe in them otherwise than as very crude and primitive generalizations of human experience. We are discarding absolute for relative judgments. "Thou shalt not kill" is only a half-truth. The more enlightened statute law has amended "God's" commandment and has made allowance for justifiable homicide. Even Cardinal Manning is reported as saying that "a starving man has a natural right to his neighbor's bread." So also do conscious and unconscious pragmatists invite us to get away from the absolute moral dogmas, to take a "moral holiday." Such persons in very large numbers remain quite calm even when limitations are applied to the seventh commandment.

What, then, is the trouble with our revival preacher and with other preachers? They have been too well educated. Without their knowing it they have come more or less to the habit of checking the intellectualization of their feelings by the use of at least a portion of the secular ideal. In other words, our revivalist had theological opinions, derived he knew not how, which he sought to justify by a more or less crude application of the scientific method. His audience had no appetite for his rationalistic processes, and he had outgrown the capacity for playing ragtime on their emotions. Therefore, he was inefficient and the audience largely disappointed. A Billy Sunday, black or white, is still in that backward state of development where he can successfully make the emotional appeal to those who are likewise suffering from arrestment in immature stages of development in the matter of their mental methods.

The church is losing its influence because humanity is becoming secularized, and in the church's secular activities it cannot compete with those other institutions which it is only imitating under a religious name, with the accompanying claim of a religious motive.

I feel quite certain that my revivalist had no conscious distrust as to his creed, but manifestly it had relatively small positive value for him. His trouble was not over creedal formulas, because these are always subject to an interpretation that is quite consistent with the individual's other intellectual attainments. Instead of being concerned with the end product of his thinking, the difficulties had more to do with his feeling attitude toward those end prod-

ucts and toward the underlying intellectual methods by which these formulas are attained. By the unconscious effects of conscious educational effort this parson had been habituated to such intellectual methods as incapacitated him for efficient work as a revivalist. Thus his intellectual self-respect came into conflict with his desire for efficiency in a field where untrained or hysterical emotions are everything and calm intellectual processes, acting in conscious relations with objectives, are as nothing. The Rev. Billy Sunday and his negro imitators are more efficient because free from the handicap of better intellectual development.

Ministers endorse Billy Sunday's work because they want congregations and are ashamed or unable to resort to his efficient means. Our educated preachers are seeking to promote religion by intellectual methods quite incompatible with the religious method, which is essentially emotional. Therefore the parson, who is specially well trained in maturer modes of thinking, does not and cannot facilitate the growth of experiential religion, or revivals. At best he can only promote a pseudo-scientific conviction about a religious subject-matter. For those who are still habituated to the religious mode of intellectualizing and rationalizing their feelings, the maturer process of inductively checking the emotions is beyond their capacity to appreciate or appropriate. Hence, with such an audience, my revivalist must inevitably be a failure.

It is not the denial of orthodox religious doctrine that is impairing the influence of the church. It is rather a change as to the place in our intellectual life which is given to feelings. It is not the power of the priest that is waning, except in the relative sense that the educated priest finds it distasteful to do that which alone would make him efficient in the old religious sense of producing an hysterical "change of heart." If the educated priest is to be influential among educated people, it must be on the basis of secular methods applied to secular interests. Many see this and act accordingly.

It is the influence of the intellectual method *behind* our changing concepts of a changing universe which is making the religious mode of intellectualizing and objectivizing our feelings more and more unsatisfactory for educated people. In other words, that infantile mode of thinking which inevitably underlies all religion, in its original sense, is passing away. Many cling to religious formulæ without

really having religion. They only affirm, thoughtlessly, some socially respectable statements about subjects of religious contemplation. This affirmation, even when it amounts to a serious conviction, is now very seldom the product of an act of faith or of the inward monitions of the spirit. Usually it is but the product of an unconscious assumption that traditional creeds are true. That cultural development which has already automatically limited religious experience has simultaneously minimized the importance of religion, and in due time will reduce all religions to the status of ancient mythologies or intellectualized wish-fulfilling phantasies.

The power of religion is waning because we are outgrowing religious modes of feeling and of thinking, and not because people are denying orthodox religious doctrines. Such denials of sacred formulas are mostly symptoms of the change in mental process. Suppressing the heretical doctrine can never be effective toward the hindrance of the procedure. Through analytic psychology we are already much acquainted with the mental mechanisms involved in the thinking process. Soon we shall know considerable about evolutionary psychology. When that time comes the scientific method will be more accurately and consciously formulated, and more generally and more thoroughly applied to religious psychology, as a means of revaluing the religious method and its resultant "truths." Even without that application, religion will come to be of no more consequence than a grown-up man's interest in that period when he normally had the measles. When men come to a mature understanding of genetic and evolutionary psychology, and apply that knowledge with scientific technique to the religions of the world, then the religious method and its resultant intellectual formulas will be looked upon as the inevitable accompaniment of the childhood of the race—something to be outgrown, just as thumbsucking is outgrown.

THE EROTOGENESIS OF RELIGION.

Studies Contributed by
THEODORE SCHROEDER.

Alienist and Neurologist, St. Louis.

1. The Erotogenesis of Religion. August, 1907; v. 28, pp. 330-341.
2. The Sexual Determinant in Mormon Theology. May, 1908; v. 29, pp. 208-222.
3. Developing a Working Hypothesis on the Erotogenesis of Religion. November, 1913; v. 34, pp. 444-476.
4. Heavenly Bridegrooms, by Theodore Schroeder and Ida C. November, 1915; v. 36, pp. 434-448; February, 1916; v. 37, pp. 52-69.
May, 1916; v. 37, pp. 211-222.
August, 1916; v. 37, pp. 259-267.
Because of the death of the editor, two numbers contained no instalment of this essay.
May, 1917; v. 38, pp. 121-146.
August, 1917; v. 38, pp.
November, 1917; v. 38, pp.
February, 1918; v. 39, pp.

Am. Jour. of Religious Psychology, Worcester, Mass.

5. Religion and Sensualism as connected by Clergymen. May, 1908; v. 3, pp. 16-28.
6. Outline Method for a Study of the Erotogenesis of Religion. October, 1912; v. 5, pp. 394-401.
7. Mathias the Prophet. Jan., 1913; v. 6, pp. 59-65.
8. Adolescence and Religion. April, 1913; v. 6, pp. 124-148.
9. The Erotogenetic Interpretation of Religion. Its Opponent Reviewed. January, 1914; v. 7, pp. 23-44.

Am. Jour. of Urology and Sexology, N. Y. City.

10. Incest in Mormonism. October, 1915; v. 11, pp. 409-416.

Bruno Chap Books, N. Y. City.

11. Erotogenesis of Religion. A Bibliography. February, 1916; v. 3, No. 2, 59 pages.

Forum, N. Y. City.

12. Proxies in Mormon Polygamy. March, 1916; v. 55, pp. 341-351.

Imago, Leipzig u. Wien.

13. Der Sexuelle Anteil an der Theologie der Mormonen. April, 1914; v. 3, pp. 197-204. Trans. of 2.

choanalytic Review, N. Y. City.

- The Wildisbuch Crucified Saint. Feb., 1914; v. 1, pp. 129-148.
15. Psychogenetics of Androcratic Evolution. July, 1915; v. 2, pp. 277-285.
16. Miscellaneous Abstracts. April, 1916; v. 3, pp. 223-230. (Contains large part of items 2, 10, 12, 13. Abstracted by the author.)

Sexual Probleme, Frankfurt, a. M.

17. Zum Theme: Religion und Sinnlichkeit; Auserungen von Geistlichen uber ihre Zusammenhang. March, 1914; v. 10, pp. 192-198. (Abridged Trans. of 5.)

Truth Seeker, N. Y. City.

18. An Odd Field of Inquiry. Jan. 30, 1904; v. 31, pp. 70-71. Included in Nos. 3 and 5.
19. The First Religion. Oct. 12, 1907; v. 34, pp. 641-643. (Same as 1.)
20. Revivals and Virtue. June 27, 1908; v. 35, pp. 401-402. (Same as 5.)
21. The Story of Mathias the Prophet. Feb. 15, 1913; v. 40, pp. 102-103. (Same as 7.)
22. The Differential Essence of Religion. October 31, November 7 and 14, 1914; v. 41, pp. 689-690; 706-707; 726-727.
23. Phases of Mormonism. Vicarious Vice, Vicarious Atonement and Especially Proxy Husbands for Certain Wives. April 1, 1916; v. 43, pp. 215-216. (Part of No. 12.)
24. The Mormon's Heaven. Absurdities dreamed of in its Theology. July 15, 1916; v. 43, pp. 449-450. Reproduces that part of item 2 which was included in item 16.)

Zeitschrift fur Religionspsychologie, Leipzig.

25. Erotogenese der Religion. March, 1908; v. 1, pp. 445-455. (Trans. of 1.)

Zentralblatt fur Psychoanalyse und Psychotherapie, Wiesbaden.

26. Die Gekreuzigte Heilige von Wildisbuch. June-July, 1914; v. 4, pp. 464-471. (Abridged Trans. of 14.)

Theodore Schroeder's Work upon this subject has been discussed in the following places:

27. Archives de Psychologie. February, 1914.
28. Boston Herald. April 10, 1915.
29. Current Opinion. March, 1915.
30. Journal of Religious Psychology. November, 1914.
31. N. Y. Times, Mag. Sec. April 4, 1915.
32. Psychoanalytic Review. January, 1915.
33. Truth Seeker. December 12, 1914.
34. Zeitschrift fur Angewandte Psychologie. 1915; v. 9, pp. 533-538.
35. Zeitschrift fur Religionspsychologie. 1908; v. 2, p. 28.
Pamphlet Reprints were issued on items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 17, 22, 25, 30, 32.