EMMANUEL MOVEMENT AND CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

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

BY ALFRED FARLOW.

PART III.—Concluding Article.

OUR critic in the Universalist Leader of April 18, 1908, declares that in the days of Jesus and his apostles the "attempts at the healing of the sick were incident to the popular belief of Satan as the cause of disease," and that they healed the sick "by virtue of their power over the devil." He adds that the method instituted by Mrs. Eddy is an "abnormal survival" of this belief "under such new names as malicious animal magnetism."

Mrs. Eddy's definition of malicious animal magnetism is identical with our Lord's description of Satan. It is synonymous with the technical word "pernicious mental evil," used by psychologists, and with the word "dragon" of the Apocalypse, which is said to be the same "old serpent called Satan and devil" which St. John said "deceiveth the whole world." It was called serpent because of its cunningness. The Master's declaration that Satan is a liar and that "his own," his offspring, is "a lie," is unmistakable in its meaning. Jesus referred to Satan as "he," but declared that he was never in the truth, that there is no truth in him, and that he is altogether a liar. It is neither person nor intelligence that lies, but a mere mystification or want of intelligence which appears as a false sense of things. The Scriptures refer to Satan as a deceiver. Evil, like darkness, is not a real power, it simply obscures, and it disappears with the revelation of truth. Sin, sickness and death, which are said to be the works of the devil, are the result of deception, the offspring of darkness. They are occasioned by a lack of true understanding and are overcome by Truth, God. Jesus spoke of the woman as having "been bound by Satan, lo, these eighteen years," and he said "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." If Satan is a liar, Satan's bonds must be deceptions. The only way that a liar or devil can bind is by deceiving. Hence deception or falsity is the proper name for the works of the devil, sin, sickness and death.

From this description it is seen that Christian Science does not indorse the fabled devil with horns and hoofs, but regards Satan in the light of Scriptural teaching, and while Christian Scientists believe that "Satan" is the "cause of disease," they are not entertaining the superstitious belief that a peculiar personage by some sort of a spell has produced this disorder, but that because of a lack of understanding and practice of righteousness mortals have lived in that state of consciousness wherein they are not properly protected and are consequently subject to disease. Now, the Christian Scientist does not believe that a lie can be doctored with medicine, that an error of consciousness can be destroyed by a drug. He knows and demonstrates the fact that it must be overcome by spiritual regeneration.

It may be asked here how drugs and will power heal the sick, and if there are two distinct mental methods of curing human woes. These questions involve a consideration of the premises of Christian Science as well as of its conclusions. Human will is the cause of all trouble, its misconceptions constitute the basis of all disease. Sickness is a false belief based upon the evidence of personal sense. This belief may be temporarily displaced by a form of suggestion which is based upon the same sense, but the patient would not be really cured because the foundation of the disease would not be destroyed. To illustrate: One who believes that four times three are eight may by persuasion be convinced that four times three are sixteen, and thus be cured of his belief that four times three are eight; but he has another error in its place. If, however, one who understands the truth quietly makes clear to him the fact that four times three are twelve, he is permanently cured of his belief that four times three are eight, since he cannot again believe that falsehood after the truth is made plain to him. The false belief has not been overcome by will force, nor by persuasion as in the former case, but by a clear consciousness of eternal truth.

Sickness is based upon the belief that man is material and has therefore lapsed into discord, while Science teaches that materiality, evil, disease are no more a part of the real, spiritual man than the smoke is a part of the object which it hides, that the material claims concerning man are no more than a cloud of false sense which to mortal sense temporarily hides the spiritual fact of being, and which is dispelled as the individual awakens to a realization of his true being. Hence the Patriarch's declaration: "I shall be satisfied when I awake in his likeness."

If one is cured by a suggestion which is based upon the evidence of the senses, upon the same belief which admits of the sickness in the first place, he is not actually cured, though the disease temporarily disappears, for he still has the error in consciousness which constitutes the foundation of his disease, namely, the belief that man is mortal and material. Christian Science makes it clear to him that he is the reflection or manifestation of God, and thus destroys his belief that he is material and consequently his belief that he is sick. Thus he is permanently cured. In this manner we illustrate the fact that there is but one method of producing actual healings namely, through that understanding of God and His creation which the Scriptures teach.

If we should accept the suggestionist's theory of disease, we would be compelled to accept his theory of the proper method of treatment, the limitation of possible cures, the necessity for material diagnosis, the belief that "only nervous disorders can be cured psychologically." These conclusions are consistent with the psychologist's point of view, but we cannot indorse his point of view. He reasons from the standpoint of human will, not from the standpoint of the allness of divine Mind. He does not compare the spiritual conclusions of the Christian Scientist with the Scientist's spiritual premises. Hence he errs in his criticism of Christian Science.

Definition of Animal Magnetism.

The word magnetism was first applied to a peculiar attraction of iron ore, and the word in itself has no significance, being applied merely because the property was discovered in the city of Magnesia. Later the term "animal" was joined to it, and it was used with reference to a supposed influence which one person was believed to be able to exert over another by physical contact. The meaning of the term "animal magnetism" has gradually broadened, and now includes any and all supposed action of the human mind. By this description it may be seen that from the very introduction of the term to the present time the word has been applied to that particular power, influence or force which is supposed to be possessed by the creature in contradistinction to the creator. Hence the propriety of the name in Christian Science.

As we have already stated, Christian Science teaches that there is in reality but one power or force; that is, God, Spirit, Mind, Truth, Love; and that, therefore, the Christian warfare is the human effort to become subject to the Mind which was in Christ—to become submissive to the divine Mind and thus silence human will, which the Scriptures denominate the "carnal mind." St. Paul described this warfare in the following words: "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other." Science always settles the battle on the side of Spirit because "Spirit is the real and eternal and "matter (flesh) is the unreal and temporal." (Science and Health, p. 468). Since Science has introduced the proposition that God is the only real Mind, the carnal mind in all its varied manifestations is naturally, in the interest of self preservation, arrayed against it. Therefore every willful phase of this supposed human opposition which is aroused by the introduction of Science is malicious. Hence the use of the term "malicious animal magnetism." It is called magnetism because it refers to a supposed power independent of God; and malicious, in keeping with the Scriptural declaration, "The carnal mind is enmity against God."

Mrs. Eddy refers to it as the "human antipode of Divine Science." It is a term which is broad enough to include all that is opposed to God. It includes every phase of evil, every phase of human antagonism to Truth. In combatting evil, Christian Science does not regard it as a person, but as a suppositious force which dominates false sense and which, in view of its false pretence of intelligence, is denominated "mortal mind." St. Paul called it "carnal mind," evidently because all its promptings or inducements are based upon fleshly desires.

The subtle arguments of malicious animal magnetism can have no effect upon those who are aware of its presence and who understand that God is the only real Mind or power. Malicious animal magnetism is that which the evil-minded, through mental malpractice, seek to use in opposition to the good influence of the divine Mind. It is known to all students of psychology, and we think we may safely say to all reasonably well-informed persons, that one may be mentally dominated by another if he is not awake to this evil and prepared to resist its deception, not because evil is power but because it deceiveth the unwary. There are, and have been for many years, schools which advertise their ability to teach a method of subjugating the will of another for the purpose of ruling him and for the purpose of subserving selfish ends.

Jesus said on one occasion, "The prince of this world cometh but findeth nothing in me." One who is perfect in consciousness destroys evil by the very aroma of his thought; evil cannot come near him nor have any influence over him. Evil suggestion finds no response in such an one, for there is no evil in the consciousness of the individual which may be magnified. Human suggestions find no response in the consciousness of the individual who does not believe in the basis of such argument, but on the contrary, understands that God is the only real power.

Discrimination Against Organic Diseases.

The New York Times, of February 12, 1908, declares that "those of them (the people of New York), who have given real thought to the matter, are still puzzled to know exactly what Dr. Worcester means when he talks of 'functional nervous disorders.' Many of the ills he mentions are as much 'organic' as any others, and at the bottom of all the rest there is the best of reasons for strongly suspecting the existence of a physical lesion as real though, of course, not as obvious, as that in a broken leg."

"And one cannot help wondering just what is Dr. Worcester's position as to miracles, ancient and modern. He makes no claims to performing them—explicitly denies it, indeed, and allows to medical science at least as much power as it possesses—but nevertheless he ascribes his cures to an influence which, in theory, ought to deal with one malady as easily as with another. It is all very bewildering. The founders of great religions have never discriminated between the 'functional' and the 'organic' in healing the sick, and for the follower of one of them to do so involves, in some opinions, a curious inconsistency. If Dr. Worcester told us that he used only 'suggestion,' as it is known to science, we could understand the care with which he selects his cases; as it is, the thing is quite beyond comprehension."

Commenting upon the above editorial a correspondent in the Times of February 14 declares: "The Times places its finger with singular precision upon the weak spot in the system of church psychopathy to which the editorial refers. Either divine healing is a fact or it is not. If it is, then setting selective limitations to omnipotence by restricting its operation to a short list picked from the myriad ills that flesh is heir to constitutes such a contradiction of logic and of Bible history that it is surprising to see pious and learned ecclesiasts advocate it."

To illustrate the present attitude of some of the medical periodicals on this subject, we quote the following from the Medical Record, published in New York City: "It is time, therefore, to ask what the movement means, and why physicians, even trained neurologists, are to be found lending themselves to the movement and supporting it by voice and pen.

"The first question raised by a perusal of the official book of the Emmanuel Movement is, Why clerical healing and why the limitation of clerical healing to functional diseases? We do not find either question answered satisfactorily in this book, and we do not see how they can be answered. . . . As physicians we should regret indeed to lose the powerful therapeutic force that resides in religion, but it does not follow from this that we are ready to welcome the priest as a fellow practitioner of medicine, or even to acknowledge that he can exercise that function in the public and wholesale way of the Emmanuel rectors without the danger of doing far more harm than good.

"At present the catchword of the Emmanuel Movement is 'functional' disease. We are told repeatedly that the clerical healers will have nothing to do with any sufferer from organic disease, and they use their medically trained allies to separate the functional sheep from the organic goats, the latter being thrust back into the outer darkness of legitimate medical practice. But what do these people mean by 'functional nervous disorders?' Do they really believe that there are two distinct kinds of disease—functional and organic? If they do not know, their medical advisors should tell them, that every day we are shifting so-called functional diseases into the class of organic diseases. Will these clerical healers abandon a functional disease to the medical healers when it is discovered to be dependent upon an organic lesion, or will they simply deny its organic base and continue to treat it? And once they find themselves treating one disease called organic, why not others? Why not all? Every physician knows that 'cheerfulness, hope, courage and religious faith and prayer,' which constitute the pharmacopoeia of the New York school of clerical healing, are just as necessary in the treatment of tuberculosis as in that of constipation, and indeed that they are often distinctly curative in various organic diseases. If the clergy have a divine commission to heal the sick, they are recreant to their trust and cruel to the suffering to deprive any of the benefit of their healing words, and it will not be long before they recognise that fact and act accordingly. That the law forbids them to practice medicine is, of course, a detail of no importance."

We do not pretend to be well versed in diagnosis, but we understand that, with the exception of those which are produced by accidents, organic lesions are the outcome of functional disorders, and that in a large number of cases when the functions of the body are rendered normal the organic diseases disappear with greater or less rapidity. Therefore, we are at a loss to know why those who believe that Christian Science can heal functional disorders go to the length of insisting that it is impossible to heal a case of organic disease by mental treatment. There is no other way of fundamentally curing disease. Any other method must depend upon doctoring the effect in order to remove the cause. This would be equivalent to topping a tree for the purpose of killing it. Such a remedy only causes the tree to spread its branches.

Although human evidence and experience may declare for the incurability of those disorders which have developed into the form that is called organic, there is no reason to conclude that they are beyond the reach of divine power, nor that those who trust God cannot utilize that power. "Behold the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save." "Man's extremity is (indeed) God's opportunity."

Dr. Richard C. Cabot, a noted medical authority, and advocate of the Emmanuel Movement, in a published statement declared that he had "studied 100 cases of Christian Science cures recorded in the recent volumes of the Christian Science Journal," and that "putting together this evidence and comparing it with" his "own experience regarding the accuracy of his own patients' statements about their own diseases," his "conclusions are, first, that most Christian Science cures are probably genuine; but, second, that they are not cures of organic diseases."

Incidentally he declares: "Functional diseases are no more imaginary than an ungovernable temper or a balky horse is imaginary. They are often the source of acute and continued suffering; indeed, I believe that there is no class of diseases that gives rise to so much keen suffering." Thus the doctor pays tribute to Christian Science by generously conceding that it heals "real" diseases and destroys an immense amount of suffering. So far, so good.

Proceeding, the doctor declares, "The sharpness of this distinction between functional and organic troubles is somewhat blurred," and organic disease is oftentimes produced by functional disease "and such organic disease is often cured by Christian Science."

Dr. Alfred T. Schofield, a medical authority, in his well-known work entitled "The Force of Mind," says: "There can be no organic disease without some derangement of function," while he also declares in agreement with Dr. Cabot, "functional disease may after all be organic at the bottom." Thus in the mouth or pen of "two witnesses" it is "established" that every case is a fit subject for Christian Science treatment, since according to the testimony of these reputable witnesses every person with organic troubles is also afflicted functionally, and every functional trouble is a fit subject for Christian Science treatment.

Dr. Cabot has stated his belief that functional disorders can be cured by Christian Science treatment. Dr. Schofield, as before stated, has asserted that all organic disease produces functional disorders. This is equivalent to saying that every sick person is afflicted with functional disease. Now it is not possible really to cure a disease without going to the bottom of it and eradicating its foundation. Every case of functional disease having an organic foundation can only be cured by destroying its organic foundation. Therefore, on the testimony of these two distinguished authorities, the fact is established that Christian Science cures all kinds of diseases, for it is evident that a functional disorder which originates in a defective organ cannot be cured unless the organic disease is first destroyed, for the functional disorder, being an effect, must of necessity reappear so long as its cause is not destroyed.

Since, as Dr. Cabot declares, the "sharpness of distinction between organic and functional troubles is somewhat blurred," it follows that it is not easy to distinguish between an organic and a functional disease, nor would it be easy to distinguish between an organic disease which is "produced by functional troubles" and one which is not occasioned by functional troubles. Therefore Dr. Cabot's logic convinces one that to be on the safe side every individual afflicted with organic or functional troubles should avail himself of Christian Science treatment lest he should be neglecting a means of recovery.

The doctor declares that he has grouped the one hundred cases which he has "analyzed" in four classes: "First, 72 in which" he finds "on careful study, reasonably good evidence for the diagnosis of functional or nervous disorder. Second, seven cases of what appears to be organic disease. Third, 11 cases very difficult to classify, but probably belonging in the functional group. Fourth, 10 cases, regarding the diagnosis of which no reasonable conjecture can be made."

May I state, parenthetically at this point that the testimonies published in the Christian Science periodicals have all been carefully verified, but that to avoid nourishing and enlarging the thought of disease, its elaborate description is eliminated from them. These descriptions, which are usually given by those who send in their testimony, but which are omitted out of consideration for the young especially, give the details of diagnosis and of painful experiences as the result of operations and drug treatment which distinctly emphasize the seriousness of the maladies endured. Hence, in the investigation into the merits of cases, and into the efficacy of Christian Science treatment for all disorders, whether organic or functional, an examination of the unabridged testimonies would greatly enlarge and strengthen the evidence that upon the basis of expert diagnosis by physicians of the most unquestioned standing, Christian Science must be credited with having proved efficient in healing cases of every variety of ill, whether organic or functional, with which poor humanity is afflicted.

What Dr. Cabot means by "careful study" is not stated. He does not make clear whether he has made any investigation outside of a mere consideration of the wording of the testimonies. Neither is it stated why the doctor "concluded" that the 11 cases very difficult to classify "probably belong to the functional group." It was doubtless natural that he should give the benefit of the doubt to his own side of the question. Otherwise he might have said that these doubtful cases "probably" belong to the organic group, or he might have added these 11 cases to the fourth group, regarding the diagnosis of which he declares "no reasonable conjecture can be made." Then the organic class would have an equal chance with the functional group.

Not very long ago, one medical authority went so far as to declare that many organic diseases were nervous disorders. Such an authority adds still more to the confusion, and we begin to wonder if, after all, our medical brethren know any more about the real nature and cause of disease than Christian Scientists. At the same time, we are well aware of the ability of our distinguished brethren to make a physical diagnosis of disease, and we are not unmindful that in this respect they possess an accomplishment to which the Christian Scientist makes no pretences whatever, except what he learns by observation and experience, and possibly some reading on the subject.

But the real question is, after all, what is the foundation of both functional and organic disorders? If by correcting the mental conditions of a patient both organic and functional troubles are healed, we have the evidence that an erroneous mental condition was the foundation of the disease, and we believe that ere long Dr. Cabot and all the host of medical men will have arrived at this conclusion and will note the fact that, notwithstanding all that is said and done regarding diagnosis, the Christian Scientist is accurate in his conclusions concerning the real nature of disease. In any event "probabilities" are not sufficient evidence to the contrary.

The doctor declares "Experience shows that when a person has had many doctors, many diagnoses, many 'diseases,' or many operations, he usually turns out to be suffering from nervous prostration or some other form of functional nervous trouble." There are a great many persons in this world who have had many doctors, many diagnoses, and many diseases, if not many operations, and it is kind in Dr. Cabot to point out the fact that there is hope for them in Christian Science.

Dr. Knapp, who is said to be opposed to the Emmanuel Movement, declares: "The distinction between functional and organic diseases is indefinite. Many diseases formerly called functional have been proved to be organic, and the few left which are still called functional will in all probability be found to be organic."

This statement practically relegates all diseases to the functional class, which we understand even the most skeptical admit are amenable to Christian Science treatment. It would seem, therefore, that sufficient testimony is already in to settle this question. We shall not hold ourselves responsible for the conviction of Dr. Cabot, but will wait for him to discover the truth of Dr. Knapp's assertion by experience.

Our critic declares: "A patient suffering from organic disease rarely consults a Christian Scientist." To be exact, it should be said that thus far very few patients suffering with any sort of disorder call upon a Christian Scientist until after they have exhausted their patience or their means in experimenting with material remedies. It is natural that one should not experiment with something that is new and untried so long as the old ways promise results. Those who apply to Christian Science are as a rule those who have failed to recover through medicine, and if it be true that from a medical point of view organic diseases are more difficult to heal, it is likely that more cases afflicted with organic troubles apply to Christian Science. If it be true that organic diseases are as a rule more difficult to heal than functional troubles, it is because the one has a stronger hold upon human belief and in the breaking requires a more stalwart understanding of the divine power. Some cases are more difficult to heal than others, just as some problems in mathematics are more difficult than others, but while even a simple problem might baffle the efforts of a neophyte or one with limited understanding, the most difficult would be easy to a master. Therefore, the remedy for the inability to heal any class of diseases does not lie in resorting to a more material means, but in understanding more perfectly the spiritual.

In the writer's own practice, extending through a period of 20 years, he has seldom had a patient who was not afflicted with both organic and functional disorders, and his success has been quite as uniform with organic troubles as with those which have been called nervous disorders.

In conclusion, our critic declares: "Believing, then, as I do, that most Christian Science cures are genuine—genuine cures of functional disease—the question arises whether the special methods of mental healing employed by Christian Scientists differ from other methods of mental healing." . . . "that is, by producing in the patient a strong belief that he will get well."

Whatever may be said concerning the Christian Scientist's ability to diagnose disease, we think Dr. Cabot will concede to him at least one privilege, namely, the privilege of stating how Christian Science heals, since the Christian Scientist is at least supposed to be informed on his own subject. To acknowledge the Christian Scientist's qualification to define his own theory and practice would be no less consistent. It is evident that no one knows quite so well how Christian Science heals as the Christian Scientist, through whose understanding the healing is effected.

No doubt when, under Christian Science treatment, a patient begins to improve, there is produced "in the patient a strong belief that he will get well," but to say that it is this belief which cures the patient is to fail entirely to analyze the modus operandi of the healing. A Christian Scientist would not hope to succeed in curing a patient by the mere belief that the patient will get well, although he is aware that such an encouraging belief is always helpful to a patient.

The healing remedy in Christian Science, as we have already shown, is the realization of the divine power and presence which illumines the mentality of the patient and destroys his sense and fear of disease.

Dr. Cabot declares: "I believe that a good many warped minds . . . just as a certain type of crooked spine, may be helped by a sharp twist in the other direction." This being true, the doctor would logically be obliged to admit that the last twist must be in the right direction, otherwise it would not be corrective.

While Christian Scientists have great respect for those who resort to medicine, while asking God's blessing upon it, they have learned by experience that better results can be obtained by relying entirely upon spiritual means. It is not a question of fanaticism or nonfanaticism, but a question of choosing the way which is most scientific and resultful. No one will ever be able to discover how much God can do for him until he experiments by throwing his whole weight upon the side of Spirit. While his neighbor feels sure that the Christian Scientist is taking a risk in his bold reliance upon Spirit, the Christian Scientist is equally sure that his neighbor is jeopardizing his safety by dividing his thought between two powers and thus weakening whatever of result he might obtain by an exclusive dependence upon either.

Medical Diagnosis.

The following incidents furnish striking examples of the fact that it is next to an impossibility for one who believes in the material theory of the cause and cure of disease to admit that organic disorders can be healed by purely spiritual means. Not long ago a man who was afflicted with what had been pronounced Bright's Disease by one of the foremost experts of this country, if not the foremost, after exhausting his hope in material remedies, was healed by Christian Science. Thereafter he returned to the noted specialist for an examination in order to make sure that he was really cured. After a second very careful examination the physician was unable to discover any Bright's Disease, but, instead of admitting that the rescued man had been healed of the disease, he gravely said, "For the first time in my life I have mistaken in my diagnosis." Another patient had been treated for several years by a physician who pronounced her disease tuberculosis of the lungs. She too turned to Christian Science and was healed, after which the physician said that she could not have had consumption, for if she had had the disease she could not have been cured by Christian Science. So it appears that, as a rule, the physician's decision that Christian Science cannot heal organic disease is based largely, if not altogether, upon the opinion that the nature of organic disease is such that it cannot be thus healed.

If we may not depend upon the diagnoses of the most learned and experienced physicians in dealing with such extremely pronounced cases, upon what evidence can it be decided that Christian Science does not heal organic diseases? If the line of demarkation between organic and functional disorders is so "blurred," that even the experts cannot discern it, may it not after all be true that there is no line of demarkation except in mistaken belief? After all the cause of disease lies deeper than functional or organic ills—the real cause is mental, a fact which is proved when by correcting the mental condition of the patient the body responds accordingly.

Those who take the position that organic troubles cannot be cured by spiritual means, but must be left to the medical practitioner, declare in substance that the healings of Jesus were confined to functional disorders. On the other hand, if they admit that Jesus healed organic diseases, they must admit that those in this age of the world who heal according to his method will be able to do likewise.

Christian Scientists are well aware of their shortcomings, their inability to produce the full fruitage of Christian Science, owing to their present insufficient spiritual apprehension. But they have proved by experience that they may do more for themselves and others with Christian Science and without material remedies than they have formerly been able to do with material remedies and without Christian Science, and this justifies the position which they take. There may be some exceptions to the rule which we have mentioned, some extreme cases that would justify a modification of the Christian Scientsts' regular practice, and it is left with the judgment of the individual student to attempt only that which observation and experience convinces him may be undertaken with a reasonable degree of success.

Compensation.

One of the criticisms made by some of the advocates of the Emmanuel Movement is that Christian Scientists accept a fee, while the new plan is conducted without a fee. It is not in the spirit of retaliation but with considerable reluctance that we call our readers' attention to the fact that, while in the Emmanuel Church at Boston no fee is exacted by those who practice "suggestion," we are informed by Dr. Worcester that no patients are accepted for treatment whose cases have not first been diagnosed and passed upon by a regular physician, and that during their course of treatment they are "frequently examined" by a physician, who charges a fee for his service. The writer happens to know of a lady who applied for help at this institution. She was referred first to one physician and then to another. Each charged her a fee of $10 for an examination. Please note that this expense of $20 was incurred while under the direction of those in charge of the Emmanuel Movement. It should also be noted that $20 pays for four weeks' service from the most proficient Christian Scientist practitioner. Dr. McComb declares that free-will offerings are accepted for the support of his movement. This is an admission that after all, every self-respecting person who is able is expected to pay in order to balance accounts with his own conscience. Many surely would consider an honest charge the better plan for both the patient and the practitioner. Moreover, the argument that the acceptance of a fee for service rendered is unChristian is borne out neither by experience nor by Scriptural teaching.

It is generally conceded that it is not only abnormal, but also unjust to accept something for nothing. Although one individual might be willing to serve another without compensation, the question arises: Would it be fair for the other to accept the service without giving an equivalent therefor? It is not only wrong to be selfish, but it is also wrong to educate selfishness in another, and indeed to use the privilege of serving another without compensation as an opportunity to be unselfish and thus win the praise of our fellows is itself selfish, for whatever of unselfishness is gained in the transaction is gained at the expense of the supposed beneficiary and by leaving him in his selfishness. The self-respect of the community is maintained by the generally accepted rule that every individual should be properly compensated for a service rendered another. Jesus said, "The laborer is worthy of his hire," which of course means that he is worthy of a proper remuneration. There might be a difference of opinion as to what would constitute extortion or over charge, but so far as is within the judgment of those concerned the fee charged for a service should be an equivalent for the service rendered. So long as clergymen are receiving an adequate salary from their congregation they may forego the privilege of accepting a fee from individuals who apply to them for help, and we think they would be justified in declining a fee under such circumstances provided the individual beneficiary contributes sufficiently to the general fund which supports them.

If our competitors can find no more worthy ground upon which to find fault with us than to attack our honest, dignified, acceptable and successful financial methods and our adherence to the belief that sin, sickness and death have no divine father and hence have only a temporal, mythical existence, we think our position is reasonably safe.

ADDRESS GIVEN BY W. D. FENTON ON "FATHER WILBUR AND HIS WORK."

Continued From Page 3.

and unfavorable conditions, and they had the time and opportunity which does not come to men of the present day. But few of their illustrious number survive the cares and marks of time. Among that number are Thomas F. Royal and John Flinn, and there may be others. Father Flinn—hale and hearty at the age of more than 90 years—still goes in and out among us in mental and physical vigor. You will recall that the Taylor-Street Church was organized in 1848, and the building was constructed in 1850. Father Flinn delivered the second discourse from the Maine Conference, and as early as September 3, 1851, became a member of the Oregon and California Mission Conference.

Among the contemporaries of Father Wilbur and Father Flinn in these earlier days were T. H. Pearne, Isaac Dillon, J. S. Smith, John W. Miller and N. Doane, all of whom were men of power and influence and of the same general type. These were the days when an empire was in process of building. The Oregon territory originally was divided into three districts or counties—Tuality, Champoeg and Clackamas. Tuality County was first established July 5, 1843, and comprised at that time all of the territory west of the Willamette and north of the Yamhill River, extending to the Pacific Ocean on the west and as far north as the north boundary line of the United States, which President Polk and his party claimed was 54:40. On September 4, 1849, its name was changed from Tuality to Washington County, and Portland, which was founded by A. L. Lovejoy and F. W. Pettygrove, in 1845, was first incorporated in January, 1851, and remained within the limits of Washington County until the organization of Multnomah County, on December 22, 1854. At that time there was no newspaper or other publication in what is now Multnomah County, and it was not until December 4, 1850, that Thomas J. Dryer published the first newspaper and named it The Weekly Oregonian. The Daily Oregonian was not published until February 4, 1861, and The Sunday Oregonian was first published on the 4th day of December, 1881.

The first school of public instruction in this city was opened in a little frame building on Front street, at the corner of Taylor, and was constructed by Job McNamee, the father of Mrs. E. J. Northrup, who, with her family, were at one time members of Taylor-Street Church. The first school teacher was Dr. Ralph Wilcox, of New York, and he had under his charge about a dozen pupils. He was also the first physician coming to this city, and it will be remembered that for many years he was Clerk of the United States Circuit Court for this district and Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Territorial Legislature of 1848.

Recurring to the statement that Wilbur was nominated in the joint convention of the Legislative Assembly, September 11, 1863, as one of the candidates for the office of United States Senator, it is worthy of historical record that in the early political history of this state there were strong and influential men identified with the Methodist Church who were more or less active in the political forces of the state. In this same Joint Assembly Thomas H. Pearne, who was a distinguished editor of the Pacific Christian Advocate, was also mentioned as a candidate for the Senate, and had the support of Addison C. Gibbs, who, on the preceding day, had been inaugurated as Governor of the state, and who was also a member of the Methodist Church; J. S. Smith, who was elected to Congress as a Democrat in June, 1868, was a preacher in the Methodist Church under the mission conference presided over by William Roberts, and was admitted to that conference in 1851-2. He also was a co-worker with Wilbur in all the activities of the church in this section. George Abernethy, the first Governor of Oregon, was a member of the Methodist Church at Oregon City, and assisted in building the first Protestant Church erected on the Pacific Coast, which is still standing at Oregon City. William Roberts was the administrative officer and active member of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this jurisdiction for many years during these pioneer times. He was an ideal executive and a fit co-worker with James H. Wilbur. The one was skillful to plan, the other strong to execute, and to these two men, in large measure, is due the successful issue of the preliminary work entrusted to their care.

The contemporaries of Wilbur profoundly admired the man, and in this regard he had the love and affection of men of all classes. In his zeal and constructive ability he has been regarded as the Jesuit of Methodism in the Northwest. If he had lived in the days of Ignatius Loyola, the Spanish soldier and prelate, he would have taken the three vows of that great order founded by him, and devoted himself to a life of poverty, chastity and obedience in the service of his Master. H. K. Hines, for some time editor of the Pacific Christian Advocate, who delivered a memorial discourse at the funeral of Father Wilbur at Taylor-street Church, October 30, 1887, speaking of him, said: "So long had he been a chief, if not the chief, figure in our Methodism on this coast, that it is not at all strange that his loss is so widely felt and unusually mourned. His place in our church work was unique; and perhaps it might be said there was place for but one Father Wilbur in our work. His was a history and a work that can never be repeated, nor even imitated on this coast. He was essentially and by nature a pioneer."

Summarizing what Dr. Hines has so well said of the man whom he knew, it may be said that Father Wilbur as an administrative and executive officer had rare discernment and force. His address was familiar, his carriage imposing, and his presence indicative of great will force. He was benevolent to a fault, and for many years prior to his death it is said that he disbursed about $3000 a year in benevolences, although he was a man of small fortune. By his will he bequeathed $10,000 to the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, $10,000 to the Church Extension Society, and $10,000 to the Freedman's Aid Society, and the remainder of his estate, amounting to about $17,000, over and above these specific bequests, was bequeathed to Willamette University.

Speaking of his work among the Indians, Dr. Hines said:

"Twenty-two years of the life of James H. Wilbur were breathed out into what was such a moral desolation when he and his companions went there; lost some would say, in the all-absorbing and unresponsive soul of paganism." And, while Dr. Hines dissents from this estimate of the sacrifice which Wilbur had made, it is debatable whether such a man should have made so great a sacrifice. A sense of natural justice and desire to bring light to a race in spiritual darkness, would prompt such men as Wilbur to give the best of their lives to such work. It is not true, as Dr. Hines has said, that "very much that was greatest in the character and most widely influential in the life and reputation of Mr. Wilbur himself, was the fruit and growth of that work and these years of consecration to the redemption of the Indian race." This may in part be conceded to be true, and yet the biographer and historian who not only narrates events but seeks to discover the philosophy and purposes of the acts of men and their influence beyond their times, must regret that the labors of so great a man should have been so long and so exclusively devoted to a race that he could not help into a permanent and enduring civilization. Here and there a remnant of that race yet remains, and its untamed blood lives its nature and instinct, in a few strong members, but the severe chronicler of the times must attest the truth of history that in large degree the work of evangelism among the native races has not measured up to the expectation of the brave men and women who have sacrificed so much of life and of treasure and labor in their behalf. And the chief distinction that will be noted in the life and work of James H. Wilbur will be that upon virgin soil, in the unbroken forests of the Oregon country, with his own hands, he laid the foundation of Taylor-Street Methodist Church, and like institutions and influences in other sections of this then new country, and that he here begun a work which, in the circle of its influence and in the effectiveness of its power, will be eternal. What he did here and elsewhere along these lines was done with no thought of distinction or enduring fame. Longfellow says that "the talent of success is nothing more than doing what you can do well, without a thought of fame," and true greatness takes no notice of what the future may have in store for those who achieve, and is not troubled about the memorial tablet. Wilbur lived a life of usefulness and struggle, but in and through it all there was purpose and achievement. Daniel Deronda, at the end of that tragic story so well portrayed by George Eliot, says: "What makes life dreary is the want of motive; but once beginning to act with that penitential, loving purpose you have in your mind, there will be unexpected satisfactions—there will be newly-opening needs continually coming to carry you on from day to day. You will find your life growing like a plant." And so it is that these early pioneer preachers, of which Wilbur was a distinguished type, were placed in the way of empire building, and the motive which most strongly impelled them to action was that they might establish a Christian civilization in this distant and remote section of their country, and that they might set in motion forces that would endure forever. They were men without fortune, and inured to the hardships and privations of a new country; they were poorly compensated in money, and at times overwhelmed by apparently unsurmountable difficulties. A mark of a great mind is the renewal of effort at each succeeding failure, and so it was in the case of Wilbur and men of his type, although they met with difficulties and oftentimes failed to accomplish results desired, each failure quickened their ambition to a higher and better effort.

Confucius says: "Our greatest glory is not in never failing, but in rising every time we fall." This is indeed pagan philosophy, but none the less Christian, for such has been the mainspring of that effort which has extended the religion of Jesus of Nazareth from a Roman province to the conquest of the world.

Books Added to Library

The following new books may be examined at the Public Library during this week and will be ready for circulation Monday, December 21:

BIOGRAPHY.

Hare—The most illustrious ladies of the Italian renaissance. 1908.

BOOKS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES.

Arstal—Forsøidre og born.
Balzac—Le pere Goriot.
Bethusy-Huc—Hans der Pole.
Broeboll—Hjaertets kampe.
Cid—Romancero selecto del Cid.
Flood—Under haperflag.
France—Le crime de Sylvestre Bonnard.
Geissler—Jochen Klahn, ein Halligroman.
Rod—L'eau courante.
Schroeder—Mit camera und feder durch die welt.

DESCRIPTION AND TRAVEL.

Calvert—Seville; an historical and descriptive account. 1907.
Henderson—Jamaica. 1906.
Willson—Norway at home. 1908.

FICTION.

Hewlett—Halfway house.
McIntyre—Modern Apollos.
Taylor—Confessions of a thug.
Taylor—Tara; a Mahratta tale.

FINE ARTS.

Hayden—Chats on old prints. 1906.
James—Painters and their works; a dictionary of great artists. 3 v. 1896-1897.

RELIGION.

Bible—Messages of the Bible; ed. by F. H. Sanders and C. F. Kent. v. 3-4. 1907-1908.

LITERATURE.

McIntyre—At early candle light, and other poems. 1899.
Vernon—Readings on the Inferno of Dante. Ed. 2, rev. 2 v. 1906.
Vernon—Readings on the Purgatorio of Dante. Ed 3, rev. 2 v. 1907.

SCIENCE.

Bauer—History of chemistry; tr. by R. V. Stanford. 1907.
Osborne—Differential and integral calculus. Rev. ed. 1908.
Thomson—The corpuscular theory of matter. 1907.
Willmon—The secret of the circle and the square. 1905.

USEFUL ARTS.

Chittenden—Insects injurious to vegetables. 1907.
Hasluck, ed.—Boot-making and mending. n. d.
Hasluck, ed.—Glass writing, embossing and fascia work, including the making and fixing of wood letters and illustrated signs. 1907.
Lovewell and others—The fireless cooker. 1908.
Rothamsted experimental station, Harpenden—Guide to the experimental plots. 1906.
Van Arsdale—Twentieth century interest tables. 1904.
Weathers—Practical guide to school, cottage and allotment gardening. 1908.

PHILOSOPHY.

Dewey—Studies in logical theory. 1903.
Quackenbos—Hypnotic therapeutics in theory and practice, with numerous illustrations of treatment by suggestion. 1908.

BOOKS ADDED TO JUVENILE DEPARTMENT.

Bubier—How to make electric batteries at home.
McIntyre—Cave boy of the age of stone.
Pyles—Story of Sir Launcelot and his companions.
Roberts—Cruise of the yacht "Dido."

A Heart to Mouth Talk.

(Mr. Taft to Mr. Roosevelt.)

W. J. Lampton in New York Times.

Come, friend of mine, dear, strenuous friend,
The best I ever had,
If you had not held up your end
I should have been in bad;
But come with me and let us chat
About where each of us is at.

Sit down, sit down, although to sit
Is not your style at all,
But now, just for a little bit,
Pray heed my earnest call.
There, that is right, how good of you
To do what you are asked to do.

Now listen while I say a word
Concerning you and me
And our relations since the 3d,
As they are bound to be
With you on deck and me about
To take your place when you get out.

I like the vigor of your style,
But say, old chap, when I
Am up to follow afterwhile,
I wish that you would try
To hold yourself in check and make
The job less hard for me to take.

By heck, these last three months of yours
Are mine to all intents,
And I don't want your strenuous stores
Charged up to my expense
When I take hold of this affair
And have to settle for your share.

Restrain your fierce desire to mop
The earth up with your foes
And, prithee, do your best to stop
Your language overflows,
At present do a thinking part
So I can have a decent start.

See?