



Visions 2000: Our Future Form of Consciousness

Max Kappeler

We all share a deep concern for the subject of cosmic history and the future form of our understanding and consciousness. The main question before us and the challenge it raises can be seen forcing us, individually and collectively, to pioneer a new concept of humankind on the frontier of the yet uncharted future.

Can God, the one infinite Being, or universal Principle be understood? Is there a Science of God—a Science of all sciences—bringing together in a fundamental synthesis, the great subject of religion and the great method of science? Such a synthesis emerged with the concept of Christian Science in the mid 1800's. Great scientific thinkers have asked questions concerning the unity of science and religion. Einstein posed similar thoughts in his later years, as indicated in his now famous statement, "Science without religion is lame; religion without science is blind."

These questions are compelling because if pursued in a reliable, impersonal, and objective, scientific manner, a meaningful framework would evolve for understanding and

valuing the gamut of life experience that entails a new definition of "man." Why? Everything we do and everything we think about ourselves occurs within the context of some larger unifying framework, whether it is based on our family's training, schooling or religious beliefs, or an amalgamation of the foregoing combined with individual life experiences. Yet why should we assume that these beliefs, and often prejudices, combined with reactions to random and isolated experiences, could form a framework capable of unifying and leading humankind to work constructively. All of us who have experienced global wars and disasters as well as those who face them imminently are forced to question the adequacy of our operating framework, including our concept of existence, and the standard model we use to make life's decisions. Questioning our

Can God, the one infinite Being, or universal Principle be understood? Is there a Science of God—a Science of all sciences—bringing together in a fundamental synthesis, the great subject of religion and the great method of science?



Visions 2000: continued

conceptual framework points to the ultimate question: What is God when conceived of as the divine infinite Principle encompassing the laws of the universe? How can this Principle and its universal laws be scientifically and spiritually understood? What “man” will emerge in the light of our progressive understanding of this Principle? In earlier times, the general public did not think that such questions were immediately meaningful. God was a matter of belief, not understanding. A Supreme Being was a comforting notion for the devout, not an imperative Life-principle. The best of reason and intellect is demanded, along with a humble willingness to be transformed spiritually according to higher wisdom and order. No knowledge beyond the human, material and visible world seemed necessary to chart a successful course through life. Experience, however, proves that such a view is met with defeat more than with success. From heartbreaking disillusionment, in the 20th century, the notion arose that “God is dead.” In its proper context, this pointed to the fact, not that God was dead, but that the people’s concept of God was dead.

**The problem:
A question of consciousness and
the concept of “man.”**

Today, at the dawn of a new millennium, our view is different. For instance, shortly before his death in 1923, Charles P. Steinmetz, one of America’s distinguished electrical engineers, was asked what direction research would take in bringing about the greatest discoveries within the next fifty years. His reply was:

“I think the greatest discovery will be made along spiritual lines. Here is a force which history clearly teaches has been the greatest power in the development of men and history. Yet we have merely been playing with it and never seriously studied it as we have the physical forces. Someday people will learn that material things do not bring happiness and are of little use in making men and women creative and powerful. Then the scientists of the world will turn their laboratories over to the study of God and prayer and the spiritual forces which as yet have hardly been scratched. When this day comes, the world will see more advancement in one generation than it has in the last four.”

Although the basic concept of God requires much reexamination, as Steinmetz predicted, the resistance today to considering the subject of God and the unity of science and religion is less entrenched than it was 50 years ago. The change has occurred because collective and individual experience indicates that real happiness, harmony, and progress can only occur with the understanding of the larger spiritual frame of reference, the primary basis on which life is conceived and patterned. There is the realization now that a material concept of existence that claims success in new technologies and social innovations, has created greater problems than it can solve. The problems that are the most life-threatening and resistant to any solution are completely man-made. For example: today humans are faced with the possibility that evolution by natural selection could be replaced with evolution by human intervention.

We need to recognize that the world we have created is a direct reflection of our consciousness of what man is.

Our concept of man reflects a certain concept of God, the foundation of being, from whose nature the standard is set not only for what is sustainable and capable of development, but also for what is inevitably self-destructive. For example: if we think that God does not exist, that there is no universal and ultimate Principle of Being governing all, to which all actions are accountable, then everyone does what is deemed

These questions are compelling because if pursued in a reliable, impersonal, and objective, scientific manner, a meaningful framework would evolve for understanding and valuing the gamut of life experience that entails a new definition of “man.”

most profitable and advantageous according to their own desires. The fact that a strategy of self-interest leads to chaos, conflict, and a lawless society, is becoming apparent in every sphere, and on every level of existence.

It is no surprise that today’s crisis is a total crisis, for it involves the total form and structure of what it means to be “man” the entire structure of our consciousness. To go forward we must: 1) find out what the structure of spiritual reality is, 2) see how our consciousness can become one with the structure of spiritual reality. Pascal, in his book, *Pensees*, wrote: “Know that man



Visions 2000: continued

transcends man infinitely.” Karl Jaspers, philosopher, states: “Insofar as we are in the world, from somewhere else, our job in this world is to transcend the world.” The post-historical “man” must represent and embody a completely different concept of understanding man according to an underlying self-evolving and governing Principle, God.

Evolution by “mutation” to higher structural levels.

How does progress occur? One prevalent concept of progress is addition or accretion, where more information is added to a basic

“...the scientists of the world will turn their laboratories over to the study of God and prayer and the spiritual forces which as yet have hardly been scratched. When this day comes, the world will see more advancement in one generation than it has in the last four.”

Steinmetz

framework that never changes. Yet even in the physical sciences the “progress through accretion” concept is outdated. For example: when atoms combine they soon reach an optimum level after which they mutate to a higher level or order a molecule. When molecules combine, they soon reach an optimum level after which they mutate to a higher level or order a cell in biology, or perhaps a crystal in chemistry. With the addition of more cells, a new structure appears, namely, an organism. Each fundamental development involves a

mutation, or qualitative restructuring. Each successive stage of progress provides a new, more comprehensive framework, making a new kind of progress possible.

This analogy for progress seems to be an appropriate tool for analyzing humankind’s present predicament. The old model of consciousness that relies wholly on human perception and reasoning that takes human perceptions, concepts and belief as the ultimate standard and frame of reference has reached its optimum. Consider the problem of terrorists: the more the military, diplomatic and technical experts present strategies for securing international peace and stability, the more we find regional wars escalating to unimaginable proportions. Consider the ecological problems: the more industry and agribusiness try to offset imbalances, the more their efforts are thwarted by unforeseen and complicated factors, often producing solutions that are worse than the problems. To persist in the old method by incremental improvement or extrapolation from the old basis and premises is to invite destruction. *What is needed is a basic mutation, a fundamental restructuring of consciousness on a new level*, one encompassing the possibility of solutions that the old method renders impossible.

The “shock” that impels progress.

An article by the physicist, philosopher, Carl Friedrich von Weizsäcker, “Shock as the Beginning of a Change of consciousness,” (1984) deals with four subjects, where peace must be accomplished: 1) world-

economy, 2) ecology (peace with nature), 3) foreign policy (peace among people), and 4) political morale, requiring a change of consciousness. In summarizing the fourth point he states:

“Political morale demands today a change of consciousness.... Mankind cannot survive if it continues to put the new instruments (science, technology, economy, i.e. the realm of reason) in the service of the old consciousness with its structure.... Yet this does not come without a *deep shock*. Read the Sermon on the Mount. Whoever is touched by its consistent, non-contradictory truth will be horrified that nonetheless he himself fails to adhere to it. This ‘shock’ is the beginning of a change of consciousness.”

Three pillars of the prevailing model of consciousness.

Like von Weizsäcker, we should be convinced that the hope of the future depends on a fundamental mutation of consciousness. This change will be advanced the more we come face to face with a recognition and understanding of the spiritual with its demands on us to conform to its high standard.

This raises a point that needs clarification, namely, the difference between the *spiritual* and the *mental*. The spiritual is neither equivalent nor synonymous with the mental. *The mental* pertains to the contents of human thinking and is molded by its conceptions. *The spiritual* is defined from what Being, infinite Principle, God is from the whole, its nature, and operations, its structure of relationships, and the way in which the structure translates itself to every level of consciousness and experience. From



Visions 2000: continued

this concept of the spiritual, it follows that we must engage in the endeavor of spiritual education in order to understand what the one infinite, spiritual Being is.

The framework from which we can successfully investigate this subject is Christian Science, an idea that, since its inception by Mary Baker Eddy over 100 years ago, has been all but buried by misconceptions and misrepresentations from within and without a treatment that history guarantees to ideas that do not conform to the prevailing mind-set of the age.

The misinterpretations of the subject are very revealing, for they indicate an age upon reaching its optimum, that rejects the advancing idea by trying to fit the new into old categories that are the root of the problem. There are three basic issues here: a) *the religious*, that believes that God cannot be understood but must be believed through emotion and faith without reason, b) *the mentalistic*, or *humanistic*, that takes the human mind and its sense perceptions as the ultimate reality and standard, and, c) *the present concept of science*, that states that there can be no science, no “knowledge” or “scientia,” beyond sense-perception. Let us consider each of these three pillars of the old model of consciousness:

a) *Can God be understood?*

We cannot tell whether or not the endeavor to understand God is possible unless we pursue it with our best methods. At present there is no discipline as devoted as the sciences to developing means, criteria, methods and standards for understanding. Experience shows that blind belief and

emotional faith in God have done nothing but harm humankind and obstruct progress. Unless we use the method of science for assessing the consistency, coherency or even practical implications of the concepts posed about “God,” we relegate the subject to personal whims and idiosyncrasies, rendering society wholly susceptible to the cultist and emotionally uncritical extremes of religion that we witness today.

b) *Is the human mind and human perception the ultimate standard for spiritual understanding and for spiritual consciousness?*

The problems that are the most life-threatening and resistant to any solution are completely man-made.

Deeply rooted in the prevailing model of consciousness is the belief that the human mind is the ultimate arbiter of truth and reality, of meaning, value, and rightness. The modern world builds on the dictum that man is a thinker. We are, above all, thinkers. From our thinking we see ourselves as being original creators, a source of good and solutions, a source of knowledge and progress, as well as someone capable of setting the standard for truth and values. There is no problem we cannot solve.

Today this modern credo is being challenged. In every field, the best experts have found no solution to the problems besieging the world. The mounting intensification of these problems suggests that humankind is facing the most critical decisions of survival as a species: Do we recognize our accountability to the larger,

governing spiritual order that encompasses not only the physical realm, but also the emotional, mental, familial, social, ethical, and psychological realms? This is the negative form of the challenge, calling into question the adequacy of human thinking based on its present structure and method.

There is also the positive challenge. Leading philosophers and theologians are suggesting that “man” is not so much a thinker as “the thought of,” introducing an entirely new and potentially revolutionary concept of “man.” The German philosopher, Martin Heidegger, when once asked why we think one thing and not another, replied: “We do not arrive at thoughts. They come to us.” Claude Levi-Strauss, the structural anthropologist, says of his own experiences:

“I don’t have the feeling that I write my books. I have the feeling that my books get written through me. ...That is, my work gets thought in me unbeknownst to me.

I never had, and still do not have, the perception of feeling my personal identity. I appear to myself as the place where something is going on, but there is no “I,” no “me.” Each of us is a kind of crossroads where things happen. The crossroads is purely passive; something happens there.”

Another concept of “man” proposed over the last few decades as an alternative to “man,” an isolated, thinking being, is the notion that we are an *information-structure*, functioning in the context of an *interrelated information universe*. Here our individual nature is seen as an individualized, diversified *reflection of*



Visions 2000: continued

the whole structure of being. The field or information structure as a whole creates the appearance of the object, the individual, rather than vice versa.

The immediate concern is: What is “man” as the *thought of*? What information-structure do we reflect and represent? From a psychological point of view: Are we the “thought” of millennia of archetypal, collective, conscious and unconscious beliefs, and conditioned responses? If so, we present a thin veneer of 20th century attitudes over a massive core of magical and superstitious fears and beliefs. Are we going to carry these over into the 21st Century? Our conscious self is only the tip of the iceberg of a vast belief structure of which we are largely unaware.

This picture gives a familiar description of the “man whose days are as grass” (Ps.103:15). Yet this is not “the true man,” the man of God, for whom we must “put off the old man,” (to borrow St. Paul’s terms) and seek man created in the “image and likeness of God.” (Gen. 1:26) What information structure do we accept as authoritative, as able to generate a concept of ourselves that can work in harmony with the universe, enabling us to pursue the possibilities of spiritual being in a scientific and spiritual way.

If God is understood as the supreme Life-principle the one Principle of an infinite information structure that finds expression through a coherent system of spiritual ideas then we have an entirely new basis to pursue the meaning of our future. Yet to propose that we are “the thought of” God, or that we are the information structure that reflects the structure of spiritual reality,

the whole means little until we gain a definite understanding of what is meant by God, the whole, the one Being itself. Here, we are led to the third consideration, that of science.

c) *Can there be a concept of science that is not empirical, not sense-based?*

There are a few, if any scientists today who would answer “yes” to this question. Instead of debating the entire empirical concept that space does not permit, let us take a positive approach in proposing an alternative a redefinition of science that is essential for our progress in understanding being and the meaning of life.

Science aims at reducing an infinite subject to a few fundamental categories that interrelate and operate with each other to form a dynamic, coherent whole. The infinite is thus reduced to simplicity, to fundamentals, through which it can be understood, for without these basics it would remain unknown. In general, these categories tend to answer three basic questions:

1) *What are the fundamental elements of science through which its nature can be defined?*

Using analogies from other sciences, we can see that chemistry deals with chemical elements; physics deals with mass, energy, space and time. Arithmetic deals with numbers, and music deals with tones.

2) *How do fundamental elements operate and interrelate with each other to form a system?*

Under this category, science must reduce the complex sets of dynamic relationships between elements to their simplest form, often defining a basic system of operation or set of laws that

describe the operations. Chemistry identifies various types of chemical reactions, of which every reaction is some variation. Arithmetic presents the basic operation of numbers through addition, subtraction, multiplication and division.

3) *How are the basic elements and their operations translatable to different levels, dimensions, or standpoints?*

The concept of dimensionalism, in contrast to the concept and method of reductionism, is relatively new in the scientific community. It analyzes how one identity or set of operations appears differently when viewed from different standpoints, or transposed to different conditions, without losing its original identity. Chemistry offers an example that is perhaps the easiest to understand. Water (H₂O) appears differently under various temperature level conditions such as: solid, (ice) liquid, (water) or gas (steam). In arithmetic, the arithmetic values and their operations can be transposed to different bases for example, to base 2 (the binary system). The values and operations retain their identity even though their form of expression, or symbolization, changes. When dimensionalism is applied to the concept of science, it reveals different aspects or dimensions of science, from

“... ‘shock’ is the beginning of a change of consciousness.”

von Weizsäcker

the pure and theoretical sciences to the applied sciences. Whereas the assumptions and fundamental methods of science remain the same, the focus and emphasis changes.



Visions 2000: continued

Once categories and the minimum number of necessary factors within each category are identified, the interpretative power of a science can appear. Everything within its domain becomes understandable through categories, and together, a structure or model for understanding evolves. In the light of the categories, laws, order, system, and structure appear where before there was only an amorphous unknown, or an apparently random or inconsequential occurrence.

For an understanding of God to evolve and grow, this concept of science is indispensable. The Bible and the Christian Science textbook, "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures," by Mary Baker Eddy, have been basic to my study and investigations. However, the value of the scientific method when applied to the realm of the spiritual has an unlimited range of applicability.

The categories of the Science of God.

There are three fundamental categories as they have appeared in the emerging Science of God. These categories are an integral part of the Bible and "Science and Health." They are present in subjects and "tones," rather than as terms in the Bible. They were not identified as the basis of the Science until discovered through the work of my teacher, John W. Doorly (1878-1950). The terminology that has evolved to express the prime factors, or root-notions, included in each category are presented in "Science and Health." The terms that are capitalized refer to God as one coherent whole. At the same time, each capitalized term represents a distinct aspect of the whole, providing

the tool of differentiation without which there could be no Science and no understanding.

First category of the divine system of reference.

The nature of God. The answer given in "Science and Health" to the question, "What is God"? is expressed through 7 synonymous terms for God, namely, that God is: *Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, Love.*" (465:10)¹ The definition of these capitalized terms differs completely from their meaning in ordinary language usage. Their definition came to be recognized as presenting the first category's constituent elements through a step-by-step evolution in research. This occurred roughly between 1914/16 and 1940 when John W. Doorly engaged in the study of various sevenfold, ordered statements, most importantly, *the seven days of creation*, (Genesis 1:3, 2:3) as well as the *first seven statements of the Ten Commandments*. (Exodus 20) He also studied the *first seven beatitudes* (Matt.5:3-9); *the seven statements of the Lord's Prayer*, (16:26, 17:11) as well as various sequences found in "Science and Health," for example, the third degree in the translation of mortal mind. (116:1) After pondering these sequential tones and their correlations over two decades he saw that they were illustrations of the fundamental, ordered statement of the divine nature, the most abstract expression of which was found in the *7 synonymous terms for God*. Since this initial insight, examples of the ordered statement of the nature of God through the same fundamental tones have emerged in many ways.

Second category of the divine

system of reference.

The operation of God. Various anomalies that arose in John Doorly's research into the first category led him to realize that there was another category that continually appears in various forms and symbols in the texts. In the Bible, the pinnacle of the symbolic examples is given in St. John's "Revelation," as the four sides of the Holy city, the New Jerusalem, that Mary Baker Eddy identified as four fundamental operational offices of Being, namely: the *Word, Christ, Christianity and Science*. The terminology is unquestionably stamped by the Judeo-Christian tradition, but its meaning is universal. The analogy I have found most useful when considering this operational pattern is one drawn from the *cybernetic model*. Every cybernetic system has four basic factors: *input, process, output, and feedback*. If the operation of Being is considered as a self-organizing, self-operating, self-regulating and self-explaining system, the following factors are present:

- a) In the beginning was the Logos, *the Word*, that declares the nature of Being. (input)
- b) The Word has a *Christ* that expresses the divine nature and processes the input of the Word by translating it to consciousness and experience individually and universally, making the general individual and specific. (process)
- c) The Christ has a *Christ-ianity*, (output)(not a Christendom) the realm of its expression, the outcome of which is "the thought of" God man, and the universe as a creation of ideas, of which the visible world and man are type and

¹ All subsequent page numbers refer to *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures* by Mary Baker Eddy



Visions 2000: continued

shadow, an approximation, the image seen “through a glass darkly.” (I Cor.13:12) d) *Science*, whose purpose is to establish a spiritually structured understanding of God, provides the eternal feedback or learning-factor, or the means and tools of understanding (feedback). As with all the categories, the terms are not as important as their tones, or themes that can be symbolized in many ways and on many levels. The multidimensionality of the divine nature and its operation reveals the necessity of investigating the third category.

Third category of the divine system of reference.

The levels of Science, or the dimensions of spiritual consciousness. Anyone who has ever engaged in a discussion on the subject of God has most likely discovered that there are many standpoints to consider, each of which may have its own measure of validity. For example, the Bible says that God “is of purer eyes than to behold evil.” (Hab.1:13) Yet it also says that God saves and delivers us from evil. How can God save from that of which it has no knowledge? Such seeming paradoxes are prolific in all great traditions, including Eastern traditions, such as Hinduism, Buddhism and Taoism, that have made an art of identifying the paradoxical. The key to the paradox is the fact that one identity can appear in different ways and through different forms, according to the standpoint from which it is considered without losing its original identity. The properties of water may seem inconsistent, (steam rises,

whereas water falls) but to one who understands the whole hydro-system and how it undergoes such transformations, there is no inconsistency, no contradiction. Each different form makes sense in the light of the standpoint and conditions from which it is viewed.

In identifying the fundamental levels relevant to understanding God, the third category presents four levels of Science: *Science itself*, (Science of Being) *divine Science*, (integral science) *absolute Christian Science*, (problem solving or applied science) and *Christian Science*, (error-correcting science). These terms, derived from their use in “Science and Health,” refer to a unified framework for understanding. Each presents a different standpoint and gives a different accentuation, ranging from the highest standpoint of the infinite One itself, to the practical issues of how the infinite Principle transforms human consciousness out of its narrowness into a consciousness of wholeness and harmony.

The new “man” in the light of divinely scientific categories

Since the middle of the 20th century, many thinkers in all fields of research have felt the growing need for a profound spiritual evolution. Such an evolution demands an entirely new concept of “man” not man of the earth...earthly [material, mortal man], (John 3:31) but man as a entirely spiritual idea whose divine nature translates itself to every level of human and material experience. Departing radically from the corporeal,

psychological image of man as presented by the natural sciences, *the new concept of man requires a new definition*. C.G. Jung put it in these words: “I cannot define for you what the theologians call God, but what I can tell you is that my work proves empirically that the pattern of God exists in every man.” *The new man reflects the pattern of God*. To know the new man, we must first know God. This brings up the challenge of the age: *What is the Science of God?* Only as we begin to answer this question, can we answer the question, *what is man?*

When the Science of God and the system of the universal divine Principle is understood through the three categories of Being, the structured understanding of God that results forms the new man. The structure of Being is reflected through the structure of our conscious understanding, establishing the new concept of “man” in us. To convey this, Jesus said, “I and my Father are one.” (John 10:30) God, as the infinite Principle, expresses itself through categories that are infinitely

“...my work proves empirically that the pattern of God exists in every man.”

C.G. Jung

related. In this context, the new spiritual man emerges as an infinitely individualized intersection of these categories. It is the one Being expressed through infinite being yet understandable through Science. The divine Principle is no longer far above, but it unfolds within us. The true man therefore is the actualization of the whole Principle of Being.



Visions 2000: continued

“Man”–Idea²

• The term “man” is an extremely ambiguous word. It lends itself to many often contradictory meanings. “Man” is only a name for something, but does not say anything definite about the nature of its meaning. When speaking about “man” it can mean the mortal, corporeal man, a person, the “I” or “you,” but it can also mean the spiritual, immortal man, the image and likeness of God, Spirit. We speak, on one hand, of men as the children

From the standpoint of divine Science, we understand that nothing is real and eternal but Principle, God, and its universal idea. This universal idea is “sweeping down the centuries....” (55:15)

of mortals, and on the other, as the children of God. Such opposites are attributed to the concept of “man.”...(p.13)

• It must have been a great step forward when religion introduced the thought that men were not created by men, but that God was their creator. This exaltation of man’s origin gave great impetus to the dignity of man. ...(p.13)

• To the question, “What is man?”, the Textbook gives the answer in part as “that which has no separate mind from God; that which has not a single quality underived from Deity.” (475:19) Man is not “he who,” a person, but *that which* has the same Mind as God. Ideas have that Mind

which is God. In a religious way we know that God has made man in his image and likeness, but the scientific statement is: “Mind creates His own likeness in ideas.” (257:12) and not, “Mind creates its own likeness as man.” ...(p.14)

• What has been named “man” is now understood in its true nature as the idea of God. Man is the family name for “the compound idea of God, including all right ideas; the generic term for all that reflects God’s image and likeness.” (475:14) The whole creation consists of spiritual ideas and not of things and people. Human thought is slow to comprehend this new understanding in its entire purity. The Textbook acquaints the student of Christian Science with this higher insight. We first learn that man is created by God, spiritual and immortal, perfect. This creation consists of ideas; bodies and people are not ideas, they are mortal human concepts. Man is the idea of God. ...(p.14)

• All explanations regarding God/man and Principle/idea, respectively, culminate in the Textbook in the statement: “This human sense of Deity” [Lord, Jehovah] yields to the divine sense, even as the material sense of personality yields to the incorporeal sense of God and man as the infinite Principle and infinite idea.” (576:31) This summarizes a long development: at first there is a human corporeal sense of God and man which secondly, yields to the incorporeal concept of God and man. Thirdly, today, even this incorporeal sense of God and man has to yield to

the concept of infinite Principle and infinite idea. ...(p.16)

• As the Textbook has to appeal to various levels of thought it is necessary to be aware of these different stages, or we are in danger of taking statements that are on a lower level as the final ones, and this would hinder our spiritual progress. In one place we read of a traditional sense of “God and man,” then on a higher level, the term “man” is replaced by “idea,” and so we read of “God and His idea” as that which constitutes the only real and eternal, the maximum of good. In other places the term “God” is substituted by its 7 synonyms so that the statements become more and more scientific. Thus, the Textbook states in a much more definite way, “that the only realities are the divine Mind and idea.” (109:5); “all that really exists is the divine Mind and its idea.” (151:26) “Mind ... is the central sun of its own system of ideas.” (209:5) The universe of ideas opens up, and there is no longer any question that “God and man,” Principle and its idea, constitute spiritual reality. ...(p.15)

From the standpoint of divine Science, we understand that nothing is real and eternal but Principle, God, and its universal idea. This universal idea is “sweeping down the centuries....” (55:15) What promise lies in the new millennium of the 21st century: Our understanding of the fact that Principle governing its universal idea, governs the universe according to its self-evolving laws of eternal Life, Truth, and Love, bringing harmony to the universe including man.

²Excerpts from Max Kappeler, *The Four Levels of Spiritual Consciousness*, 1978, pp.13-16.



The Spiritual Breakthrough to the Next Millennium

Max Kappeler

Our future rests entirely with the development of consciousness. The Bible explains the steps of the spiritual evolution of consciousness through seven thousand-year periods following the order of the definition of God as Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, and Love. (S&H 465:10) Every successive period of spiritual evolution demands a higher form of understanding and method of practice. Standing today at the turning point from the sixth to the seventh thousand-year period in biblical history, and on the brink of the 21st century, it is of greatest importance to understand what form spiritual consciousness will take in the next millennium.

Paperback: 84 pages

\$9.00

Evolution—Material or Spiritual?

Max Kappeler

The question of evolution remains foremost in the world today. What brings order out of chaos? What impels progress? In order to answer these questions we need to understand the spiritual laws *behind* evolution—the self-evolving laws of God, eternal Life, Truth, and Love.

In *Human Destiny*, Pierre Lecomte du Noüy analyzes evolution, and shows that evolution occurs through *mutation* in seven stages, and that these stages cannot be explained by material science. Kappeler explains how the sevenfold nature of God corresponds to these seven evolutionary stages, and that the laws of God are the impelling spiritual laws behind evolution.

Pamphlet: 23 pages

\$4.50



Audio/Video Recordings

Genesis and The Apocalypse

Max Kappeler

Max Kappeler's research and pondering of the spiritual structure of these two chapters, Chapter 15 "Genesis" and Chapter 16 "The Apocalypse," in the main body of the "Key to the Scriptures" section in *Science and Health*, by Mary Baker Eddy forms the basis of the article in this newsletter: "Visions 2000: Our Future Form of Consciousness."

Through Mrs. Eddy's spiritually scientific interpretation of the first and last books of the Bible, we see the universal idea of divine Science "sweeping down the centuries," declaring and revealing the ordered operation of the three fundamental categories of reality. Reasoning from, and remaining in, the categories of reality—the capitalized terms for God—provide the key for discerning the answer to what form our consciousness will take in the future.

The chapter *Genesis* lays the groundwork for our future form of consciousness by providing us with a spiritual understanding of the first record of creation—God in its sevenfold nature and operation. This operation of God proves the falsity of the second record of creation—that man is a separate and mortal consciousness.

The structure of the chapter *The Apocalypse* proves that man is the image and likeness of God, as stated in the first record of creation in *Genesis*. Chapter 16 is unique in that it is written in the structure of the levels of Science, rather than the structure of the 7 synonymous terms for God. The structure of this chapter shows that man, as the idea of God, is the eternal operation of the laws of Life, Truth, and Love. *Genesis* is the premise, or statement, of man's true nature. *The Apocalypse* proves this premise through its structure and operation.

Genesis

Tape Code: **C-1G**

26 hours

Audio: \$286 (*special price \$215*)

Video: \$390 (*special price \$290*)

The Apocalypse

Tape Code: **C-1AP**

25 hours

Audio: \$275 (*special price \$205*)

Video: \$375 (*special price \$280*)

Newsletter special prices are good through 12/31/99.