EMMANUEL MOVEMENT AND CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

How the Two Differentiate in Essential Principles, from the Christian Scientist's Point of View

DISCUSSION OF THE EMMANUEL MOVEMENT.

All who have an interest in the Emmanuel Movement—they are legion—want to know what Christian Scientists think of it.

In the next issue of The Sunday Oregonian, Alfred Farlow, authorized spokesman for the church, will continue his articles.

They commend themselves to Christian Scientists, to those who are impressed by the Emmanuel Movement, and to the multitude "on the outside" who wish to listen to the testimony in the case.

BY ALFRED FARLOW.
PART II.

Jesus Not a Psychologist.

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 placed 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 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 M. D.'s. 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's one's faith in God by enlarging one's understanding of Him. Our confidence increases as our acquaintanceship 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 is 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, and 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 time."

We are reminded of the convenient method of the man who sought to prove 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 comforiable 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' mortal squeamishness of wishing to banish the lie from suggestion altogether." May 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 is ever present and why he sustains his creatures and 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 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 hope thus created 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 materiality," 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 his 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 is suffering too greatly to grasp the spiritual thought sufficiently to gain relief therefrom, 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 is about to take place." A curative argument in Christian Science is one that is based upon the everlasting truth that man is always at 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 will." Again Dr. Worcester declares, "I convince myself that the patient's inability to move does not proceed from the 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 therefor, he must explain either that he bases this 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 by 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 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 contemplation 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 Mr. Rollin Lynde Hart for some definite formulae used in the "psychological" treatment of insomnia. In a magazine article published in December, 1907, Mr. Hart quoted a formula of treatment and certain ideas 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 beneficient art of fooling the body into good behaviour."

In Isaiah xxix: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 contend that Jesus and his Apostles employed this kind of remedy for the unrest of the world? 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 it is not essential that the reason shall be put to sleep in order to render the sub-conscious 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 therefor.

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 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, while the latter are based upon falsehood, have no scientific foundation, and therefore darken 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. Harte 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 you 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 thin eyes shalt thou behold and see the reward of the wicked. 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 inharmony in the patient's life than the quiet wakeful consciousness of God's ever presence and His protecting care?

Is it possible 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 prompt them, and what shall be their basis?

Christian Science is a systematic, scientific 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 thought 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 deflect 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 its true self as the reflection of God, good; there is 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. 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 will force that presents 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 ills attending this false sense therefore depart.

Christian Science Versus Mental Suggestion.

Although we may concede to every nonmaterial method, by which result 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 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 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 Pharoah there were the counterfeit as well as the genuine manifestations. The Egyptians for a while appeared to duplicate the wonders performed by Moses, but there came a time when they could no longer follow him. Their efforts failed, they could proceed no further 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 eternity which needs never to be retraced. In original investment it costs no more to possess the true 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 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 fathers all disease, is like trying to rid one's self of error by covering it up; to use a common expression it is like telling one falsehood to cover another. Such practice could not be considered a cure.

The argument which measures human woes by an abiding consciousness of the divine power and presence as understood in Christian Science is as convincing as a known mathematical truth and hence certain and permanent in its results. Mrs Eddy declares in Science and Health, page 270, "Only by understanding that there is one Power, Mind—not two powers, matter and mind—are scientific and logical conclusions reached." The practice of Christian Science consists of arriving at logical conclusions based on the premise that God is infinite Truth, Life and Love, and that he is the only cause and creator. These conclusions are accompanied with a deep and overwhelming conviction and serve the purpose of destroying the opposing evils quite as effectually as the sunlight dispels the darkness, for they are based upon immutable and eternal Principle.

The basis of all disease and sin is the belief that there are other creators, other powers, besides God. There can therefore be no real cure except that which destroys this foundation of the trouble. A form of mental treatment which is itself based upon the same error that caused it cannot cure it. If a belief in minds many or powers many caused the trouble, only the understanding of the one infinite power, God, can cure it. There is something about the truth which brings with its appearing a conscious and conclusive conviction, which begets the assurance that no further investigation on the given point is necessary; whereas random arguments which are not based upon divine principle and which are merely the suggestions of what one would have come to pass, are more or less weak and uncertain in their results.

This marks the distinction between the nature and effect of Christian Science and those methods which do not depend upon God. The "stately operations" of Christian Science begin with God, and every argument employed by the Christian Scientist is based upon his understanding of immutable Principle. His effects are, therefore, elevating and permanent. The application of Christian Science must invariably produce good results in character because they constitute a plea which opposes all error and which is in behalf of the divine will. A consistent Christian Scientist can never do anything but good. To do wrong necessitates an immediate departure from Christian Science, and the institution of human methods of mental operation. Human suggestion is unrestrained except by the moral status of the operator, while a Christian Scientist is restrained by the spiritual apprehension which governs him in his method.

The effort to overcome disease by the exercise of human will does not rid one of its cause; it leaves the patient still in the belief that he has a mind of his own, still without any recognition of the divine power, still without a knowledge of the basis of a healthy mental condition. The practice of mental suggestion leaves the patient where it found him save that he has an intensified belief in a mind of his own—the same belief which constituted the basis of his disease in the first instance. He is not, therefore, healed even though his condition appears to have changed for the better. He has simply a new form of belief which must be destroyed in order that he may have permanent health.

One would not argue that to open the window and let in the sunlight and dispel the darkness is a method of mental suggestion, and yet such an operation exactly illustrates the practice of Christian Science. It opens the door of understanding to the sunlight of God, which destroys evil and disease. It is, therefore, manifestly unfair to the public that one should coin a definition of mental suggestion broad enough to include the practice of Christian Science without making a clear distinction between Christian Science and those forms of mental practice which depend upon something besides divine mind to heal.

Healing Inevitable Fruit of Gospel.

The Universalist Leader of April 18, 1908, commenting upon the "Mind Cure Department" and the church, declares: "In the end we shall have more disease, more unhappiness, more scandal." No doubt there is a peculiar form of mind practice which might result in such an end, but it is not necessary for the church to adopt such a form. That system of mind healing is most efficacious and commendable which relies most implicitly upon God, and we assume that the "Universalist Leader" did not intend to condemn the practice of an implicit, an unreserved and an unbounding faith in God, nor to overlook the Scriptural teaching, "God is an ever-present help in trouble," nor the teaching, "Because thou hast made the Lord, which is my refuge, even the most High, thy habitation; there shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling." God is spirit, and to dwell in spirit is to have an abiding consciousness of the ever presence of spirit, to understand that "in Him, we live and move and have our being," and that we are therefore safe.

The "Universalist Leader" declares, "For the church to attempt to add to the cure of souls the cure of bodies will be a colossal blunder." No doubt the writer of this article had in mind that the physical condition is of lesser importance than the spiritual well being of the individual, and with this we agree, but we should not overlook the Master's promise, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." It would be impossible to live under the government of the infinite good without being affected bodily, for it is a scientific fact that a healthy body is the manifestation of a healthy mental condition. The "Leader" further declares: "The healing ministry of the early church lapsed for good and sufficient reasons." We imagine that it would tax the ruminating capacity of the "Leader" to its utmost to discover what these reasons may be. It adds that "because the apostles treated the sick if an argument that ignores the decisive lessons of the intervening history of many centuries of progress and discovery." "To argue that we ought to re-establish the treatment because it was an apostolic practice is to ignore the fact that Providence itself put a stop to the practice by changing man's conception of the universe and human life."

Such reason would be equivalent to the argument that there is no such thing as a lost art, that if any particular useful or truthful thing is forgotten the fact proves that it was worthy only of being forgotten. Moreover the Scriptures do not warrant any such belief. Jesus said "I am the way, the truth and the life," and he also declared, "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," meaning undoubtedly that his way was the way of truth and life and that it would continue to be the way out of human woes even unto the end, even unto the time when the kingdom of God, good, shall be established in its fullness and all evil and discord shall be ruled out of existence. Jesus said, "He that believeth on me, the works that I do, shall he do also" This declaration evidently applied to the future as well as the present. He meant that in every age of the world those who understood what he understood and practiced what he practiced would secure the same results; and history has demonstrated the truthfulness of his prediction.

(To be Continued next Sunday.)

MRS. JAMES BROWN POTTER NO. 1 VALUES HER NAME AT $100,000.

MRS. J. BROWN POTTER

NEW YORK, Dec. 12.—(Special.)—Mrs. James Brown Potter No. 1 is to return to this country to appear in vaudeville. Her coming will renew the trouble over her use of her former husband's name. When she leaped from her recitation of Sim's "Ostler Joe" in Mrs. W. C. Whitney's drawing-room to the stage in a blaze of publicity, Mrs. Brown Potter left her husband and they were divorced.

She continued to call herself Mrs. James Brown Potter, however. She would not even use her maiden name of Urquhart in the combination.

Therefore, when Mr. Potter decided to marry again his wife-to-be was placed in a most uncomfortable position. To be known as "Mrs. James Brown Potter" was to be confused with the actress. Mr. Potter tried to solve the difficulty by making a business proposition to No. 1. It is said she placed a valuation of $100,000 on the name she was using. He would not pay so much to have her discard it. Perhaps they will come to terms on her return. She has not been in this country for a good many years, having appeared meantime in London with varying fortunes. Her manager says she is to get $2000 a week.

In a Quiet Town.

Chicago News.

This here town's quiet anyhow,
But awful dull and slow just now.
It's wuss'n ever, I allow,
I set here chewin'
From mornin' till it's a'most night,
But, shucks! There ain't a thing in sight
The dogs ain't got the spunk to fight,
There's nothin' doin'.

The folks ain't comin' in to trade,
The Marshal's snorin' in the shade,
The licker business, I'm afraid,
Will go to ruin,
I'd feel right thankful if a gust
O' wind would come and stir the dust,
It does seem just about the wust!
There's nothin' doin'.

It's shore a quiet place to stay,
In Punkintown, this dreary day.
Back in the woods a mile away
The doves is cooin'.
Except for that there ain't a sound.
It makes me want to yell and pound.
It's lonesome jest to set around
With nothin' doin'.

The Doll Days.

Wex Jones in the New York American.

Have you ever observed at this time of year
How pale all the dolls in the windows appear?
These weeks before Christmas turn sawdust hearts cold,
For a doll never knows to whom she'll be sold.
Heigh-ho,
How is a doll to know?

No wonder that worry leaves wrinkles and tracks
On an otherwise flawless complexion of wax;
No wonder a doll should feel all broken up
To think that perchance she'll be chewed by the pup.
Heigh-ho,
How is a doll to know?

Or perhaps the attentions a doll may expect
Will be missing, and dolly expire of neglect;
Or perhaps a bad brother to test a new knife,
May let out her sawdust, and thus end her life.
Heigh-ho,
How is a doll to know?

So remember the weeks that they've passed in suspense
While straining their eyes—dolls, you know, have one sense—
And wish a kind mother and safe home to each,
Where brothers, unkindness and pups cannot reach—
But heigh-ho,
How is a doll to know?

Afraid of Ghosts

Many people are afraid of ghosts. Few people are afraid of germs. Yet the ghost is a fancy and the germ is a fact. If the germ could be magnified to a size equal to its terrors it would appear more terrible than any fire-breathing dragon. Germs can't be avoided. They are in the air we breathe, the water we drink.

The germ can only prosper when the condition of the system gives it free scope to establish itself and develop. When there is a deficiency of vital force, languor, restlessness, a sallow cheek, a hollow eye, when the appetite is poor and the sleep is broken, it is time to guard against the germ. You can fortify the body against all germs by the use of Dr. Pierce's Golden Medical Discovery. It increases the vital power, cleanses the system of clogging impurities, enriches the blood, puts the stomach and organs of digestion and nutrition in working condition, so that the germ finds no weak or tainted spot in which to breed. "Golden Medical Discovery" contains no alcohol, whisky or habit-forming drugs. All its ingredients printed on its outside wrapper. It is not a secret nostrum but a medicine OF KNOWN COMPOSITION and with a record of *40 years of cures*. Accept no substitute—there is nothing "just as good." Ask your neighbors.