

THE EMMANUEL MOVEMENT AND CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

(The second of a series of articles by Alfred Farlow on this subject.)

Rev. Francis R. Godolphin, Grand Rapids, Mich., declares that "Underlying the success of Christ's ministry lies nothing more nor less than the laws of psychology, the power of mind over the body," and the gentleman's further discussion of the subject indicates that he places the exalted work of the Master on the basis of human suggestion, the force of his will over material things and conditions and over the minds of others. Jesus attributed his demonstrations not to himself but to the direct influence of the Father.

Another clergyman has declared that Jesus healed the sick through magnetic manipulations; still another claims that he was controlled by good spirits. Dr. Elwood Worcester expresses an opinion that if there had been proficient medical practitioners in the day of the Master, he would have had a physician to diagnose the cases of sickness which came to him, and that he would have turned over the cases of organic diseases to the medical practitioners. It appears that each particular individual is prone to bespeak the Master's commendation of whatever the individual himself would recommend and to credit the Master's good works to whatever means is required, in his judgment, to produce a given result. Inasmuch as Jesus was unincumbered by any sort of material means or methods, it follows that he had the most expeditious and convenient method the world has ever known. He certainly would not have acted the part of wisdom in seeking or using any imperfect means when he already had in his possession the perfect, a possession which he demonstrated by the perfect results which he obtained.

Dr. Godolphin is right in his declaration: "I believe when some of us fail to get an answer it is because we are lacking in faith. We have got to learn to submit our lives to God." This leads us to say that Christian Science contributes very largely toward one's faith in God by enlightening one's understanding of Him. Our confidence increases as our acquaintance enlarges. If we know only a little about God we may have a small faith. If we have a misapprehension of God and look upon Him as the author of discord and calamity we may dread Him rather than trust Him. The understanding that God's love, that He is infinite mind, an omnipresent intelligence, that constantly upholds, sustains and protects His creatures, fosters a strong faith in Him. It would be impossible to entertain this infinite and exalted consciousness of God without having infinite and abiding faith in Him. Such faith amounts to understanding and destroys evil and disease.

Suggestion.

One authority on mental suggestion declares: "There are two auto-suggestions that will cure most cases of insomnia. The first is this—when you go to bed make up your mind that you are going to have a sleep. Say to yourself, 'I am going to have a good sleep tonight.' The other idea is that if you don't sleep it doesn't make any difference." This authority says he explains to his patients that sleep is a "bad habit, very wasteful of the convenient method of the man who sought to obey the obedience of his dog. The master said to his dog, which was under the bed, 'Gyp, come out here.' Gyp did not move. Then his master said, 'Gyp, stay under the bed.' Gyp remained under the bed. Now, said the man to his friend, 'Did I not tell you that Gyp was an obedient dog?'"

Dr. McComb declares that the patient needs to "assert again and again to himself, 'I will sleep.'" This is about as simple a dose of human will as one could imagine. It is sheer human determination, without even a material basis for its utterance and is certainly in striking contrast with the Master's declaration, "Not as I will." If it is said "You are in a good atmosphere, in a comfortable bed, and therefore you will sleep," the answer may be, "I acquired the habit of insomnia in this very atmosphere and in this very bed." Thus we might name one suggestion after another until we have exhausted every argument which human consciousness is able to produce and still not find one which has a logical, truthful and substantial basis or any feature whatever that could rationally be expected to convince the patient, that he will surely sleep, and yet the suggestionist informs us that by such argument he has put his patient to sleep. The inevitable conclusion is that whatever result is produced by such a process is not by the argument or arguments employed, but by the employment itself, that is, by the force of will or magnetism put forth in the effort.

Professor Dickinson S. Miller, in a letter which appeared in the New York Times, November 14, 1908, declared: "We almost never can truthfully say to a patient, 'You will get well.' We do not know whether he will or not. I confess to the 'unpractical' moral squeamishness of wishing to banish the lie from suggestion altogether." Now we suggest to the gentleman that there is but one possible way of doing this, and that is by adopting the Christian Science method.

Mark the striking contrast between the above practice and that of the Christian Scientist, who, with calm assurance, elucidates to his patient the fact that he is in the very presence of God, infinite Love, and that his rest is in God, in whom man lives and moves and has his being. The patient is made to know why and how God gives them peace at every moment. Christian Science gives a definite, comprehensive, truthful understanding of God and of man's relation to Him. The patient is thus lifted into a consciousness of ever present Spirit, the infinite good, and this good overcomes evil according to the admonition of the



MARY BAKER G. EDDY

Master. Thus we note that in Christian Science it is God alone who heals, that Christian Science heals by the direct influence of God.

We affirm that neither an honest denial of the reality of disease nor an assured affirmation concerning the recovery of a patient can ever be made upon any other basis than that on which Christian Science rests.

We hear it said by all believers in the mental treatment of disease that the "impartation of hope and cheer to a patient" is a means of great benefit to him. To this we readily agree. Then, we would ask, what shall we offer the patient as a means of generating hope and cheer? We might place him in the midst of beautiful surroundings and present him with all the comforts which money can buy and yet fail to cheer him, for his experience may already have been like that of Solomon, who said, "All is vanity." We aver that there is nothing so conducive of hope and cheer as the abiding consciousness of the constant presence of God. Such a consciousness affords lasting and unbounded hope, for it is based upon that which is known to be immutable and eternal. It has been demonstrated through Christian Science that those thus treated will do more for a sick man than anything else. It has been proved that the spiritual understanding of God and man and their relationship is more practical than anything in this world. Then why resort to any lesser means? Why depend upon uncertain human suggestion as a means of destroying sin and sickness when the divine power is more available, more powerful and more practical?

An Effect of Suggestion.

As he argues, the mental suggestionist holds his patient in consciousness as a corporal person, a body of matter. He thinks of him as such and this amounts to a direct suggestion to him that he is material and mortal and implies that as such he is subject to discord, disease and unrest. On the other hand, the Christian Scientist thinks of his patient's real individuality as God's image and likeness, His spiritual reflection; and his denial of sickness is based upon his understanding that sickness is only a false sense. Such an argument is consistent with its premises—premises which are based upon eternal truth.

The thought of the medical practitioner, as well as the suggestion which the act of dealing out drugs gives to his patient, is on the exact basis of the suggestionist, and hence not inconsistent with the practice of the psychologist. If the doctor gives the patient a dose of medicine, he practically suggests to his patient, "You are material, taking material medicine," though he utters not a word. Thus by his suggestion he intensifies the patient's belief in materiality, especially if there is any result from his treatment. Though the patient may take the drug with a doubt as to its efficacy, if thereafter apparent good results are forthcoming, he is thereby convinced that he had been mistaken and that, after all, there is something in it. Under such circumstances, matter has become more real to him. He has builded higher in material belief and thus has drifted farther away from faith in spirit as the only real life, substance and intelligence. On the other hand, if the patient fails to obtain good results through the use of material remedies his faith in materiality decreases and he is thus brought nearer to the truth, for, having lost faith in matter, he is more ready to accept that which emphasizes faith in spirit. Similarly, he who is apparently benefited by mental suggestion is given a stronger faith in mortal mind and is thus carried away from his faith in the one and only mind. Thus we may prove that the supposed benefits derived from the use of drugs and mental suggestion are, in reality, harmful to the spiritual growth of the individual. The tendency of such benefits is to fasten the individual to erroneous beliefs and thus interdict his seeking and finding the better way. This, however, should not be looked upon as a hopeless condition, for Christian Science offers a way out of the

dilemma, after he eventually fails in his make-believe benefits. Here it may be well to mention that sometimes when an individual fails to gain relief from agonizing pain by Christian Science treatment he may find it a lesser evil to seek temporary relief by material remedies in order that he may regain a position from which he is able to effectually demonstrate Christian Science. In the case of a broken bone, he may, because of his limited understanding, find it advisable to resort to surgery, and in her text book Mrs. Eddy advises that surgery be left to the fingers of a surgeon.

It is advisable and in accord with the teaching of Christian Science that we practice absolute Christian Science as far as possible. Beyond that, we choose the lesser of two evils, and few, indeed, are the occasions when it becomes necessary for a Christian Scientist to resort to material remedies as an emergency means.

"A Curative Suggestion."

Dr. Worcester defines "curative suggestion" as "an effect obtained through the conviction that it (a cure) is about to take place." A curative argument in Christian Science is one that is based upon the everlasting truth that man is always well and always rest, because he lives and moves, and has his being in God. Dr. Worcester says, "I earnestly tell him that in a few moments he will be asleep, adding 'if he knows that hundreds of other persons have undergone this experience, he will be more certain to accept my assurance and to obey the suggestion.'" Thus he bases his assurance of results upon a prospect, a mere speculation. He has no assurance that the patient will be asleep. He pins his faith to the belief that he will be able to produce the result. This is not depending upon God but upon oneself. This is in direct opposition to the Master's healing, who prayed "not as I will, but as thou wilt." Again Dr. Worcester declares, "I convince myself that the patient's inability to move does not proceed from true paralysis, and I assure her that she can rise, and I earnestly command her to do so, which she proceeds to do." How or by what means does he convince himself? There are only two ways of answering this question; either he must declare that he has, or that he has not, a reason for this declaration. If he affirms that he has a reason therefore, he must explain either that he bases his declaration upon a mere hope or that he rests upon the understanding of the spiritual facts of being and the unreality of paralysis.

He declares, "I divert her mind, place my hand on the suffering part to heighten the impression that something is about to be done for her, and I confidently inform her that the pain is diminishing, that it is going down in degrees, and that in a given time, five minutes, it will have disappeared." Again, we ask, what assurance has he that the pain will disappear? Upon what ground does he "confidently inform" the patient that the pain is diminishing and will disappear? Why will the pain have disappeared? Has pain always disappeared under such treatment? Statistics of results which Dr. Worcester has offered to the public indicate that a large percentage of those treated by him were "not perceptibly influenced." How does he know that this patient will not be one of those not to be influenced? How does he know that he is arguing the truth? To declare something as truth which one does not know to be true, and probably does not even believe to be true, is not a Christian practice.

It is certainly very plain that the results just mentioned are effected wholly by the will of the operator, and in contrast to such a practice, it may be well to note that every effort of the Christian Scientist is a plea in behalf of the omnipotence of God, good. The Christian Scientist pleads only that the divine will may "be done," and leaves the consequences to God.

"Auto-Suggestion."

When the Christian looks away from earth to his infinite heavenly Father as life, truth, love, and in this conten-

plation loses his pain, it is no more proper to say that this has occurred through "auto-suggestion" than to declare that when the darkness is destroyed by the light the result has been accomplished through auto-suggestion. It seems as though the effort to explain all results upon a human basis and to credit oneself or the human mind with a power to heal is to leave God out and to drift into infidelity and atheism.

Modus Operandi of Suggestion.

We are indebted to Rollin Lynde Hart for some definite formula used in the "psychological" treatment of insomnia. In a magazine article published in December, 1907, Mr. Hart quoted a formula of treatment and certain ideals concerning the essentials of health which he credited to Dr. Worcester.

He says, "For instance, here is Dr. Worcester's mental cure for insomnia: say to yourself, 'I am going to sleep. I am drowsy, drowsy. I cannot keep awake, I am drunk with sleep.' This Mr. Hart designates as 'the fine and beneficent art of fooling the body into good behavior.'"

In Isaiah 29:9 occurs the following rebuke: "They are drunken but not with wine; they stagger, but not with strong drink." Is this the sort of sleep that our critic proposes to produce? Does he offer this sort of remedy as a substitute for that of the Master?

There is another class of individuals, who seem to think there is "joy" in drunkenness, and yet, who that is sober will deny that the hilarity of the drunken is based upon pure imagination. Mr. Hart declares that it is not essential that the reason shall be put to sleep in order to render the subconscious self responsible to suggestion, and yet he affirms that the patient must be "fooled." Such advice is open to no other interpretation than that he is made to lose his senses in that he is "fooled," which means, of course, that if very great results are to be forthcoming, he must be "fooled" to a very great degree. To "fool" means to deceive, to cheat, to trick, to dupe, to delude, to impose upon, to hoodwink. We mention these points for the purpose of showing what Mr. Hart, who decries Christian Science as a bit of "nonsense" and "moonshine," has to offer in its stead, what he recommends as a latter-day presentation of the method by which Jesus and the apostles healed the sick, or as a substitute thereof.

As a treatment for insomnia, the Christian Scientist, through prayer, helps his patient to be conscious (not unconscious) of God's ever presence, helps him to realize that this divine presence brings constant peace, harmony and rest, and that the discords and troubles of earth, which would interfere with his harmony, can no more affect the reality of his being than the clouds can blot out the sun. With this simple truth, the fear of the patient is destroyed; he becomes calm and peaceful and is at rest, not because he has been "fooled," but because he is unfooled, because the truth has been whispered into his consciousness and the error which prevented his sleeping has been destroyed. The Psalmist says: "I will both lay me down in peace and sleep; for Thou, Lord, only makest me dwell in safety."

The distinction between the arguments of the Christian Scientist and those offered by our critic is that those of the former are based upon eternal truth and clarify the mind of the patient. Hence our critic's argument, "I am drunken with sleep," is inconsistent with his general proposition. If by such an argument apparent rest is produced, such rest could only be fictitious.

Mr. Hart declares that the practice which he recommends is calculated to "arrest" the "reason" of the patient, but this is not in harmony with Jesus' teaching, for he declared, "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." He did not say, ye shall be stupefied, and drunken, bereft of reason, in order that you may be free, but ye shall know the truth. Is there anything that can possibly inspire greater hope and courage—is there anything that can act as a greater preventive and destroyer of fear than the understanding of the ever-presence of divine love and the assurance of safety which comes from such a consciousness? The Psalmist said, "Though I pass through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for Thou art with me. Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me."

It is written, "He that dwelleth in the secret place of the most high shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty. I will say of the Lord, He is my refuge and my fortress; my God, in Him will I trust. Surely, He shall deliver thee from the snare of the fowler, and from the noisome pestilence. He shall cover thee with His feathers, and under His wings shalt thou trust; His truth shall be thy shield and buckler; Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night; nor for the arrow that flieth by day. Nor for the pestilence that walketh in darkness, nor for the destruction that wasteth at noonday. A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee. Only with thine eyes shalt thou behold and see the reward of thou behest. Because thou hast made the Lord which is my refuge, even the most high, thy habitation. There shall be no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling."

We have quoted at some length from this chapter, because it so pointedly names the fact that one's real refuge and fortress is God, and that His "truth" shall be thy shield and buckler. "What can bring greater 'peace' to the 'conscience'—what can kindle 'greater hope'—what can 'create more substantial faith'—what is a more effectual remedy for the sadness and in-harmony in the patient's life than the quiet, wakeful consciousness of God's ever presence and His protecting care?

It is impossible for any individual to stop thinking. If one is to be rid of the consciousness of fear, if one is to rid oneself of "sad thoughts," "irritability," he must have something else in their place, and the question naturally arises, what kind of thoughts shall be entertained as a remedy for sad thoughts and what shall be their basis? Christian Science is a systematic method of "renewing" as well as changing one's thought, not by means of deception, not by means of "fooling" oneself, but by reminding oneself of the eternal truth, by lifting one's thoughts thus above the frail, mutable, temporal things of life to a comprehension of the spiritual and eternal facts of being. Christian Science destroys unrest by the teaching that man is, in his real individuality, a child of God, that he has no occasion to worry because he is continually protected and sustained by the power of omnipotent and ever-present Spirit.

"Suggestion" to Children.

Dr. Worcester, in an article on the subject, "What Suggestion Can Do for Children," declares "in all cases affecting the moral life of the child I regard a direct appeal to the child's better nature as quite as important as suggestion." I believe Dr. Worcester would not object to our supplementing the further affirmation that a direct appeal to the child's better nature is the most important thing and that the reformation cannot be completed without reaching the child's better nature. For this reason, the child should early be instructed in regard to his moral responsibility, and there is no better way than that which is outlined in Christian Science. The child should early be taught his relationship to God, that in his real individuality he is a child of God, a good child, and that he should live this fact and cease to fall short of this individuality by permitting "naughty thoughts and deeds."

In his suggestion to the child, Dr. Worcester uses the words, "God is truth and you will be truthful." This indicates a reaching out after a more spiritual method and is really scientific and Christian, so far as it goes, but because of its incompleteness it does not carry sufficient conviction. May we ask what relation does the statement, "You will be truthful" bear to the statement, "God is truth"? If it is based upon the teachings of Christian Science, the statement that "God is truth" means to the child that God's child is the reflection, the manifestation of truth, and, therefore, expresses only truthfulness, and can express nothing else. With such an understanding, the argument is wholesome, truthful and effectual. It is based upon the eternal science of God and its result is sure. Dr. Worcester argues to the child, "You do not wish to be a liar. You know it is wrong," but he gives no reason why the child does not wish to be a liar, nor why the child knows it is wrong. Therefore, there is nothing in the suggestion per se which could convince the child.

If the child is taught that to be untruthful is to deviate from truth, God, and thus defect from his real individuality as God's child, and that the evil results of lying are thus perpetuated, and that the child knows that lying is wrong, because such practice is out of keeping with his true self as the reflection of God, good and is therefore utterly unbeneficial to him, there is a reason for the "hope within." There is basis of conviction and the argument of truth is permanently effectual. If, however, a

child is told, "You do not wish to be a liar," and he has no reason for believing this except the mere fact that he is being told, so his acceptance of it cannot be more than temporary. If he is taught a scientific, truthful reason why he does not wish to be a liar, the conviction is likely to be lasting, for its foundation is in truth. It is more than a mere suggestion. While by the aid of Christian Science the sinner learns that sin brings suffering, the inevitable fruit of false life, it immediately gives him hope by the revelation that he is a slave only to an unreal master. This gives him courage to try, and to succeed in his battle to overcome evil. Mark the suggestion, "You will do just what I tell you, for you and I are good friends." Is it safe to accept an argument simply because one is on friendly terms with the one who presents it, or simply because it is his declaration? It is only safe to accept and act upon that which is positively right, and we can always be sure that we are right if we are arguing from the standpoint that God is good, that the child is his likeness and manifests only the good characteristics of good. Take Dr. Worcester's argument, "You are a brave boy." The question is, where is the evidence, since the senses declare that he is not a brave boy? He who believes material evidence could not believe that the child is a brave boy, and for such an one to declare that he is a brave boy is to declare what the suggestionist believes to be a falsehood. There could, therefore, be no effect from such an argument except in the confidence imposed in the one who presents it and the will force that accompanies it. The argument in itself could have no force whatever. Is this method scientific? Is there anything about it that is definite, precise or accurate? In what way does it suggest Jesus' method? Take again the argument, "You will be able to speak without hesitation or stammering." What is the basis of such an argument? If it is founded upon the prospect of improvement, it is not based upon a certainty and, at best, could be nothing more than a wish that the patient might be able to speak without stammering. Is such a suggestion more rational than the argument of the Christian Scientist, that stammering is no part of God's child, no part of God's creation, that the child itself is spiritual and perfect, and there is, therefore, no imperfection in him? Such an argument is founded upon the everlasting truth. It is advanced with positive assurance by the practitioner and carries strong conviction to the patient. It corrects the false sense of man's true nature and the ill attending this false sense, therefore, departs.

The Distinction.

Although we may concede to every non-material method, by which results are sought, the propriety of being called mental, yet we must learn to mark the distinction between that which is mortal—that which results from the action of the so-called mortal mind—and that which is spiritual and immortal, the action of the divine mind. It is not always easy to determine, from external observation, the difference between the effect of Christian Science and that of mental suggestion, for so far as concerns the outward appearance, the improved condition of the supposed beneficiary of mortal mind influence is very similar to that of a beneficiary of Christian Science. The chief distinction is likely to be seen in the mental and moral status of the individual. Jesus knew this when He counseled that we "Judge

not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment." It is sometimes possible to produce changes in the physical condition of a subject through the influence of mortal mind, because of the close relationship between thought and the bodily organism, but we cannot be assured of the permanency of such changes, even though they appear to be changes for the better, because they are not based upon a fixed principle.

A mental mode of healing the sick which depends upon a mere change of human thought or belief, irrespective of its absolute truthfulness, though producing a temporary change in external appearances, cannot be considered a real cure, but is on a par with that which is mentioned in the scriptures as healing "the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly, saying, 'Peace, peace, when there is no peace.'" Even as far back as the days of Moses and Pharaoh there were the counter-facts as well as the genuine manifestations. The Egyptians for a while appeared to be healed, but there came a time when they could no longer follow him. Their efforts failed, they could proceed no farther in their attempted wonder-workings, and they said of Moses' power, "This is the finger of God." Thus we note that experience developed a conviction which mere phenomena could not produce.

It has oftentimes been argued that bodily healing cannot be considered as absolute evidence that Christian Science is the truth, since results can be had by the application of other mental theories. This seems plausible, but we insist that a result which is not based upon divine truth is not a genuine result, but a mere seeming. If we are unwilling to believe this, we will surely be convinced by the logic of events. Error may be temporarily substituted for error, but only truth can destroy it, therefore it is wise to learn the truth and make our results permanent. Every step taken scientifically is really a step in advance and hence a step for which needs never be retraced. In original investment it costs no more to possess the truth than it does to possess the counterfeit. One is as available as the other. It therefore behooves us to have the best, to adopt that which can be permanently retained, the "better part," which the Master said could never be taken away. To believe that Christian Science heals by the same methods which are employed in suggestion is detrimental to one's well-being, since it obscures the line of distinction between the influence of spirit, God, and that of human will, which is more or less misguided, and, therefore, prone to seek the enforcement of that which is not good.

Mental operations should have for their motive something more exalted than the mere purpose of influencing or being influenced. They should have in consideration the character of the influence involved as well as the character which it begets. Those mental modes which are not prompted and governed by divine intelligence, but which are at the mercy of human judgment, are quite as likely to be wrong as right. It is more easy to determine the difference between Christian Science and mental suggestion by considering the basis of operations than by noting phenomena, but in the long run the basis of results will be unmistakably evident in their virtue and permanency.

To attempt to cure disease by mortal influence, the same influence which

(Continued on Page Nine.)

THE MILWAUKEE HOLDS



FIRST PLACE

because of its light draft, ease of handling and the manner in which it takes care of the heaviest grain, elevating and binding it without difficulty.

The above points of advantage appeal to the farmers throughout all grain growing sections of the country. They are some of the features that create a demand for Milwaukee machines.

To use the Milwaukee is to use a machine that leads—it is placing yourself in the lead with your neighbors. The complete line includes: Binders, reapers, mowers, rakes, corn binders, knife grinders, and binder twine.

Nelson & Cannon Co.
 Phone 221 Corner Cedar and Stevens Streets