




“Quo vadis?”



Where are you going,
Christian Scientist?

Max Kappeler

© Copyright 2003 Kappeler Institute for
the Science of Being, Inc., USA
All rights reserved
ISBN 0-942958-27-6

Cover by Blueline Design
Seattle, WA



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

Message from Max Kappeler

Dear readers,

For many years I have written books with the purpose of contributing to the understanding of Christian Science teachings. This book serves a different purpose, and I am rather hesitant to publish it, but hope that you will understand why I do so.

This time I write of something very different, namely about the Christian Science movement, that revolutionary discovery Mary Baker Eddy brought to our age. The movement of Christian Science, as organized by The Mother Church in Boston, has been in a serious crisis for quite awhile. The important question is: What is the cause of this crisis? Can we continue to maintain and promote the idea of Christian Science in the same way as before?

When Mrs. Eddy left us in 1910, the movement carried on by using the same method of church practice and governance, except that the directors took the place of Mrs. Eddy. Since then, the church services and rituals have remained the same—for over 100 years—in contrast to Mrs. Eddy's time, during which she constantly reformed things. The rigidity (and eventual failure) of this method has shown itself, among other ways, in Boston's rejection of the paradigmatic discovery made by John W. Doorly, CSB (London). The Christianly scientific system that Doorly found attained its full and final form during the 1940s. My life-work rests completely on the foundation of this system, which helps to unlock the deeper

meaning of the Bible and also opens up the deeper spiritual meaning of the structure of the Christian Science textbook, "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures." Unfortunately, all the insights gained since then are still attacked today by the organized church of Christian Science. The critics of the "Doorly-Kappeler movement," as it is wrongly called, have hardly read our writings—and if they read them, they did not understand them. Science cannot be fully grasped by merely "reading" our books; understanding requires a constant prayerful spiritual culturing of a new consciousness.

What stands in the way of a scientific understanding is what I call an "organization-consciousness." It is a mental attitude, one that clings to the old and considers it as a protection for the spiritual idea. Thank God that, in the meantime, there has been a steadily increasing interest in the spiritual idea of Christian Science as a *Science* of the divine Being; independent and freethinking Christian Scientists worldwide can determine for themselves the validity of the scientific logic of our research.

I have already given my foundational position in regard to church organization—at the request of my teacher, John W. Doorly—in my book "Christian Government—its Scientific Evolution" (1946). At the time, this book was called "church-destructive" and was literally burned, though I was strictly adhering to Mrs. Eddy's entire body of writings. Today, we can look at the situation in the Christian Science movement and see that the conclusions given in "Christian Government" proved to be right.

I give you now—55 years later—another book on this subject. It is an analysis of the present situation of the Christian Science movement, which has shown a rapid decline since the mid-1940s. I will try to show wherein the cause of this decline lies.

John Doorly prophesized in 1946 that under the dictatorial leadership of the church organization “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.”¹

Unfortunately, this prophecy has been fulfilled. I ask that you take this article to heart, and those of you who see the sad situation the organized Christian Science church finds itself in, to assist in finding the solution in a progressive scientific way.

Max Kappeler.

Zürich, Autumn 2002

¹ John W. Doorly, *A Statement* (London: The John W. Doorly Trust, 1945) p. 4. This booklet contains a short summary of his research and all of his correspondence with the directors in Boston regarding his research work and excommunication. A copy can be obtained from Kappeler Institute USA, or the John W. Doorly Trust, SSI House, Fordbrook Business Centre, Marlborough Road, Pewsey, Wiltshire SN9 5BL, England.

Contents

Introduction	1
I. The present situation in Christian Science	1
II. The Church organization	3
The first Church organization	3
The second Church organization	5
III. The Science of Christian Science	9

Introduction

In the apocryphal legend, the question “*Quo vadis?*” (“Where art thou going?”) was asked by a stranger to Peter, who had fled Rome because of the horrible persecution of the Christians and was on his way back to Jerusalem. Peter suddenly recognized that the stranger was his Master, Jesus, and this vital question reminded him of his duty: He understood the reminder, turned back, and fulfilled his mission in Rome. In the present situation in the Christian Science movement, this same question “Where art thou going?” must be asked of every Christian Scientist.

I. The present situation in Christian Science

The question “*Quo vadis?*” must be asked as more and more official communications appear that show a heavy quantitative and qualitative retrogression in the Christian Science movement. No one who knows me can doubt that I am deeply concerned about the unfoldment of the idea of Christian Science, and I stress therefore emphatically that my intent in presenting the following information is not to be a “devaluing critic.” Rather, my motive is a sober assessment of the situation, so that honest answers can be deduced from it.

The figures below show that the unfoldment of the Christian Science movement increased until the middle of the 1940s, but since then it has experienced a significant decline.

Number of practitioners:

In 1911	4,732
In the mid-1940s	approx. 11,000–12,000
In 2000	1,797

The Christian Science Monitor newspaper circulation:

In 1974	239,000
In 1989	156,276
In 2000	73,079

Number of Christian Science Churches and Societies:

In 1911	1,238
In 1958	3,115
In 2000	approx. 2,100 ¹

These trends are even more dramatic if we see them in relation to the population. The population has—especially in the USA—increased two-and-a-half to three-fold since the beginning of the 20th century. For accurate comparison, the numbers from the early 20th century should be multiplied by 2.5 to 3 times.

Naturally, I am aware that quantity alone does not matter and that the spirit is of final importance, the remnant about which the prophets have written. But we have to heed the situation as it is, and not ignore it or treat it lightly. The entire field of Christian Science is very disturbed by this situation and is trying in vain to improve it. The question is: How can that be done?

¹ These numbers are from: Charles S. Braden, *Christian Science Today* (Dallas: 1958), Andrew W. Hartsook, *Christian Science after 1910* (Zanesville, Ohio: 1993), and Andrew W. Hartsook, *The Banner*, Vol. 15, November 2, Winter 2002.

I. The present situation in Christian Science

Fundamentally, there are two groups of Christian Scientists who feel that they have the solution for bringing about a successful resolution. The one group sees the cause of the problem as errors in church government; they want to reform the organization and truly observe and obey the Manual, albeit under the leadership of the directors as Mrs. Eddy's successors. The other group, for whom the teaching is of primary importance, sees the problem as the misunderstanding of the scientific nature of the teaching, a misinterpretation of what Mrs. Eddy really wanted, namely to establish Christianity as the *Science* of divine being and to explore it scientifically. This second group is more interested in the teaching and not so much in the historic and organizational question. It is interested in the idea. The first group, on the other hand, is concerned with the details of the organizational structure and function.

This “organizational consciousness” — trying to use an organization to protect an idea — is the wrong attitude: Christian Scientists are trying to attain human solutions by some human, external organizational means, despite the fact that they know that only the Christ-idea brings forth a true solution.

II. The Church Organization

The first Church organization

Let us first consider the solutions offered by the first group of Christian Scientists. Their foremost concern is the strict obedience to the Church Manual. There is constant discussion about the 29 estoppel clauses, those

clauses that demand the presence of Mrs. Eddy; about the question of having four or five Directors; about the constitutional versus the congregational system of ruling the church; about the right of church members to be informed about church finances; about the question that if the Directors are the last ecclesiastical and administrative authority of The Mother Church, whether that makes them also “the ultimate authority” for the interpretation of the teaching; about whether members have the right to actively make decisions and criticize the activity of church government, or if they have only the right of “democratic prayer” for the church; and many other questions.

Can an extremely well organized church organization bring forth a good Christian Scientist? Can correcting organizational mistakes bring forth better Christian Scientists or attract more people to become Christian Scientists? We must see that organization in the teaching plays an insignificant role, actually none at all. At first, Mrs. Eddy wanted no organization. One forgets too easily and too quickly that which was repeated over decades in Mrs. Eddy’s work. Even in the first edition of her Textbook she writes:

“We have no need of creeds and church organizations to sustain or explain a demonstrable platform ... 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...”
(S&H, first edition, 1875, p. 166).

II. The Church Organization

Yet, Mrs. Eddy founded a church. This first church organization existed in the early years of her discovery, in the year 1879 until 1889. Then she dissolved it.

The second Church organization

In her autobiography, which appeared in November, 1891, shortly before the discussion of church organization became extremely important, Mrs. Eddy writes:

“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. After this material form of cohesion and fellowship has accomplished its end, continued organization retards spiritual growth, and should be laid off,—even as the corporeal organization deemed requisite in the first stages of mortal existence is finally laid off, in order to gain spiritual freedom and supremacy” (Ret. 45:4).

Mrs. Eddy could have left out these words in the later editions. She did not do that. I have experienced the truth of these words again and again. After having been forced to give up material (church) organization, I have experienced, in obedience to the spiritual idea and its unfoldment, the freedom and beauty of spiritual development even until this day. This was worthwhile, in spite of all difficulties.

In official church circles at the time, it was believed that Mrs. Eddy disorganized the church in order to change the form of the organization, improve it, and then to reorganize it. As a matter of fact, she had not planned

to reorganize the church, but she yielded to the desire of the students, who were demanding the reorganization and who finally, in 1892, got it. Mrs. Eddy’s true attitude toward church organization can easily be seen from her correspondence with the secretary, William B. Johnson, in spring/summer 1892. As an answer to the request of her students who wished a church organization, she wrote on March 23, 1892:

“Your only danger now lies in the past being repeated ... I wrote you, Miss Bartlet, and others, not to organize a Church! There it was reported that I gave the order to organize, but I did not.”²

But, nevertheless, the partisanship pressed on. Mrs. Eddy gave a strong answer and wrote on 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 church³ ... 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 those 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” (ibid.).

² Gilbert Carpenter, *Precepts: Vol. I & II*. Quotations from Mrs. Eddy’s letters to the clerk of the Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston.

³ Here, Mrs. Eddy meant the “spiritually organized church of 1889–1892,” which was not a legally organized church, but the time of the Christian Science movement’s greatest development.

II. The Church Organization

Mrs. Eddy could not compel the students not to do something that was near their hearts. But she wanted them to open their eyes and see that the consequences of reorganization *must* be negative. As soon as one tries to organize a spiritual idea or to restrict it, it will thereby be suffocated. Mrs. Eddy had to give in to the wishes of her students, but a few days later, on May 10, 1892, she wrote again a remainder:

“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”^[4] (ibid.).

Only one day later, on May 11, 1892, she wrote:

“...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” (ibid.).

After Mrs. Eddy submitted herself to the will of the students and accepted the reorganization, she wrote on May 23, 1892, in her own handwriting, a hint for a possible future solution:

⁴ Again, this refers to the “spiritually organized church of 1889–1892.”

“Do not come under any obligations not to disorganize when the time comes; *remember this*” (ibid.).

On August 22, 1892 she finally wrote:

“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 ... This absolves me from all future *loss of God*, from any dealings with infants in Christian Science” (ibid.).

Mrs. Eddy never changed her scientific attitude. She had absolved herself from the shipwreck that awaited The Mother Church. But having a great sense of spiritual motherhood, and just as a mother gives no beefsteak to the little baby, but milk, she saw that “the infants in Christian Science” were not yet ready for the stronger spiritual demand. Therefore, she took The Mother Church organization under her wings. Her way of life shows that she was always prepared to choose the lesser evil instead of the greater when there was no other way. When the field was in need, she was always ready to obey Jesus’ demand: “Suffer it to be so” (Matt. 3:15). Mrs. Eddy guided The Mother Church with a firm hand, with a Manual that she gave her students in 1895, and with by-laws that she called the “laws of limitation,” which she had hoped “would never be needed” (My. 229:26). As long as she was alive there was no misuse. In this way, she exemplified true motherhood, which teaches independence and freedom, not bondage.

III. The Science of Christian Science

Today, almost a century has passed since Mrs. Eddy provided leadership to the church. The question now is: Can the present drastic decline in the Christian Science movement be reversed by external organizational means? Can this situation be improved by exact obedience by The Mother Church to the Manual and by reforming the organization from within? Can we stop the decrease of membership through expensive advertising, grand constructions, and superb media? Or, more importantly: Is the decline of material forms really something to be regretted? The unknowledgeables in this case still argue that it is unthinkable that Mrs. Eddy wanted to end the organization after she had put so much work into its development. But is not Mrs. Eddy's spiritual work much greater? Is the situation of today not her great demonstration? Did she not explicitly warn: "His [God's] rod alone will do it"? And did she not give the advice "Do not come under any obligation not to disorganize, when the time comes; *remember this*"? Could she say what she meant any more clearly, when she compared the material church organization with the mess of pottage for which Esau sold his birthright and the blessing of his father?

III. The Science of Christian Science

There is, as I said, another group in Christian Science, which proposes another solution for the present situation, which tends to strive for a spiritual solution. It too bases itself on Mrs. Eddy's vision. In her book "Unity of Good," she writes in 1887:

“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 has strength to bear” (Un. 6:10).

And further down in the text she gives the reason, namely because:

“...the platoons of Christian Science are not yet thoroughly drilled in the plainer manual of their spiritual armament” (Un. 6:25).

She saw that the Science of physical harmony has to unfold to the Science of spiritual harmony (see S&H p.503).

She goes on in “Unity of Good” with predicting the following:

“‘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).

This prediction points to the year 1937, in which it was fulfilled. After many decades, John W. Doorly found, thanks to his cultured spiritual consciousness and devotion, the key to the scientific nature of the Textbook and its system of the divine categories of Being. With his insight, he opened the Bible and gave us the foundation for a holistic interpretation of the Textbook.

In the summer of 1909, Mrs. Eddy made another prediction, which was often wrongly interpreted. She found it so important that she signed it with her own handwriting.

“...in answer to on-coming questions, will say: I calculate that about one half century more will bring to

III. The Science of Christian Science

the fore the man that God has equipped to lift aloft
His standard of Christian Science” (Coll., p. 97).

With “the man” she naturally did not mean a certain person, but that “consciousness” to whom the idea of Christian Science has been revealed in its purest form; in its lawfulness, its system, and its ordered dynamics. This consciousness is not limited to a single person, but it can manifest itself through an individuality, as it did through Jesus, Paul, Mrs. Eddy, and John W. Doorly. In the following 50 years, the spiritual armament of Christian Science, which Mrs. Eddy spoke of, developed and sharpened. The weapons of a science are its logic, its clear concepts, its categories, laws, order, rules—in short, its systematics with which it informs, defends, and explains its truths.

The culmination of this spiritually scientific unfoldment led to the discovery of the structure of the entire Textbook, and with it, the certain proof of its scientific nature. The complete conformity of the structure of the Bible with the structure of the Textbook came clearly to light with this discovery, and fulfilled another prediction Mrs. Eddy made in December, 1886:

“I forsee 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...” (Mis. 363:30).

Actually, Doorly was the first to prove to some extent that the spiritual deep-structure of the Bible shows the same deep-structure and the same spiritual system as the Textbook. His biblical research has been published

in 16 volumes of more than 5000 pages. His research on the Textbook was published in his book: “Christian Science Practice” – Chapter XII of “Science and Health.”⁵

It is highly interesting how Mrs. Eddy presents her work in Christian Science in the “Preface” of her Textbook (pages vi–vii). There, she presents herself not as a founder of a Church, but as an author, teacher, researcher,

⁵ Editor’s Note: The following clarification of this topic can be found in Max Kappeler, *The Spiritual Breakthrough to the Next Millennium* (Seattle: Kappeler Institute Publishing, USA, 1986), p. 83: “The fact that Mary Baker Eddy expected ongoing spiritual evolution to ever higher and broader forms of understanding is further indicated in a signed statement, authoritatively dated the summer of 1909. There she says: ‘I calculate that about one half century more will bring to the fore the man that God has equipped to lift aloft His standard of Christian Science’ (Coll., p. 97). This prediction finds its fulfilment through the continued development of the idea of the Science of Christian Science—a development which began with John Doorly. With the key of Science and its fundamental categories, the structures of the Bible and the Textbook were opened, bringing to light a divinely holistic understanding of these two revealed texts. From this structural understanding came an apprehension of spiritual laws. Although the Textbook states that there are laws of God, no one was able to state what these laws are, much less define them through their elements and relationships. Only through the method of spiritually structured text-interpretation was it possible for this great breakthrough to occur, enabling us to define the spiritual laws of Being, to state the categories through which they operate, and to show how they translate themselves to every level of existence as spiritual laws.” For additional information on this topic, see Max Kappeler, *Epitomes for the Spiritually Structured Interpretation of the Christian Science Textbook* (Seattle: Kappeler Institute Publishing USA, 1982).

III. The Science of Christian Science

and Scientist. She writes that in 1867, she founded the first school of Christian Science Mind-healing and, in 1881, she founded the Metaphysical College. In seven years she taught over 4000 students, published her own works, and (for a portion of this time) was sole editor and publisher of the “Christian Science Journal.” This description of her activities shows that in the center of her thinking, the teaching and publishing of her writings, especially the Textbook, were foremost. She also mentions that she was pastor of the first Church organization (1879–1889). Then, in 1889, she closed the College and reopened it in 1899. In the entire “Preface,” in which she outlines her many achievements, not one word is written about The Mother Church! Therefore, the Textbook *never* mentions organization, but teaches Science alone. The spiritually scientific meaning of “church” is defined in the “Glossary” as: “The structure of Truth and Love; whatever rests upon and proceeds from divine Principle” (S&H 583:12).

Can Science be organized? Of course not. Are mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, sociology, and psychology centrally organized? No. Naturally, there are research institutions and teaching guidelines that provide direction. But in science, nobody decides what scientists must think or believe, what they should do or not do. There is no “highest” scientific organization that decides what is right and what is wrong, what is good and what is bad. Instead, there is the fundamental truth of free research and teaching. Unfortunately, this freedom is rejected by ecclesiastical authorities. It took almost 400 years for the Pope to justify Gallileo, who was sentenced

and sent to prison for his scientific research in 1633, and was not reinstated until 1992. For Mrs. Eddy, the self-teaching of Christian Science is found in the Textbook, which states, “For this Principle there is no dynasty, no ecclesiastical monopoly. Its only crowned head is immortal sovereignty” (S&H 141:17). Mrs. Eddy wanted the Textbook to be the only teacher.

Today, the question of whether the idea of Christian Science could again be lost is often heard. The majority answer: Never again, because an idea cannot be extinct. Mrs. Eddy thought differently. A short time before she died, she dictated to her secretary, Adam Dickey, the article “Principle and Practice.”⁶ In the article we read:

“The nature and position of mortal mind are the opposite of immortal Mind. The so-called mortal mind is belief and not understanding. Christian Science requires understanding instead of belief; it is based on a fixed eternal and divine Principle, wholly apart from mortal conjecture; and it must be understood, otherwise it cannot be correctly accepted and demonstrated ... Christian Science is not a faith cure, and unless human faith be distinguished from scientific healing, Christian Science will again be lost from the practice of religion as it was soon after the period of our great Master’s scientific teaching and practice.”

The word “but” is important. As Mrs. Eddy was “standing ... within the shadow of the death-valley”

⁶ Published in the *Christian Science Sentinel*, September 1, 1917; written in 1910.

III. The Science of Christian Science

(S&H 108:20), she had, while reading the Bible, a sudden, spontaneous healing. Similar “wonders” occurred before and after Jesus, and the people were grateful. She writes that in earlier times “cures were produced in primitive Christian healing by holy, uplifting faith” (S&H 109:17). She was not content with this, and she made a great stride in understanding by saying to herself: If such a thing as a Christian healing can occur, then it is not a “wonder.” There must be a law behind it, and a law can be understood scientifically by a law. Then, she continues the above sentence with “...*but* I must know the Science of the healing” (S&H 109:19) [*italics added*]. She had the standpoint that there are no “wonders,” *but* the manifestation of scientific spiritual laws that had not been seen. Therefore, she devoted her future life-work to the research of Christian Science.

This “*but*” is especially important for every Christian Scientist. Every one of us who tries to understand Christian Science stands before the decision: Should we, through holy faith, heal the sick, or should we, as Mrs. Eddy demands, try to understand the healing work through Science? Only a very few chose the second way, to which Mrs. Eddy devoted her whole strength and life.

Christian Science is a Science. Mrs. Eddy’s great endeavor was that her discovery should be understood in a spiritually scientific way, and not as a religious faith. In the Textbook, she mentions “Science” over 1000 times, whereas “religion” only about 40 times, and then mostly in a negative sense. Naturally, in her time it was practically impossible to communicate the idea of an understandable God through a scientific study of the

Bible and the Textbook. The subject of God, and all the related questions, were forever the domain of religion. To consider it as Science was already too much for that time, and even today it generates a lot of criticism. Even today the rendering “the religion of Christian Science” is still used, though it is a contradiction in itself and a leaning toward the “new age.” But naturally it provides a certain protection, because one needs not argue scientifically, as one has religious freedom. It is naturally very comfortable not to involve ourselves with scientific disputation.

So, the question that follows is: Is the aim of the Christian Scientists to grow in spiritual understanding or to heal the sick? Mrs. Eddy writes that “Healing physical sickness is the smallest part of Christian Science” (Rud. 2:23). Unfortunately, the main interest of most Christian Scientists is to have a healthy body, a good financial standing, to feel well in the material, and to enjoy unhindered the joys of material senses — although everyone theoretically knows that the Textbook demands that not only the pains but also the joys of the corporeal senses have to be given up. In the well known “Course in Divinity,” which Mrs. Eddy taught only to her home staff, she said on September 24, 1903: “...one who has suffered sickness or discord, I have always found more tractable in Science than one who has always been well ... health in matter must be given up for health in God” (Coll. p. 12). The foundation for this perplexing expression, in which she points to the necessity of suffering and cross-bearing in the human, lies in the fact that she knew that nobody is

III. The Science of Christian Science

ready to give up materiality of their own free will, except that they experience the discomfort of living in matter.

Definition of Science. The title of the Textbook should force us to think differently. It says “*Science and Health*,” not “*Health and Science*.” The important word is Science; therefore, Science has the priority. The adherents of Christian Science call themselves proudly “*Scientist*.” Are they truly scientists? If asked what they understand under the term “*Science*,” they can only give a hesitant and false answer—and this in the “age of science”!

The cause of the rapid decline of the Christian Science movement lies in the problem that it never asked what Mrs. Eddy understood under the term “*Science*.” Christian Scientists generally believe that because they know facts that are contrary to what the world generally believes, that makes them true Scientists. But the foundational definition of science is:

“Knowledge of a single fact, not known as related to any other, or of many facts, not known as having any mutual relations or as comprehended under any general law, does not reach the meaning of science; science is knowledge reduced to law and embodied in a system” (Funk and Wagnall’s Dictionary).

We cannot repeat this often enough! The knowledge of single facts alone—even if there are many—does not make a science, or a scientist. But is this not what most Christian Scientists believe? They know many Christianly-scientific truths and therefore they believe that they are Scientists. But in order to be a Scientist, they must know the relationships that exist between the

various truths. They must know the lawful order and the fundamental system through which the single truths are related in a logical way. In order to understand the Textbook rightly — that is, scientifically — the oneness of Being must be understood in the form of laws, order, rule, system, form (gestalt), and plan (design). Are the followers of Christian Science aware of this? How many have ever asked what the Science of Christian Science is? For most of the followers, Christian Science consists of the knowledge of many beautiful truths. This cannot be called scientific at all.

A progressive concept of Science. The Textbook teaches a science, but not the materialistic concept of science pervasive in the 19th century, the age in which Mrs. Eddy lived. In the Textbook, we find a dynamic and progressive concept of science. It is so progressive that an approach to it has only been discerned recently in the modern theories of science. Mrs. Eddy said that she discovered “the Christ Science or divine laws of Life, Truth, and Love” (S&H 107:1), the Science of Spirit. She also defined exactly what she understood under the term science. In “No and Yes,” she defines science as follows:

“Divinely defined, Science is the atmosphere of God; humanly construed, and according to Webster it is ‘knowledge duly arranged and referred to general truth and principles on which it is founded and from which it is derived.’ I employ this awe-filled word in both a divine and human sense...” (No. 9:25).

In this definition, we find two very different explanations for Science. The divine definition more closely

III. The Science of Christian Science

corresponds with a transclassical concept of science, which is being applied more and more in modern science. At the same time, the human definition of the concept of classical science is still used as a reliable foundation for all scientific works. While in the world, the classical and transclassical concepts of science struggle for predominance, in Mrs. Eddy's writings they are woven into a unity without any controversy. The Textbook contains a new Science, a Science of wholeness and oneness of the one Being in which "the atmosphere of God" (ibid.) is stated in laws, orders, rules, structure, and dimensions of the truths of Spirit, deduced from the Principle of Being. The Textbook contains both the classical concept of science, as well as the higher plane of transclassical meaning. In the Textbook, Mrs. Eddy anticipated in the 19th century what would slowly be accepted in the middle of the 20th century by modern scientific disciplines. We now live in the 21st century and, therefore, the Textbook should be studied with a consciousness that goes out from the highest possible concept of Science available to us today, so that the beauty and depth of Christian Science can be fully fathomed. As Mrs. Eddy predicted: "Centuries will intervene before the statement of the inexhaustible topics of Science and Health is sufficiently understood to be fully demonstrated" (Ret. 84:1).

A change in the structure of consciousness is necessary. Why was the standard of the scientificity of the Textbook not recognized, degrading the Textbook to a religious reading book, and why was the Textbook's text atomistically split up into single sentences, thereby

destroying its spiritual connection? It happened unwittingly, and certainly without malicious intent, but it did happen. We read the Textbook again and again. We loved its single sentences, knew them by heart, and knew exactly where they occurred. Even Mrs. Eddy had, until 1907, “never read this book throughout consecutively in order to elucidate her idealism” (S&H xii:20). But how many of us ever thought about what it meant when we read: “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), or “The categories of metaphysics rest on one basis, the divine Mind” (S&H 269:13). How many of us have asked: What are these categories, what is this system, and have found an answer? The categories and system of divine metaphysics, which are the unmistakable proof of the scientificity of Christian Science, are contained within the Textbook. Through a change in the structure of our consciousness we can bring what seems hidden to the surface.

How can we make progress, especially when we hold fast to the old and familiar at any price? Mrs. Eddy expected an unfoldment of consciousness. The first step of this unfoldment came through John W. Doorly, CSB, London (England)⁷ toward the mid-20th century. Through his pioneering research of the Textbook, the basis of the

⁷ John W. Doorly (1878–1950) became a Christian Science practitioner in 1907, a teacher in 1910, a lecturer in 1914–29, and President of The Mother Church in Boston in 1918. See his biography, Peggy M. Brook, *John W. Doorly and the Scientific Evolution of Christian Science* (London: The Foundational Book Company for the John W. Doorly Trust, 1977).

III. The Science of Christian Science

system of Christian Science was uncovered. Through a change of consciousness, one can understand the text of the Textbook in its system and in its spiritual structure. Unfortunately, the church organization in Boston did everything to suppress this scientific contribution. But a divine idea cannot be suppressed; it has enough strength to overcome any opposition, because it is one with its divine Principle.

John W. Doorly's contribution. The divine Mind made use of John W. Doorly's consciousness for the unfoldment of Science and spiritual consciousness. Doorly had discovered the orders and categories on which the system of the Textbook is grounded, and he clearly stated this system. Everybody who wanted to know about his insights could freely have access to them. In his studies, he relied only on the Bible and Mrs. Eddy's writings, nothing else; he added nothing to Mrs. Eddy's Textbook, nor did he take anything away from her writings. He was deeply moved by her statement in the Textbook: "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). He found and explained the categories of this system on the basis of divine Mind. Can the Science in Christian Science unfold by itself? Can Christian Scientists allow the structure of their consciousness to evolve? Yes, of course. There must be development, unless we are content with being considered a "small sect."

A paradigm shift in consciousness. But the new concept of Science demands of the student a paradigm shift in consciousness. Students must not only leave behind

focusing their study on their favorite single sentences, but also linear reading of the text. These practices are, at first, absolutely necessary, but must eventually be put secondary in favor of a structurally oriented study. This change in focus is necessary in order to comprehend the Textbook holistically. Then, every detail can be understood in its place value within the whole, and thereby, get its sense and meaning from the whole of the Textbook itself. Then there are no more human hypotheses, where we research the text only with the purpose of finding a personal answer to a selfish question—this falsifies the text. Instead, with a consciousness molded by the divine system of Christian Science, we can more infinitely discern the meaning of the text, because we will have a higher sense of scientific text-interpretation. We will see the bigger picture—namely, a complete image of the text’s structure—and with it grasp a deeper explanation of the Textbook. We experience exactly what the mathematician and physicist Paul Davies⁸ wrote about science, namely that he considers science as the most secure method to obtain *reliable* understanding, because science has the ability to reveal hidden orders, orders that we would never see if our thinking was limited to the old paradigms. Further on in the same book, he says something very important: If we find layer upon layer, always deeper layers of order, then it is proof that these orders are not man made, or that they are merely data being misconstrued by scientists for their own purposes. Rather, such

⁸ Paul Davies, *Are We Alone?* (New York: Basic Books, 1995), pp. 121–126.

III. The Science of Christian Science

layers suggest that these orders truly exist as orders in reality (Being), which reveal themselves as existing orders of true life-experience (being), and explain themselves through science (Science).

This is exactly what we experienced in researching Christian Science—that levels of laws and orders revealed themselves upon a thorough scientific treatment of the text of the Bible and Textbook. At first, the seven days of creation revealed themselves as the 7-fold order of creation. This same order was seen in the biblical Commandments, the Beatitudes, the Lord’s Prayer, the definition of God through the seven synonyms in the Textbook (see S&H 465:10), and so forth; eventually they showed themselves to be orders, suborders, and sub-suborders within the Bible and Textbook. To this, the 4-fold operational orders of the divine categorial system and, furthermore, the ever-deeper 4 levels, or dimensions, of the scientific consciousness—the structure of Being—were revealed

What did John W. Doorly leave to us? After 30 years of spiritual preparation, his work reached its spiritual pinnacle in the 1940s. But he found no acceptance within the church organization in Boston, and was excommunicated for his spiritually scientific research in Science. The idea of Science was, and still is, foreign to the movement, which wants religious sentiment. When “pride and fustian” “turn the poor and the stranger from the gate, they at the same time shut the door on progress” (see S&H 142:13–16). Science was, even at that time, the stranger; when Doorly’s research was shut out, progress was shut out, too.

So we see that in the 1940s, the Christian Science movement reached the highest point, and then the decline began. This should answer the question as to why the Christian Science movement has experienced a decline from that time forward. John Doorly wrote in his landmark booklet, “A Statement,” to the church that excommunicated him after decades of devoted activities:

“Why do I raise these issues? I will answer frankly. Because I love Christian Science more than anything in all the world and because 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.”⁹

Is this not exactly what has occurred? But Doorly was not alone in developing his consciousness and taking the step from an organized to a non-organized concept of Christian Science; many great thinkers in the movement have been denounced by The Mother Church—I think of Edward Kimball, Bicknell Young, Herbert Eustace, Alice Orgain, and Dr. de Lange, among others. The experience of Robert Peel is especially perplexing. Peel was a strong supporter of the Manual for the Directors of The Mother Church. He was *the* competent

⁹ Doorly, *A Statement* (1945), p. 4.

III. The Science of Christian Science

authority who was consulted in all questions of the church and, through his three volumes on Mrs. Eddy and her history, had worldwide recognition outside the church. But at the end of his life, he was counted as a dissenter. About this, one of his schoolmates wrote about him:

“Robert Peel was perhaps the church’s most respected, most beloved member and, at the end of his life, a dissident—a surprise even to him ... Shortly before his death, he spoke with me from his apartment, within sight of The Mother Church, from which he was then painfully estranged.

“I asked him what would happen if the church went bankrupt, and he hesitated before he said, ‘That might be the best thing in the world that could happen.’

“He spoke to me of the possibilities of a great flowering yet to come. It was a beautiful image, a great leap away from the material world, one that would light up the heart of just about anyone with spiritual longing.” (Yankee Magazine, July 1992, p.13)

As Doorly’s student, I was excommunicated from the branch Church in Zürich in 1946 after 12 years of active membership. We had a very beautiful church building in Zürich, and along with the Christian Science Society in Zürich, we had about 1200 in attendance. All seats were full and we had to sometimes sit on the steps. Today, the great, imposing church room is rented to the opera orchestra and the church services are in the former Sunday School room. Only about 3–5 dozen participants attend church services now.


One can call the present situation of the Christian Science movement a catastrophe. One can also legitimately call it Mrs. Eddy’s demonstration of the spiritual unfoldment of her revelation—of which she was already aware in 1892—that organization of a Science leads to disaster.

A science can only flourish when it has the protection of freedom and human rights. I was excommunicated in 1952 from The Mother Church in Boston after 17 years of membership. What was the reason? Living in a 700 year-old democratic society (Switzerland), I have always worked under the assumption of human rights; the freedom of thought and research, the freedom of speech and writing. Many centuries have passed since my ancestors fought for these rights under the engagement of body and life. One of my forefathers battled for freedom of religion with the reformer Ulrich Zwingli, in the year 1531, against a Catholic force five times greater in size. Zwingli was put to death, and the Reformation made no further progress. More than 400 years later, The Mother Church excommunicated me because I exercised the same human rights my ancestors fought for: I published the results of my synonym research, the “Compendium for the Study of Christian Science.” Though these compendiums consist predominantly of references from the Textbook to help the reader understand the 7 synonyms for God (see S&H 465:10), I was penalized because I had made use of the right of research and the right of free speech. Is this worthy of a modern day church, one that co-exists with modern day democracies?

III. The Science of Christian Science

And especially, is this worthy of Christian Science, which Mrs. Eddy left us and which she desired that we study scientifically?

Quo vadis? Where are *you* going, Christian Scientist?



ISBN 0-942958-27-6

