

Christian Government
— *Its Scientific Evolution*

Max Kappeler

Max Kappeler

Christian Government
— *Its Scientific Evolution*



Kappeler Institute Publishing

PO Box 99735, Seattle, WA 98139-0735

Phone: (206) 286-1617

FAX: (206) 286-1675

E-mail: mail@kappelerinstitute.org

Website: www.kappelerinstitute.org

First English Edition printed in London, England, 1946

Second English Edition printed in USA, 1953

Third English Edition printed in USA, 1991

German Translation: Christliche Regierung
– ihre wissenschaftliche Entfaltung,
printed in Switzerland, 1947

Copyright © 1953 by Max Kappeler

ISBN 0-85241-070-0

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 58-26852

All rights reserved under International and
Pan-American Copyright Conventions.

Printed in the USA by BookCrafters

FOREWORD

THE world to-day is full of unsolved problems about government; it would seek a reliable foundation on which to build. The writer of this work is convinced that only a thorough understanding of Christian Science, revealing the Science of the Bible, can meet this need. From such a viewpoint this book is addressed to students of Christian Science.

More and more questions arise about the discrepancy existing between the divine laws contained in the Christian Science textbook, *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, on one side and the restrictive by-laws in the "Manual of The Mother Church" on the other. The former teach that God alone is the lawgiver, executes laws and pronounces judgment, the latter give to some few human beings a large measure of executive and judicial power; the former give to every individual the right to teach and to preach, the latter limit this right to a few chosen ones; the former lead the students into unlimited freedom, the latter constitute "laws of limitation" (My. 229:26), as Mrs. Eddy herself calls the by-laws of the Manual. What is the solution to these questions? Is the movement going to put the textbook first, and thus interpret the Manual metaphysically? Or is it going to interpret the Manual humanly, and thus forsake the basis of divine law as explained in the textbook? The latter course would subjugate spiritual law to "laws of limitation."

A thorough study of the literary works of Mary Baker Eddy shows unquestionably that such a discrepancy does not in fact exist, and reveals that both books—the textbook and the Manual—fully support each other. The understanding of the inherently spiritual nature of the Manual, combined with an exact adherence to its letter, alone fulfil the purpose for which the Manual was intended,—namely, "to maintain the dignity and defense of our Cause . . ." (Man. p. 4).

In order to lead thought to a satisfactory solution, the pure Science of government is first expounded in Chapter I; then, in Chapter II, attention is drawn to what the concept of "church" implies. In Chapter III, "government" and "church" are both investigated with regard to human organization; and finally, the eternality of spiritual church-government, the government of the Church of Christ, Scientist, is presented in Chapter IV.

No effort is made to elaborate the whole theme in detail. Far more is it intended to arouse the thinker and to encourage him to investigate the subject himself in the published writings of Mary Baker Eddy. As a help towards this goal, some references to these writings are given at the bottom of the pages.

MAX KAPPELER.

FOREWORD TO THE THIRD ENGLISH EDITION, 1991

Kappeler's book "Christian Government — Its Scientific Evolution" was first published in England in 1946, in Switzerland 1947 and in USA 1953. It was written as an answer to John W. Doorly's excommunication from the Christian Science Church Organization in 1946. Doorly was known world-wide for more than 40 years as a practitioner, teacher, lecturer and — during the critical years of the "Christian Science Litigation" (1919-1920) — president of The Mother Church. His deep investigation into the question of what constitutes the Science and system of Christian Science brought him during World War II into disagreement with the Board of Directors in Boston, which finally culminated in his excommunication. A short survey of Doorly's view of what constitutes the Science and system as found in the Christian Science textbook, "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures" by Mary Baker Eddy, and the complete correspondence between Doorly and the Board of Directors is published in his "Statement" (obtainable free of charge). The whole issue can be reduced to the thousand-year old problem: Spirituality versus organized religion. Many of Doorly's students left The Mother Church organization but continued to remain adherents of the true Church, "the structure of Truth and Love; whatever rests upon and proceeds from divine Principle" (S&H 583:12).

Today the Christian Science organization is evidently in a state of deep crisis. The members of The Mother Church are aware that something is fundamentally wrong. The central problem turns around the question of the right interpretation of the Church Manual, which has been a stumbling block since Mrs. Eddy's time. Already, back in her later years, she was pressed to make a clear statement as to how the movement should be governed after she was no longer with us. At that time the 29 estoppel clauses in the Manual could be interpreted in two completely different ways:

- 1) the organization must be dissolved, because Mrs. Eddy's consent was no more obtainable;

- 2) the estoppel clauses need no longer be observed, so that the government of The Mother Church would fall into the hands of the Board of Directors, acting in place of Mrs. Eddy.

In view of this difficulty, it would have been easy for Mrs. Eddy to make a by-law which would have stated clearly, either that with her death the Board of Directors should take her place, or that the church organization should be dissolved. Her answer was, that God had told her to leave the Manual as it was.

The Manual, not being a legal document, can therefore not be understood legally; it is God's way of government and needs to be interpreted spiritually. Spirituality is not the outgrowth of human organization. Christian Science is the Science of Spirit and can only be understood in a scientifically spiritual way. No science can be institutionally organized; Truth must be forever unorganized. Spiritual growth is therefore synonymous with abandonment of human organization. Spirituality must keep human organization in its proper place.

Mrs. Eddy stated clearly that her successor is generic man (see My. 346:18-5), not a person or a body of people. Man's scientific understanding is the successor and will lead on the centuries. This understanding is gained through an understanding of the Christian Science textbook, which contains "the complete statement of Christian Science" (Ret. 37:2). This textbook does not mention the need of churches, church members, church organizations. It is not imaginable to have textbooks of other sciences with implications that their subject can only be practiced within the frame of an organization which has dictatorial authority on questions of right and wrong. Human organization is the very opposite of science and system. A scientific system is self-organizing and does not need a personal authority. In her heart, Mrs. Eddy did not want to organize the church; she did not even want a church. Her ideal was Science, and she uses this capitalized term about 1000 times in her textbook alone, whereas she never capitalizes "religion" and only uses this term a very few times positively, and never used the term "the religion of Christian Science". Her great goal was to lead the student to the point where he listens to God and can hear God speak; and by putting himself under the government of God, man is self-governed.

Why then, it is asked, did Mrs. Eddy organize a church? It was a concession to an infant understanding on the students' part, who could

not grasp at once the spiritual altitude of divine Science. Mrs. Eddy herself distrusted religious organization right from the beginning. In her first edition of the textbook she states that "we have no need of creeds and church organizations" and that "the mistake that the disciples of Jesus made to found religious organizations and church rites... was one the Master did not make..." (page 166). But the unenlightened cry still persists: Give us a king! Mrs. Eddy's concessions to church organization were always concessions for a certain period or for the logic of events, a "suffer it to be so now"; this "now" was a century ago. Thus she organized a church in 1879 and ten years later she disorganized it again because of her "growing conviction that every one should build on his own foundation, subject to the one builder and maker, God" (Ret. 48:7). Although the materially organized church was dissolved, the spiritually organized church still went on bringing forth renewed spiritual growth. But her students wanted a church. Thus in a letter written on March 23, 1892, to Wm. B. Johnson, clerk of the church, Mrs. Eddy states: "I wrote you, Mrs. Bartlett and others, not to organize a Church! Then it was reported that I gave the order to organize, but I did not." She was determined to found no material organization.

Mrs. Eddy's ideal was to establish Christian Science in world consciousness as Science and not as a church organization, but at her time this ideal was too high so she had to make concessions. As the church organization still exists today, it should not be forgotten what the motives for its founding were and how far these motives are still adequate to the requirements of our progressive age.

Then pressed by her students again in 1892, she finally gave her consent for reorganizing the church, adding: "If you reorganize it will ruin the prosperity of our church... I have consented to whatever the Church pleases to do, for I am not her keeper, and if she again sells her prosperity for a mess of pottage, it is not my fault." (Letter to Wm. B. Johnson in May 8, 1892). And in another letter she wrote: "When we will not learn in any other way, this is God's order of teaching us. His rod alone will do it." (Letter to Wm. B. Johnson in May 11, 1892).

In order not to destroy the budding thought, Mrs. Eddy made "concessions... for the advancement of spiritual good" (S&H 56:4) but stressing that it was only a "suffer it to be so now"; it was a submission to the lesser of two evils. When the church organization of 1892 was forced on her by the students, she made it clear that they would have to

pay a heavy price for it. She emphasized this attitude in a letter to Wm. B. Johnson on May 23, 1892: "Do not come under any obligations not to disorganize when the time comes; *remember this*." And in another letter to him (August 22, 1892) she insisted passionately that the establishment of a church was "not of God", that it had been "forced upon her", and that the proper place for it is "in the hearts of men".

In a science there is actually no such thing as a good or bad organization. Christian Science is the way out of religious organization. Mrs. Eddy made this very clear when she was asked in 1901: "How will it (The Church of Christ, Scientist) be governed after all now concerned in its government shall have passed on?" Her answer was: "It will evolve scientifically." (My. 342:25) Trying to find a right legal answer to the Manual does not touch the real issue, which is a wholly spiritually scientific one. The government depends on the spiritual level of the Christian Scientists' scientific understanding and not in the first place on that of the Board of Directors in Boston.

This was the issue which lay at the root of John W. Doorly's excommunication. He was a greatly devoted student and researcher of the Bible and of Mrs. Eddy's teachings. His investigations led him to see what Mrs. Eddy presented as the divine system of the Science of Christian Science. He taught it in his classes and lectures and presented it in his books. This deeper insight into Science, which has no place in organized religion, brought about his excommunication in 1946, and consequently his freedom to teach and write according to his highest scientific understanding; he put himself under the total government of Principle and its Science. Thus government evolved scientifically.

So organized religion was finally expelled from Science, — which actually must always be so. For the Christian Science church the disaster began. Doorly promised in 1945: "I am completely convinced that unless, as members of The Mother Church, we will awaken to the deeper, more exact and more scientific understanding of our Leader's revelation, also to the true nature of her church government, that in about 25 years from now the Christian Science church will be in danger of becoming another small religious denomination to which humanity will pay less attention than it is even now paying." ("Statement", p. 4) This prophecy fulfilled itself.

The book "Christian Government — Its Scientific Evolution" builds its reasoning entirely on Mrs. Eddy's teaching and seeks to show the basic ideas underlying the scientific evolution of church government. It shows that the dissolving of a materially organized church is not a matter of human decision and should not be undertaken prematurely, but will be the natural consequence, when Christian Scientists begin to understand Christian Science in its Science and system. The solution lies with the students and not with the Board of Directors in Boston; in a democratic government, in government by the people, the students are the people.

From the point of view of scientific evolution the unfoldment, which forces the Christian Scientists to reconsider the question of their church government, offers a great chance. The central and fundamental question is: Will mankind learn to govern itself divinely?

The Christian Scientist can give full attention to these questions by searching for an answer from the textbook and not from people, and can through the scientific evolution of church government exemplify to the world how any human government can gradually be overformed to the point where it finally gives way to man's self-government by God.

But in order to support this unfoldment the Christian Scientists must devote their energies to the individual research of the Science of Christian Science and to the necessity of asking themselves the question what constitutes its scientific nature. Do we understand what is meant by the 'Science' of Christian Science or by the 'system' of divine metaphysics, if for instance the textbook states: "Divine metaphysics is now reduced to a system..." (S&H 146:31)? Do we know what is meant by "the categories of metaphysics..." (S&H 269:13) or by the "divine infinite calculus" (S&H 520:14)? The answer to all such questions can be found in John W. Doorly's writings which help to lift the ecclesiastical-religious concept of Christian Science into scientific understanding. Then the government will evolve scientifically.

Addenda

Quotations from Mrs. Eddy's letters to the clerk of the Church of Christ, Scientist in Boston (from Carpenter: "Precepts" Vol. I and II)

March 23, 1892

Your only danger now lies in the past being repeated. ...I wrote you, ... not to organize a Church! There it was reported that I gave the order to organize, but I did not. ... Again I repeat, do not unless God speaks through me to you to do it, change your present materially disorganized — but spiritually organized — Church, nor its present form of Church government, and watch that the Directors are not carried to propose or to make changes relative to the present forms of Church work.

May 8, 1892

"I hope a word to the wise will again be sufficient. Hence my caution in this note. If you reorganize it will ruin the prosperity of our church. ... I have given full permission, or my poor consent, for the church to do anything she chooses. But I tell you the consequences of reorganizing and you will find I am right. Open the eyes of the church to these facts. I have consented to whatever the Church pleases to do, for I am not her keeper, and if she again sells her prosperity for a mess of pottage, it is not my fault."

May 10, 1892 (to the Church)

"I have said you have my permission to reorganize, if you desire to do this. But I also realize it is my duty to say that our Father's hand was seen in your disorganizing, and I foresee that if you reorganize you are liable to lose your present prosperity and your form of church government, which so far has proved itself wise and profitable, ..."

May 11, 1892

"I seem to hear so plainly tonight the words that tell me I am doing too much for the Church in Boston, more than is my duty to do. All her disputations are laid on my bending shoulders. ... let it, the church, reorganize if she thinks best. Perhaps this is the best lesson for her. ... Now let her pass on to her experience and the sooner the better. When we will not learn in any other way, this is God's order of teaching us. His rod alone will do it. And I am at last willing *and shall struggle* no more."

May 23, 1892

"Do not come under any obligations not to disorganize when the time comes; *remember this.*"

August 22, 1892

Drop all further movements towards chartering a church in Boston! God is not pleased with this movement that has been forced on me to attempt. — Let there first be a Church of Christ in *reality* — and in the hearts of men — before one is organized. — You are not ready for His Church. — Now *incorporate at once* by whatever name you please — so that the Building funds can be legally turned over to you. This absolves me from all future *loss of God*, from any dealings with infants in Christian Science.

Letter from Bicknell Young to Dr. de Lange, May 4, 1937:

“What we have now to run the Christian Science organization, our Leader never established. She set up two co-ordinating boards with deeds of trust to serve as a balance. They worked together while she was here to control them, but as soon as she left, they each wanted the power, especially the Board of Directors. They appealed and resorted to the advice of human lawyers and the court. (Paul appealed to Caesar.) Nothing has gone right since 1910 when she left; it has not been carried on according to Mrs. Eddy’s intentions.

“Politics chiefly and financial pressure seems rampant, and the only answer to all that error is that the Christ must prevail.

“The ‘estoppel clauses’ in the Manual have not been heeded nor obeyed. They are a protective measure to our cause. Some, selfishly, even tried to persuade Mrs. Eddy to remove them from the Manual, but she would not because they were divinely inspired to prevent hierarchical control and domination; also to gradually dissolve an organizational sense of church and Being. Our office and function is to live the Christ, which is the one and only power of the divine Mind, Life, Love, Being.”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD	
INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	1
I. THE SCIENCE OF GOVERNMENT	
1. The law of God	5
2. The government of God.	6
3. The rights and duties of man	12
(a) The rights	
(b) The duties	
4. Divine justice	24
II. THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, SCIENTIST	
1. Definitions of Church	26
2. Christian Science not yet fully understood	31
3. The unfoldment of Christian Science	37
4. Pioneers and reformers	44
5. Retrospection	47
III. THE MOTHER CHURCH, THE FIRST CHURCH OF CHRIST, SCIENTIST, IN BOSTON, MASSA- CHUSETTS	
1. Organization.	52
2. The Manual of The Mother Church	60
3. The government of The Mother Church	68
4. The rules and by-laws of the Manual of The Mother Church and absolute doctrines of Chris- tian Science	74
IV. THE CONTINUITY OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, SCIENTIST	86
APPENDIX	103

When quoting from Mary Baker Eddy's books, the following abbreviations have been used:—

S. & H.	Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures
Mis. . . .	Miscellaneous Writings
Man. . . .	Manual of The Mother Church
Chr. . . .	Christ and Christmas
Ret. . . .	Retrospection and Introspection
Un. . . .	Unity of Good
Pul. . . .	Pulpit and Press
Rud. . . .	Rudimental Divine Science
No. . . .	No and Yes
'00. . . .	Message to The Mother Church, June 1900
'01. . . .	Message to The Mother Church, June 1901
'02. . . .	Message to The Mother Church, June 1902
Hea. . . .	Christian Healing
Peo. . . .	The People's Idea of God
My. . . .	The First Church of Christ, Scientist, and Miscellany

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

IN presenting the subject of church government, it may be expedient in the first place to clarify three fundamental metaphysical facts which underlie the whole problem.

1. THE THREE DEGREES OF THE "SCIENTIFIC TRANSLATION OF MORTAL MIND"

(S. & H. 115:19)

In Christian Science, every human problem can be summarized in the *three degrees*, as depicted in their general meaning by Mary Baker Eddy in the "Scientific Translation of Mortal Mind," as given on page 115:19-3 of her textbook, *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*. The "first degree," under the heading "Depravity" and "Physical," presents "unreality;" the "second degree," under the heading "Evil beliefs disappearing" and "Moral," depicts the "transitional qualities;" the third, and highest degree, under the heading "Understanding" and "Spiritual," explains "reality." The student of the Christian Science textbook should gain some understanding of these three degrees and also recognize the degrees of which he is speaking or writing.

For instance, if the student is speaking of the problem of man as mortal, material or sensual, he is referring to the concept of man as given in the *first degree*, the Adam-man. If the characteristics are those of the human man, with a human mind, which might be described as containing a certain proportion of mortal mind and a complementary proportion of divine Mind, the student is referring to the concept of man in the *second degree*, or on a transitional plane. This state of manhood indicates an increase in thought of the proportion of the divine Mind and an equal reduction in the proportion of mortal mind. In the *third degree*, Mary Baker Eddy speaks of man in the absolute, sometimes defining him more closely as the spiritual man, the

Christ-man, generic man, and the ideal man. Here mortal mind disappears and man enters into his primal status of complete spirituality, where the material, sensual man ceases to exist. Thus one sees that whenever the term "man" is used, the student must be quite clear which of the three degrees he is referring to—otherwise there will be misunderstanding and misapprehension. Especially is this true with regard to the human man and the spiritual man, and between these a clear distinction must be drawn. The human mind is apt to accept the human concept of man as the true and perfect man, and therefore has, as its ultimate goal, life and health in matter instead of in Spirit.

2. THE RELATIVE AND ABSOLUTE POINTS OF VIEW

The *beginner* in Christian Science sometimes thinks the explanations given in the Christian Science textbook are *inconsistent* and even contradictory. He may read on one page, for instance, that God knows no such things as sin, sickness, and death, and on another that God heals the sick, saves the sinner, and raises the dead. He finds himself asking: How can God, who knows no sickness, heal the sick? If God heals the sick, he reasons, then God must know sickness.

The *student* who has looked more deeply into these things, and who consequently has a clearer sense of spiritual values, *finds no such contradictions*. In fact, he has come to realize that the statements containing these seeming contradictions confirm one another. That Mary Baker Eddy experienced difficulty in making this subject clear to the student is brought out in her article "Caution in the Truth" in *Unity of Good*. The title itself is significant, and in the first few lines she points out that "one of the 'things hard to be understood' " is the fact that "God knows no such thing as sin" (Un. 1:3-4).

A satisfactory answer can be found only as the student of Christian Science is able to distinguish the angle, or point of view, from which the subject is regarded,—whether from the *absolute* standpoint or the *relative*. Considered from the absolute, God knows no such things as sin, sickness, and death: but

seen from the relative, it may be said that God comes to us, pities us, and heals us. In other words, Christ comes to the flesh and destroys the errors of the flesh. This is a process which takes place in the relative or human consciousness,—never in the absolute or divine consciousness.

3. PERFECTION *versus* CONDEMNATION TO TILL THE GROUND

The Christianly scientific student's aim is to progress out of the first and second degrees of the "Scientific Translation of Mortal Mind" (*ibid.*) into the third degree, where "mortal mind disappears, and man as God's image appears" (S. & H. 116: 4-5). How can he attain this? The answer is that only by *reasoning from the absolute*,—that God knows no such thing as evil,—can satisfactory progress be made. The answer to every human problem always lies in the attainment of a higher spiritual understanding of God. There is no other starting-point, no other basis from which to reason, since the relative standpoint is but an exemplification of the divine process on the material or human plane. In spite of human belief in matter and the flesh, we may see God. Job said: "Yet in my flesh shall I see God" (Job 19:26).¹

Mortal mind would suggest another way by which to progress,—namely, "by thought tending spiritually upward . . . to destroy materiality" (S. & H. 545:9-10). Mary Baker Eddy calls this process "the condemnation of mortals to till the ground" (S. & H. 545:7). This method is disheartening because it starts from the imperfect point of view, instead of from the perfect. It admits, at the outset, that there is something to be improved, whereas scientific reasoning is always along the line of *perfection* and regards error and all relative conditions as states which will disappear when correct spiritual foundations and facts are understood.

Any scientific unfolding, evolution, or progress, therefore, must rightly start from the basis of the third degree—"Under-

¹ S. & H. 320 : 24-5

standing.” The wholly *spiritual aspect* of a problem must be fully grasped before Truth can act upon the erroneous condition and so be manifested in the second degree as improvement,—in other words, before the proportion of thought based on the divine Mind can be increased and the seeming proportion of mortal mind be lessened. To admit a human or even a material situation as something fixed and definite, or to take it as a basis on which to build or to elaborate further, is always fatal in metaphysics. Divinely, the spiritual status is all that matters. Nothing else ever counts.

I. THE SCIENCE OF GOVERNMENT

1. THE LAW OF GOD

"Law constitutes government," writes Mary Baker Eddy in the *Manual of The Mother Church, The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts* (Art. I, Sect. 9). Since cause determines effect, a correct appreciation of *law* is necessary in order to demonstrate a true government. But law in Christian Science is quite distinct from laws adopted for the regulation of civil, political, social, economic and religious affairs,—distinct from their nature and essence, as well as from their origin and motivation. Consequently, it is important to get a correct understanding of the basis and origin of fundamental law and its inherent nature.

Modern democracies have abolished, to some extent, those laws which allow men to act arbitrarily. They have adopted a higher sense of law,—law which does not require the subject to obey the will of a single individual. Even the king is under God and the law. But who has created such law? Who has conceived it? Though this law has come through the developed thinking of leading, outstanding men and women, and has been kept abreast of the times by them, the fact remains that such a standard of law has been instituted by human beings and adopted by the majority of the community. And what of the minority? Is it not an impairment of individual rights that the minority must support the will of the majority? Is the majority always right? The antinomy between *liberal idealism* and *democracy*, and the frictions arising from it, are well known, and point to an unquestionable fact,—that the harmonious and fundamental law of government has not yet been established. The world of to-day clamors for a solution.

Mary Baker Eddy, who discovered the Science of all sciences, has given an answer regarding these leading questions in her

explanation of the Science of divine and Christian government. She has established the fact that law is not created by a single man, ruler, king, or despot, nor by a majority of people; but is eternally vested in God, divine Principle, alone. *God* is the *lawmaker* and *lawgiver*; He is law to Himself.¹ This lawgiver is described as divine Mind, the omnipotent, infinite All.² He is Spirit, and His laws are purely spiritual.³ He is the "law-creating, law-disciplining, law-abiding Principle" (Mis. 206: 18-19), which needs no help from persons in order to demonstrate itself, and is free from the beliefs and prejudices of human beings, societies, isms and ologies. Nowhere in her writings does Mary Baker Eddy indicate that man could create real laws, or enforce and develop them. Besides God there is no true law-maker, and the realization of this truth establishes one universal law, bringing freedom, harmony, perfection, eternity, and never causing division, friction, discord and decay.⁴ Moreover, God's laws apply to all equally and are forever universal.

Any attempt to enforce other laws and statutes than the *spiritual laws* of God must sooner or later lead to discord and so hinder progress. "Human law is right only as it patterns the divine" (My. 283:26).

2. THE GOVERNMENT OF GOD

Government is the execution of law. The differing forms of government may be classified according to the nature of the laws on which they are based. *Anarchy* implies an absence of law. *Autocracy* may be defined as absolute authority exercised by one person, or by a small group of persons. *Democracy* is described as sovereign power exercised directly or indirectly by the majority of the people. *Theocracy* is government under the immediate direction of the will of God. When law is vested in God, divine Principle, then God, not man, governs. In such government, there is no ruling of man over man as in an

¹ Mis. 258 : 12-13 ; S. & H. 184 : 12-15 : S. & H. 381 : 15-16

² My. 108 : 15-16

³ S. & H. 434 : 30-2

⁴ Mis. 259: 14-18; Mis. 208 : 6-10; No. 10 : 27-3

autocracy, or even in a democracy, for all men owe allegiance to God alone.

Divine Science reveals that God, the infinite All-in-all, is not only the universal legislator, but also the sole executive power, the *Supreme Ruler*,¹ governing man in perfect harmony. St. Paul spoke of "one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all" (Eph. 4:6). As there is but one lawgiver, the divine Mind, and but one governor, the divine Principle, man and the universe are governed harmoniously and intelligently. All action, volition, functions, relations, plans—all that is real and true from the infinitesimal to infinity—are embraced in God's government.

Perfect *government* will not become apparent until *Christ*, God's ideal, is understood spiritually and scientifically. Of this Christ it is written, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder" (Isa. 9:6), and Mary Baker Eddy prophesied: "Christ, God's idea, will eventually rule all nations and peoples—imperatively, absolutely, finally—with divine Science" (S. & H. 565:16-18).

That the understanding of true government must be based on Science becomes even more certain as we apprehend the close relation forever existing between Science and government. Mrs. Eddy writes: "The term Science, properly understood, refers only to the laws of God and to His government of the universe, inclusive of man" (S. & H. 128:4-6).² Just as every other subject must be learned scientifically, so man must gain a spiritual and *scientific understanding* of the divine Principle of the universe and of its absolute government.³ In the measure that he realizes this fact will ideal government appear. This government is infinitely good, and man is tributary to it alone, and must ever remain in obedience to the law of God.⁴ Subjection to so-called laws which rest on belief, blind faith, emotion, stereotyped doctrines, dogmas, personal opinions, and the like,

¹ S. & H. 590 : 15-19

² Mis. 58 : 22-25; S. & H. 264 : 32-1; S. & H. 219 : 20-21

³ S. & H. 304 : 22-26; S. & H. 536 : 8-9; S. & H. 141 : 21-26;
S. & H. 39 : 22-27

⁴ S. & H. 14 : 9-11; Mis. 199 : 1-8; My. 278 : 1-2; Ret. 90 : 29-2

results in restrictive laws, slavery, and inadequate forms of government.¹

It is well to remember, therefore, that the government of the universe, including man, can be based neither on material nor on human laws,² also that any interference with God's law is inadmissible.³ Consequently, human opinions, concepts, ways and means must be eliminated. The physical and moral (transitional) must give place to the *spiritual*. The spiritual must be attained through a right apprehension of God as Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, and Love; also through the understanding of Christ, God's spiritual ideal; and through divine Science and Christian Science.

The question may arise: What relations exist between spiritual, human, and material government, and which must have the preponderance? It is a rule of Science that *the greater controls the lesser*; the higher governs the lower.⁴ Man, the governed, is subject to God who governs. Man cannot, therefore, make laws either for God or for man. Mortal man has no dominion over his fellow-man and consequently cannot govern him. Ethically, there can be no question among men, "Who shall be greatest?"

Mary Baker Eddy leaves no doubt that spiritual *understanding* is always higher than *belief*, higher than faith, far above ritualism and creed.⁵ Christian Science likewise teaches that divine laws cannot be circumscribed by human and material laws or forms, for the greater cannot be put into the lesser.⁶

As we understand the supremacy of Spirit and the nothingness of matter, we shall be ready to admit that the higher is a rebuke to the lower,⁷ that the *lesser* must *yield* to the *greater*,—must, in fact, give itself up and disappear. Human experience is but a transitory, shadowy state, hinting at reality in a greater or lesser degree. As has been previously stated, the final solu-

¹ Rud. 10 : 5-9; S. & H. 184 : 17-18; S. & H. 225 : 2-3; S. & H. 282 : 23-25

² S. & H. 83 : 16-20; S. & H. 231 : 12-16

³ S. & H. 62 : 22-26

⁴ S. & H. 121 : 22-24; S. & H. 318 : 28

⁵ S. & H. 458 : 20-22

⁶ S. & H. 467 : 17-23; S. & H. 223 : 9-12

⁷ S. & H. 589 : 19-22

tion to human problems will not be found in working up from the material through the human to the spiritual. Such a process only involves "the condemnation of mortals to till the ground" (*ibid.*). Spiritual thinking must always be from the absolute.

In the spiritual realm, the greater controls the lesser; so in the suppositional material realm, the stronger erroneous thought claims to rule and to dominate the weaker.¹ And so we ask: What rules—the *majority* or the *minority*? Democracies have accepted the rule that the majority governs the minority. That which the majority decides upon, must be accepted by all, even if, at certain times, the rights and freedom of the minority are thereby curtailed. Is this divinely scientific? No. In God's sight all men are equal; no one is more important than another, although each maintains his eternal individuality in Science.² Christian Science shows that in human experience the beliefs which are in the majority seem to rule,³ but it also teaches that through scientific understanding man can rise above the majority of human opinions and find that "one on God's side is a majority," because Science teaches man how to demonstrate his divine Principle.⁴ It will thus be seen that scientific *understanding* reigns even over the majority of human *opinions*.⁵

As spiritual understanding develops, a more perfect government must become apparent. This applies equally to the government of the human body and to the government of the body of the Christian Science movement. Every body, individual or politic, reflects exactly what governs it, whether it is *Science* or mere *religious faith*, understanding or mortal belief, progressive thinking or apathy, original thinking or mass-thinking.⁶ Hence the necessity for guarding thought against wrong motives, erroneous judgments, sentimentalism, emotion, self-seeking,

¹ S. & H. 154 : 16-21; S. & H. 198 : 23-28

² Pul. 4 : 7-14

³ S. & H. 155 : 3-11; S. & H. 177 : 25-7; S. & H. 164 : 17-23

⁴ S. & H. 155:11-14; Mis. 102:27-31; Pul. 4:14-17; Mis. 245:23-29; No. 45:24-2

⁵ S. & H. 62 : 27-28; My. 293 : 32-6; S. & H. 323 : 17-18; S. & H. 569 : 6-11

⁶ S. & H. 324 : 7-11

apathy, and other mortal beliefs which endanger the health of the human body and of the body politic. Forward steps in human government must come from spiritualized thinking, from the scientific understanding of the government of divine Principle, Love, which is able to solve every problem.

Are Christian Scientists working out God's government in matters affecting their own bodies, the Christian Science movement, and the world? Democracy will certainly fail unless democracy patterns theocracy.¹ In order to gain a purer sense of democracy, we must first gain a *scientific understanding of theocracy*—the government of God, the reign of divine Science. This Science rests on one universal Principle. When divine Principle is understood scientifically, even by a minority, the understanding of Science by that minority will control the majority,—those who do not understand, but who merely believe, who “having ears, hear not.” No other government can hold crime in check or give a satisfactory solution to the present world problems. But progressive steps in spiritual understanding must include honesty in admitting past failures; also willingness to part with old concepts in order to make room for the new wine.

With the coming of a more progressive period, men began to question the right of man to rule over his brother. Mary Baker Eddy, who must be regarded as one of the most liberal-minded thinkers the world has ever known, gives a clear answer in her writings. In unmistakable terms she declares that in divine Science man is governed by God alone. Man, as God's reflection, was given *dominion* over all the earth. He was given the ability to know as God knows, *i.e.*, to understand and demonstrate spiritual reality. Any government which gives man the power to dominate his fellow-man humanly is Christianly unscientific, since it would presuppose more than one Principle. Mary Baker Eddy states this clearly: “If the individual governed human consciousness, my statement of Christian Science would be disproved; but to demonstrate Science and its pure monotheism—one God, one Christ, no idolatry, no human

¹ My. 283 : 26-28

propaganda—it is essential to understand the spiritual idea” (My. 303:15-19). Scientific understanding of the spiritual idea alone governs: nothing else can. This understanding does not give man the power to dominate or control his fellow-man, but it enables every man to demonstrate his unity with God; and unity with God is the only majority rule.

The spiritual idea will evolve true government. It must therefore have free course. Democracy patterns this requirement by allowing the vox populi *free speech* and *open criticism*, both of which have their proper place in the Christianly scientific government.¹ If they are lacking, there is danger of autocracy.

Evolution makes strong demands on men, and this is true in questions of government as in all else. In general, people are willing to leave the physical (the first degree of mortal mind) with its depraved qualities, but they are not so willing to strive to lay down those moral qualities which are described by Mary Baker Eddy as being transitional in nature. The present age, however, demands that man leave not only the first but also the second degree, since no rightful government can be built on either basis. The first and second degrees have to be superseded. “Mistaken or transient views are human: they are not governed by the Principle of divine Science: but the notion that a mind governed by Principle can be forced into personal channels, affinities, self-interests, or obligations, is a grave mistake; it dims the true sense of God’s reflection, and darkens the understanding that demonstrates above personal motives, unworthy aims and ambitions” (Mis. 291:1-8). It should be constantly kept in mind that transient views are human (second degree) and that they do not originate in the Principle of divine Science. When human forms of government are superseded and human thought is finally relinquished, man will find himself governed by God alone, entirely, absolutely, and finally. This development comes as the result of a clearer apprehension of the law-enforcing Principle of divine Science. Even the best forms of human government at the present time must evolve

¹ Mis. 80 : 16-23; My. 240 : 15-19

scientifically, and the *Science* that governs these changes must be spiritually understood.¹ The more spiritual and scientific the apprehension, the more natural will be the evolution.

3. THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF MAN

The Bible and the Christian Science textbook teach that man is created in the image and likeness of God. Man, therefore, possesses and reflects the nature and quality of God. He reflects the great lawgiver, and so becomes a law unto himself. Thus he can claim the right to be governed by God alone. The relation of God and man is fixed and based on Science; it cannot be changed. The question then arises: How is man governed? It is revealed that God's government of man consists of definite spiritual laws, rights, and duties.

(a) THE RIGHTS OF MAN

The development of the rights of man in human experience has had a long and bloody history. All down the ages man has fought for his birthright,—for liberty. He values liberty above all his possessions; when it is attacked, he is even willing to risk his life for it. But man had never claimed his full freedom and true birthright until Mary Baker Eddy discovered divine Science, which enables him to free himself not only from the bondage and slavery of other men, but also from myriad false beliefs. This is the great forward step of the present age and leads to ultimate perfection. A *new Bill of Rights* has been given, namely: "The Magna Charta of Christian Science means much, *multum in parvo*,—all-in-one and one-in-all. It stands for the inalienable, universal rights of men. Essentially democratic, its government is administered by the common consent of the governed, wherein and whereby man governed by his creator is self-governed" (My. 246:30-5). Every Christian Scientist must understand these inalienable rights which are contained in the Magna Charta of Christian Science, and which coincide

¹ S. & H. 224 : 4-10

with the teachings of the Bible. In the case on trial, in the textbook, Mrs. Eddy writes: "The attorney, Christian Science, then read from the supreme statute-book, the Bible, certain extracts on the Rights of Man, remarking that the Bible was better authority than Blackstone" (S. & H. 437:32-2).

Man's birthright is divine, and it is his right and duty to claim it.¹ Ignorance of his God-given rights leads only to slavery and demoralization, just as blind obedience to human and material laws, rules, and regulations would finally do.² It follows that man's *full rights* must be acknowledged, supported, and *granted*, since every law of limitation, every curtailment of divine rights, is an error in itself and must eventually be overcome.³

What are man's rights? Let us consider some of them.

Mind, God, the divine intelligence, gives man the *right to think*, to think independently, dependent only on divine Mind. He has the right to think genuinely, progressively, definitely, correctly, individually, rightly, and fearlessly. The ability to *reason* is one of man's divine rights.⁴ He has the right to know God, and to be taught about Him unrestrictedly. The teachings of Jesus were for all peoples and for all times; and so are the teachings of Christian Science.

The right to think gives man also the *right of choice*; he can choose for himself, and needs no human propaganda or channels through which he may be erroneously influenced.⁵ He has the right of honest *investigation* and *conviction*;⁶ the right to *say* and *write* what he thinks to be true, good, honest, and necessary, and to act accordingly. He has also the right to be esteemed for thinking and acting according to his best understanding, though this right does not always seem to be acknowledged as it should be.⁷

Mary Baker Eddy lays much stress on the *right of conscience*.

¹ S. & H. 226:14-21; S. & H. 228:14-16

² S. & H. 227:3-13

³ Mis. 266:4-6

⁴ S. & H. 106:7-9

⁵ Ret. 71:11-14

⁶ Mis. 246:31-5

⁷ Un. 5:19-27

She states: "God has endowed man with inalienable rights, among which are self-government, reason, and conscience" (S. & H. 106:7-9).¹ Conscience is the faculty by which to distinguish right from wrong. The human desire is often to tell another what he should think and do, and what is right or wrong in a given case. The apathetic thinker is no friend of the right of conscience. He either gets stirred up too much or he aimlessly resists conscience.² If there is no progressive thinking and no right of conscience, mankind will never awaken out of its false dreams. On the other hand, the one who is honest enough to act according to his convictions enters new fields of thought and cannot go back. To utilize the rights of conscience demands a whole man. "The man of integrity is one who makes it his constant rule to follow the road of duty, according as Truth and the voice of his conscience point it out to him" (Mis. 147:14-16).³

The Mind of Christ gives to every man, as God's reflection, the *right of vision*. The revelations of God belong to all equally. They can neither be monopolized nor controlled by a certain class of people, nor can a certain category be responsible for new vision. All men have equal opportunities, and vision is a universal gift.

Without the right to think, and to think deeply and unrestrictedly, because "The time for thinkers has come" (S. & H. vii:13), no progress is possible. The divine urge demands that man part with his old beliefs and rise into higher realms.⁴ Spiritual ideas unfold forever. So man has the *right of progress*, the right to go forward and to leave his mental cradle. Stagnation, which keeps thought in ancient ruts, and which would fight every new idea, is opposed to man's right of progress. Where there is no unfoldment there is no *spiritual history*, but "Christian Science and Christian Scientists will, *must*, have a history" (Mis. 106:3-4). It is the duty and the right of man to labor unceasingly for the development of new ideas, for a

¹ My. 220 : 29-32

² Mis. 237 : 16-21; Mis. 236 : 10-14

³ Peo. 13 : 12-16

⁴ Rud. 8 : 15-18

higher understanding of God and His Christ, and for the spiritualization of life and being that Christian Science makes possible.

Perhaps the most treasured right of man is *freedom*. True freedom in Christian Science is won through identification with God, whereby man frees himself from all material or human so-called influences.¹ As long as the divine order of God's government is upheld, there is freedom, because the law of God is then acting unrestrictedly.² Freedom in Christian Science is something much more significant than human freedom. It is wholly spiritual. Through revolutions and wars, human liberties and rights have been acquired. Yet an even greater struggle awaits mankind, a struggle for freedom from sin, sickness, death, material sense, human codes, scholastic theology, materia medica, hygiene, false laws, ignorant beliefs,—in short, freedom from every sort of physical and mental error.³

Right motives are necessary in order to gain this freedom, and these *right motives* must have *free course*. Freedom to speak and to write belongs essentially to man.⁴ If this freedom is impaired, stagnation follows in its train. Mary Baker Eddy asserts that censorship is a form of inhumanity and fosters error. Ecclesiasticism, priesthood, and mysticism have always tried to rob man of his freedom to worship God according to the dictates of enlightened conscience. This form of mental aggressive suggestion and despotism is not yet fully destroyed; it still whispers silently and audibly.⁵

Democracies do not grant unrestricted freedom. A wrong sense of freedom can be bondage. And so we are faced with the paradox that freedom is sometimes restricted in order to have freedom. There can be freedom in limitations, but it must be made perfectly clear that only unlicensed and false freedom calls for restriction. Freedom in its pure sense is *disciplined freedom*, a freedom that is the direct result of obedience to universal Principle, which makes strong demands

¹ S. & H. 90 : 24-25; S. & H. 114 : 23-27

² Mis. 259 : 14-21

³ Mis. 101 : 8-13; S. & H. 226 : 5-13; S. & H. 226 : 25-2; S. & H. 228 : 11-19

⁴ No. 45 : 24-2

⁵ Mis. 246 : 1-12; My. 117 : 22-27

on man. Unlicensed freedom is lawlessness: true freedom is law-abiding. All these facts apply essentially to Christian Science. Freedom must be something higher than the mere human sense of it.¹ Man is not free to sin, offend, slander, gossip, or condemn. Freedom to do wrong is no freedom at all, but slavery. The freedom of Soul must be in complete obedience to divine Principle, and therefore implies divine duties. Freedom and duty must unite in the harmony of Science.² Faith, blind belief, sentimentalism, emotionalism, untempered zeal, and sectarian beliefs bring no lasting freedom, but ultimate in disaster, because they are not based on scientific understanding. Even seemingly good motives can be disastrous, unless they are controlled by Science. That which controls unlicensed freedom is, therefore, first, a scientific understanding of God, divine Principle, and second, man's duty—not to person, but to God.

Whereas in everyday affairs the rights of men are determined by human methods, Christian Science teaches that nothing but divine Principle can rightly determine them.³ It is man's inalienable *right* to claim his *unity with God*, and this unity bestows *self-government*. Man is self-governed, by reflection; and so governs himself.⁴ In other words, man in Science subordinates himself to the one universal, divine Principle. Insubordination to Principle leads to chaos.⁵ True self-government demands freedom from evil suggestions and from personal interference.

In Christian Science, God is revealed as the infinite individuality, which is reflected in individual spiritual man.⁶ Man, therefore, has the divine *right* to preserve and develop his *individuality*.⁷ The clearer his understanding of spiritual individuality becomes, the more apparent is his true manhood. Yet mortal mind is always trying to materialize and personalize individuality, and to form it after its own pattern. Whatever

¹ S. & H. 552 : 19-21

² Mis. 297 : 28-29

³ S. & H. 226: 18-21

⁴ S. & H. 125: 16-17; S. & H. 106: 9-11; '01. 20: 5-6

⁵ S. & H. 236: 21-22

⁶ S. & H. 281: 14-17

⁷ S. & H. 317: 16-20

materializes or personalizes our lives, government, freedom, or trend of thought and action cripples our true individuality. One great foe is conventionality, which suggests that mankind should think, act, proceed, govern, and live schematically, and woe to him who would interfere with this scheme! Yet, from the divine standpoint, schemes and formulas kill the spirit, and with it divine infinite individuality. Man, therefore, has not only the divine right but also the duty to do what God requires of him,—namely, to think and act according to his highest understanding; and with it goes the right to be esteemed and supported by his fellow-man. Individuality knows no competition and no limits, for it is infinite. All men have equal rights, even though their individualities are distinct and differ from each other.¹ To be exactly like another is impossible in Science. God knows best what is necessary for each man, but his brother may not know. Personal domination ultimates in disaster, both for the one who dominates and for the one who is dominated, unless it is corrected by Science.²

Christian Science teaches that it is the all-important *right* of man to be the *son of God*. Man has divine authority to claim this birthright and to recognize God as his only Father. Man is therefore heir to a great estate, the kingdom of heaven. He is free born. “Man is not made to till the soil. His birthright is dominion, not subjection. He is lord of the belief in earth and heaven,—himself subordinate alone to his Maker. This is the Science of being” (S. & H. 517:31-4).

In various ways Mary Baker Eddy in her writings emphasizes that God gave man *dominion* over all the *earth*, but that man himself is subject to God alone. He has the divine right to dominate error through spiritual understanding and to be its master.³

Every man can individually claim his birthright to be the son of God; consequently, *all men are equal* before God. There is no distinction; no questioning: Who shall be greatest? All

¹ Ret. 70: 14-19; Ret. 85: 16-17

² S. & H. 155: 11-14; S. & H. 392: 17-21; S. & H. 73: 8-14

³ No. 40: 14-22; '01. 20: 2-8; S. & H. 380: 19-21

have equal opportunities, equal rights and privileges.¹ In God's sight, there can be no class distinction and no sex distinction, for instance. It follows, therefore, that preference given to one class or sex is contrary to the doctrine of Christian Science, since it is based on a human and material classification.² In divine diversification and classification, all good is available to each of God's ideas.

The foregoing expositions have attempted to present some of the most vital rights of man. They do not, of course, contain a complete list, and are not intended to do so. The purpose has been to draw attention to the fact that the real *rights* of man are entirely *derived from God*, and that man, of himself, cannot institute them.

In this connection, it may be helpful to investigate briefly the *erroneous suggestions* of mortal mind, sent out in an attempt to destroy man's divine rights.

Reason, intelligence, and vision are opposed by *ignorance*, material knowledge, and material science, and sometimes by a blind zeal to work for God. A lack of scientific understanding of the divine Mind enslaves man and robs him of harmony.³

The right of progress is threatened when the purely spiritual method is adulterated by material or *human ways and means*. In the divine order, the fruits of Spirit can be brought forth only by spiritual development. If this order is interfered with, man's rights are endangered, since material or human footsteps, laws, and rules cannot result in spiritual attainment.⁴

Liberty is lost as soon as the attempt is made to *put* that which is *spiritual into* that which is *material*, the infinite into the finite, the greater into the lesser, the impersonal into the personal, or to rule the greater by the lesser, the divine by the human. From this fact arises the opposition of sinful humanity to the Science of Soul.⁵

¹ Mis. 291: 12-16; My. 181: 13-20; My. 230: 9-10

² S. & H. 63: 12-17; My. 247: 5-9; No. 45: 13-20

³ S. & H. 280: 30-4; S. & H. 381: 2-4; S. & H. 7:10-14; S. & H. 214: 21-25

⁴ S. & H. 4: 32-2; S. & H. 106: 12-14

⁵ S. & H. 315: 16-20; S. & H. 224: 28-4

Manifold are the arguments of evil against the indisputable unity that exists between God and man. The belief that *man* is *separated from God*, that he is dependent on other men, on organizations, societies, popularity, etc., is altogether destructive. It leads to the belief in "gods many." Strict reliance on the one divine Principle alone preserves the right of self-government. Dependence on persons or things destroys it. The same is true if man has a personal sense of himself and of his capabilities and faculties.

The right of individual life is disputed by the belief that man lives in matter,—that life is not wholly spiritual, but material, structural, and organic. These beliefs limit individuality, make *life schematic*, stamp it with *routine*, and render it soulless and colorless.

The belief that man can humanly rule over man must be energetically disputed. It is the old Adam-belief, which always results in disaster.¹ If mortal man had the right to *rule over* his *brother*, he would also have the right to judge according to his own will and human reasoning, thus denying the right of everyone to self-government. The result would be a false classification and grading of human beings and their activities which, from a divine standpoint, would have to be defined as the reign of injustice. Justice upholds freedom. Injustice is bondage.²

Legion are the methods adopted by mortal mind to disprove the right of every man to be the beloved son of God. Hate, malice, envy, jealousy, fear, treason, and hypocrisy are the most common. *Fear* of punishment for doing right, according as conscience dictates, is the cause of much discouragement. It tends to withhold the treasures of truth and to deprive man of the fruits of discovery and progress. To be punished for wrongdoing may be in accordance with Principle, but mortal mind would punish man for doing right. "Fear of punishment never made man truly honest" (S. & H. 327:22).

¹ S. & H. 529:30-4

² S. & H. 64:1-2; Mis. 80:16-18

(b) THE DUTIES OF MAN

In divine Science, the rights of man are forever established. God is conscious of His ideal, of His own creation, of His image and likeness, and so man is the *reflex image* of God. We realize that perfect man reflects God, as Christian Science teaches, and that man's duty is to reflect God in all His ways, to be always conscious of God.

What are the *requirements* in order to fulfil this duty, and to demonstrate these God-given rights? The answer is: Christ and Science. Without Christ, there is no ideal, no divine plan for mankind, no standard of divine right. Without Science, there is no system of metaphysics or spiritual understanding by which man can inherit and demonstrate the divine ideal. So we see that the Science of Christ is the true standard of liberty and of the rights and duties of man.¹

One may ask: What are the highest duties? Without doubt they are the gaining of a full understanding of one God, one Christ, of man as God's image and likeness, and of Christian Science, which enables one to demonstrate reality. Man must harmonize with his divine Principle. He must establish in consciousness the indestructible unity of God and man, thus realizing that all thought and action must be in subordination to God, divine Principle.² *Obedience to God* and His laws and government is essentially requisite; no other obedience is required. Obedience implies consecration and sincerity.³

Loyalty ranks high in the list of virtues, and Christian Science lays much stress on this requirement, giving it a much higher meaning than is commonly associated with it. "Divine Mind rightly demands man's entire obedience, affection, and strength. No reservation is made for any lesser loyalty" (S. & H. 183: 21-23). The only loyalty is loyalty to God, divine Principle. Personal sense makes strong claims for loyalty, asking for strict adherence to human and personal ways and means. This is the

¹ S. & H. 227: 21-29; S. & H. 228: 14-16

² S. & H. 517: 31-4; S. & H. 444: 31-1; S. & H. 202: 3-5

³ S. & H. 91: 5-8; My. 220: 26-27; S. & H. 261: 32-5; '01. 1: 19-21

basis of mortal mind's desire to have a king and to classify mankind in accordance with the suggestion of least and greatest. Such so-called loyalty ends in discord. "By loyalty in students I mean this,—allegiance to God, subordination of the human to the divine, steadfast justice, and strict adherence to divine Truth and Love" (Ret. 50:19-22). No loyalty to persons or material and human ways and means is demanded.¹ True loyalty is entirely spiritual.

Obedience and loyalty, based on the scientific understanding of God, demand *willingness to follow Christ* and to keep God's commandments.² This alone solves the problem of true government and true brotherhood. Personal love for man, without understanding his true nature as the image and likeness of God, is not enough. Without Science and Christianity, even the best motives may end in war. Brotherhood can be demonstrated only if it is based on a right apprehension of the indestructible relationship forever existing between the one divine Principle and individual man, and this true sense of relationship guarantees the divine rights of men.³ The *Golden Rule*, or the law of loving our neighbor as ourselves, can then be understood in its true spiritual meaning. Only through God, divine Love, can our brother be blessed; human method must be subordinate to this. Dictating the thoughts and actions of others is Christianly unscientific and infringes man's divine rights.

Some of the *duties* of man towards his *fellow-man* are given in the Commandments. Moses first stated man's higher duties towards God. He then proceeded to expound his duties towards his fellow-man:—"Thou shalt not kill," or in other words, not reckon life and individuality to be at the mercy of time and organization; "Thou shalt not commit adultery,"—not mingle material and spiritual ways, means, and processes; "Thou shalt not steal,"—not take away the rights of man, his divine birthright, his right of self-government; "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor,"—not testify to man

¹ '02. 4: 3-4

² S. & H. 37: 22-25; S. & H. 337: 7-10

³ S. & H. 205: 22-27; S. & H. 454: 17-18; S. & H. 467: 9-13; S. & H. 469: 30-5

as sinning, sick or dying; "Thou shalt not covet,"—not covet the abundance of your brother's vision and understanding, not covet the measure of his divine individuality.

One of the chief requirements in government and in the relation of man to man is *unity*. A slogan of democracy is "One for all and all for one." This implies a good measure of Christ-like thinking, but it does not attain the climax of perfection and is but a stepping-stone to a higher sense of unity. History shows that such a theory has been accepted even by dictator countries and movements, and that mortal mind has been cunning enough to use this theory in order to engender enslavement, instead of promoting freedom. This was only possible because there was little understanding of absolute Principle through which to interpret the true meaning of unity.

Christian Science—in strict accordance with its teaching of one Principle, one God, governing the universe, including man—presents a higher sense of unity. "Unity is the essential nature of Christian Science. Its Principle is One, and to demonstrate the divine One, demands oneness of thought and action" (Mis. 264:10-12). This shows unmistakably that the starting-point for unity is *unity of Principle and idea*—unity with God—and that only on this basis can true unity among men (which is indispensable) be brought about.¹

Unity means "oneness of thought and action" (*ibid.*) and this oneness can be demonstrated only when thought has grasped the true understanding of *one Principle* and the way in which Principle interprets itself. As long as there are diverse opinions about God, divine Principle, there can be no real unity, even if one party is willing to submit—for the sake of unity—to the opinion of the other party. "Diverse opinions in Science are stultifying. All must have *one Principle* and the same rule; and all *who follow the Principle and rule* have but one opinion of it" (Mis. 265:8-11). Unity with Principle demonstrates unity with men. The effort to achieve human unity at any price is wrong, only hiding the fact that disunity exists, and prevents intelligent criticism and progress. When the understanding of

¹ S. & H. 202: 3-5; Pul. 4: 9-11

true unity is attained, the cry "One for all, and all for one" will give place to "*multum in parvo*,—all-in-one and one-in-all" (*ibid.*), which Mary Baker Eddy declares to be the Magna Charta of Christian Science.

This Christ-like unity brings forth *spiritual co-operation*, the much-needed bond of perfection.¹ One has to be wide awake to the tendency of the human mind to compromise in the attempt to establish human unity, for the belief is that in this so-called unity lies strength. Mary Baker Eddy was well aware of this argument. In the year 1888, before the disorganization of certain institutions of the Christian Science movement took place, she wrote: "We come to strengthen and perpetuate our organizations and institutions; and to find strength in union,—strength to build up, through God's right hand, that pure and undefiled religion whose Science demonstrates God and the perfectibility of man" (Mis. 98:16-21). But in 1890 she advised disorganization, and said: "I once thought that in unity was human strength; but have grown to know that human strength is weakness,—that unity is divine might, giving to human power, peace" (Mis. 138:17-19).

In Christian Science, the majority (humanly) has no right to rule the minority. "One on God's side is a majority." To be on God's side calls for an *understanding* of one's divine *unity* with God, Principle, and for the Mind of Christ. This unity is spiritual power. "A small group of wise thinkers is better than a wilderness of dullards and stronger than the might of empires" (My. 162:7-9). In such a case, it would be disastrous to attempt to get unity by joining forces with the majority.² Even human separation might be preferable, if it would bring out a closer unity with Principle. The only danger to true unity lies in the belief that man can be separated from his perfect Principle.³

Under divine government, man has a *duty* not only towards God, Christ, and his fellow-man, but also *towards himself*. He

¹ Pul. 21: 18-20; My. 164: 22-27

² Mis. 138: 9-14

³ Ret. 85: 22-28

must ever be on the watch that his pure reflection of God does not become distorted. He must know himself spiritually and scientifically, and thereby maintain his integrity.¹ His duty lies in obedience to his conscience and to absolute Science, and in doing his own work as an individual. He must fight his own battles, and woe betide him who turns back because of fear! Sooner or later he will have to retrace his steps. Man cannot flee from error; error must flee from him. Man's duty is to become immune to the attacks of mortal mind,—“to defend himself daily against aggressive mental suggestion, and not be made to forget nor to neglect his duty to God, to his Leader, and to mankind” (Man. Art. VIII, Sect. 6).

4. DIVINE JUSTICE

In Christian Science, God is not only the sole legislative and executive power, but He is also the *only judicial authority*. From an absolute standpoint, this authority is God interpreting Himself; seen from the relative, it is the operation of true justice. In divine government, man is subordinate to divine justice alone.

God, Mind, the great lawmaker and lawgiver, is conscious only of His own law, of His government, and of the divine rights He bestows on man. This law is the law both of justice and of mercy. In order to demonstrate divine justice, it is necessary to be able to *interpret the laws of God*, purely spiritual laws, *scientifically*, for without Science there will be no correct interpretation and therefore no real justice.

Only as human justice coincides with divine justice can it pattern the divine. True *justice*, the moral signification of law, has in itself the power to destroy injustice, and so put an end to all false laws. Divine justice delivers from unjust laws of limitation.

The Christian Science textbook explains that in matters affecting divine judgment *Christ is the judge*.² His office is to restore and protect. The scientific man reflects the Mind of

¹ S. & H. 359: 11-14; S. & H. 458:23-25; Mis. 317: 5-9; Mis. 147: 14-18

² S. & H. 391: 4-6

Christ and Christly judgment by bringing forth like fruits. "Let us be faithful in pointing the way through Christ, as we understand it, but let us also be careful always to 'judge righteous judgment,' and never to condemn rashly" (S. & H. 444:16-19). That man does best who remembers the Master's counsel, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." Just as man has no right to dominate his fellow-man, so has he no divine right to judge him.

Since in God alone justice may be found, He alone can pronounce true *judgment*. There is no other who should punish or reward.¹ Mind, being a law to itself, cannot judge arbitrarily; the divine law condemns only those laws, beliefs, acts, etc., that are false.² This is the essential nature of divine justice. No human being is needed to pronounce the verdict, because the divine law declares itself to be self-acting, inescapable law. "Escape from punishment is not in accordance with God's government, since justice is the handmaid of mercy" (S. & H. 36:7-9).

Does the law of God know no pardon or forgiveness? Man may pardon without enforcing any condition, but the divine Principle, God, demands *correction* by the reducing of the mistake to its native nothingness.³ No mortal man, or body of people, should enforce the divine method of pardon; it is a wholly spiritual process, and every man has the right to work out his own salvation in this way. Only God knows what is absolutely right or wrong. No legal or ecclesiastical court is required when man is willing and able to demonstrate Christ-anly scientific self-government.⁴

¹ S. & H. 441:25-27

² S. & H. 440:20-21; S. & H. 537:14-15

³ S. & H. 11:12-18; S. & H. 339:1-2

⁴ S. & H. 6:3-5

II. THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, SCIENTIST

1. DEFINITIONS OF CHURCH

Mary Baker Eddy deals with the question of "church" in the same way as she treats the subject of man,—that is, through the three degrees of the "Scientific Translation of Mortal Mind" (*ibid.*).

The *material church*, which is built on land, whose structure is of stone with material embellishments, typifies the first degree,—the "Physical." It has a title, usually a legal one; it holds religious services, and has administrative offices and officers. Money is required to build it and to maintain it. This type of church has played an important part in most religious bodies, and the belief has grown up that the prosperity of a religion can be measured simply by the number and structural quality of its churches. This material aspect of church lies wholly in the realm of the "Physical." Such a concept must be fatal to any religion, and Mrs. Eddy describes this first degree of thought as "Depravity."

The material church is not the Alpha and Omega of church. There must be a motive underlying and governing it, a religious platform, something that is of higher meaning than the building. It is this motive that constitutes the church of the second degree,—the social church, or *organized church*. This is the transitional or intermediate stage, in which the material structure still plays a part, although by no means the only part. In this church, the life-giving idea of the movement is still clad in human and material vestments, and is therefore organic.¹ Rules and laws, which cannot be said to be purely spiritual, govern this church, its administration, and even, in some degree, its very life.

In the third degree, mortal mind, and consequently matter, disappears. This is the *spiritual Church* that needs no material

¹ Mis. 106: 30-4; My. 162: 21-24

building, no human administration, offices, officers, etc.¹ It is the Church of "Understanding," and is the only Church that exists in reality. This brings us to the question: What is the true idea of Church? When a definite answer can be found to this question, then an answer can also be found as to how this true Church must govern the organized or social church. It will also be learned in what measure the latter must give place to the spiritual Church, and how this can be accomplished. In Science, the higher governs the lower.²

In Mary Baker Eddy's writings, her interpretation of "church" includes many shades of meaning. It is evident that these different aspects must all be taken into consideration. When, on April 12, 1879, she founded her *first organization*, it was voted: "To organize a church designed to commemorate the word and works of our Master, which should reinstate primitive Christianity and its lost element of healing." (Man. p. 17.) The aim, therefore, was to "reinstate primitive Christianity and its lost element of healing" (*ibid.*). The method by which to attain this aim was "to commemorate the word and works of our Master" (*ibid.*). This church-organization was the first step in the ascending thought. Through this commemoration, it was designed to strengthen faith and hope by establishing the fact that the teachings of Jesus were based on Truth, and that this healing Truth would elevate humanity, and thus "reinstate primitive Christianity" (*ibid.*). This was clearly a relative, human footstep, for, regarded from the absolute, there is no process of reinstatement.³ In order to attain the absolute, we need only Science, the exact understanding of God.

This first organization corresponds to Mrs. Eddy's definition of "*Temple*" in the Christian Science textbook, which reads as follows: "Body; the idea of Life, substance, and intelligence; the superstructure of Truth; the shrine of Love; a material superstructure, where mortals congregate for worship" (S. & H. 595:7-10). Here the stress lies not on the essentials of Science, but on the outcome of them. The temple is not the structure,

¹ Pul. 2: 9-15; My. 194: 6-10; My. 13: 16-27

² My. 195: 24-31

³ Mis. 180: 7-10

but only the "superstructure." In the same way, it is not the "shrine" which is essential, but that which is enshrined.¹ Again, the "idea of Life" is not the essential, but Life itself, including the idea. In the temple-consciousness, good effects,—healing, kindness, peace, and unity,—are worshipped. In the Church-consciousness, the divine cause is worshipped, and consequently the effects are understood and demonstrated, but as secondary things, since cause includes effect. In the definition of "Temple," neither the word "Christ" nor "Science" is included. So long as thought regards the temple state of consciousness as the ultimate goal, spiritual progress is limited.

In course of time, Mary Baker Eddy was forced to realize that holy, uplifting faith was not in itself sufficient to demonstrate Science, and after a lapse of ten years she disorganized her first church-organization, and in solitude searched for a higher platform.

Her *second organization*, formed in 1892, was "designed to be built on the Rock, Christ; even the understanding and demonstration of divine Truth, Life, and Love, healing and saving the world from sin and death; thus to reflect in some degree the Church Universal and Triumphant." (Man. p. 19.) This inspired declaration of the nature of her Church indicates to the thinker two points of view: first, "the understanding and demonstration of divine Truth, Life, and Love, healing and saving the world from sin and death" (*ibid.*); and second, the promise and prophecy of a "Church Universal and Triumphant" (*ibid.*)² In the Glossary of her textbook, Mrs. Eddy has described "Church," in part, as "The structure of Truth and Love; whatever rests upon and proceeds from divine Principle" (S. & H. 583:12-13). Surely this must be the Church Universal and Triumphant which Mrs. Eddy foresaw and foretold—the climax of all that the term "church" indicates. In the Glossary, she further defines "Church" as "that institution, which affords proof of its utility and is found elevating the race, rousing the dormant understanding from material

¹ My. 357: 11-12

² My. 139: 3-8; My. 154: 25-27

beliefs to the apprehension of spiritual ideas and the demonstration of divine Science, thereby casting out devils, or error, and healing the sick" (S. & H. 583:14-19).

From the absolute point of view, Church is "the structure of Truth and Love" (*ibid.*); from the relative, it is an institution. *Structure* is defined as the "way in which a body is built up; arrangement and mode of connection of the parts of an organic whole; formation, construction, organization of component parts" (Wild). Structure, therefore, is something that defines the established whole in all its parts and relationships. *Institution* is defined as "the act of instituting; a permanent rule of conduct or of government" (Annandale); and "to institute" is defined as "to set up or establish; to found; to set in operation" (Annandale). It is as though Mary Baker Eddy, in her Glossary definition of "Church," would first point out the absolute whole of that which constitutes Church,—the structure of it,—and would then show the activity and operation of it with regard to the human,—its institution.

The fact is, that in Mrs. Eddy's Church Manual, her description of her Church, founded in 1892, is primarily that of a *healing* and *saving church*, foretelling and leading to the Church Universal and Triumphant, whereas in her textbook, her definition of Church starts with the higher sense,—the Church Universal and Triumphant,—and then shows the effect of this Church in its healing and saving work. It must, therefore, be evident to any sincere and honest thinker that in 1892 Mary Baker Eddy established that sense of church which would lead men eventually to a higher sense of Church and Science, but that in her textbook she reveals what the results will be when men have attained this higher sense of Church and Science.

When Mary Baker Eddy disorganized her first church, she added to "The Apocalypse" in her textbook her explanation of the 21st chapter of Revelation. In this chapter, she describes the "*New Jerusalem*," showing that all true consciousness must be spiritually fourfold, and that all correct reasoning must be subjective. She writes of "the city foursquare": "There was no temple—that is, no material structure in which to worship God,

for He must be worshipped in spirit and in love" (S. & H. 576: 12-14). Furthermore, she foresaw for the twentieth century the development which would demonstrate this "fourfold unity between the churches of our denomination in this and in other lands" (My. 199:20-1). Will not the fuller understanding of this city foursquare therefore bring to Christian Scientists that much longed-for sense of unity, since this city is truly the symbol of divine oneness? On this same "fourfold unity" our Leader built the Church of Christ, Scientist, and she writes: "It will embrace all the churches, one by one" [universal unity], "because in it alone is the simplicity of the oneness of God" [first: the Word]; "the oneness of Christ" [second: the Christ] "and the perfecting of man" [third: Christianity] "stated scientifically" [fourth: Science] (My. 342:21-24). This Church is wholly spiritual. So we see that Mrs. Eddy changed her first concept of church, which was objective, and founded her second organization on the purely subjective. In other words, she tried to turn the thoughts of her students from the worship of good effects to the understanding of an infinitely good cause, which necessarily includes good effects. She even went so far as to foretell a final stage, the *Church Universal and Triumphant*, wherein consciousness is not even concerned with the law of cause and effect, but understands God as the infinite All and One.

The idea of church has developed with the ages. It has been forced to keep pace with progress. *Jesus' church* exemplified *Christ's healing-power*. "Jesus established his church and maintained his mission on a spiritual foundation of Christ-healing" (S. & H. 136:1-2). The basis was the Christ-healing, the Christ-idea. This is also accentuated in the discourse Jesus had with his disciples when he asked them, "But whom say ye that I am?" And Peter answered: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Then Jesus made that remarkable statement: "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matt. 16:18). Quoting from this passage, Mrs. Eddy writes: "And I say also unto thee, That thou art

Peter; and upon this rock [the meaning of the Greek word *petros*, or *stone*] I will build my church; and the gates of hell [*hades*, the *underworld*, or the *grave*] shall not prevail against it.' In other words, Jesus purposed founding his society, not on the personal Peter as a mortal, but on the God-power which lay behind Peter's confession of the true Messiah" (S. & H. 137: 29-5). The basis of Jesus' church was the Christ-ideal.

Mary Baker Eddy named her Church *the Church of Christ, Scientist*. Whatever aids the understanding to demonstrate Christ scientifically and to "rouse the dormant understanding" (*ibid.*) belongs to this Church. We are members of this Church only in so far as we are willing to follow Christ understandingly and fulfil the requirements of Science. Finally, our Leader exalted the basis of church when she wrote: "Our Church is built on the divine Principle, Love" (S. & H. 35: 19-20).

2. CHRISTIAN SCIENCE NOT YET FULLY UNDERSTOOD

Mary Baker Eddy makes it perfectly plain that she presented to the world her "final revelation of the absolute divine Principle of scientific mental healing" (S. & H. 107:5-6). It is to be remembered, however, that Mrs. Eddy writes of her final discovery: "Gradually this evidence will gather momentum and clearness, until it reaches its culmination of scientific statement and proof" (S. & H. 380:25-28). It is evident, therefore, that she expected the discovery, which was final to her, "to gather momentum and clearness" (*ibid.*) in both "statement and proof" (*ibid.*) throughout the ages. How pathetic, then, to find earnest men and women believing that they are honoring the Discoverer and Founder of Christian Science by assuming that the *infinite* can ever be wholly circumscribed in any *statement*, proof, discovery, or revelation.

Everything that the student of divine Science needs to know, however, in his practice of "scientific mental healing" (*ibid.*) can be found in the Christian Science textbook and in Mrs.

Eddy's other writings. Her students have not to add anything to her discovery in order to complete it, nor have they to make any changes. She presented a *perfect system*,—Christian Science. At the same time, it would be wrong to argue that, as we have been given the complete Science of being in the textbook, there is therefore no need to study it very closely in order to gain the full meaning of her discovery. She points out, again and again, that the student cannot hope to grasp the full import of her writings unless he is willing to work and to give consecrated thought to their *study*. Only in this way can he gain a broader and higher understanding of her revelation.

Many sayings of Jesus are better understood to-day than they were at the time he was teaching in Galilee. Yet the words are the same. Mrs. Eddy was confronted with a very difficult task. She knew that her followers at that time were not able to grasp the full meaning of her revelation, but that she must present a *textbook* which would give to the advanced spiritual thought of future generations the culture it would demand. She had, therefore, to write her textbook in such a way that it would be adequate both for the standard of spirituality of the time in which she lived and also for the thought of generations yet unborn.

Her textbook is not an exposition of her own ideas, but it is God's *message*,¹—a message so vast that new generations will find in its pages a higher understanding of divine Science, a more definite and exact knowledge of God. Mary Baker Eddy did not at first understand the full meaning of her own textbook.² She had to learn the meaning of what she wrote, and was herself a consecrated *student* of that book, never tired of searching through its pages. She also writes of her "feeble sense of Christian Science" (S. & H. 577:28), indicating that she well realized that she herself was only at the beginning of Christian Science.³ If she saw the necessity for constant study in order to understand this textbook more fully, her students must surely recognize this need also.

¹ My. 114: 23-27; My. 115: 4-9

² My. 271: 4-8

³ S. & H. ix: 16-19; '01. 22: 15-16

The Christian Science textbook is fundamental. It needs to be studied constantly. Although the actual words remain the same, their underlying meaning will take on fuller significance, and thereby point to higher concepts. Every earnest student of Christian Science knows that a sentence or paragraph which he has read many times suddenly takes on a higher significance. Mary Baker Eddy states that centuries will pass before the full spiritual import of her textbook will be understood.¹ It will be seen, therefore, that the deep meaning of the teaching is still in advance of the present age.

From what has already been said, it is not surprising that Mrs. Eddy stated at that time that Christian Science was not yet being taught correctly.² We also see from her writings that, even in her day, the effort was made to convince her followers that the full meaning of her textbook had already been grasped,—an argument which engenders the belief that a higher, more exact, and more scientific meaning of the textbook is unimportant. Only a few of her students realized that the *climax of scientific statement had not yet been attained*.³ To-day, it is imperative that the whole movement should realize this. If it does, this realization will bring with it a great spiritual impulsion, a consecrated love and an overwhelming desire to search for God. There is no doubt whatever that only a small part of Christian Science has so far been understood even by the most loyal seekers.⁴

The student of Christian Science must not only pray and work for a higher understanding of the textbook and the Bible, but must also *welcome every new idea* which is in consonance with these books. The human mind does not like making an effort, nor does it welcome a change from what it has believed; and as history proves, this is particularly true in religious matters. Only the wise man has sufficient meekness to learn more and a willingness to change his viewpoint and so rise higher. He

¹ Mis. 92: 4-9; No. 27: 9-14; Mis. xi: 5-8

² Mis. 43: 6-12

³ My. 146: 12-16; My. 136: 3-8

⁴ Mis. 317: 14-18; Mis. 269: 14-19; Mis. 22: 6-10; My. 159: 12-14;
Peo. 6: 19-27

says with St. Paul: "When I was a child I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things."

When Mary Baker Eddy writes that it will take centuries before divine Science will be understood completely, the reason is obvious. Divine Science is the *Science* that *includes all sciences*.¹ As it takes a lifetime to learn a single human subject properly, it is clear that the work of learning the Science of all sciences is enormous, and can be accomplished only if true consecration, energy, and love are given to it, as well as willingness to welcome and support every new idea that throws fresh light on it. The Christ-spirit is needed in order to gain scientific truth.

How will Science unfold? There are many indications that one of the most important ways through which it is unfolding is a *higher understanding of the spiritual import of the Bible*, on which the whole teaching of the textbook is based. Whenever a higher meaning of the Bible appears, and finds its confirmation in the Christian Science textbook, this is always a sign of an advanced spiritual step. Mrs. Eddy states this clearly when she writes: "I foresee and foresay that every advancing epoch of Truth will be characterized by a more spiritual apprehension of the Scriptures, that will show their marked consonance with the textbook of Christian Science Mind-healing, *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*. Interpreting the Word in the 'new tongue,' whereby the sick are healed, naturally evokes new paraphrase from the world of letters" (Mis. 363:30-5).

Mary Baker Eddy also makes a definite prophecy regarding the future history of Christian Science in "Caution in the Truth" (Un. p. 1-7). It has already been pointed out that one of the "things hard to be understood" in the study of Christian Science is "that God knows no such thing as sin" (*ibid.*). When writing *Unity of Good* in 1887, she made the following statement as applicable to that time: "The Science of physical harmony, as now presented to the people in divine light, is radical enough to promote as forcible collisions of thought as the age

¹ My. 107: 24-28; My. 126: 31-3; My. 226: 6-16

has strength to bear" (Un. 6:10-13). Note: the *Science of physical harmony*, not the Science of spiritual harmony. In that age, thought was only prepared to accept a progressive step which would give it more harmony in matter. And even this step induced "forcible collisions of thought" (*ibid.*). The mentality which is looking for a better material state is not prepared to accept the higher understanding that there is no matter, and that matter is of itself evil.

Yet the fundamental truth in divine Science is that there is no matter, no evil, no sin. This divine fact, however, could not be accepted until the age had grown more spiritual. Therefore Mrs. Eddy continues, in *Unity of Good*: "Until the heavenly law of health, according to Christian Science, is firmly grounded, even the thinkers are not prepared to answer intelligently leading questions about God and sin, and the world is far from ready to assimilate such a grand and all-absorbing verity concerning the divine nature and character as is embraced in the theory of God's blindness to error and ignorance of sin" (Un. 6:13-19). Questions relating to the fact that God knows no sin cannot be answered before the heavenly law of health is firmly established. When will that be? The answer is: when the platoons of Christian Science are thoroughly drilled. "Not much more than a half-century ago the assertion of universal salvation provoked discussion and horror, similar to what our declarations about sin and Deity must arouse, if hastily pushed to the front while the platoons of Christian Science are not yet thoroughly drilled in the plainer manual of their spiritual armament" (Un. 6:22-27). How long will this drilling take? "'Wait patiently on the Lord;' and in less than another fifty years His name will be magnified in the apprehension of this new subject" (Un. 6:27-2). These fifty years were over in 1937. Has Mrs. Eddy's prophecy been fulfilled? It unquestionably has. The Christian Science movement is steadily awakening to the recognition that the central point of Mary Baker Eddy's discovery is the purely spiritual and scientific nature of divine Science. This is the *Science of spiritual harmony*. Science knows nothing physical, no mistake, no fault, disorder, irregularity, error or evil.

The momentous step which the movement is now called upon to take is to leave the temple state of consciousness (the worship of the effect of good in matter) and to be willing to enter the true Church, the Church of Christ, Scientist. But this Church can be entered only when the platoons of Christian Science are drilled in the "plainer manual of their spiritual armament" (*ibid.*). The spiritual Church must have a *spiritual manual*; this Church cannot be eternal if its manual is less than spiritual. The material and human cannot enter the spiritual and divine. The statement quoted above closes with the words: "an acknowledgment of the perfection of the infinite Unseen confers a power nothing else can. An incontestable point in divine Science is, that because God is All, a realization of this fact dispels even the sense or consciousness of sin, and brings us nearer to God, bringing out the highest phenomena of the All-Mind" (Un. 7:20-26). Sin, and all that it includes, is ruled out when we understand God from a purely scientific point of view, because Science is faultless in its very nature.

But the fact remains that divine Science cannot be understood before Christian Scientists are thoroughly drilled. Though a higher platform has unfolded, as foretold, during the fifty years, it does not follow that it can be realized simply because of the time factor. This higher platform is available only to those who are willing to *pay the price of drilling*, and for this the Christ-spirit is necessary. Animal magnetism suggests that one fine morning we shall awake to the full understanding of God without having searched and striven for it. Yet the student who would attain his goal must pay the price. "The song of Christian Science is, 'Work—work—work—watch and pray'" ('00. 2:7-8).¹

What is this price? Willingness to work for the discovery of divine Science, and this entails absolute consecration to gain even a part of it. The Christian Scientist always requires the qualities of a *discoverer*, a seeker, a pioneer.² This is co-ordinate with the first Beatitude: "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for

¹ Mis. 269: 25-26; Mis. 22: 6-10; No. 11: 18-22; No. 33: 8-11

² Mis. 165: 29-2; My. 122: 18-22

theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5:3). Has the student enough of the Mind of Christ to investigate thoroughly so great a subject? If so, it can be said that he has to some degree entered the true Church. If he has lost the yearning, the craving and the desire to strive for a higher understanding of Truth, then he has lost the true concept of Church. This is also true of those who oppose progress, and whose dormant understanding cannot be aroused. Hence the deep significance of Mrs. Eddy's request: "Bear with me the burden of discovery and share with me the bliss of seeing the risen Christ, . . ." (My. 120:9-11).

3. THE UNFOLDMENT OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

The definition of "Church" in the Glossary of the Christian Science textbook indicates the necessity of unfoldment, growth, and evolution, without which the dormant understanding could not be aroused from material beliefs and so be elevated to the apprehension of spiritual ideas. One of the intrinsic characteristics of "Church," therefore, is *continual unfoldment*. "Progress is the law of God" (S. & H. 233:6). This law is based on the ever-impelling Mind of Christ, continuously imparting new ideas; spiritual creation is shown to be states and stages of progress, the dawn of ideas forever going on.¹

Seen from the human standpoint, unfoldment appears to be a *process of separation*, during which the false is separated from the true, the material from the spiritual.² This separation process lifts the student out of material beliefs into spiritual understanding. Such spiritual development constitutes Church. Progress requires willingness to leave old concepts for new, to free oneself from mortal, material, limited concepts in order to gain the unlimited, spiritual perception of all things. "Every step of progress is a step more spiritual" (Peo. 1:2).

But progress will not be realized until spiritual receptivity

¹ S. & H. 506:13-14; S. & H. 508:21-23; S. & H. 509:24-28; S. & H. 511:17-18; S. & H. 513:6-7; Mis. 57:27-29

² S. & H. 256:1-5; S. & H. 296:4-9; S. & H. 323:32-5; Mis. 232:14-17; My. 181:8-12

is attained. The "*poor in spirit*" receive the blessing, because they welcome the new idea and mentally step forward to receive it. Progressive steps of spiritual development must be taken gladly and not resisted. "If the soft palm, upturned to a lordly salary, and architectural skill, making dome and spire tremulous with beauty, turn the poor and the stranger from the gate, they at the same time shut the door on progress" (S. & H. 142:11-15). This is a warning to every church to watch and see that the *poor* (the poor in spirit, the seeker, the striver) and the *stranger* (he who has new and advanced ideas) are not turned out. "Pilgrim on earth, thy home is heaven; stranger, thou art the guest of God" (S. & H. 254:31-32). These qualities of thought are necessary in order to have a progressive church. If they were lacking, Truth would be stereotyped instead of progressive. Step by step this spiritual unfolding must take place, and in this way the true idea of Church will grow and be manifested.

Many seem to be the *foes of a progressive church*. They vary from one extreme to the other. Idleness is the very opposite of the song of Christian Science: "Work—work—work" (*ibid.*). Yet zeal without knowledge is equally harmful. Blind zeal to work for God is sometimes the seed from which religious persecution and intolerance spring. In like manner, all forms of ignorance, such as self-conceit, Pharisaism, mad ambition, personal contagion, etc., can be classified as the anti-Christ.

It is important to recognize and appreciate the channels provided for *gradual development*.¹ Evil suggestions put forward extreme methods. "Growth is restricted by forcing humanity out of the proper channels for development, or by holding it in fetters" (Mis. 359:12-14). God-given channels must be utilized and enlarged; but they must not be fettered or stereotyped, else the new wine bursts the old bottles.

Mankind in general is willing to admit the need for *individual spiritual progress*. In fact, many people strive constantly to make steady progress, to advance step by step towards their ideal, and so secure success. Unfortunately, the human mind

¹ Un. 4: 28-8; Un. 43: 9-11; Peo. 1: 2-14

is not always willing to acknowledge the right of others to progress. The time has come, however, when individual success and advancement is not of itself sufficient, and the individual problem must be seen to be inseparable from the *collective* and the *universal* problem. When this is realized, every progressive idea will be welcomed universally.

Just as the individual Christian Scientist rises higher in his understanding of God, so there must be a general trend of development in the Christian Science Church. True, the advanced step is always taken individually, but a right idea can inspire all and so become a common possession. *Thinkers* and *reformers* have always been *in advance* of the age in which they lived,¹ but everyone has the right of vision and to be in some degree a discoverer and pioneer. If we limit this right to a chosen few, we limit the infinite. Mrs. Eddy writes: "To one 'born of the flesh,' however, divine Science must be a discovery" (Ret. 26:22-23).

Spiritual ideas unfold eternally. Mary Baker Eddy's literary works are themselves a proof of this. She states clearly that what she wrote in the early days of her discovery cannot be regarded in the same light as her later writings; also that her prose works served as *waymarks* in the continual development of her understanding.² In the year 1907, after many previous revisions, she was able to publish the final edition of *Science and Health*. Mrs. Eddy's frank statements regarding the constant development of Christian Science should be a guide to every Christian Scientist. They show not only that vision belongs to everyone, but that this vision may at first be measured. Even her sudden recovery from what appeared to be a fatal illness in 1866 was at that time inexplicable to her.³ Only as the divine motherhood welcomes and cherishes the new idea does it become stronger and clearer.

Mary Baker Eddy's discovery was certainly of the first magnitude, and her followers are not concerned with trying to discover a new way by which to improve it. On the contrary,

¹ S. & H. 371: 20-25; Mis. 359: 20-26

² Ret. 27: 5-12; Mis. x: 13-16; My. 237: 5-11

³ Ret. 24: 17-21; Ret. 27: 23-26; Ret. 28: 22-25; '02. 9: 21-24

their one desire is to investigate what she has given them, because they are convinced that only a small part of her discovery has as yet been understood. This fact points to the necessity for a further *unfoldment* of our Leader's *revelation* of Christian Science. Unfoldment is a law of progress and belongs to the true Church. One of the methods of animal magnetism is to dishearten the student of Christian Science by suggesting that Mary Baker Eddy's statements on metaphysics are final and need no further elucidation. This was never her viewpoint. She encouraged her students to write about their investigations, and makes it quite clear that the textbook does not curtail the development of scientific statement. She writes: "Many years ago the author made a spiritual discovery, the scientific evidence of which has accumulated to prove that the divine Mind produces in man health, harmony, and immortality. Gradually this evidence will gather momentum and clearness until it reaches its culmination of scientific statement and proof" (S. & H. 380:22-28). It must be made quite clear that her discovery is a complete system, but that the elucidation of this system requires unfoldment. The textbook will, therefore, always be regarded by the student as containing a wealth of new and priceless treasures. In this lies its value and its immortality.

It is well to note that whatever is written on this subject must partake of the nature of Science. *Religion*, of itself, is inadequate. *Science* is the yet unexplored field of investigation in which the true Christian finds himself today, and the adventure of spiritual discovery must be undertaken individually.¹ "It only needs the prism of this Science to divide the rays of Truth, and bring out the entire hues of Deity, which scholastic theology has hidden" (Mis. 194:13-16). Without Science there can be no true Church.

At this point, it may be well to consider what Mary Baker Eddy foresaw that her discovery would mean to the world; also in what way Christian Science would unfold, and what it would accomplish. Christian Scientists should be aware of many references in her books on these points. Otherwise, they may be

¹ Mis. xi: 11-16; My. 158: 9-10

tempted to fight every advancing step in the development of Christian Science and its Church.

The situation in which we find ourselves at the present time is well described by our Leader when she writes of the "full-orbed promise" (Mis. 355:3), the promise every student of Christian Science can today but dimly perceive, also of the "gaunt want" (Mis. 355:4). Every earnest student feels this want; he is conscious of being "poor in spirit," realizing that there is still much to be accomplished. He is no longer satisfied with the manna of yesterday.¹ There must be not only a history of the past, but also of the future, a history of the spiritual idea, of Christian Science, and of Christian Scientists.² But where is the orientation for future development? The Christ Science shows that the way is upward and Spiritward. A chicken must break open its shell; it cannot remain inside the egg. This is true also of the Christian Scientist. He must emerge. He must use his right of conscience, investigation, and discovery.

The question may be asked: Had Mrs. Eddy a definite idea as to what the future history of Christian Science would be? She certainly had. Of the *twentieth century* she expected much. "The twentieth century in the ebb and flow of thought will challenge the thinkers, speakers, and workers to do their best. Whosoever attempts to ostracize Christian Science will signally fail; for no one can fight against God, and win" ('00. 9:20-24). In almost every department of life this prophecy is seen to be true. And what of Christian Science? The requirements, seen through the lens of future possibilities, are enormous. "If the lives of Christian Scientists attest their fidelity to Truth, I predict that in the twentieth century every Christian church in our land, and a few in far-off lands, will approximate the understanding of Christian Science sufficiently to heal the sick in his name" (Pul. 22:9-13). The fact is that we have now passed the middle of this century, and therefore may well ask ourselves: What are the signs of the fulfilment of this prophecy? At present they are very few. The fault does not lie with Mary Baker Eddy or her prophecy, but with her followers. Have

¹ No. 45: 24-27; Mis. 12: 11

² Mis. 106: 3-4

they been intelligently devoted to the cause of Christian Science? Have they welcomed every progressive step and supported it?

In 1895 Mary Baker Eddy wrote *Pulpit and Press*. In it she makes statements foretelling the retrospective view of the *generation of 1970*. Of that period she writes: "It will then be instructive to turn backward the telescope of that advanced age, with its lenses of more spiritual mentality, indicating the gain of intellectual momentum, on the early footsteps of Christian Science as planted in the pathway of this generation; to note the impetus thereby given to Christianity" (Pul. vii:11-16). And later she says of the children of 1895, who will be mature in 1970: "The children are destined to witness results which will eclipse Oriental dreams" (Pul. 8:28-29). From these statements one cannot fail to see that she envisaged a vast development of her discovery, a widespread apprehension of the Science of being, which would hold crime of every form in check.¹ Can we behold the first signs of it? Can we stop war, and hold the dangers of material science in check? Are we accomplishing these things? Unfortunately we are not. Yet only twenty-five years, according to these prophecies, remain in which to understand and demonstrate Christian Science so accurately as to be able to prove Mind's mastery over matter in a wider and more outstanding way. Where are the unquestionable signs of a "gain of intellectual momentum" (*ibid.*), as was foretold when the discoverer of Christian Science was still with us? Facing these questions honestly, we cannot fail to realize that a mighty task will have to be done in the next twenty-five years; also that it can be successfully accomplished only in so far as the students are not only faithful,—faithful to Truth,—but also show a willingness to advance fearlessly. To believe that all these prophecies will be fulfilled without the utmost intellectual and spiritual effort from every student would be as fatal as the blind belief of the Israelites in the mere prophecy that Jerusalem would never be captured, because it had within its walls the holy temple containing the Ark of the Covenant. The great need is for a constant rousing of the dormant understanding.

¹ My. 266: 29-2

After the goal has been recognized, it is still necessary to find the *way* leading to it. Most of the difficulty lies in a mistaken sense of the signs which mark the beginning of a new era of thought. "Today people are surprised at the new and forward steps in religion, which indicate a renaissance greater than in the mediaeval period; but ought not this to be an agreeable surprise, inasmuch as these are progressive signs of the times?" ('00.4:11-15). A great *renaissance*! Are we willing to be reborn? Such a renaissance is of the essence of a revolution. Thinkers realize that we live in a period in which thought is advancing out of the science of physics into the Science of Spirit. This step forward can only be described as a complete upheaval. Do Christian Scientists like these revolutionary changes? They should welcome them, seeing in them the signs of progress, although the human mind may find them disturbing. "Science is absolute and final. It is revolutionary in its very nature; for it upsets all that is not upright" (Mis. 99:1-2).¹ The superficial mind cannot value rightly a revolutionary experience nor a revolutionary period; it usually clamors for peace at any price. Such periods of development naturally demand men and women of real character, who can stand in the midst of intellectual wrestlings and not be afraid.

The more we understand of Science, the stronger is the demand for a progressive outlook. Progress should take place in a natural way, and often it comes in a way least expected, but one cannot escape it.² The advance which comes through loyalty to Principle increases in power as it develops. This loyalty is the rock upon which the house of the Lord is built. *Scientific revolution* is a sign of progress and should never be considered to be the work of the devil.³

If there could always be willingness to go forward as God points out the way, we should experience spiritual *evolution* instead of *revolution*, but the more fixed the false beliefs, the stronger the desire to hold to them and the more unwillingness there is to forsake them. It is understandable that *youth*—by

¹ No. 11: 15-18

² Mis. 140: 1-10; Hea. 19: 18-21

³ Mis. 15: 13-17; Un. 43: 9-11

which is meant those who are unprejudiced—is more willing to accept a progressive idea, and thus represents that type of mentality necessary for the building of the spiritual Church.¹ Is the Christian Science movement awake to this? If not, ignorance will clog the wheels of progress.

4. PIONEERS AND REFORMERS

A new idea, a progressive thought, usually comes through individuals. It is then taken up by others, and not until some time has elapsed is it generally acknowledged. This is not a divine law but a human. Yet in spite of her explanations of divine law and its unfoldment, Mary Baker Eddy knew that the world, and the Christian Science movement as a whole, would not always be ready to acknowledge the advancing thinker or listen to the warning voice. General *progress* is largely dependent on the willingness to support a new idea, from whatever source it comes. This willingness is always found in the true Church.

Every movement in any age needs pioneers and reformers. "We live in an age of Love's divine adventure to be All-in-all" (My. 158:9-10). And for such an *adventure* there must be discoverers, explorers, and those who are ready to strive. Apathy in these matters will never get us anywhere. "We err in thinking the object of vital Christianity is only the bequeathing of itself to the coming centuries. The successive utterances of reformers are essential to its propagation" ('01. 30:4-7). The reformer and his message are necessary in order to impel humanity forward.² Though usually unacknowledged in his day, he is serving his brother in the best possible way.³

Christian Scientists must realize that they are *reformers* in so far as they understand divine Science. They are luminaries in every generation.⁴ Are they conscious of their high calling? Superficial thinking, or resistance to progressive thinking, will

¹ S. & H. 236: 29-32; '00. 6: 12-19; Mis. 53: 25-28; '02. 2: 10-11

² Mis. 237: 19-23

³ Mis. 266: 9-10

⁴ '01. 20: 30-5

take them nowhere. The human mind in general does not want to think more than is necessary, and definitely shuns anything that calls for progressive and fearless thinking. The fewness and faithfulness of the followers of a progressive idea attest its worthiness.¹

The reason why pioneers and reformers are always persecuted lies in the unwillingness of mankind to take a forward step.² Persecution strikes at progress and only indirectly at person.³ Many are the changes which progress demands. Science upsets time-honored beliefs.⁴ Investigation of the deeper meaning of Science illustrates the fact that Science not only opposes the testimony of the corporeal senses, but also shows that personal sense is no part of Truth. *Science* and the *physical senses* are forever *at war*,—hence the attempt to persecute Science. Those who stand most faithfully for Truth must be in the arena. “Loyal Scientists are targets for envy, rivalry, slander; and whoever hits this mark is well paid by the umpire. But the Scientists aim highest. They press forward towards the mark of a high calling” (Mis. 347:31-2).

Science calls not only for the severest conflicts, but also for the Christ-spirit. Those following *Christ* and especially Christ’s divine Science have always been *put out of the synagogues*. The sectarian church-element persecutes them.⁵ But Science and Christ constitute the only true Church, and this Church is always above the organized church. Who has enough Christ-like scientific understanding to stand for progress until the fight is finished? Those who understand Science can separate the true from the false, and they alone establish the true Church.⁶

It has been stated as a fact in Christian Science that the higher governs the lower. The higher never persecutes what is beneath it. The lower, on the other hand, persecutes the higher, or tries to do so. “Persecution is the weakness of tyrants

¹ S. & H. 225: 5-8; Mis. 308: 8-11; '00. 3: 9-20; '00. 10: 5-8; '01. 28: 29-10; My. 104: 17-20

² Mis. 218: 17-26

³ Hea. 6: 5-7; Mis. 371: 20-21

⁴ My. 112: 2-3; My. 103: 10-12; Mis. 102: 27-31

⁵ S. & H. 131: 13-18; Ret. 65: 15-19; '01. 28: 15-17; Hea. 2: 1-9; My. 221: 1-5

⁶ S. & H. 444: 22-27

engendered by their fear, and love will cast it out" (My. 191: 7-8). When we see *persecution* taking place, we know from whence it comes—the tyrannical mortal mind, fearful of exposure. The reformer knows that he must pay the price for voicing something higher than thought in general has yet accepted. The pioneer of spiritual progress in a material age must be a hero, and God calls upon spiritual heroes to do His work; He does not place new ideas in the hands of weaklings.¹ The cross must be taken up—and this will win the crown.² Everyone can make his own choice,—either to help or to persecute the pioneer.³ In any case, he must eventually be conscious of the fact that Truth can never be destroyed, and that persecution is always wrong and powerless. It is the sin of sins, the sin against the Holy Ghost. The Revelation of St. John describes the end of persecutors. This should give food for thought.

There are also other signs showing how the true reformer can be recognized. The superficial thinker believes that the surest way by which the righteousness of a new idea may be gauged is by its *popularity*, although Bible history, as well as the history of all great men and women, disproves this. Failure to receive acknowledgment for what has been done is no sign that one has been wrong, and does not bring discouragement to the true pioneer. One's responsibility is to God alone, and to Him only honor belongs. Reward always comes to the faithful, either here or hereafter.⁴

We cannot understand the true meaning of Church, nor perceive the government of this Church, if we are blind to the problems arising from advanced thinking. The progress of a cause is often dependent on a *right apprehension of its pioneers*. Pioneers promote progress, because they arouse thought to the apprehension of a new idea. "Martyrs are the human links which connect one stage with another in the history of religion. They are earth's luminaries, which serve to cleanse and rarefy

¹ Mis. 99: 12-18; Mis. 277: 13-17; '00. 9: 16-18; My. 203: 13-15; My. 248: 9-13

² '01. 25: 3-7

³ My. 116: 24-12

⁴ Mis. 237: 24-25; Pul. 10: 20-23; '01. 28: 29-30; Mis. 33: 3-5

the atmosphere of material sense and to permeate humanity with purer ideals" (S. & H. 37:9-12).

5. RETROSPECTION

Christian Science is as old as God. But has it always been understood and demonstrated? No. It may therefore be helpful to look for a moment over the past centuries and so try to perceive the outstanding *stages of unfoldment* which finally led up to the discovery of divine Science.

The Bible is full of helpful and pertinent incidents. In the Old Testament, we find many things recorded which would still attract the attention. These *marvels*, however, were not always the demonstration of the great "I AM," but sometimes exhibitions of occultism or animal magnetism. It may be recalled that many wonders were done by the magicians in Egypt in the time of Moses. In those days it was sometimes difficult to distinguish between the phenomena of mortal mind and of the one divine Mind.

Even the student of Christian Science may be puzzled by many of the acts of the great *prophets*, who sometimes called on a God who was not conceived of as the one all-loving God, but as a mighty tribal deity, who both loved and hated, blessed and punished. Consequently, the prophets inferred that they, too, were entitled to condemn and even kill. This does not mean, however, that the prophets were without marvelous glimpses of the nature of the divine Infinite. Some of their works are still looked upon as unparalleled marvels, and their mistakes provide valuable lessons. Yet these happenings alone do not prove that the prophets understood the Science of God and man.

The prophets worshipped God through spiritual vision, but we must advance and find the higher way, the way of Science. We must always look forward and upward. The prophets of old in their day were *spiritual heroes* and pioneers, marching along hitherto untrodden ways of spiritual progress in order that later generations might benefit. But our veneration for the prophets must not blind us to the necessity of seeking higher

ways, nor so absorb our attention that we are constantly looking backward instead of forward. They belonged to a different age, and had to deal with the problems of that age. "But they knew not what would be the precise nature of the teaching and demonstration of God, divine Mind, in His more infinite meanings,—the demonstration which was to destroy sin, sickness, and death, establish the definition of omnipotence, and maintain the Science of Spirit" (S. & H. 270:16-21). They knew little of God's "more infinite meanings" (*ibid.*) and of the "definition of omnipotence" (*ibid.*) and of "the Science of Spirit" (*ibid.*). This was left to the revelation of Mary Baker Eddy, who presented a great step forward, a step out of holy, uplifting faith and spiritual vision into absolute spiritual Science.

In proportion as evil has taken on new forms, as a result of changed mortal thought and of material science, so the effort to deal with evil through blind belief, faith, or flair has been found impossible. Such forms of evil can be met and mastered only by Science. The medicine of yesterday is not the medicine of to-day. This is clearly illustrated in the following words: "The divine Principle, or Life, cannot be practically demonstrated in length of days, as it was by the patriarchs, unless its Science be accurately stated" (S. & H. 283:24-27). This is an emphatic declaration that the *Science* of God, His Christ, and man (including the universe) must be *accurately stated*, in order to demonstrate eternal life.

Moreover, Mrs. Eddy makes it clear that even the primitive Christian healers did not fully understand the Science of Christianity. She writes: "It is a question to-day, whether the ancient inspired healers understood the Science of Christian healing, or whether they caught its sweet tones, as the natural musician catches the tones of harmony, without being able to explain them. So divinely imbued were they with the spirit of Science, that the lack of the letter could not hinder their work; and that letter, without the spirit, would have made void their practice" (S. & H. 144:30-7). But the question still remains: How much of the Science of Christianity did the early healers understand? Mrs. Eddy indicates that they were imbued with

the *spirit of Science*, but she makes it quite plain that they did not understand its full meaning. She writes, "I knew the Principle of all harmonious Mind-action to be God, and that cures were produced in primitive Christian healing by holy, uplifting faith; but I must know the Science of this healing, and I won my way to absolute conclusions through divine revelation, reason, and demonstration" (S. & H. 109:16-22). "Primitive Christian healing" (*ibid.*) was accomplished by holy, uplifting *faith*. But the emphasis of Mrs. Eddy's statement lies on the necessity of presenting to the present age a scientific explanation of God and of the Science by which the divine nature can be demonstrated.

It has previously been pointed out that it took Mary Baker Eddy many years to understand the full meaning of what she had written, and that she herself was the keenest student of her textbook. Many of her immediate followers hardly understood even a portion of this Science, although they held the posts of editors, teachers, lecturers, etc. Mrs. Eddy realized that the best thinkers of her time and the most faithful seekers for Truth had grasped but a moiety of her discovery. Many of her own students even failed to distinguish between Christian Science and hypnotism, theosophy, and spiritualism. She was well aware that much of the healing work was based on "holy, uplifting faith" (*ibid.*),—faith in God as All-in-all, the one Good. As early as 1891 she pointed out in her work, *Retrospection and Introspection*,—in an article entitled "Faith-cure," that *mere faith is a danger*. Several times in her writings she even indicates the possibility that Truth, if not understood scientifically, may be lost to this age.¹

That there is danger in faith-cure, and that animal magnetism would try to hide her discovery by lulling students into the belief that Christian Science can be practiced through faith alone instead of scientific understanding, is clearly stated by Mrs. Eddy in her last warning given to the movement in the article "Principle and Practice," published in the *Sentinel*, September 1, 1917. In this article she explains that Christian Science may be lost again, if belief in her discovery does not give place to

¹ Ret. 54:16-21; Ret. 61:26-2; Man. Art. VIII, Sect. 11; "Principle and Practice," *Sentinel*, September 1, 1917; My. 116:24-2

exact understanding. She states that *belief weakens the intellect*, whereas she insists that "the time for thinkers has come" (*ibid.*). It took seven years to break down the attempt of animal magnetism to withhold from the movement this last and most important message from our Leader, published only in 1917. Had Mary Baker Eddy been satisfied that an accurate understanding of Science had been established in the thoughts of her students, there would have been no need for this article or for the importance she attached to it when dictating it to her secretary, Adam Dickey.

Fortunately, this article was not left unheeded, in spite of the persistent attempt to submerge it. Those Christian Scientists who had ears to hear were awake to the warning, and worked and strove for a clearer and more scientific understanding of Christian Science, the discovery that will take centuries to grasp. According to her prophecy, the date at which the movement should have become conscious that it must rise out of the science of physical harmony into the understanding of divine Science, was 1937. To the watchful student there is little doubt that this prophecy has been fulfilled. The movement is steadily beginning to see the first rays of *divine Science*, the Science that includes all sciences. The infinite *order and system of divine ideas*, which must always underlie divine Science, is becoming immeasurably clearer and more exact. The beginning of the new idea, or new-born child, is "meek," but already its growth is becoming "sturdy." When this scientific aspect of divine Science is understood and appreciated by a wider field, there is hope that Mary Baker Eddy's further prophecies will be fulfilled, but it will require obedience and vision from her followers and the honest recognition of progressive thinkers. Who is going to give this support? Only those who understand and can demonstrate "Science vast."¹

Are Christian Scientists willing to give to the new child all that it needs? Will they mother it, understand it, clothe it, feed it, care for it? Will they give it the higher institutions it requires? These are questions of paramount importance. Are

¹ My. 354: 21-24

they willing to provide *new bottles* for the *new wine*? Or are they going to try to put the new wine into old bottles? These questions involve two ways: Science—or suffering. One thing is sure: “Spiritual rationality and free thought accompany approaching Science, and cannot be put down” (S. & H. 223: 21-22). “Spiritual rationality and free thought” (*ibid.*) are the only institutions which can arouse the dormant understanding; they foretell the true Church, the Church of Christ, Scientist. There is no power that can oppose Science.¹

¹ S. & H. 566: 9-11

III. THE MOTHER CHURCH, THE FIRST CHURCH OF CHRIST, SCIENTIST, IN BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

1. ORGANIZATION

Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures contains the complete and perfect system of Christian Science. It defines clearly the meaning of Church,—the Church of Christ, Scientist. This Church is wholly spiritual, based on the Christ-Mind and on the understanding of divine Science. Whatever is based on the divinely scientific is, in fact, Church. The textbook in *no* way indicates the *necessity* of an organized church, and it can therefore be assumed that the real Church,—the Church of Christ, Scientist,—exists in the understanding of Christ and Science.

Considering the Prose Works and the Manual of The Mother Church, however, one finds that the problems of an organized church play an important part. This may at first appear to be a contradiction, and the student may be even more puzzled when he finds that in the first edition of Science and Health (p. 166) Mary Baker Eddy wrote: "We have no need of creeds and church organizations to sustain or explain a demonstrable platform, that defines itself in healing the sick, and casting out error. The mistake the disciples of Jesus made to found religious organizations and church rites, if indeed they did this, was one the Master did not make." So we see that in the first edition of the textbook the thought of an *organized church* was rejected, and was even described as a *mistake*. This viewpoint was never altered, although later Mary Baker Eddy felt it to be wise to leave this sentence out of her textbook, when she found that she was being forced by human thought and circumstances to establish an organized church.

It is necessary to investigate this subject further, especially in

the light of absolute Christian Science, and to see what our Leader's attitude was towards organization. We learn from what she says that fundamentally *organization is a relative condition* to be outgrown. She writes that when so-called physical science "lacks organizations to support it, its foundations are gone" (S. & H. 124:5-6). It follows that organization constitutes the strength of material science, of the laws of mortal mind; so if Christian Science is going to destroy the beliefs of material science, it certainly must also break the beliefs of organization, and especially that there is real strength in organization. Further, we read that material organization "wars with Love's spiritual compact" (Ret. 47:2-3), and that it can "take no cognizance of the spiritual facts of the universe, or of the real man and God" (Ret. 60:26-27). But Christian Science aims to understand Love and the spiritual status of man and the universe. An organized institution, therefore, cannot be the ultimate channel by which to attain this end.

On the contrary, the demand is to *relinquish organization*, as spiritual Science is understood. Mrs. Eddy pertinently writes: "continued organization retards spiritual growth, and should be laid off" (Ret. 45:9-10). "The great element of reform is not born of human wisdom; it draws not its life from human organizations" (Peo. 1:2-4). ". . . mental endowments are not at the mercy of organization . . ." (S. & H. 488:25-26). ". . . and the deathless Life, or Mind, dependent upon no material organization" (S. & H. 509:3-4).¹ Not only material, but also human organization can be, in itself, a danger to spiritual growth. "Take away wealth, fame, and social organizations, which weigh not one jot in the balance of God, and we get clearer views of Principle" (S. & H. 239:5-7). Again, Mrs. Eddy writes, "But the time cometh when the religious element, or Church of Christ, shall exist alone in the affections, and need no organization to express it" (Mis. 145:3-5).²

Yet our Leader organized a church. Looked at from the absolute standpoint, this would seem to be a mistake, and it is necessary to find the *reason* why Mrs. Eddy was willing to bring

¹ S. & H. 249:19-20

² Mis. 90:21-3

about such a contradictory situation. When the reason is found, it is possible to understand and handle the question in a wise way.

The important point which must be considered is that Mary Baker Eddy regarded *organization* as something *temporary*. Again and again she lays stress on this point. "Material organization is requisite in the beginning; but when it has done its work, the purely Christly method of teaching and preaching must be adopted" (Mis. 359:2-4). "Despite the prosperity of my church, it was learned that material organization has its value and peril, and that organization is requisite only in the earliest periods in Christian history" (Ret. 45:5-8). "Distinct denominational and social organizations and societies are at present necessary for the individual, and for our Cause" (Mis. 32:25-27). These statements show clearly that *organization* may be *necessary in the beginning*, but as our Leader knew well the willingness of mortal mind to perpetuate the temporary, she gave a definite warning: "It is not indispensable to organize materially Christ's church. It is not absolutely necessary to ordain pastors and to dedicate churches; but if this be done, let it be in concession to the period, and not as a perpetual or indispensable ceremonial of the church" (Mis. 91:4-8).

A further reason for organization at that time was her *concession* to the traditional *religious thought*,¹ which demand is in no way prevalent in our world of to-day. It is interesting to note that she justifies a church organization at the early stage of the movement with the same statement that Jesus used when he, too, made a concession to the religious thought of his age. It is the "Suffer it to be so now" (Matt. 3:15). "If our church is organized, it is to meet the demand, 'Suffer it to be so now'" (Mis. 91:8-10).² In Lyman P. Powell's book, *Mary Baker Eddy: A Life Size Portrait*, New York, 1930 (page 311),³ is reprinted an interesting letter which Mrs. Eddy wrote to a student: "You recall his (Jesus) . . . turning water into wine for the marriage feast, and even being baptized to meet the necessity of 'suffer it to be so now for thus it becometh us to

¹ Mis. 298: 15-18

² Ret. 48: 25-3

³ P. 305, 1953 ed.

fulfil all righteousness.' His age or the age in which he lived required what he did and his wisdom caused his concession to its requirements in some instances. Just as this age requires organization to maintain Christian Science." The movement clamored for a church, for a visible symbol and material institution in which to worship Spirit, the ever present All-in-all. What a contradiction! Just as corporeal organization is requisite in the first stages of mortal existence and must at last be laid aside in order to gain spiritual freedom and supremacy, so the material or organized church must one day be laid aside in order to gain the true Church and spiritual government.¹

Organization was a wise concession to materiality in the initial stages, but at the right time disorganization must inevitably be the outcome of increased spirituality. The *blessings* which must come from *disorganization* will prove this to be true. Disorganization does away with "the dangers arising from being placed on earthly pinnacles, and Christian Science shuns whatever involves material means for the promotion of spiritual ends" (Ret. 47:9-11). It helps the student to turn his "sense of worship from the material to the spiritual, the personal to the impersonal, the denominational to the doctrinal, yea, from the human to the divine" (My. 139:19-22). Organization is not always a means for co-operation, but more often produces conflict.² It also induces the desire for popularity.

It should never, therefore, be forgotten that as organization is requisite only in the beginning, it must consequently have an end; it is a "suffer it to be so now"—not forever. Regarding the necessity for organization, Mary Baker Eddy drew a distinction between her own students and the students of others.³ This human classification again indicates that organization is neither universal nor impartial, but rather a concession to mortal mind. Mrs. Eddy on one occasion advised the National Christian Scientist Association to disorganize, while at the same time she left the students' organization intact.⁴ The whole ques-

¹ Ret. 45: 5-13; Mis. 145: 3-7

² Mis. 138: 9-14

³ Ret. 50: 23-30

⁴ Mis. 138: 20-29

tion is, therefore, an *individual problem*. Man's birthright to progress with or without organization must be worked out individually. Every Christian Scientist must learn for himself what he gains or loses by adhering to or by leaving an organization. What may be right for one, may, at the present time, be wrong for another. Mrs. Eddy writes: "Be it understood that I do not require Christian Scientists to stop teaching, to dissolve their organizations, or to desist from organizing churches and associations" (Mis. 358: 20-22). But later she continues: "When students have fulfilled all the good ends of organization, and are convinced that by leaving the material forms thereof a higher spiritual unity is won, then is the time to follow the example of the *Alma Mater*" (Mis. 358:30-1). That example was the disorganization of the College at the height of its prosperity. To Mary Baker Eddy, prosperity and popularity did not necessarily indicate that organization is something good in itself; on the contrary, she saw in these signs grave danger. Again, she writes: "Other institutions for instruction in Christian Science, which are working out their periods of organization, will doubtless follow the example of the *Alma Mater* after having accomplished the worthy purpose for which they were organized" (Ret. 49:4-8). She even found that the disorganization of the College "was the Father's opportunity for furnishing a new rule of order in divine Science" (Ret. 50: 26-28). And it is interesting to learn that she valued the benefits resulting from the disorganizing of the church very highly: "This measure was immediately followed by a great revival of mutual love, prosperity, and spiritual power" (Ret. 44:27-28).

In a few instances, however, our Leader indicates the necessity of gaining a *higher meaning* of the word "organization." In one case, she draws the attention of the student to the requirements of "a love unselfish, unambitious, impartial, universal,—that loves only because it is Love" (Pul. 21:3-5), and then continues: "Let this be our Christian endeavor society, which Christ organizes and blesses" (Pul. 21:11-13). Christ's organization! But the student of Christian Science knows that Christ is neither material, human, nor personal, but wholly

spiritual. On another occasion, she points the way for students to advance, until "we all shall take step and march on in spiritual organization" (Mis. 138:28-29). Christ's spiritual organization is the high goal, and it is necessary to march step by step in the right way, or the goal will never be reached. Mrs. Eddy speaks of the "spiritually organized Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston" (Ret. 44:30-1), after she had disorganized it materially, clearly indicating that her use of the term "spiritual organization" had no connection whatever with human organization. All that was left of the first organization was its name; yet the members were exhorted to "continue as a Voluntary Association of Christians knowing no law but the law of Love, and no Master but Christ in the exercise of all the ministrations and activities heretofore performed by them as a Church of Christ (Scientist)" (Powell (*ibid.*) p. 309).²

What is the definition of *organization*? "Orderly systematic arrangement, grouping of parts and assignment of functions; to arrange, group, the separate parts of, and allot to each a special function, so that all work together as a whole or unity" (Wild). What is the meaning of organization, when translated from the material or human back into Spirit? Let us compare the above definition with a definition of "*system*" given by Webster: "a group of diverse units so combined by nature or art as to form an integral whole, and to function, operate or move in unison." Both definitions have corresponding traits of meaning, namely, that parts are grouped together in order to form an active whole. But the difference lies in this: organization is a human or material activity composed of parts, whereas system is natural and unconditional and the important factor is the complete whole rather than the parts. System exists by itself; it exists because it conforms to nature and art. Organization is something instituted and enforced by human beings for the purpose of sustaining and supporting something which is not self-supporting or self-sustaining. Scientifically considered, therefore, organization is a human belief counterfeiting the divine system.

Christian Science is a divine system of ideas.¹ Since organiza-

¹ S. & H. 146: 31-1

² P. 302, 1953 ed.

tion should be laid off as soon as the spiritually-advanced thought requires it, it follows that an understanding of Christian Science as a *divine system* must first take place. It would be wrong for the student to lay aside his highest concept of organization, until he gains some understanding of that divine system which alone can take its place. In the same way, it might be unwise to divest the movement completely of organization before it has risen to an understanding of the scientific divine system of Christian Science. Yet the fact must be faced that only as organization is superseded by Christ-like system can we really grasp the full import of divine Science.

A forward step is never taken by a movement as a whole, but usually by one or more of its members. The birth of a new idea is generally the outcome of the vision of an individual; and every man has the right of vision. An individual has the God-given right to act according to his conscience, and the more he is supported by Truth the more fearlessly will he go along the narrow way of progress. This is his divine right, and as all truth is universal, his fellow-men have the essential right to go in the same direction. No one has the right to hinder, persecute, or malign individual unfoldment simply because the hitherto accepted beliefs are questioned and have been found inadequate to meet the needs of the moment.

The Christian Science movement to-day is beginning to realize that prophecy is being fulfilled, and that the Science of physical harmony is giving place to the Science of spiritual harmony, wherein there is no evil, matter, etc., but only the rhythm of divine ideas. In the same measure, the divine system of ideas,—revealing divine Science,—is urging its claim on the beliefs of organization and demanding its true freedom and appropriate institutions. A divine system cannot be forever held in a human organization. This is a scientific impossibility. The *relinquishment of organization*, the crumbling away of material and human elements, must keep pace with the constant unfolding in the understanding of divine Science as pure Science, and consequently of its divine system of ideas. In the realm of ideas, there are no such things as limitations, restrictions, pro-

hibitions, personal sense, and vested interests. The demand, then, is for divine system in place of material organization. Christian Science translates matter back into Spirit; this law applies also to the translation of organization back to its original meaning,—system.

This translation is gradual, and takes place in the way exemplified by the retirement of our Leader from organization. One step must be taken at a time. It is not wise to change over hastily from one extreme to the other. Between the present form of church organization and the spiritual Church are many states and stages of thought. The world of 1895 was very different from the world of to-day. No period in human history has been marked by such tremendous revolutions of thought as the past half-century. The Christian Science church was organized at a time when men were religiously-minded and attended church regularly. To-day in many countries hardly ten per cent of the population goes to any church. Yet people are thinking deeply and searching for absolute Truth. An organization which has not outgrown old religious beliefs cannot meet the needs of scientific thinkers. The church that maintains the standard of arousing the dormant understanding to the dynamic and essential nature of Truth must be *adapted to the requirements* of those who are striving to find Truth. The organized institutions of yesterday are no longer able to meet the needs of to-day. Only spiritual vision can discern the necessary footsteps for future development which will satisfy the thinkers of the present era.

The belief still persists that Christian Science will be propagated through the organized churches, as if the unfoldment of any Science could be organized. Mary Baker Eddy gives a very clear and definite answer in her textbook when she writes: "Must Christian Science come through the Christian churches as some persons insist? This Science has come already, after the manner of God's appointing, but the churches seem not ready to receive it, according to the Scriptural saying, 'He came unto his own, and his own received him not'" (S. & H. 131:13-18). In her writings, she leaves no doubt that the organized Christian

Science church is deemed to be one of the Christian churches. Mrs. Eddy expected Christian Science to be taught in the universities and in schools, but the church organization contains no provision for such an advanced step. *Science* is something that has *outgrown church organizations*.

2. THE MANUAL OF THE MOTHER CHURCH

One of the definitions of *manual* reads: "a prescribed exercise in the systematic handling of a weapon." A manual, therefore, may contain rules and laws necessary to reach a definite goal. Mary Baker Eddy's final goal was to establish the Church of Christ, Scientist, as the Church Universal and Triumphant. She knew that it would require a long warfare with error and matter before this ultimate purpose could be reached. From the purely spiritual standpoint,—and this is the only real standpoint,—the laws and rules applicable to the establishment of this Church are to be found in the Christian Science textbook. The Science of divine government, and all that is necessary to the working out of individual as well as universal salvation, is presented there. This Science needs to be understood. The laws of God and the rights and duties of man constitute harmonious government, and must be embodied in the manual of the Church. The demonstration of them means true government. "Law constitutes government" (*ibid.*).

It has already been pointed out that every human proposition has to be considered from the point of view of the *three degrees* of the "Scientific Translation of Mortal Mind" (*ibid.*), or else there is danger of misinterpretation. This certainly applies to a manual, which contains the laws and rules of a church. Just as the concept of church can be classified firstly as a physical, material, or structural church; secondly, as an organized church; and thirdly, as a spiritual Church, so can the laws and rules appertaining to these varying concepts of church be classified in a manual. One thing is sure, that in a manual a law or rule which is not based on the understanding of what constitutes the purely spiritual Church must be looked upon as something

which sooner or later must be abandoned. In a material age, it may still be found necessary to regulate material conditions in a proper way, and to find ways and means adapted to raise the standard of human and moral conditions and relationships. There may not be much danger in the material institution itself, though it is not spiritual and divine, but there certainly has always been, and still is, a great danger in the fact that the human mind mistakes the material institution for a permanent and ultimate goal. Consequently, it opposes everything that challenges this concept with a zeal based on the blind belief that it is doing something for God, or in support of Truth, failing to see that Truth does not need human support to sustain it.

The Manual of The Mother Church, The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts, is—as the title indicates—not a Manual of the Church Universal and Triumphant. In Article XXIII, Sect. 2, we read that “‘The First Church of Christ, Scientist,’ is the legal title of The Mother Church.” Thus it is perfectly evident that there exists a certain degree of difference between “The First Church of Christ, Scientist” and “The Mother Church;” and the student of Christian Science knows full well that *legal* titles and laws have nothing to do with the laws of God, but are necessary concessions to the organization of human society. It follows, too, that the Manual of The Mother Church is not intended to be a handbook of entirely spiritual laws and rules, but must of necessity contain regulations concerning the organized church, the church of the second degree—and, in fact, some of the first degree,—both of which aspects of church have to be outgrown step by step.

This was undoubtedly the purpose of Mary Baker Eddy. Her Manual is a handbook regulating the steady *transit out of church organization* into the Science of Christianity. It is adapted mainly to the transitional stage, during which thought unfolds and takes form in a more exact and definite understanding of the true Church and of the absolute doctrines of Christian Science. Our Leader never intended that all the by-laws and rules should be perpetual; she was, on the contrary, very definite that they should be regarded as necessary in the

beginning. It has already been shown that organization may be useful for the early periods of the movement, and the rules and by-laws of the Church Manual were evidently regarded by Mrs. Eddy in the same manner. Of these rules and by-laws she writes: "hence their simple, scientific basis, and detail so requisite to demonstrate genuine Christian Science, and which will do for the race what absolute doctrines destined for future generations might not accomplish" (Mis. 148:17-21). For the future generations she foresaw "absolute doctrines" (*ibid.*), and not laws and rules adapted to the immediate demands of a young church. This fact is actually incorporated in the Manual in order to emphasize it. In Man. Art. XXXV, Sect. 1, writing about the Manual, our Leader says: "It stands alone, uniquely adapted to form the budding thought and hedge it about with divine Love." Its purpose is expressly defined as "adapted to form the budding thought" (*ibid.*). How many years will it take to form the budding thought? The Manual was first published in 1895. Half a century has passed since then—a long time for the budding thought to be forming. The world of to-day has little in common with the world of 1895.

Having seen that organization can be useful in the initial stage, and that the Manual is mainly composed of rules and laws to protect this beginning, it becomes evident that not all its by-laws and rules deal with pure metaphysics, because the metaphysical is timeless and needs no such provision. It is reported on reliable evidence that Mary Baker Eddy stated that the *organization* of her church was *not of God*, but that it was forced on her by her students.¹ Seeing that her followers were not ready to drop all their old ecclesiastical forms of doctrine, she gave the movement a code of laws and rules which would help them ultimately to rise to the true meaning of Church. Honest Christian Scientists need to ask themselves to-day if they are not still bringing their old ecclesiastical beliefs into our Leader's Church, and so obscuring and delaying the appearing of the true Church, which Mrs. Eddy knew to be the hope of mankind.

At the time that our Leader established her Church Manual,

¹ Hugh A. Studdert Kennedy: *Christian Science and Organized Religion*, pages 18-19.

she knew that the powers of evil were in league to destroy the infant church. Moreover, at that period her great desire was to withdraw from active church work in order to give herself time for the further development of her discovery. After her withdrawal, she established a *code of regulations* intended to *guide* and *protect* her church, and the movement was happy to have it. When instituting her Church Manual, she accepted with a certain touch of irony the praise which came from the field, knowing that much of the freedom which the textbook gave to Christian Scientists was being taken from them.

Her article on pages 229-230 of *Miscellany* entitled "Mental Digestion" makes this two-sided situation clear, and it is advisable for the reader to study this article carefully. She begins by pointing out that she received plentiful praise for giving "laws of limitation for a Christian Scientist" (*ibid.*). The movement actually thanked her for giving them *laws of limitation!* She herself called "the twentieth century Church Manual" (*ibid.*) "laws of limitation." At that time, the human mind was not ready to appreciate the full meaning of "Christian Science, where fetters fall and the rights of man are fully known and acknowledged" (S. & H. 227:1-2). On the contrary, it was craving for some detailed regulations which could easily be grasped. When grasped and observed, this human mind would find its reward in being called "loyal," the supposed climax of honor. A standard of measurement would thus be found for a so-called loyal student, and he who fulfilled the requirements would be tempted to regard himself with a certain amount of pride and self-satisfaction as a real Christian Scientist, forgetting that it is much easier to conform to certain "laws of limitation" than it is to obey the laws of Christ; and he would also come to believe that all that could be done for the promotion of Truth had been done. Such mentalities would regard it as a crime if a wider vision of freedom enabled one to break away from the laws of limitation. They would fear to do so, being incapable of judging if such action would lead them into the realm of the third degree or push them back into the first. They would argue that a step in the wrong direction would incur just pun-

ishment, and so decide that it is safer not to do anything at all, but rather to abide by the laws of limitation. All this would lead one to suppose that the time for thinkers is past. No wonder that our Leader received "heaps upon heaps of praise" (*ibid.*) for giving "laws of limitation." Hence her "disappointed hope" (*ibid.*).

Yet she was also filled with "grateful joy" (*ibid.*). Why? Because "the redeemed should be happier than the elect" (*ibid.*). Suffering under the "laws of limitation" awakens the student to the real value of freedom, the freedom which at first they reckon of little worth, only asking to be governed by "a king," instead of by God. The man who has been healed often appreciates health more than the man who has never been sick. So those who will eventually claim their birthright of spiritual freedom, after years of servitude to "laws of limitation," will rejoice in their right to live under the eternal government of God. The Israelites threw away their liberty,—their theocratic government,—and *clamored for a king*. And they got one. Samuel did his utmost to prevent this, but was forced to acknowledge that under the circumstances only suffering would bring the people back to a better understanding of God's government. So he gave them what they demanded. The result was that the free nation went down into slavery under foreign kings in foreign lands, before the lesson was learned that nothing short of divine Principle could successfully govern a spiritually-minded people. History can teach many lessons. It repeats itself until the lessons are thoroughly learned. In order to learn, one must first understand the fundamentals of a subject, and in this case the subject is the Science of government. In Science, there are no laws of limitation; on the contrary, such laws are temporary, and unless recognized as such, they lead to slavery, while the right way of Science leads to freedom.

That the Manual points out the way of liberty is also indicated in the article previously quoted. Here Mrs. Eddy states: "Notwithstanding the sacrilegious moth of time, eternity awaits our Church Manual, which will maintain its rank as in the past, amid ministries aggressive and active, and will stand when

those have passed to rest" (*ibid.*). "Laws of limitation" as given in the twentieth century Church Manual are always subject to the "moth of time." Our Leader states, however, that "eternity awaits our Church Manual" (*ibid.*). It is evident that Mary Baker Eddy envisaged the time when the spiritual concept of Church Manual would free thought from the "laws of limitation," as embodied in the twentieth century Church Manual. One may ask: What will be the considered outlook on a Church Manual in the twenty-first or the thirtieth century? One thing is certain: the whole concept of government will be different. More and more will the prophecy be understood and fulfilled that absolute doctrines of Christian Science will govern Church, in place of detailed laws required for the forming of a "budding" church.¹ Laws of limitation will gradually be dropped. The Christian Scientist knows that limitations are not eternal, but temporal. *Eternity* in every detail awaits the Christian Scientist, for the spiritual man is eternal. But the material and limited must be put off before the eternal is reached. Whatever is material and human must pass away; only then will eternity reign. The same applies to the Church Manual. All that is purely spiritual in our Church Manual is eternal. Many of the laws and rules, however, have long since ceased to be in effect, *e.g.*, Art. XXII, "Relation and Duties of Members to Pastor Emeritus." Eternity cannot await these laws. The "sacrilegious moth of time" has already swallowed them up. Many other by-laws have also been discarded as being impracticable under present circumstances,—for instance, all the by-laws requiring Mrs. Eddy's signature or permission.

The spiritual sense of the Church Manual is eternal; it contains only laws and rules which are based on absolute Christian Science, and which apply equally and universally to all mankind. When speaking of the Manual in this light, and not as the twentieth century Church Manual, our Leader states: "Of this I am sure, that each Rule and By-law in this Manual will increase the spirituality of him who obeys it, invigorate his capacity to heal the sick, to comfort such as mourn, and to

¹ Mis. 148: 14-21; Man. Art. XXXV, Sect. 1

awaken the sinner"¹ (*ibid.*). *Spirituality* can only be gained through obeying *spiritual laws*. For instance, how could the spirituality and the capacity to heal be increased by obedience to Art. IX, Sect. 2? "If a member of The Mother Church shall decease suddenly, without previous injury or illness, and the cause thereof be unknown, an autopsy shall be made by qualified experts. When it is possible the body of a female shall be prepared for burial by *one of her own sex*." Many other regulations could be cited which have nothing at all to do with absolute doctrines and which are as material as the human laws relative to the organized body of a human being. True, a man's body should be as harmonious as it can be under present circumstances, but it should not be forgotten that harmony in matter is not the truth of being, and can sometimes be a greater deterrent to spiritual growth than a sick body; and further, that the way out of matter is not found in merely human and material provisions. A solution can only be found by starting from the absolute standpoint.² The starting-point in the Manual from which to demonstrate the eternality of the Church laws and rules is the spiritual Science of government. This is the greater which must govern the lesser, and no law in the present Manual should be interpreted in such a way as to destroy, or even attempt to destroy, spiritualization of thought. All rules and laws must be applied in such a way as to ensure that the spiritual standard, once reached, will not be lost again. The development of church laws must therefore be along the line of spiritualization, rather than that of adding restrictions and so infringing still further the rights of man. A progressive sense of Church government must be carefully and wisely propounded. Christian Scientists must now face the fact that if they are going to idolize and idealize "laws of limitation" and call them spiritual government, they can expect only disaster. Such laws must be outgrown in order to inherit eternity.

It may further be noted that the Manual was written in order to deal with special problems which arose through the rapid growth of Christian Science and by the disorientation which

¹ My. 203: 7-8

² No. 34: 4-9

always characterizes a young movement. Of the rules and by-laws of the Manual of The Mother Church, Mary Baker Eddy states that "they were impelled by a power not one's own, were written at different dates, and as the occasion required. They sprang from necessity, the logic of events,—from the immediate demand for them as a help that must be supplied to maintain the dignity and defense of our Cause" (Mis. 148:12-17). They were adapted to "the logic of events" (*ibid.*), to the *requirements of occasions*. New occasions need new methods.

They were also intended "to maintain the dignity and defense of our Cause" (*ibid.*). Christian Science naturally is self-supporting. This, however, does not exclude the necessity for certain regulations in order to give, at the same time, a safe *moral standard* and *dignity*, which otherwise might easily be torn down by some adherents who have not fully grasped the deeper meaning of Christian Science. Many rules, therefore, are incorporated in our Manual which could be found in a manual of any religious sect, and which cannot be described specifically as Christianly scientific. Marriage, for example, has nothing to do with Mrs. Eddy's discovery of absolute Science; yet certain rules apply to this problem. Many other by-laws in the Manual must be classified in this category; their sole purpose affects the *moral* and human, but not the spiritual. Yet Christian Science demands: "Include moral as well as physical beliefs in your efforts to destroy error" (S. & H. 418:26-27). Some of the by-laws are applicable to certain countries and must be interpreted differently in other countries, according to the laws existing there. For instance, Art. IX, Sect. 1, of our Manual may be in conformity with conditions in America, but not with conditions in many countries in Europe, where practically all Christian Scientists break this rule. God's laws, on the other hand, apply to all equally. From this it will be seen that the laws and rules of our Manual in many cases are limited and temporal, and are not spiritual.

Moral qualities are transitional qualities, which must finally yield to a higher sense of what constitutes reality, as found in the third degree of *understanding*. It is interesting to note that

only a few rules in the Manual relate to this third degree, and that they are mainly to be found in Art. VIII, "Guidance of Members," particularly in Sects. 1, 3, 4, 6, and also in some others. But they add nothing to what may be found in the textbook, serving rather to draw attention to some outstanding problems and to furnish daily admonitions.

Thus it becomes clear that not all the rules and by-laws in our Manual are to be accepted as remaining for all eternity, nor was it intended that they should remain. They were simply adapted to "the logic of events" (*ibid.*). Progress teaches that man is to be governed more and more by laws and rules that are spiritual, because man's harmony can be demonstrated only through obedience and loyalty to spiritual laws, the laws that belong to the *Manual of the Church of Christ, Scientist*. What is increasingly needed is "the plainer manual of . . . spiritual armament" (*ibid.*), and this is attained not only through higher understanding of divine Science, but also by abandoning willingly the outworn institutions of yesterday and adopting others suited to the needs of the age.

3. THE GOVERNMENT OF THE MOTHER CHURCH

In order to see this question in its proper light, thought must be centered on the absolute, the perfect, the ultimate goal. From no other point of view can we ever reason logically and scientifically. In Chapter I, it was shown unmistakably that there is only one true government,—namely, the government of God, divine Principle. Under the government of Principle, man is in full possession of his birthright. For this government a purely spiritual manual alone is adequate. "The Magna Charta of Christian Science means much, *multum in parvo*,—all-in-one and one-in-all. It stands for the inalienable, universal rights of men. Essentially democratic, its government is administered by the common consent of the governed, wherein and whereby man governed by his creator is self-governed" (*ibid.*). The basis of this government is *theocracy*, God being the only lawgiver and governor of the universe. Its demonstration is democratic

in the purest sense of the word,—man governing himself by reflecting divine government. As soon as men understand and govern themselves by the laws of God, this common consent will bud into perfect democracy. This was in a measure Moses' ideal of government, and it is Mrs. Eddy's.

A church governed by this ideal brings forth fruit that is spiritual. "The church is the mouthpiece of Christian Science,—its law and gospel are according to Christ Jesus; its rules are health, holiness, and immortality,—equal rights and privileges, equality of the sexes, rotation in office" (My. 247:5-9). "... its law and gospel are according to Christ Jesus" (*ibid.*), and we know that Jesus based his church solely on the *understanding of the Christ*, and not on organization.¹ These facts should not be forgotten, because they point to the ultimate goal.

Yet our Leader saw the necessity of organization for a young church. She gave the church an organization, therefore, which would help it to stand until it could support itself. A church which relies on human support has not yet attained the true status of Church. With church organization naturally arises the problem of church government. Mary Baker Eddy sought that form of government which would most nearly approximate to perfection and yet be understood by the thought of her age. She therefore established a government which was partly theocratic and partly democratic. The predominant feature of the government of The Mother Church is that—according to the Manual—fundamentally, nothing can be done without the *consent* of the *Pastor Emeritus*, the head of the whole organization. On her consent depends the *election* of the President, the Board of Directors, the Clerk, the Treasurer, the editors and the manager of The Christian Science Publishing Society, the Board of Trustees,² the manager of the general Committee on Publication and its assistant, the librarians of the Reading Rooms of The Mother Church, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Business, the Board of Education, including the

¹ Mis. 144: 32-7; Mis. 91: 13-20

² According to the "Deed of Trust" (1898) the Trustees do not need the consent of Mary Baker Eddy after she has passed on. The text of this Deed of Trust is reprinted as an Appendix to this book.

teacher of the Normal Class, and also the Board of Lectureship. All the most important offices and officers of The Mother Church were in this way under Mrs. Eddy's control.

A second outstanding feature of the government is the regulation that *no new Tenet or By-law* can be adopted, nor the existing ones amended or annulled, nor the Manual be revised without the written consent of Mrs. Eddy (see Man. Art. XXXV, Sect. 1, Art. XXXV, Sect. 3, and Art. XXII, Sect. 18). She did not intend to let the reins of government of her infant church slip out of her hands.

These two features alone show very clearly that Mary Baker Eddy knew herself to be the *Leader* of the movement in every sense. She delegated the administrative affairs to the officers of The Mother Church and to some extent also the power to discipline. But since the election of the officers depended on her approval, and since she had the right to step in at any moment when her decision was needed, she kept in her hands the supervision of all the activities of The Mother Church. She did, however, free herself from the detailed work.

The government of The Mother Church was her government. She alone was the Mother; and her church, The Mother Church, demanded government by a Mother-consciousness. In the "Church Universal and Triumphant," which Mrs. Eddy foretells, motherhood gives place to Oneness and universality—"*multum in parvo*,—all-in-one and one-in-all" (*ibid.*). "The Mother Church must be self-sustained by God" (Mis. 316:9).

The members of the Mother Church have no right to make any new by-laws,—they have, indeed, no legislative power to do so. Nor have they the right to elect the officers who rule over them. They have no direct power over the executive or judicial authority, although they definitely have the right of criticism, and are entitled to notify The Mother Church if an officer fails to fulfil his duty. Apart from this, the legislative, executive, and judicial power remained solely in the hands of our Leader.

Such a government can hardly be termed democratic in the ordinary sense of the word. Anyone who did not appreciate and understand Mary Baker Eddy's spiritual vision of God and

her love for mankind would certainly classify it as autocratic and dictatorial. But the Christian Scientist who knows that she did not rule either by personality or by will-power, but by her clear understanding of divine Principle, God, perceives in this form of government a trend towards that theocratic form of government which may perhaps be paralleled to the government of Israel under the Judges. It certainly is not pure theocracy, which needs no offices or officers. It has been said that the best form of government would be the dictatorship of an angel. Mrs. Eddy's government of The Mother Church may be regarded somewhat in this light—*the dictatorship of a deeply spiritually-minded woman*. She understood God well enough to know what was best for the movement, and was therefore entitled to assume power, without giving the members any sense of arbitrary government. And yet she asked for no personal loyalty, advising her students to follow her only so far as she followed Christ. She always put Truth first.

While her government of The Mother Church does not appear to be *democratic*, the government of the *branch churches*, according to the Manual, is distinctly so. "In Christian Science each branch church shall be distinctly democratic in its government" (Man. Art. XXIII, Sect. 10). This does not mean that any branch church can do exactly what it likes. The Manual of the Mother Church regulates many of the activities of the branch churches; these regulations must be obeyed and cannot be overthrown even by a majority of the membership: for instance, the organization of branch churches (*e.g.*, Art. XXIII, Sect. 6, 7), the membership (*e.g.*, Art. XXIII, Sect. 9, 10, 11, Art. VIII, Sect. 16), Tenets (Art. XXIII, Sect. 4), Readers (Art. III), Church Services (*e.g.*, Art. VIII, Sect. 2, 5, Art. XIV, Sect. 2, Art. XVII, Sect. 3, 4, Art. XVIII, Sect. 2), Sunday School (Art. XX), Reading Rooms (Art. XXI, Art. XXV, Sect. 7), Lectures (Art. XXXII, Sect. 4), Committee on Publication (Art. XXXIII, Sect. 3, 4, 5), relation to other branch churches (*e.g.*, Art. XXI, Sect. 1, Art. XXIII, Sect. 1, 6, 10, 12, Art. XXXI, Sect. 3). Within the framework of these regulations, the members of the branch churches are free to govern them-

selves according to democratic principles. Usually, the officers of a branch church are elected by at least a majority vote of the membership. This is quite different from the procedure of The Mother Church, in which an election or a resolution passed by a majority vote of the members is not provided for and would be impracticable.

Although Mrs. Eddy's government of The Mother Church may be regarded as the dictatorship of a spiritually-minded woman, it still contained some elements of democracy, notably in regard to the control of the officers. *Mutual control* is essential to the perfect working of a democracy. The Board of Directors not only had the duty of controlling other Church officers (Man. Art. I, Sect. 9, par. 2), but also any member of The Mother Church could inform the Board of Directors when an officer failed to fulfil his duties (Man. Art. I, Sect. 9, par. 3); the members even had the right to complain to the Clerk if the Board of Directors failed to fulfil the requirements of the by-laws, and if "the complaint be found valid, the Directors shall resign their office or perform their functions faithfully" (Man. Art. 1, Sect. 9, par. 4). Mutual control also existed between the Board of Directors and the Board of Trustees. Each Board was originally constituted by a Deed of Trust; within the frame of the Manual, the Board of Directors had to transact the business of The Mother Church (Man. Art. I, Sect. 6), the Board of Trustees to "hold and manage the property . . . conveyed, and conduct the business of 'The Christian Science Publishing Society' on a strictly Christian basis, for the promotion of the interests of Christian Science" (Man. Art. XXV, Sect. 1). The duties of both bodies, incorporated by two independent Deeds of Trust, are of great importance to the whole movement. Our Leader therefore sought ways and means by which to establish a mutual control with overlapping authority. According to the Manual, "The Christian Science Board of Directors shall have the power to declare vacancies" in the Board of Trustees, while the Board of Trustees "shall fill the vacancy" (Man. Art. XXV, Sect. 3). The Christian Science Publishing Society "selects, approves, and

publishes the books and literature it sends forth" (Man. Art. XXV, Sect. 8), while it is the duty of the Board of Directors "to see that these periodicals are ably edited and kept abreast of the times" (Man. Art. VIII, Sect. 14). Mutual control existed also in regard to the duties of the Committees on Publication and the Readers of the branch churches (Man. Art. XXXIII, Sect. 3, 5). In such a way, our Leader gave to the movement that perfect form of mutual control which is essential to a democracy,—a form which in this respect is not to be found even in the best democratic organizations existing today.

As has been previously pointed out, the Manual contains many rules of the "Thou shalt not" variety. Some of these rules contain essential statements on Christian Science, others merely refer to ordinary rules of conduct, while other by-laws are restrictive to Christian Scientists—*laws of limitation*, as Mary Baker Eddy herself called them. No wonder that it sometimes cost her long nights of prayer and struggle to lay down such rules and by-laws! In this respect, her form of government might be described as *bondage*,—a bondage wisely adapted to the needs of a young church. Restriction is often far better than unrestrained freedom, but continual bondage has always resulted either in revolution or decay; it is something that thinkers cannot endure when they have outgrown the need for it.

Mary Baker Eddy's government of The Mother Church is, therefore, a mixture of theocracy, democracy, and autocracy. As has been seen, the branch churches are distinctly democratic in their form of government, although much of their activity is controlled by the Manual of The Mother Church. Consequently, the *government of the movement* as a whole is *not in full accordance with the Science of divine government*, and the rules and by-laws do not reflect that ultimate state which is described as the Magna Charta of Christian Science. This discrepancy does not exist because of any failure on the part of our Leader, but because, in her wisdom, she saw the need for restrictions at the beginning of her church formation, until the time came when the thinking of her followers would be on firmer ground and her lifework could not be overthrown by aggressive action.

Organization was seen to be a necessity in the initial stages, but organization being in itself a limitation, any form of government for such an organization must of necessity be temporary.

4. THE RULES AND BY-LAWS OF THE MANUAL OF THE MOTHER CHURCH AND ABSOLUTE DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

Half a century ago, our Leader wrote that government by *absolute doctrines* of Christian Science was destined for *future generations*. Yet to-day, perhaps more than at any time, the movement is clinging to the provisions of the Manual, as if nothing had changed since then. Those future generations of which Mary Baker Eddy spoke are already very much in evidence, and they clamor for freedom. The time for the relaxation of the laws of limitation would appear to be ripe. Should not the movement be glad to see this evidence of development? Or is it true that Mrs. Eddy saw those future generations as belonging to the next century, and is this demand for full freedom the suggestion of malicious animal magnetism trying to wreck the unfoldment of Christian Science? These are questions that call for serious consideration.

In order to see clearly, it is necessary to look more deeply into the matter than blind loyalty is able to do. Whatever the decision may be, some important facts must be kept steadily in mind,—facts which cannot be denied. Before looking at the facts clearly, it would be wrong to make any decision regarding the *right measures* to be taken. And even then it might be questionable what human step it would be wise to take, and opinions might vary on the subject, so that we might have to choose the policy to “agree to disagree” (No. 45:21-22). But there can be no divergence on metaphysical facts.

It has already been shown that the government of The Mother Church is not in full accordance with the divine government of which Mary Baker Eddy writes in her textbook. This would indicate that the *Manual* of The Mother Church and the Christian Science *textbook* are in many points at variance. It

is extremely important to know how far this is true,—otherwise we have no clear goal ahead of us and no common way by which to reach this goal. It is not intended to explore all these divergencies, but rather to awaken the thought of the reader to the fact that they exist, in order that he may investigate the subject for himself in greater detail.

God, divine Mind, is the only lawmaker and lawgiver, and He is His own law. Why, then, should we need a written *code of laws* in the Manual, most of which are obviously unknown in the spiritual realm? Why should we need “laws of limitation,” as Mrs. Eddy terms them? The answer has already been given, but it is essential to keep always in thought that man’s birthright is to reflect the *laws of God* only, and these laws are unrestricted. Could anyone imagine Mrs. Eddy describing the divine facts about God and man, as stated in the Christian Science textbook, as “laws of limitation”? Acting in accordance with the laws of God must always be in harmony with our Leader’s revelation, and should not, therefore, be interpreted as disloyalty to the provisions of the Manual or to Christian Science.

God, Principle, is revealed as the *Supreme Ruler*, governing man through Christ’s divine Science. Man is subject to God alone, and no mortal man is allowed to rule over him. Does the Manual adhere to this absolute doctrine? No. In many instances, according to the Manual, *man rules over man*. This becomes especially evident in regard to the question of discipline. The Board of Directors has power to discipline and to punish members, although the textbook teaches that God alone can punish, or pardon, and in the Bible we read: “Judge not, that ye be not judged” (Matt. 7:1), and “I judge no man” (John 8:15). A large part of the Manual deals with the subject of discipline, with the placing of members on probation, and with excommunicating them. Mary Baker Eddy writes: “You have come to be weighed; and yet, I would not weigh you, nor have you weighed. How is this? Because God does all, and there is nothing in the opposite scale” (Mis. 280:9-12). These contradictions are very characteristic of the divergence existing be-

tween the Manual, as interpreted to-day by the movement in general, and Christian Science. How many people are there who know God's laws and His higher ways well enough to be able to judge and punish in His place? Where are the men and women who can claim for themselves this capacity? "He who judges others should know well whereof he speaks" (Mis. 130: 21-22). Mankind is objecting more and more to personal or dictatorial discipline. Right, based upon Principle, is regarded as the only adequate judge. As long as Mrs. Eddy was with us, there was no danger of an unjust judgment, because if the need arose she could deal with it Christianly and scientifically, and did so on many occasions.

How can the *right of conscience* be preserved and protected if, according to the Manual, various normal activities are either prohibited or are permitted only in certain specified circumstances or to a certain class of people? Can we have a code of regulations covering situations which may arise in the course of centuries? Of course we cannot, although the human mind would like to establish such a code, just as the Levites and Pharisees built up a whole system of *thou shalt not's*. The Manual was the outcome of the "logic of events" (*ibid.*), and was to meet an "immediate demand" (*ibid.*). Where does it lead us, when acts which are the acknowledged rights of centuries, essentially in accordance with one's conscience and motivated by the love of mankind, are controlled by an ecclesiastical court, and not by God? Where does it lead us, when there is a constant *fear* inculcated that one's actions may be misconstrued and misinterpreted and may end in punishment meted out by judges who may not be the most spiritually-minded people of our time? In these circumstances, fear may govern conscience, but "fear of punishment never made man truly honest" (*ibid.*). If fear arises through wrong-doing, the case is different, but how many right acts have never been performed because of the fear of punishment? There must be many, while those who are courageous enough to do what is right, in spite of the possibility of punishment, are few. These courageous ones belong to the class of pioneers and reformers who love God more than them-

selves, and who are willing to pay the price on this plane of existence.

This situation becomes even more dangerous when questions on metaphysics are at issue, and when man's *understanding* of divine Science is *controlled* and judged by human beings. This tends to destroy a movement. Moreover, in such a case, the interpretation of the Manual should never infringe these wise words of our Leader: "Drifting into intellectual wrestlings, we should agree to disagree; and this harmony would anchor the Church in more spiritual latitudes, and so fulfil her destiny" (No. 45:21:23). The practice of this admonition would prevent the trend of mortal mind to classify everything as false which it has not fully investigated and which it does not understand, and then to mark those who are faithful to what they know to be true with the awful word "disloyal."

Some of the by-laws uphold the traditional form of *sex-distinction* (e.g., Man. Art. II, Sect. 1, Art. XXXIII, Sect. 4), particularly in the case of officers whose duties bring them into contact with people outside the movement. Although the Manual gives to women a wide field of activity, its still-existing restrictions, arising from sex-distinction, do not correspond with the teachings of pure Christian Science nor with the demands of the present age.

The question also arises: How can the *restrictive* by-laws regarding *teaching* and *lecturing* be reconciled with Jesus' command: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15), and Mrs. Eddy's request, "Give them a cup of cold water in Christ's name" (S. & H. 570:16-17)? The answer is that they cannot. Our textbook is written for everyone. It contains a special chapter on "Teaching Christian Science," in which is shown how Christian Science is to be taught and what the requirements are. Nowhere in this chapter is it stated that it is intended for a select number of people who are in possession of a *certificate* authorizing them to teach. The chapter is written for everyone, just as the chapter on "Christian Science Practice" is available and applicable to all. Every Christian Scientist studies these chapters,

and the Lesson-Sermons contain references to them. The right to teach and to be taught every subject correctly is man's individual right. It is interesting in this connection to note our Leader's reasons for closing her College in 1889: "My conscientious scruples about diplomas, the recent experience of the church fresh in my thoughts, and the growing conviction that every one should build on his own foundation, subject to the one builder and maker, God,—all these considerations moved me to close my flourishing school" (Ret. 48:5-10).

Here it may be interesting to look back for a moment on the *history of teaching* Christian Science. In 1867, at the time Mary Baker Eddy had glimpsed the first faint meanings of the healing message, she commenced to teach a pupil. From that time her teaching work took on more and more importance until, in 1881, she opened her Metaphysical College and taught thousands of pupils. She tried to hand over the task of teaching to her students, but soon found that the pupils wished to come only to her. In 1889 she closed the College.¹ She saw at that time that teaching must become impersonal if it is to stand through the centuries. Then "the divine concurrence of the spirit and the Word appeared" (My. 246:20-21), and she realized that teaching was no longer dependent on her personality. This step led to the establishment of the institution known as the Board of Education. At the end of 1898, she taught her last class and then, in 1899, she handed the teaching over to this new Board. Normal Classes were first held annually. In 1907, a further step was taken towards making the activity still less personal. A by-law was amended, according to which the Normal Class was to be held once every third year with a maximum attendance of thirty pupils. Our Leader most certainly knew the importance attached to this by-law, and simple arithmetic also shows what her intentions were. A Normal Class of thirty members every three years means an average of ten new teachers every year, which is insufficient to make up for the loss of those who have passed on, been put on probation, excommunicated, or prevented from teaching by any other

¹ My. 246:11-24

reason. By restricting the number of teachers, provision was made by which, in a rapidly growing movement, many students would have to get their inspiration and instruction direct from the Bible and *Science and Health* and not necessarily from a personal teacher.¹

This action on the part of our Leader confirms the fact that her ultimate desire was for *teaching* to be done primarily by *the Bible and the Christian Science textbook*, and also that she looked forward to the time when teaching would be universal and there would be teaching by healing and healing by teaching.² To this end, the chapter on "Teaching Christian Science" was incorporated in the textbook. Personal teachers were needed at the outset, but were not to be regarded as a permanent necessity.³ Again and again, we find hints in her writings that class teaching might at some time be abolished and that for some people it might not be necessary.⁴ It is a known fact, as reported by one of Mrs. Eddy's earliest pupils, who lived many years in her home, that Mrs. Eddy frequently stated that she had appointed only thirty new teachers every three years because she wanted that kind of teaching to stop at some time. This statement is on record in the files of The Mother Church.

Thus the trend of development in class teaching is clearly seen. First, our Leader taught personally; then she saw a danger arising from personality and arranged for the teaching to be done by the Board of Education. As time went on, these classes became less frequent, and it was seen that eventually personal *class teaching* would be *abolished* altogether. A close study of Christian Science will disclose in our Leader's article "Class Teaching," in Miscellany, more than a hint of the inevitability of such a step, and even the indication of when it will occur, namely, when "the elucidation of the Principle and rule of Christian Science through the higher meaning of the Scriptures" (My. 241:4-6) has been grasped. But first it would be necessary for the Science of Christian Science to be

¹ Mis. 136: 18-21; Mis. 318: 14-22

² Mis. 358: 4-6

³ Mis. 273: 16-22

⁴ Mis. 317: 12-14

perceived. Then the textbook would take its proper place as the only true teacher, and every man, perceiving the Science contained in it, would regain his right to proclaim the Word of God, as is foreseen in the chapter on "Teaching Christian Science."

The step which involves freedom in teaching would have been a dangerous one to take until the absolute Science of Mrs. Eddy's discovery was sufficiently understood to be correctly interpreted and explained.¹ The fact is that Truth alone can take care of and protect the development of its own idea. Mrs. Eddy makes this perfectly clear on page 463:5-20 of *Science and Health*, where she instructs the Christian Scientist to detach his thinking from the mortal sense of every development or birth, and to place it on a wholly spiritual basis. Mathematics needs no protection, nor does music. *Incorrect teaching* in either subject *meets its own doom*. Far less does God's own idea, God-endowed, God-protected, and God-maintained, need to be constantly supported and protected by mortals, although its mother may have found it wise to protect it in its early stages. No branch of science can ever be organized: it must always be individual.

Mrs. Eddy's prophecy, however, has been fulfilled, and the time has come when the Science of Christian Science can be interpreted accurately from her writings. Not only has the pure Science of Christian Science been revealed, but this revelation has at the same time elucidated the Science of the Bible, laying bare the exact, *scientific correlation* between the *Bible* and the Christian Science *textbook*, each divinely systematic. So we are standing at the opening of a new epoch in the history of Christian Science. The student is finding in the textbook a teacher sufficient for his needs. "Material organization is requisite in the beginning; but when it has done its work, the purely Christly method of teaching and preaching must be adopted" (*ibid.*). This shows the way out. If the teaching of Christian Science is going to spread all over the world, as Mary Baker Eddy intended that it should, then this

¹ Mis. 284: 4-12

teaching must take on a more universal form. It must be *adapted to its scientific aspect*. "The education of the future will be instruction, in spiritual Science, against the material symbolic counterfeit sciences" (Mis. 61:4-6). This is the education of the future. As the system of divine ideas is beginning to be understood,—though even the most consecrated seekers are but on the fringe of this understanding,—new forms of presentation and new methods of propagation will be required. The time must come, and should come quickly, when the workers in our Cause are called to preach in other churches of Christian denominations, and to give courses on divine Science in our universities. The textbook and the Bible give everyone the right to respond to such a call. Does not our Leader prophesy what the results of such education will be? "Let our pulpits do justice to Christian Science. Let it have fair representation by the press. Give to it the place in our institutions of learning now occupied by scholastic theology and physiology, and it will eradicate sickness and sin in less time than the old systems, devised for subduing them, have required for self-establishment and propagation" (S. & H. 141:28-3).

There are to-day men and women in the Christian Science movement who understand in a degree Mrs. Eddy's metaphysical system, as established in her writings accurately and scientifically, and who realize that she meant exactly what she said when she wrote: "Divine metaphysics is now reduced to a system, to a form comprehensible by and adapted to the thought of the age in which we live" (S. & H. 146:31-1). Are these Christian Scientists to be penalized, disciplined, slandered, and designated as disloyal, because they understand Mary Baker Eddy's discovery as pure Science, to be universally interpreted and taught? If such a campaign against progress is allowed to continue, Christian Science, as truly scientific, must perish, and Mrs. Eddy's lifework be lost.

A similar development can be noticed in regard to *preaching*. First, there were personal preachers in the Christian Science churches; but at that time the subject of Christian Science was little understood, and the sermons delivered by many of Mrs.

Eddy's own students misinterpreted her discovery. The danger arising from such a state of affairs was obvious. Consequently, our Leader sought another solution, and found it by impersonalizing the preaching, or in other words, by ordaining the Bible and the Christian Science textbook as the only preachers.¹ Even the titles of the sermons were fixed, and yet the Board of Trustees may "in their discretion, change the name or style of such Quarterly publication as occasion may demand" (Deed of Trust establishing The Christian Science Publishing Society, 1898), and the Board of Directors can "determine that it is inexpedient to maintain preaching, reading or speaking in said church" (Man. page 133).² The final method of preaching will be found in the Bible and the textbook alone. "For this Principle there is no dynasty, no ecclesiastical monopoly. Its only crowned head is immortal sovereignty. Its only priest is the spiritualized man. The Bible declares that all believers are made 'kings and priests unto God'" (S. & H. 141:17-21). No laws of limitation can be right when they result in hindering the free propagation of a true idea. Our Manual is not made for that.

Much harm has resulted from a narrow interpretation, or—to be quite frank—from a *misinterpretation* of the Manual. If "the twentieth century Church Manual" (*ibid.*) is placed above the absolute doctrines of Christian Science,—above the teachings contained in the textbook,—there is bondage and injustice. This Manual, containing "laws of limitation for a Christian Scientist" (*ibid.*), can be demonstrated harmoniously only when in subordination to the teachings of pure Christian Science. The greater (the spiritual) must rule the lesser (organization). Every problem of church government must be looked at in this light.

Much trouble has been occasioned by misinterpreting Man. Art. VIII, Sect. 10, 11. Section 10, "No Adulterating Christian Science," deals with copyright. *Copyright* continues for an author's lifetime and for a certain time after his or her death,

¹ Mis. 382: 32-7

² Pul. 7: 24-28

and constitutes a protection by state law in practically all civilized countries.¹ It would need no special regulation in our Manual if every member would respect the rights of man or at least conform to the international laws regarding copyright. This applies to Mary Baker Eddy's literary works on Christian Science, but not to Truth itself. "Christian Science is not copyrighted" (Ret. 76:2).

Plagiarism is certainly not in accordance with the rights of man. When dealing with a specific subject, the investigator is entitled to use the ideas and words of other authors, especially when the works of such authors are analyzed. Copyright gives every author the right of quoting extracts from books of others by giving due credit. In this way, the work of other writers is duly honored. It is evident that Mrs. Eddy agreed with this procedure: "All published quotations from my works must have the author's name added to them. Quotation-marks are not sufficient. Borrowing from my copyrighted works, without credit, is inadmissible" (My. 130:21-24). This statement indicates our Leader's appreciation of the fact that her students would write about Christian Science and would quote her works.

Art. VIII, Sect. 10 of the Manual contains another regulation: "A member of this Church shall not publish profuse quotations from Mary Baker Eddy's copyrighted works without her permission" (*ibid.*). *Profuse* has the meaning of "pouring forth liberally; prodigal; very abundant or copious" (Webster). Mrs. Eddy's experience with one of her former co-workers, Edward J. Arens, showed that aggressive suggestions could lead the very elect to abuse this world-wide standard of copyright. In *The Life of Mary Baker Eddy* by Sibyl Wilbur (page 265), it is stated that Arens published a pamphlet in which "he for over thirty pages repeats Mrs. Eddy's words verbatim, having copied them without quotation and filching, among other passages of the book, the very heart of Christian Science." No author would agree that entire chapters of his or her book should be reprinted in the writings of other authors without acknowl-

¹ According to the laws of the United Kingdom, Mrs. Eddy's works can now be published (under certain provisions) in the United Kingdom. It is important to note that Mrs. Eddy did not copyright the last edition of her textbook, which alone contains the final text.

edgment. If this could be done, anyone could publish a copyrighted work from beginning to end simply by putting the whole subject-matter in quotation marks. In order to be allowed to publish profuse quotations from her copyrighted works, Mrs. Eddy's permission is necessary. This consent is no longer obtainable. Therefore the question must be solved by common decency and the Golden Rule, which would prohibit quoting consecutive pages and whole articles, since this would tend to obviate the necessity of reading the author's works. On the other hand, the purpose of this book and of all honest writing on Christian Science is to turn the seeker to the Bible, to the Christian Science textbook, and to Mrs. Eddy's other writings.

Section 11 of Article VIII deals with *correct literature*. One who loves Christian Science will never desire to write anything which is incorrect on this infinite theme. Partially incorrect statements, however, will occur until Christian Science is better understood. Such an understanding will need centuries for its attainment, because "scarcely a moiety, compared with the whole of the Scriptures and the Christian Science textbook, is yet assimilated spiritually by the most faithful seekers" (Mis. 317:14-17). As the period of pioneer work is not yet past, every forward step should be proved by quotations from Mrs. Eddy's books, thus manifesting a desire for honest and correct interpretation.

It has been stressed that only a small part of Christian Science is yet understood and that the understanding of this great subject must continually unfold. The written word is to-day considered to be an adequate and necessary institution for the propagation of any and every subject. Mrs. Eddy makes it quite clear that the propagation of the new tongue demands *successive expositions in literature*.¹ We certainly can gather from her works that she expected Christian Scientists to write about Christian Science. "A student can write voluminous works on Science without trespassing, if he writes honestly, and he cannot dishonestly compose *Christian Science*" (Ret. 76: 4-7). If animal magnetism finds ways and means to hinder

¹ '01: 30: 4-9; Mis. 364: 3-5

such writings, then it would seem to have won a victory. No wonder that evil has tried to inculcate the followers of Christian Science with a misinterpretation of Art. VIII, Sects. 10, 11.

Although students are exhorted to write about the immense subject of Christian Science, Man. Art. VIII, Sect. 11 has unfortunately been misinterpreted and replaced by the slogan "*unauthorized literature*." Nowhere in her writings does Mrs. Eddy use this term, and yet everything which is published about the subject of Christian Science, other than by The Christian Science Publishing Society, is generally classified by the movement as "*unauthorized literature*." This mistake would not be so dangerous if it did not imply that such literature is incorrect. Is our movement going to have a codex of prohibited books, as some other churches have, a codex in which figures all literature on Christian Science which is not published by The Christian Science Publishing Society and with the approval of the five Directors? Where can we find such a by-law in the Church Manual? There is no Christian Science church in which this problem has not caused untold harm. It is, however, a Christian privilege to write honestly on a subject, and to be persecuted for it is certainly an evil. To tax honest writing as "*unauthorized literature*" and then judge it, by implication, to be wrong, has no connection with any rule or by-law in the Manual. And to judge such writings without having thoroughly investigated them, as is usually the case, is certainly a sign that belief in Christian Science "*weakens the intellect*" (*ibid.*).

IV. THE CONTINUITY OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, SCIENTIST

It must be kept in mind that the only true government there is, is the government of God and His Christ, understood scientifically; also, that man has inalienable rights bestowed on him by God, and consequently he can only come under the jurisdiction of divine Mind, the universal, impersonal Principle. Church is a state of consciousness based wholly on the Christianly scientific understanding of the infinite God. Everything that is contrary to this state of consciousness must be classified as mortal, temporal, and finite.

Organized churches, including their codes of regulations, are naturally a *concession* to an age not yet fully enlightened; they are not in complete accord with the divine idea. The Manual of The Mother Church, The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts, contains rules and by-laws with regard to The Mother Church and also to its legal aspect. This legal aspect is embodied in the title, "The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts." ¹

Every Christian Scientist in his daily life has to obey some *physical* so-called laws, and also *moral* laws, but at the same time he is trying more and more earnestly to establish in himself the *spiritual law*. His aim is to gain his primitive spiritual state of being, which will result in his ultimate exit from the body. The more he understands of spiritual law, the less he observes and is willing to observe physical laws; also, he regards moral codes of the transitional stage as necessary but relative. Thus the spiritual must govern the physical and the moral. He is constantly prepared to leave the first and second degree of the "Scientific Translation of Mortal Mind" (*ibid.*) and to dwell in the third degree, wherein mortal mind disappears.

¹ Man. Art. XXIII, Sect. 2

Just as the propositions of “man” or of “church” must be regarded in the light of these three degrees, so must the question about our Manual. Its rules and by-laws regulating church government according to the first and second degrees of mortal mind must be relinquished step by step, just as in Mrs. Eddy’s time, when she often *changed a by-law* from one day to another according to the requirements of the occasion. This proves clearly that the by-laws were not eternal laws, incapable of being changed as thought expanded spiritually. But there exists a very definite provision that no tenet or by-law can be amended or annulled without the written consent of Mary Baker Eddy. This raises the question: Why should Mrs. Eddy desire the twentieth century Church Manual to remain unchanged in its text? Does not this very fact necessitate the final exit from temporary by-laws?

It has been explained before that the whole government of The Mother Church depends, according to the Manual, on the consent of the Pastor Emeritus. No officer can be “manually” in office without her approval, and in some instances this consent must even be given in her own handwriting. Now, the Pastor Emeritus is no longer with us, and her consent cannot, therefore, be obtained. The officers of The Mother Church can no longer hold office according to the requirements of the Manual, nor can they exercise “manually” their rights and duties as in Mrs. Eddy’s time. *Even the very first by-law* (Man. Art. I, Sect. 1) *can no longer be fulfilled*, and on this by-law rests the whole government of The Mother Church—though not of The First Church of Christ, Scientist.

Neither in the Manual, nor in Mrs. Eddy’s other writings, nor in any of her Deeds of Trust can any statements be found to the effect that she had appointed, or would appoint, a *human successor* to take her place. She appointed neither a specific man or woman nor a body of people (*e.g.*, The Board of Directors) as her successor. It is true that she waited for a long time, hoping to find a student who could take her place, but did not find one capable of understanding so great a task.¹ The body known

¹ Ret. 44: 10-16; '00. 9: 25-30

as "First Members" originally had some power of authority. In 1903 Mrs. Eddy changed their title to "Executive Members," but in 1908 she abolished entirely the by-laws relating to "Executive Members" (Man. p. 18).

It can well be imagined that the movement was in a state of indecision when our Leader passed on and there was no human successor to take her place. At that time, the feeling seemed to prevail that the *Board of Directors* should carry on the denominational government of The Mother Church as if the consent of the Pastor Emeritus were obtainable. Actually, this was a breach of the by-laws. Was it so wrong? At one time, Mary Baker Eddy undoubtedly intended to give to the Board of Directors power to make regulations themselves. In her Deed of Trust (1892) is the following passage regarding the authority of the Board of Directors of The First Church of Christ, Scientist: "they shall maintain public worship in accordance with the doctrines of Christian Science in said church, and for this purpose they are fully empowered to make any and all necessary rules and regulations." (Man. p. 131.) But she soon found that she could not let the reins of government slip out of her fingers. She even had to learn from experience that it was impossible to leave either the inception or the enforcement of by-laws entirely in the hands of a body of people. Many times she had to intervene and supervise herself the government of the movement.¹ As a result of much experience, in 1903 she changed those provisions in the Deeds of Trust of 1892 according to which the Board of Directors were "empowered to make any and all necessary rules and regulations" (*ibid.*), and decreed by another Deed "that no new Tenet or By-Law shall be adopted, nor any Tenet or By-Law amended or annulled by the grantees unless the written consent of said Mary Baker G. Eddy . . . be given therefor" (Man. p. 137).

The foregoing shows Mrs. Eddy's *distrust of personal rulership*, and the trend of her steps makes it clear that she did not intend to give to human beings the power to rule over a world-wide spiritual movement. The lesser cannot rule over the

¹ My. 343: 22-28

greater and should not claim or attempt to do so. Mrs. Eddy realized that even she herself could not "be the conscience for this church" (Mis. 146:20). To-day when we have witnessed the disastrous results of a dictatorship of a single person or of a small group of persons, we are astounded that in 1910 the Christian Science movement should have adopted the point of view it did. But looking back, in the light of recent events, it is easier to judge; the movement as a whole did what seemed to be the right thing at that time, and the generation of to-day has no right to condemn. Yet it is evident that Mary Baker Eddy, who, during her lifetime, dissolved the Executive Members and reduced the power of the Board of Directors, would certainly not have entrusted in its entirety the future unfoldment of the Christian Science movement to five human beings, three of whom can out-vote the other two. She undoubtedly realized that the most spiritually-minded people in the movement naturally would not always be willing to give their time to transact the business of The Mother Church, and this is the office of the Board of Directors.¹ Likewise, they would not be willing to subject themselves to the opinions of the Board of Directors on questions of metaphysics or of the teachings of Christian Science. No one taught more definitely than did Mrs. Eddy that one's individual spiritual growth and vision must always be subjected to God alone. Looking back, one wonders how, at the time of our Leader's passing, the movement could have exchanged a higher form of government for a lower. This could not have been her intention. She foresaw the necessity of unfoldment towards true self-government. Therefore she left provisions in the Manual that would necessitate in her absence the dissolution of The Mother Church, thus showing the way out of what she termed "laws of limitation" (*ibid.*).

From the spiritual point of view, Mrs. Eddy did elect a successor. During an interview with a correspondent of the *New York Herald*, in May, 1901, she said: "No present change is contemplated in the rulership. You would ask, perhaps,

¹ Man. Art. I, Sect. 6

whether my successor will be a woman or a man. I can answer that. It will be a man" (My. 343:6-8). And she explained this answer later on when she stated: "I did say that a man would be my future successor. By this I did not mean any man to-day on earth. . . . What remains to lead on the centuries and reveal my successor, is man in the image and likeness of the Father-Mother God, man the generic term for mankind" (My. 346:27-5). *Mrs. Eddy's successor* is not "any man to-day on earth" (*ibid.*), but *generic man*; and every Christian Scientist has the God-given right to demonstrate individually the image and likeness of God and thus "lead on the centuries" (*ibid.*). According to her statement, no human advice is needed, nor any regulation, in order to work out individual salvation and lead the age.

In 1927 The Christian Science Publishing Society published a booklet, "Permanency of The Mother Church," in which an article appeared by Judge Clifford P. Smith, entitled "Mrs. Eddy's Expressed Intention." In this article, Judge Smith attempts to prove that the Board of Directors could act as if our Leader were here and would have given her consent. The writer endeavors to convince the movement that the *organization* of The Mother Church should be *permanent*. After what has already been stated, one wonders how such a completely opposite point of view can be justified. Numberless references in Mrs. Eddy's writings state unmistakably that organization is only a question of time; it has also been pointed out that the rules and by-laws of the Manual do not all reflect absolute Christian Science and that most of them are regulations in the range of the first and second degrees of the "Scientific Translation of Mortal Mind" (*ibid.*), and therefore cannot be permanent.

In this pamphlet, three counselors-at-law support in thirty pages Judge Clifford Smith's point of view. Mrs. Eddy's death meant to them nothing more than the fact that her consent could no longer be obtained, and that this circumstance could not in any way alter the denominational government. For a lawyer this may be a satisfactory solution; but it is not so for a

student of Christian Science. Why take *lawyers' advice* on such a vital metaphysical question, since, in Christian Science, government is wholly metaphysical? Do we take medical advice when we have to heal the sick? We certainly do not, and there is no reason whatever why Christian Scientists should take another attitude where a metaphysical problem of government is concerned, especially when the spiritual government of our Church and the inalienable rights of man are threatened. How can even the best lawyers decide such matters from a legal point of view alone?

Judge Clifford P. Smith's article mentions six so-called proofs of the permanency of the denominational government of The Mother Church. The first, second, third, and fifth are in the same category. They are taken from legal documents, which naturally are written in the *legal language* of the State, and conform to customs there prevailing. In the passages relating to the Board of Directors, such phrases occur as "... their legitimate successors in office forever ..." (Man. p. 128-129); "... a perpetual body or corporation ..." (Man. p. 130); "... their successors in office ..." (*ibid.*); and in regard to the First Reader of The Mother Church "... each successive First Reader thereof forever ..." (Deed 1905). Legal language has to adopt a certain phraseology in order to make it clear that a Deed of Trust may be intended not only for a specific person still alive, but that it includes all successors and covers a period not yet defined. To infer from the use of a legal term that Mary Baker Eddy intended the organization to continue eternally and to be perpetual is obviously a misinterpretation, especially when considered in the light of the many references which can be found in her writings stating that organization is necessary only in the beginning, and must be laid off in the measure that progress dictates.

There are still other arguments which can be brought forward proving that the legal Deeds of Trust do not imply eternal perpetuity; such proofs can even be found in the text of these *legal documents*. For instance, in the Deed of Trust of 1892, where Mrs. Eddy wrote of the Directors and "their legitimate

successors in office forever" (*ibid.*), she also decreed: "Whenever said Directors shall determine that it is inexpedient to maintain preaching, reading or speaking in said church in accordance with the terms of this deed, they are authorized and required to reconvey forthwith said lot of land with the building thereon to Mary Baker G. Eddy, her heirs and assigns forever by a proper deed of conveyance" (Man. p. 133, point 10). The Directors were not forced to maintain preaching eternally in The Mother Church, and in the event of it being discontinued, they were empowered to reconvey the land with the church. This provision certainly disproves any indication that the present church organization should be continued forever. This becomes especially clear when one considers the fifth so-called proof in Judge Clifford Smith's article, dealing with ". . . each successive First Reader thereof forever . . ." (*ibid.*), which makes it evident that the term "forever" is a legal term, which cannot possibly have the meaning that the provisions laid down must under all circumstances be eternal. When analyzing this particular Deed in the light of the Deed of 1892, it becomes evident that if the Board of Directors, according to point 10 of the Deed of Trust of 1892, used its power to discontinue preaching, then there would be no First Reader and consequently no need to accommodate a First Reader for all eternity in the house at 385 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston.

To a student of Christian Science it is absolutely illogical to maintain a so-called law of eternal *perpetual office* in human affairs; this concept is entirely contrary to the doctrines of Christian Science. Mary Baker Eddy had to use a legal term in stating that as long as such offices and officers are required her Deeds of Trust should be valid not only for a known person or body of persons, but for all the unknown successors yet to come. As she could not foresee how many successors had still to come, she had to use the legal instrument of perpetuity. In Christian Science a "perpetual body or corporation" (Man. p. 130) is as temporal as *everlasting punishment* (see Lesson-Sermon subject); both are seen to be temporal as soon as the truth that the spiritual idea always rules the human or material prob-

lem is understood. When the infinite system of divine Principle, God, is understood and demonstrated, the organization and human government of such a perpetual body or corporation becomes subject to change and progress. A few months before our Leader signed, in 1892, the "Deed of Trust Conveying Land for Church Edifice," she wrote in the *Journal* (March, 1892), as if for a warning: "It is not indispensable to organize materially Christ's church. It is not absolutely necessary to ordain pastors and to dedicate churches; but if this be done, let it be in concession to the period, and not as a perpetual or indispensable ceremonial of the church" (*ibid.*). How can any loyal follower of Mary Baker Eddy deduce from such a statement that our Leader, who built on Spirit, intended to maintain a perpetual human organization?

As a fourth proof, Judge Clifford Smith quotes from a letter written by Mrs. Eddy wherein she states: "If I am not personally with you, the Word of God and my instructions in the by-laws have led you hitherto and will remain to guide you safely on." Certainly our Manual shows the way for the future unfoldment of The Mother Church, because it tells us not to depart from the by-laws and consequently from the many by-laws which have value only when the consent of the Pastor Emeritus is given; such by-laws in no way stipulate that the officers of The Mother Church have the right to act as if Mrs. Eddy were here and could give her consent for their election and also supervise them. She indicated above all in that letter that the *Word of God is an adequate guide*, our highest Leader; furthermore, the Manual itself maintains the standard that the Word of Truth, Life, and Love shall govern mankind. (Art. VIII, Sect. 4.) The fact is that obedience to the Manual indicates the way, after Mrs. Eddy's passing, as the disregard of personal guidance and entire reliance on the divine. Strict loyalty to the letter and spirit of our Manual will alone secure the right evolution of church government.¹

The sixth so-called proof of Judge Clifford Smith's article refers to Art. XXIII, Sect. 6 of the Church Manual, where we

¹ My. 251: 26-2

read: "If the Pastor Emeritus, Mrs. Eddy, should relinquish her place as the head or Leader of The Mother Church of Christ, Scientist, each branch church shall continue its present form of government in consonance with The Mother Church Manual." From this by-law it was inferred that the government not only of the branch churches, but also of The Mother Church, should be maintained in the same form as in Mrs. Eddy's time. Is this a true inference? The Manual is predominantly the handbook for The Mother Church. Why, then, did Mrs. Eddy make provision for the *continuity of the branch churches* after her passing, but did not make such provision for The Mother Church? This would indicate that she rejected the idea of an eternally organized Mother Church, and intended, on the contrary, that it should be the first to dissolve, naturally and at the right time, and thereby show an example of spiritual progress. The Mother Church should always be in advance of the branch churches, as is illustrated, for instance, in Art. XVIII, Sect. 1, 2, of our Manual.¹ The Manual further demands that no branch church shall ever assume the position of a Mother Church. Such a danger could evidently have arisen at the time when Mrs. Eddy passed on and The Mother Church became "manually" obsolete. It is clear, therefore, that this by-law provides for such a situation by demanding that no branch church should place itself in the position previously occupied by The Mother Church.²

With her passing, the theocratic dictatorship of the Pastor Emeritus was over, and such a high standard of government could not be replaced by a dictatorial government of five human beings. To suggest that our Leader intended to place the future prosperity of the Christian Science movement in the hands of a few people, whom she did not know, is an insult to her intelligence, to say the least of it. It would be comparable to appointing five human beings to control the development of mathematics, music, or any other science, throughout the world. Her goal was the self-government of each individual, and one of the

¹ My. 142: 10-20

² Man. Art. XXIII, Sect. 3; Man. Art. XXIII, Sect. 5.; Man Art. XXXV, Sect. 1

steps in this direction was the *distinctly democratic government of the branch churches*, the government by the many, not by the few.

Yet the *Deed of Trust* Conveying Land for Church Edifice (1892) and the *Deed of Trust* establishing The Christian Science Publishing Society (1898) leave no doubt that the Christian Science Board of Directors, as well as the Trustees of The Christian Science Publishing Society, should stay in office even after Mrs. Eddy's death. She undoubtedly meant that the regulations laid down in these Deeds should be carried out even after her death by a perpetual body. But they do not refer to The Mother Church, but to The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts. The Manual of The Mother Church was Mrs. Eddy's own form of government and was certainly satisfactory as long as she was here and could supervise it. She was the Mother, and her concept of governing the field was through The Mother Church. The denominational government of The Mother Church ceased with her death. But the self-government of the branch churches remained; and so did the original Deeds of Trust, 1892 and 1898, as well as some others which are not fully known to the movement. According to the Deed of Trust of 1892, the Board of Directors of The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts, can, for instance, elect a Reader for said church. Further, there remained, according to the Deed of Trust of 1898, the Christian Science Publishing Society with "the purpose of more effectually promoting and extending the religion of Christian Science." Yet nowhere is there any indication that any incorporated body should legally take over Mrs. Eddy's government of The Mother Church. The exercise of human authority over Christian Scientists in matters metaphysical is gone. They are no longer under their Leader's wise personal government and must now turn their gaze upward to God as the adequate and only Ruler.

Looking back to 1910, when Mary Baker Eddy passed on, one may ask why the movement has not adopted this solution. Also, why did Mrs. Eddy not give a solution in plain words as to what exactly should be done? Actually, only a few months

before she passed on, she was asked to change those by-laws requiring her personal consent, and it was explained to her that confusion would arise if she did not change them. Yet she refused to do so, stating that they were God-given. The present confused situation has been an enigma to Christian Scientists and has caused a good deal of discussion among them, especially during the years of litigation between the Board of Trustees and the Board of Directors. To-day, as the smoke of battle is clearing away, one begins to see the wisdom of our Leader's silence on the subject. If she had stated that the Manual would automatically dissolve The Mother Church at the time of her passing,—and this is the only way the Manual can be interpreted,—this might have resulted in just as much chaos as will take place if the movement's present interpretation does not rise to a higher level. In the year 1910 the field was not mentally ready to accept a higher form of government, and such a sudden change might have done untold harm to an *infant church*. It was not to be expected that the movement as a whole would be able to adapt itself so swiftly to quite a new form of government. Such a change required time in which natural growth could take place. On the other hand, our Leader could not know the exact period of time it would take before many of the by-laws would become out of date and so fetter the orderly unfoldment of Christian Science.¹

One thing only she trusted,—the eternal government of Principle. She also knew that there would be men and women whose love of Truth was deep enough to lead them out of the "laws of limitation." Such men and women would clamor for freedom regardless of restrictive interpretations of by-laws. They would thus prove that even "manually" they were entitled to this freedom, in *full loyalty* to the provisions of our Leader.² When a spiritual idea develops out of infancy, its maturing strength will inevitably *break the fetters of restriction* at the right time and in the right way. Has not Mrs. Eddy written: "A small group of wise thinkers is better than a wilder-

¹ '00, 8: 26-7

² Mis. 245: 23-29

ness of dullards and stronger than the might of empires" (*ibid.*)? And because she had taught her followers the value of the Golden Rule, she naturally expected that the new birth in her Church government would not be characterized by persecution, malignity, gossip, etc.

It is understandable that Mary Baker Eddy had *no* desire to bring about *sudden changes*, such as the dissolution of The Mother Church in 1910, but rather that she foresaw and hoped for an evolution. Naturally, the progress of such development would be dependent on the measure of spiritual understanding of the true concept of church. This problem is clearly stated in her interview with a journalist in May, 1901. She then said: "The continuity of The Church of Christ, Scientist, is assured. It is growing wonderfully. It will embrace all the churches, one by one, because in it alone is the simplicity of the oneness of God; the oneness of Christ and the perfecting of man stated scientifically" (*ibid.*). She was speaking of the spiritual Church, not the organized church, because Truth unfolds forever. Judge Clifford P. Smith, unfortunately, overlooked this fact when writing the before-mentioned article, and deduced from this statement that the administration of The Mother Church should continue "to exist and to function as a permanent institution" (p. 8). Since that article was written, many people have come to realize that such a concept of our Leader's church government is a mistake, although at that time this was apparent only to a few. But progress is gained by experience. We have no right to judge past mistakes, but must act according to our understanding at the present time.

That there was in Mrs. Eddy's mind no thought of static government with regard to The Mother Church can be seen in the next answer she gave to the same interviewer. The question put to her was: "How will it be governed after all now concerned in its government shall have passed on?" She replied: "It will evolve scientifically. Its essence is evangelical. Its government will develop as it progresses" (My. 342:25-28). She did not say that when those concerned in its government had passed on others would take their place for an unlimited

period. Rather did she foresee a process of spiritualization. The *government will evolve scientifically*. Certainly there must be constant growth out of human and material organization into spiritual organization,—into the understanding of a divine system of ideas, revealing the Science of divine government. In the course of this development, all that is not purely spiritual in our Manual will naturally crumble away, because the greater rules the lesser. All that is metaphysical in the Manual will be eternal, and will stand forever: “eternity awaits our Church Manual” (*ibid.*). Let progressive steps have free course! Then the Church will evolve scientifically. As the movement grasps the scientific nature of Mrs. Eddy’s discovery, clearly stated in her textbook, scientific evolution will gather momentum. Those who touch even the fringe of this idea of government naturally appreciate the dangers of organization. The movement as a whole must awaken to our Leader’s spiritual government, in which “spiritual rationality and free thought accompany approaching Science, and cannot be put down” (*ibid.*).

The Manual is therefore a necessary protection for the Christian Science textbook. A protection against what? Against the age-old tendency of mortal mind to clothe a spiritual idea with a permanent, unchangeable organization and to subjugate it under the government and supervision of an ecclesiastical hierarchy, which inevitably obscures the idea. Herein lies the importance of Mrs. Eddy’s words: “There was never a religion or philosophy lost to the centuries except by sinking its divine Principle in personality” (My. 117:22-24). She saw the necessity of decisively forestalling such a development and so provided that no personal rulership could ever be possible without her consent,—hence the many by-laws in the Manual stipulating that no office in The Mother Church could be filled without her approval. *Thus she made certain for all time that the movement could never adopt any form of government which did not correspond to her highest ideal, i.e., the self-government of man.* She thereby safeguarded the unfoldment of Christian Science from the lust for power emanating from personal sense. Only from this point of view could eternity await our Church

Manual. The movement cannot be too grateful to Mrs. Eddy for having held in her hands the reins of government with imperative authority and thereby made any form of central church organization, with its necessary officialdom, impossible for a perpetual, universal, and triumphant Church.

What will be the steps in this line of evolution? The human mind, doubting the scientific reality of *orderly unfolding*, always wants to know what the morrow will bring forth. But to-morrow grows out of to-day. We should have that attitude of thought which characterized our Leader's first infant organization—"Hitherto hath the Lord helped us" (Man. p. 18). When, in 1889, our Leader dissolved her most important organization, she did not know what would be the exact form of future development. She only foresaw the danger of organization and so laid it down, well knowing that God would show her the way. To-day we are in a similar position. The movement is governed by an organization which corresponds neither to God's spiritual government nor to Mrs. Eddy's intention. We should not fear to face these facts. On the contrary, we should rejoice that we have awakened to them. "The redeemed should be happier than the elect" (*ibid.*).

What is the *solution* to this question of church government? Certainly it cannot be found in the line of human steps. This government "will evolve scientifically" (*ibid.*), not humanly. What needs to be done is thinking,—scientific, fearless, unconservative, progressive thinking; to acquaint oneself with the Science of divine government; to put first things first,—spiritual and divine laws above human and material laws, the spiritual Church above the organized church; to claim the rights of man. These steps will certainly raise the movement out of its present dictatorial form of government to a more democratic one. The idolatry of "loyalty to Boston" will be replaced by loyalty to God, Life, Truth, and Love,¹ and also by active and Christian criticism. Christian Science is "the higher criticism" (*ibid.*).² Such government will establish fundamentally democratic elements, which will counteract arbitrary decisions.

¹ '02. 4: 3-4; My. 129: 28-32

² My. 240: 15-19; '00. 11: 26-5; '00. 12: 22-23

Only twenty months before our Leader left us, she advised that major officers should *rotate*.¹ The movement may demand that at headquarters this advice should be taken seriously. As long as Mrs. Eddy was with us, the government of The Mother Church was *her* government; but for successive periods she stipulated a quicker rotation in office, in order to conform more closely to the principles of democracy. Rotation in office would prevent, in a great measure, the dangerous effects of wrong decisions. Mrs. Eddy well knew that no human being is infallible.

The question, therefore, is not primarily one of abolishing to-day or to-morrow all the institutions of The Mother Church, but rather of getting a broad and scientific understanding of what constitutes true government. This understanding will bring about a willingness to let those forms of preaching, teaching, and lecturing crystallize which are *adapted to progress* and to the demands of future occasions. The movement will have taken a big step forward when it stops persecution, and supports progressive thinking. When the line of demarcation between spiritual laws of government and "laws of limitation" is clearly drawn,—when this firmament is established,—then "Spirit, God, gathers unformed thoughts into their proper channels, and unfolds these thoughts . . . in order that the purpose may appear" (S. & H. 506:18-21). But as long as "laws of limitation" are held sacred and are mistaken for divine laws, there can of necessity be no progress. Finally, the government will merge into *complete self-government*.

For many people it may be a shock to realize that the *time-honored concepts of organization must be laid down*, yet, when they realize that they are being forced to give up only "laws of limitation" in order to gain the inalienable rights of man, they will remember Jesus' words: "Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted" (Matt. 5:4).

This *upward way* is illustrated in the last picture in *Christ and Christmas*, entitled "The Way." This picture deals

¹ My. 255: 6-10; My. 250: 4-11; My. 250: 28-3

specifically with the subject of "Church" (fane). Its corresponding verse reads:

"No blight, no broken wing, no moan,
Truth's fane can dim;
Eternal swells Christ's music-tone,
In heaven's hymn."

(Chr. 53:57-60.)

The picture presents three distinct stages. The first stage is represented by a hard, heavy, black cross. Does it symbolize the first church organization, which Mary Baker Eddy had to close down after ten years, in order to save the movement?¹ The second cross is budding, and its upward trend is illustrated by birds, some of which have already left the cross in their attempt to fly heavenward. This cross represents a transitional stage with its theological danger. Close to this cross on the right may be seen the indefinite head of an ecclesiastical dignitary, partially hidden from view. Is this second stage, with its cleverly veiled danger, symbolic of the second organization, "adapted to form the budding thought" (*ibid.*), and is not such an organization a concession to a theological, religious age? The line of unfoldment in this picture does not lead to a third cross (a third form of organization), but to an imperial crown, the symbol of government by divine Principle, Love.² Does not this crown typify the Church Universal and Triumphant? From it a dove (divine Science), bearing in its beak a detached branch with six leaves (the number 6 typifying generic man), brings the message of self-government. "In Science, divine Love alone governs man" (*ibid.*). Government by "laws of limitation" with officers and offices, has become obsolete.

The tendency of the human mind is always to perpetuate human conditions, symbols, and methods, which can only be transitional in their significance. Even *Jesus* had to conform to

¹ Powell, *ibid.*, page 309, reprints a letter from Mrs. Eddy, November 28, 1889, and further a resolution of the Church Board, December 2, 1889, illustrating the danger arising from Church-organization, (p. 302-304, 1953 ed.).

² My. 6: 17-26

human ways and means which were foreign to his own exalted sense of the way to establish Truth. Thus he was forced to face the issue of the *cross*,—an experience which he prayed might pass from him. This step must at length have seemed essential in order that he might prove to men the eternal reality of Life.¹ Unfortunately, mankind misinterpreted the true import of the crucifixion and glorified and worshipped the symbol, that is, the cross.

In like manner, *Mrs. Eddy* hoped to establish Christian Science through spiritual and individual means. Her followers, however, wanted an outward sign, and so she was forced to establish a church organization. This was her cross. It involved a human footstep and concessions to a religious age, but had the ultimate aim of leading mankind to some understanding of the "house built without hands,"—namely, the "Church Universal and Triumphant" (*ibid.*). Yet the movement failed to grasp the transitional nature of this symbol and eagerly undertook to worship it perpetually. Thus it blindly repeated the mistake of centuries in attempting to preserve and propagate Truth through an ecclesiastical hierarchy,—and that in spite of Mrs. Eddy's warning: "There was never a religion or philosophy lost to the centuries except by sinking its divine Principle in personality" (My. 117:22-24). Are Christian Scientists going to attempt to glorify Mrs. Eddy's "cross,"—the church organization,—or are they going to work for the final *exit out of organization* to the true concept of church, as "the structure of Truth and Love" (*ibid.*)? As we rise, the symbols must disappear; if we cling to the symbols, we cannot rise.

Divine Love forces us to give up things which are not purely spiritual but are still dear to us, in order that we may *rise higher in the scale of spiritual being*. "My angels are exalted thoughts, appearing at the door of some sepulchre, in which human belief has buried its fondest earthly hopes. With white fingers they point upward to a new and glorified trust, to higher ideals of life and its joys" (S. & H. 299:7-11).

¹ S. & H. 509: 4-8

APPENDIX

TEXT OF THE DEED OF TRUST ESTABLISHING THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PUBLISHING SOCIETY EXECUTED BY MRS. EDDY, JANUARY, 1898

BE IT KNOWN THAT I, Mary Baker G. Eddy of Concord, New Hampshire, in consideration of one dollar to me paid by Edward P. Bates, James A. Neal, and William P. McKenzie, all of Boston, Massachusetts, and in consideration of their agreement to faithfully observe and perform all the conditions hereinafter specified to be by them observed and performed, and for the purpose of more effectually promoting and extending the religion of Christian Science as taught by me, do hereby sell, and convey to them, the said Bates, Neal and McKenzie, and their successors in the Trust hereinafter established all and singular the personal property, goods, and chattels which were sold and conveyed to me by the Christian Science Publishing Society by its bill of sale dated January 21st, 1898, said property being located in the premises numbered 95 and 97 Falmouth Street in said Boston, including the publication called "The Christian Science Journal" (not including the copyrights thereof), the linotype, all pamphlets, tracts and other literature conveyed to me by said bill of sale, the Hymnal, the subscription lists of *The Christian Science Journal* and of *The Christian Science Quarterly*, all stationary fixtures, stock on hand manufactured or otherwise, machinery, tools, mailing lists, book accounts, notes, drafts, checks, and bills, whether in process of collection or not, five United States bonds of one thousand dollars each, all cash and bank accounts and all personal property of whatsoever kind or nature which belonged to said Society and which were conveyed to me as aforesaid, excepting only such of said property as may have been used and disposed of since the date

of said sale to me, *upon the following perpetual and irrevocable trust and confidence, namely:*

1. Said Trustees shall hold and manage said property and property rights exclusively for the purpose of carrying on the business, which has been heretofore conducted by the said Christian Science Publishing Society, in promoting the interests of Christian Science; and the principal place of business shall be in said Boston.

2. The business shall be done by said Trustees under the unincorporated name of "The Christian Science Publishing Society."

3. Said Trustees shall energetically and judiciously manage the business of the Publishing Society on a strictly Christian basis, and upon their own responsibility, and without consulting me about details, subject only to my supervision, if I shall at any time elect to advise or direct them.

4. Said Trustees shall keep accurate books of account of all the business done by them, and shall deposit in a responsible and reliable Bank or Trust Company all bonds, mortgages, deeds, and other documents or writings obligatory of every kind and nature for safe keeping; also all surplus funds over and above the sum necessary to defray the running expenses of the business, until the same shall be paid over to the Church Treasurer, as herein provided. No papers or monies shall be taken from said Bank or Trust Company excepting by and in the presence of a majority of said Trustees. Once in every six months the Trustees shall account for and pay over to the treasurer of "The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts," the entire net profits of said business. The "net profits" shall be understood to mean the balance remaining at the end of each six months after paying the usual and legitimate expenses incurred in conducting the business. No authority is intended to be conferred upon the Trustees to expend the money of the Trust for property not necessary for the immediate successful prosecution of the business, or to invest the same for purpose of speculation, or to incur liabilities beyond their ability to liquidate promptly from the current income of the business.

Said treasurer shall hold the money so paid over to him subject to the order of "The First Members" of said Church, who are authorized to order its disposition only in accordance with the rules and by-laws contained in the Manual of said Church.

5. The business manager shall present to the Trustees, at the end of each month, a full and correct statement of the receipts and expenditures of the month.

6. Said Trustees shall employ all the help necessary to the proper conduct of said business, and shall discharge the same in their discretion or according to the needs of the business, excepting that the business manager may call in at times of necessity such temporary help as will facilitate the business.

7. The Trustees shall employ such number of persons as they may deem necessary to prepare Bible Lessons or Lesson Sermons to be read in the Christian Science churches, the same to be published quarterly as has heretofore been done by and in the name of *The Christian Science Quarterly*; and they may, in their discretion, change the name or style of such *Quarterly* publication as occasion may demand. They shall also fix the compensation of the persons so selected.

8. Said Trustees shall have direction and supervision of the publication of said *Quarterly*, and also of all pamphlets, tracts, and other literature pertaining to said business, using their best judgment as to the means of preparing and issuing the same, so as to promote the best interests of the Cause, reserving the right to make such changes as I may think important.

9. Said Trustees and their successors in Trust shall not be eligible to said trusteeship or to continue in the same, unless they are loyal, faithful, and consistent believers and advocates of the principles of Christian Science as taught by me in my book, "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures."

10. Whenever a vacancy shall occur in said trusteeship for any cause, I reserve the right to fill the same by appointment, if I shall so desire, so long as I may live; but if I do not elect to exercise this right, the remaining Trustees shall fill said vacancy. The First Members together with the Directors of said Church shall have the power to declare vacancies in said

trusteeship for such reasons as to them may seem expedient.

11. I also reserve the right to withdraw from said Trust, if I shall so desire, the publication of *The Christian Science Journal*, but if I do not exercise this reserved option, then said *Journal* shall remain a part of the Trust property forever.

12. Upon my decease, in consideration aforesaid, I sell and convey to said Trustees my copyright of *The Christian Science Journal*, to be held by them as the other property of said Trust.

13. Said Trustees shall each receive annually one thousand dollars for their services in that capacity, payable semi-annually in payments of five hundred dollars, or such salary as the said Church may determine from time to time.

14. The delivery of this instrument to, and its acceptance by, said Trustees shall be regarded as the full establishment of the Trust and as the agreement by the Trustees to honestly and faithfully do and perform all things to be done and performed by them within the terms, objects and purposes of this instrument.

WITNESS my hand and seal at Concord, New Hampshire, this twenty-fifth day of January, 1898.

(Signed) MARY BAKER G. EDDY

(Seal)

Christian Government

— Its Scientific Evolution

The book

The first edition of this book was published in 1946 and its effect has been to turn a great number of earnest Christian Scientists to a deeper individual study of the Manual of The Mother Church and to find that when interpreted from the basis of pure, spiritual Science, the Manual contains laws of liberation and not restriction.

The whole question of government – in the home, in the community, in national and international government – is today, as ever, a very vital one and although the purpose of this book is to awaken Christian Scientists to a logical, inspired and unbiased concept of the Christian Science Manual, this discussion of the fundamentals of Christian government and their scientific evolution must be of great interest to all progressive and freedom loving thinkers.

The author

A teacher, lecturer and practitioner of Science for nearly fifty years, Max Kappeler was born and educated in Switzerland, where at the University of Zürich he received a Ph.D. in economics. In the late 1930's he became a student of John W. Doorly C.S.B. in London, England, eventually joining Doorly's research team which scientifically investigated the seven synonyms for God through the Christian Science textbook. That research led Kappeler to give up a successful business career and devote his entire life to his own extensive research and writing on Christian Science as Science.

Though residing in Zürich, his teaching work has taken him regularly to Germany, England and the United States. Through the Kappeler Institute for the Science of Being in Germany, Switzerland, USA and Australia, his books and tape recordings are made available in German and English.