

Copyright by

LEE ZEUNERT JOHNSON

1964

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION:

A STUDY OF GROUP AND PRESS INTERACTION

by

Lee Zeunert Johnson
B.A., Montana State University, 1952
M.S., Syracuse University, 1955

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in Communications in the Graduate
School of Syracuse University, June 1963

Approved

George R. Bird

Date

May 29, 1963

PREFACE

Several times as an undergraduate the writer remembers reading references to the Christian Science Committee on Publication in books and articles he picked up. Almost always this public relations facility of one of the smaller religious denominations was discussed critically. These criticisms aroused his curiosity.

Now, some years later, the writer has had the opportunity to evaluate this agency in all of its activities through a firsthand study of original source materials. As he looks back, he finds it hard to judge the early comments. Most of the references were brief; most were borrowed, not original; most contained some truth and some error.

But, above all, the comments uniformly missed, he believes, the bigger picture--the broader panorama of activity and interplay of issues. While meanings and facts frequently emerged constricted, the larger issues too often remained untouched--the writers grasped for shadows while the living substance fled from them.

A study of a group's interaction with the media of mass

communications is, of course, an undertaking in the field of social science. The social unit of our study is an agency of a church group. The social phenomena we are to consider is the influence of public relations, taken in its broadest sense, on the media.

Social phenomena are elusive. The investigator knows that his study inevitably will drastically simplify a continuing drama that involves countless available facts. Important meanings, values, relationships, and patterns will escape him. Others will emerge from the social continuum distorted. Part of his problem is that he must "stop the clock" on his phenomena, even while human life keeps moving on and on--while, in our case, a church's information agency keeps adding, modifying, and discarding policies and work ways to meet the needs of each new day.

We shall in this study refer to The Christian Science Committee on Publication by its short title of "Committee." We shall use the term in two senses, but not in perhaps the most common meaning of all, namely a body of persons sitting for the purpose of collective action.

We shall use the term "Committee" to refer to a

single individual, or position filled by a single individual. This is the Committee's usage and also Webster's first definition, which is "A person to whom some trust or charge is committed."¹ Thus, the Committee on Publication for Texas is one individual, the Committee on Publication for France is one individual, and the Committees for the United States total 51 individuals.² The writer will usually refer to "area Committee" when he means this single person.

We shall also use "Committee" to refer to the combined organization of Assistant Committees, state Committees, and the Manager in Boston. Thus by "policy of the Committee" is meant a policy that applies to everyone connected with the Committee's organization, whether located at Topeka or Tokyo.

This study has been entirely an independent investigation. The facts the writer has provided and the conclusions he has drawn are his own, and while he feels deeply grateful to those who have assisted him along the way he, of course, absolves them all of responsibility for the end result.

¹Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1959.

²There are two Committees for the state of California.

The writer wishes to thank the members of his faculty committee at Syracuse University. He owes a very special thanks to Dr. George L. Bird, whose helpful counsel continually kept setting the compass heading and warning of hidden reefs. He also thanks Dr. Robert D. Murphy for his numerous constructive criticisms; and the other members of his examining committee, Dr. Wesley C. Clark, Dr. William P. Ehling, Dr. Eugene Foster, and Dr. Roland E. Wolseley.

The author acknowledges his indebtedness to Will B. Davis, Manager of the Committees on Publication until 1962, and to DeWitt John, Assistant Manager under Mr. Davis and his successor. They and their staffs generously gave of their time as the writer sought information. This study, in a small degree, is a testimony to the many complex tasks to which the Manager and his staff with dedication address themselves.

The writer knows that the Manager and his staff, from their much great familiarity with the subject, will inevitably spot errors of fact and emphasis. He hopes these will not be numerous or very important.

The writer wishes to thank Robert Peel, chief of the Editorial Section of the Manager's office. Not enough can be said about Mr. Peel's enduring patience, magnanimous outlook and ever ready willingness to give aid.

The writer is deeply appreciative of the energetic assistance and special legal talent provided by Robert Parker, a legislative assistant on the Manager's staff.

The writer pays grateful tribute to Mrs. Jane McCarty, who untiringly typed this dissertation and gave much helpful encouragement along the way; to her husband, Art, who so many times delivered typed papers to the writer, up four flights of stairs no less; to Miss Marlène Fuchs, Miss Jane Archer, and Miss Marjorie Keall for their further typing; to Mrs. Helen Turner and Miss Elizabeth Woolley for carefully reading and criticizing parts of the manuscript; to Gordon Ramsay for his "legwork" to libraries and other assistance; to Miss Cecilia Morris, Miss Luned Watkins, Mrs. Helen Lowell for giving so much time to the tedious task of checking the typed pages against the drafts; to Bill Whipple for his assistance; to Miss Margaret Ellis and Phil Kupper for their helpful

assistance in finding materials in the Manager's file department; and to others who assisted and encouraged the writer directly and indirectly.

This study was made possible through the access to files allowed by The Christian Science Board of Directors. They considered the writer's project in 1957 and at that time kindly granted permission for him to have access to the office files of the Committee on Publication and to quote from this agency's file correspondence. For this access, the writer is deeply grateful.

The writer acknowledges with appreciation the permission that the Trustees under the Will of Mary Baker G. Eddy have given for him to quote from Mrs. Eddy's published writings.

The writer is grateful for the financial generosity of The Foundation For Biblical Research and Preservation of Primitive Christianity at Charlestown, New Hampshire, and its secretary, Miss Margaret W. Arnold. Their help saw him through some lean times.

No one but the writer endorses this study, and that he does, he must confess, with great trepidation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	ii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
INTRODUCTION	1
Conceptualization	5
Methodology	29
PART I. AN AGENCY OF IMPACT	
Chapter	
I. "TO COMMEMORATE THE WORD"	51
II. "IMPOSITIONS ON THE PUBLIC"	126
III. "IN A CHRISTIAN MANNER"	147
IV. "ON ITS OWN MERITS"	167
PART II. MODES OF IMPACT	
V. CORRECTION--I: AN EXAMINATION OF THE GROUP'S RESPONSE OF DIRECT REPLY	199
Books, Periodicals, and Pamphlets	203
VI. CORRECTION--II:	287
Syndicated Material	287
Sermons	326
Medical Talks	337
Classrooms	338
Libraries	345
Distribution	354
Some Conclusions	372

VII.	COERCION: AN EXAMINATION OF THE GROUP'S RESPONSE OF CENSORSHIP	378
	Economic Sanctions	384
	Use of State Power	402
	Distributor Relations	408
	Some Conclusions	423
VIII.	INFORMATIONAL SERVICES: AN EXAMINATION OF THE GROUP'S RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FROM THE MEDIA	428
	Providing Information	434
	Checking Manuscripts	452
	Preparing Articles	462
	Some Conclusions	464
IX.	PUBLICITY AND ADVERTISING: AN EXAMINATION OF THE GROUP'S COMMUNICATIVE INITIATIVE	469
	Press Relations	474
	Station Relations	488
	Broadcasts Out of the United States	513
	Films	519
	Libraries	524
	Advertising	528
	Some Conclusions	533
X.	LOBBYING: AN EXAMINATION OF THE GROUP'S COMMUNICATIVE RESPONSES AND INITIATIVE TO INFLUENCE GOVERNMENT	539
	Some Conclusions	562

PART III. CONCLUSION

XI. THE COMMITTEE AND THE FUTURE 566

XII. FURTHER RESEARCH 595

APPENDIX: RELIGIOUS TENETS OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE 605

BIBLIOGRAPHY 607

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. GEOGRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLICATION, DECEMBER 1959	113
2. CORRECTIVE RESPONSES BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION, JUNE 1958 TO MAY 1960	201
3. CORRECTIVE RESPONSES TO BOOKS, PERIODICALS, AND PAMPHLETS--EXCLUDING SYNDICATED MATERIAL--BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION, 1958-1960	203
4. SUCCESS OF CORRECTIONS--BOOKS, PERIODICALS, AND PAMPHLETS	216
5. ALL PUBLISHING REQUESTS HANDLED BY MANAGER, 1958-1960	430
6. "HOW CHRISTIAN SCIENCE HEALS" RADIO SERIES, June 1958 to May 1960	496
7. "HOW CHRISTIAN SCIENCE HEALS": STATIONS BROADCASTING	505

ERRATA

Page numbers omitted: 46, 165, 166, 447.

INTRODUCTION

In what ways and to what extent the organized group has an impact on the media of mass communications is a crucial question to the student of the free press. Groups clearly have through their informational activities an influence on the press. Exactly what this influence is, however, and whether it is a help or hindrance to the press is not so clear.

Several factors urge this study. They all start with the patent fact that the activity of organized groups in the United States is, taken in the aggregate, enormous and of strategic significance to society. A single statistic suggests this: in the United States there are over 200,000 distinct organized groups.¹ Probably the majority of the American people

¹Department of Commerce, National Associations in the United States (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1949), as cited by Donald C. Blaisdell, American Democracy Under Pressure (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1957), p. 25.

belong to these.¹

It seems only natural that knowledge of the free press should take account of group activities. By their numbers and social pervasiveness groups are in a position to further or retard the democratic goal of an informed electorate. Indeed, it might be said that the group in its role of adding and modifying messages in the communicative process plays a fourth role in the conception of the free press after the citizen, the mass media of communications, and the government.

The intent of this study, then, is to add to the knowledge of groups in the process of social communication and thereby to the knowledge of the free press as a cherished liberty. Among aspects of the subject that this study will consider are the kinds of group activities that bear upon the mass media, the reasons for these activities, and how these activities

¹Alfred de Grazia, "Nature and Prospects of Political Interest Groups," Unofficial Government: Pressure Groups and Lobbies, CCCXIX of The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science (Philadelphia, September 1958), p. 119. (The short title, The Annals, will be used in subsequent references to this work.)

fit into the scheme of a free and virile press.

More specifically, the study will attempt to show (1) that the impact of the group on the mass communicator and mass media is identifiable as correction, coercion, informational services, publicity, and advertising; (2) that these activities are called forth by normal needs in a democratic society and by the difficulties of the established media to satisfy them; (3) that there is no necessary incompatibility between these communicative activities of groups and a free press; and (4) that the group's working success with the media is in fact related to the group's pursuit of the norms of a free press.

The first point--or hypothesis--holds that the group has an impact on the mass media in five distinct ways. These will be defined in later pages of this chapter and serve the body of this study as chapter titles.

The second point considers an enduring social problem--the gap between the legitimate needs of free men and the institutions provided to meet these needs.

The third calls for standards in the group's communicative activity that are consistent with a free press. The final point suggests that on the basis of the group's self-interest, practical recommendations can be fashioned to bring the group's communicative activities more nearly in line with the values of a free press.

The fact-finding side of this study takes up a public relations agency of a church group, the Christian Science Committee on Publication. This agency works with and through the media of mass communications to inform the public on the religion and activities of the Church. The Committee on Publication has no responsibility in the Christian Science Church's own publishing activities.

Several particular fact-finding questions will be addressed to this agency. Some are: Through what channels does this agency influence the media? By what methods does it seek to influence? What has contributed to particular instances of success and failure? What is the complementary nature of the

Committee's work with the several media?

On the following pages we shall consider the problem of this study in two of its fundamental phases-- conceptualization and methodology.

Conceptualization

It is strange that the terms commonly used to describe the group's impact on social processes are so often "bad words." Terms such as "pressure," "protest," and "lobbying" used to identify group activity hardly raise favorable images in at least the layman's mind's eye. While the group, even as the press and other social institutions, may on occasion misuse its freedom, group activity hardly deserves universal condemnation.

The term pressure, such as in "pressure group," is often construed as an opprobrious term, as though the group's influence is only or even chiefly a deleterious influence.¹ The word protest is

¹Political Scientists Garceau and De Grazia point out that much of the academic literature has been hostile to interest groups. According to Garceau, the "thinking about groups has been obsessed with guilt. . . . Theory has been somewhat reformist, imitative, and simplistic." Oliver Garceau, "Interest Group Theory in Political Research," The Annals, p. 111. De Grazia comments, "our troubles are in ourselves and not in our groups." Alfred de Grazia, The Annals, p. 121.

regularly identified with the "crackpot groups."¹
Lobbying is often taken as little more than a series of "deals."² To these might be added a fourth term, coercion, which frequently is naively assumed to be in every case "un-American."

The fact of the matter is, of course, that the activities these terms describe must be judged case by case. They should not and cannot be lumped together and denounced. Some phases of these activities are wholly normal and natural to a free, vigorous society; others are not. Unfortunately the terms themselves convey no such distinctions.

Take pressure, which is one of the most common terms used to describe the group's impact on the press. Neither Constitutional theory nor everyday experience provides reason for surrendering the term to the denouncers.

¹". . . the whole area of protest writing to editors, especially by vocal crackpot groups, has been sadly neglected." Hans H. Toch, Steven E. Deutsch, and Donald M. Wilkins, "The Wrath of the Bigot: An Analysis of Protest Mail," Journalism Quarterly, XXXVII (Spring 1960), p. 176.

²Viz., the distinction between the "new lobby" and the "old," discussed in later paragraphs.

Pressure is the logical outcome of the First Amendment to the Constitution. For one thing, both the group and the press look to this Amendment for Constitutional protection--and as equals. There is a significant propinquity in Article I between "the right of the people peaceably to assemble" and the provisions for freedom of religion, speech, and the press:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.¹

And judicial interpretation holds freedom of assembly and freedom of the press as "equally fundamental":

¹It can be assumed that this Constitutional provision for the right of citizens to group together is broader than just for the purpose of appealing to government. "The right of assembly guaranteed in the Federal Constitution to the people is not restricted to the literal right of meeting together 'to petition the government for a redress of grievances.'" American Jurisprudence, Constitutional Law, XI, (San Francisco: Bancroft-Whitney Company, 1937, 1938, with "Cumulative Supplement" for 1956), sec. 325. Harold J. Laski explains that freedom of association "involves the idea of a recognized legal right on the part of all persons to combine for the promotion of purposes in which they are interested" and "the right freely to assemble for the purpose of public meeting." "Freedom of Association," The Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, VI, p. 447. On the right of petition Blaisdell says: "The basic right of individuals and groups to request governmental action to redress their grievances has been transformed in modern times to a right to propagandize the country for special purposes." American Democracy Under Pressure, p. 40.

The right of peaceable assembly is a right cognate to those of free speech and free press and is equally fundamental.¹

Furthermore, the theory of the free press, as protected in this same First Amendment, urges group pressure, indeed assumes it. The theory has the premise that the general welfare requires minimum restriction on the airing of views of all kinds. These views are to be allowed to mingle, compete, synthesize, win, lose--before the bar of public reason. From this competition truth emerges²--but also diversity, pluralism, the spirit of faction,³ and pressure. Individuals join those with whom they agree, and together as a group they endeavor to forward their cause, for one thing through the most expeditious route to the public, namely the

¹American Jurisprudence, XI, Sec. 325.

²That the practice falls short of the ideal is pointed out by Hocking, who states: "I fear it is simply not the case that in the profuse and unordered public expression of today the best views tend to prevail. . . . The classical argument is not sustained by an examination of current facts." William Ernest Hocking, Freedom of the Press, A Framework of Principle (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947), p. 93.

³Which Madison argues for in the tenth essay of The Federalist. Roy P. Fairfield, ed., The Federalist Papers (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Company, Inc.), pp. 16-23.

media of mass communications. Henceforth, pressure.

The concept of "the competition" of ideas is in the ringing words of Justice Holmes:

But when men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they have come to believe . . . that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas,--that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market; and that truth is the only ground upon which their wishes safely can be carried out. That, at any rate, is the theory of our Constitution. It is an experiment, as all life is an experiment.¹

About the media being drawn into the contests and sharing in the pressure that contending sides generate, the

Committee on Freedom of the Press states:

A free press is free from compulsions from whatever source, governmental or social, external or internal. From compulsions, not from pressures: for no press can be free from pressures except in a moribund society empty of contending forces and beliefs.²

Pressure groups are no less than the extension of the rights of individuals. They are one way an individual responds who desires a public hearing, indeed, who

¹Oliver Wendell Holmes in Abrams v. United States, 250 U.S. 616 (1919), cited in Milton R. Konvitz, Fundamental Liberties of a Free People: Religion, Speech, Press, Assembly (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1957), p. 294.

²Commission on Freedom of the Press, "Summary of Principle: A Statement of the Commission," in Freedom of the Press by Hocking, p. 228.

wishes to share generally in democratic processes. In the group the individual finds the necessary resources, skill, and continuity to ensure the hearing that might otherwise be for him inconvenient, difficult, or even impossible. In effect, he elects the group to represent him as his advocate to the public. He delegates--it might be said--the exercise of his Constitutional right of free expression to the collective individual, the group.

Pressure can be taken according to not only its Constitutional implications but also its contributions to the workday press. While the group may make for mischief, the group also may provide a significant, if not indispensable, contribution. The group through its public relations may serve the press as a useful partner--a fact that needs as careful reckoning as the more publicized derelictions.

For one thing, there is the reportorial function. A group may supply a release to the media that is genuinely newsworthy and in the best newspaper tradition.

It may be the sort of news item that the editor finds difficult, costly, or perhaps impossible to obtain otherwise. According to Ross,

No argument is needed on behalf of the "reporting function"--the straightforward dissemination of facts . . . ¹

Secondly, there is the assistance that the group's public relations can render to the newsman or editor who comes calling.² The newsman may need information on a subject which is a specialty of the group or may require a statement or article setting forth the group's position or activities. Or the newsman may request to be put in touch with events he may wish to witness or with an official of or authority in the group from whom he can obtain a story. The group's public relations office can provide a variety of news and research assistance. Where it does not or cannot, the newsman may be severely handicapped.³

¹Irwin Ross, The Image Merchants (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1959), p. 268.

²Discussed as "informational services" in this study.

³"[par.] The fact remains . . . that any editor worth his salt knows that he is just about as dependent upon the public relations man as they are upon him. [par.] The task of covering the news . . . has become a job of such magnitude and of such complexity that it cannot

A third function is popularization. Information from whatever source needs not only dissemination but also an attractive format and clear presentation to draw, hold, and inform the reader. The technical requires simplification the long and detailed calls for the terse, the prosaic needs the touch of the dramatic. Though danger may lurk in too much simplification and too much ingenuity, popularization has a necessary part in responsible news writing. According to Pimlott, the "chief significance for society" of public relations people is as "experts in popularizing information."¹

be done without help. [par.] No newspaper could afford the staff it would take to turn out the vast amount of news that fills the papers every day." J. Q. Mahaffey, "PR and the Press," Public Relations Journal (June 1953), quoted by Stanley Kelley, Jr., Professional Public Relations And Political Power (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1956), p. 204. Ross says much the same thing; see Ross, pp. 19 and 136.

¹J. A. R. Pimlott, Public Relations And American Democracy (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1951), p. 257. Pimlott also notes: "The better the job of popularization, the more smoothly will society function, but also the greater the understanding which the plain citizen will have of his own place in relation to the 'big' and seemingly inhuman groups whose interplay is important for the 'dynamics of group behavior,'" p. 257. Also see Pimlott, p. 240.

A fourth function is providing diversity of content to the press. Groups in conflict,¹ if they have an active public relations facility, will not long allow the press to remain ignorant of their positions. While a group's press release on a contentious point may emit more heat and fog than light, the newsman still has less reason to let the clash go unreported and, more important, undefined with the release before him.

But conflict after all probably belongs to the lesser number of human events. Groups can add diversity by supplying the press with information about the other part--cooperation. Through "cooperation news"² the

¹"Free expression is destined not to repress social conflict but to liberate it. But its intention is that the level of social conflict shall be lifted from the plane of violence to the plane of discussion." Commission on Freedom of the Press in Hocking's Freedom of the Press, p. 214. See also Pimlott, p. 242, and Harold D. Lasswell, National Security and Individual Freedom (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950), p. 47. Gauer puts the matter colorfully: "Advertising, after all, is infinitely better in the long run than bribery or murder." Harold Gauer, How to Win in Politics (Boston: B. Humphries, 1947), p. 185, quoted by Malcolm Moos in "New Light on the Nominating Process," Research Frontiers in Politics and Government, Brookings Lectures, 1955 (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1955), p. 157.

²Several content analyses have been reported in the literature which attempt to distinguish between

group lets society know of its services, purposes, and everyday activities, both to attract new members and to construct a reservoir of public good will. The net effect is to add to social integration and to strike at the divisive barriers of ignorance, suspicion, prejudice, and distrust. Indeed, the group tells of its participation in society and participates even in the telling.

The press can count on the groups to bring a diversity to its content, whether as conflict or as cooperation news. It is up to the newsman to screen and select and make that diversity meaningful.

Protest, like "pressure," has been semantically reduced too often to a bad word and given negativistic

conflict and nonconflict or cooperation news. Conflict news is taken to encompass news about contention, such as between groups, and also the "police blotter" fare. Nonconflict news concerns the cooperation of man with man--"society at work." As for the purpose of these analyses, Cony provided for his study the hypothesis "that newspapers emphasize conflict to the extent that reality is twisted out of shape and a false picture of society as a jungle is presented to the reader." See Edward R. Cony, "Conflict-Cooperation Content of Five American Dailies," Journalism Quarterly, XXX (Winter, 1953), pp. 15-22; also Walter Gieber, "Do Newspapers Overplay 'Negative' News?" Journalism Quarterly, XXXII (Summer 1955), pp. 311-328.

connotations. Refutation, rebuttal, reply, correction, and rectification, though more respectable terms perhaps, probably cannot be distinguished from the protest in everyday journalism.¹ While there are misuses of the "protest," this is not reason to surrender the word to the critic--no more so than to surrender the term "pressure" and on much the same grounds.

In Constitutional theory protest or the right of reply has a secure place. The "competition of the market" allows fully as much for the challenge to views as their original utterance, for the setting aright of demonstrable falsehood or the public self-defense as for the critic's criticism in the first place. In fact, the person criticized owes it to the democratic society, which needs the maximum expression of views, as well as to himself to speak up when he feels he has been wronged. It is no less the "take" than the "give" that

¹At least we shall not attempt it. In this study we shall use almost exclusively the term "correction," partly because it has found a place in public relations thinking. Canfield allows for correction in his review of public relations techniques. He lists as fifth of ten "Public Relations Objectives of Social Welfare Organizations": "To correct misconceptions and answer criticism directed at an organization and its policies and practices." Bertrand R. Canfield, Public Relations: Principles, Cases and Problems (Homewood, Illinois: R. D. Irwin, 1960), p. 317.

makes for free men.

About reply, Hocking observes:

expression is free whenever and wherever a man can say and print what he ought to say and print and take the natural consequences. His freedom does not require that there be no consequences or that they shall be to his liking.¹

The Commission on Freedom of the Press provides:

Freedom of expression can never be made a costless immunity by shackling hostile response, for response is also expression. . . .

.
If a man is burdened with an idea, he not only desires to express it, he ought to express it. The socially indispensable functions of criticism and appeal may be as abhorrent to the diffident as they are attractive to the pugnacious, but for neither is the issue one of wish. It is one of obligation--to the community and also to something beyond the community, let us say, to truth.²

Protests, as right of reply, also have a certain legal status. Civil (Roman) law gives standard recognition to an aggrieved person's right to his own published reply or to a public apology or retraction by his critic. Anglo-American law is much more limited in its recognition.

The first law codifying a right of reply was

¹Hocking, p. 136.

²Commission on Freedom of the Press, in Freedom of the Press by Hocking, pp. 214, 218. Italics added.

introduced in France about 140 years ago.¹ Germany and other Continental countries subsequently adopted similar laws; also Latin American nations. According to Donnelly, Denmark has a special court concerned with the right, known as "Committee for Rectifications."²

In American law the right has only limited recognition. Nevada has a general reply statute, and Mississippi has a statute applicable to candidates for political office.³ A limited right of reply in broadcasting is recognized in the Federal Communications Act.⁴ Also, libel statutes give implicit recognition when they allow a defendant to introduce a published retraction in mitigation of damages.⁵

¹Richard C. Donnelly, "Right of Reply--An Alternative to an Action for Libel," Virginia Law Review, XXXIV (November 1948), p. 884.

²Ibid., p. 891.

³Ibid., p. 886.

⁴Ibid., p. 895. Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934 provides for a limited right of reply in situations which involve radio stations and political candidates. See also Code of Federal Regulations, (Revised as of Jan. 1, 1958), Title 47, Section 3.120.

⁵Donnelly found in 1948 that twenty states had libel statutes with this provision.

Apart from its legal status, right of reply is also customarily awarded some recognition in practical journalism. At least, the widespread editorial feature, "letters to the editor," serves as a common vehicle for reply. Across the Atlantic, the British Press Council has taken a position in favor of retractions to correct errors against "a person or group of persons."¹

The practical usefulness of right of reply or protest is limited in several ways. For one thing, there is a popular failure to distinguish between censorship and the public protest, perhaps because both after all have the same intent, namely to impede the public course of a message. To side against the protester on other than the merits of his case, to identify criticism directed at an author with censorship, does a disservice. It fails to allow the distinction between adding comment to the public fare, as the protest does, and censorially depriving the public. Also, it fails to recognize the basic right of a person to agitate for public cooperation in order

¹J. Edward Gerald, "The British Press Council: A Summary and an Evaluation," Journalism Quarterly, XXXVI (Summer 1959), pp. 303-304.

to protect as well as promote his interests.

Holmes argues what is and what is not censorship as follows:

Does freedom, in other words, mean the exposure of the weak to the strong, and the license of error to wreak its utmost havoc without interference?

Such assertion, or suggestion, is natural, but quite absurd. Not in a free society are any to be left defenseless against enemies or traducers. Instead of outlawing serious literary and dramatic works in which offensive or careless material appears, let the sensitively maimed rise up and protest. In a country such as ours, the very atmosphere is hospitable to truth. Platform, pulpit, and printing press are everywhere available to reach and educate the public mind. Picket lines may be formed, and public meetings held, to challenge and correct error. Nothing is more unfair than to assume that all the varied instrumentalities of freedom in a democracy are at the disposal only of the misguided and misinformed, even the wicked. As a matter of fact, every means for the expression of free opinion is as available for good as for evil uses. It is only when such means are fanatically denied us, that we need be afraid. Truth, and the liberty to speak it, is our whole case.¹

Also undermining the usefulness of the right are the demagogic techniques of the "big lie" and "character assassination." The accusation bannered

¹John Haynes Holmes, "Sensitivity as Censor," Saturday Review, XXXII (February 26, 1949), as quoted by Robert B. Downs, ed., The First Freedom: Liberty and Justice in the World of Books and Reading (Chicago: American Library Association, 1960), p. 155.

in the front-page headline leaves in the public mind a tenacious impression hard to correct no matter how erroneous. When the eventual reply is only a letter to the editor in an inside page, the accuser from first to last clearly has the upper hand.

Barth makes this point in a discussion of the "punishment by publicity" that the press unwittingly helped to administer during the high point of Senator McCarthy's influence.

Newspapers especially tend to make headlines out of accusations and to treat denials less prominently. This stems in large measure from the concept of news as sensation and is scarcely less true of those newspapers that strive for objectivity than of those that deliberately use their news pages to serve editorial biases. . . . Thus, what is one day properly regarded as unpublishable gossip is treated the next day as news of great moment because it has been uttered under official auspices. Refutation, no matter how compelling, never catches up with charges of disloyalty and never erases their imprint.¹

The group itself may contribute to the erosion of right of reply. From oversensitivity the group may fail to distinguish between the trivial and significant in crying "Wolf! Wolf!" over even the most minor

¹Alan Barth, The Loyalty of Free Men (New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1951), pp. 11-12.

comment.¹ Also, the group may not draw a distinction between the actual misrepresentation and the genuine difference of opinion. The ubiquity of social criticism generally allows no group to escape long. Thus the group's ability to draw such discriminations is probably an indicator of its maturity.

At best, right of reply or correction serves to supply the public with another viewpoint; also to police the media of mass communications. No group is to be ridiculed or misrepresented if it has an articulate public relations facility. At worst, right of reply is a nuisance which adds further to the superfluity of meaninglessness that already clogs much of the mass communications. It is to be tolerated only to ensure that no idea which counts fails to get a hearing.

In short, while society has the right to criticize, the group has the right to reply.

¹"By banishing all unfavorable presentation of their part in our common world, they strive to escape the prejudice and persecution, the mean misunderstandings and horrid hates, which are all too often made their tragic lot." Holmes, as quoted by Downs in The First Freedom, p. 153.

The use of coercion, as a group practice in social communication, is also sometimes misunderstood. Like pressure and the protest, coercion--that is censorship and suppression--has phases well within the norms of a free press. While it constitutes an alternative to reason, argument, and persuasion--indeed, to the protest--, coercion is surely not for that reason to be always considered illegitimate.

There is coercion effected by recourse to the civil, criminal, regulatory, and police powers of the state. This coercion embraces the well recognized limits on freedom of expression obtainable under laws of libel,¹ unrestrained obscenity, misbranding, fraudulent advertising, copyright infringement, incitement to riot, and sedition. While there may be opposing voices raised in particular instances, these types of coercion on the whole find a broad supporting consensus.

There are other types of coercion through state powers that do not have general support, however. The

¹In some states, legal redress is obtainable under group libel laws. See Robert E. Cushman, Civil Liberties in The United States, A Guide to Current Problems and Experience (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1956), pp. 23-25.

American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), for instance, has objected to state legislatures passing, on the insistence of groups, sweeping laws which allow local officials to interfere with the distribution of publications almost at will. It has also disapproved of police and prosecuting attorneys cooperating with a group to bar, by threat or direct action apart from due process of law, books and magazines from newsstands and book stalls. It has objected to similar acts by commanders at military installations against books and magazines.¹

Cushman notes another objectionable form of coercion. Groups in some instances have been able to persuade city officials not to permit a cause offensive to them the use of a public building open to others.²

Coercion is effected sometimes through not only city and state powers but also economic sanctions. Our "business civilization" makes the economic coercion

¹American Civil Liberties Union, "Statement on Censorship Activity by Private Organizations and the National Organization for Decent Literature," as provided by Downs in The First Freedom, pp. 134-138.

²Cushman, p. 63.

especially potent.

The ACLU has set forth its specific objections to economic coercion. It has made clear that it does not object to a group's advising the members of the group for or against any publication. Nor does the ACLU oppose the group's informing the general public of the group's opinion. The ACLU has objected, however, when a group organizes an economic boycott among its members and the general public aimed at putting out of business a news dealer who carries an offending title.

The ACLU has decried the activities of one group which compiles and distributes to news dealers, drug stores, and other booksellers lists of books, mostly paperbacks, disapproved by the group. These business people are asked not to carry or sell the books. Their compliance is publicized to members of the group with the recommendation that the members confine purchases to complying firms.¹

About coercion, the ACLU comments:

In discussing this kind of censorship, we make a clear distinction between the right of all or-

¹ACLU Statement provided by Downs in The First Freedom, p. 136.

ganizations to express their opinion, which we defend, and acting in such a manner as to deny those who do not agree with their opinion an opportunity to read the literature themselves.¹

It also notes that ". . . criticism is a right of private freedom, and must immediately be protected when threatened."²

Lobbying is a fourth term with equivocal implications that is often used to describe a set of group practices. Lobbying is of interest in a study of the press because of the significant calls modern lobbying practices make upon the press.³ In the political process, Lasswell reminds us, "the number one instrument of accountability in America is the daily press."⁴

A distinction is sometimes drawn between the "old lobby" and the "new lobby."⁵ The main difference

¹Ibid., p. 134.

²Ibid., p. 136.

³"A chronological study of works on our political life would show the authors giving longer and more elaborate treatments to propaganda, the mass media of communication, and the strategies and techniques of ~~campaigners and pressure groups.~~" Kelley, p. 2.

⁴Lasswell, National Security, p. 178.

⁵For one of the earliest studies drawing this distinction, see Edward Pendleton Herring, Jr., Group Representation Before Congress (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1929).

is that the new lobby works through the press more than the old lobby did. And this use is "one of the most legitimately democratic procedures imaginable."

Schattschneider says:

A broad program of propaganda designed to convert the public generally to the views of an organized minority is obviously one of the most legitimately democratic procedures imaginable. Under certain conditions (assume that the subject of the controversy is a great one, that the resources of the group are adequate, and that the opposition is powerful) it may be possible for an organized minority to provoke a great debate and to lay the matter before the public as the final arbiter.¹

The old lobby depended chiefly on the lobbyist's personal influence with legislators and government officials. Personal "deals" were involved; also minor favors and some not so minor, campaign contributions and assistance, intimidation, the "social lobby" and its features of lavish entertainment, and general cryptic and corrupt lobbying practices. Epitomized in such powerful nineteenth-century political figures as "King of the Lobby" Sam Ward² and "My Lord Thurlow" Weed,³

¹E. E. Schattschneider, Party Government (New York: Rinehart, 1942), p. 189.

²Herring, p. 33.

³Blaisdell, American Democracy Under Pressure, p. 63.

the old lobby began to dim in significance around World War I. This occurred during a period that saw simultaneously a trend in legislatures and the public against corrupt lobbying practices¹ and a rapid growth in public relations in many phases of American life.

The new lobby looks to gain its ends by mass persuasion, by reaching the legislator through his constituents. The lobbyist is found between crises constructing among the legislator's constituents a reservoir of good will and a "philosophical consensus." He does this in good measure by placing publicity and advertising in the press. Then in time of crisis, when the "chips are down" and the interests of the group are vitally at stake, he taps the reservoir--he carries his case to the legislator's constituents and sends them after him. If broad support is not soon forthcoming, the lobbyist makes it appear so anyway through expressions in the media and inspired mail campaigns. From first to last, the lobbyist uses the media as a tool for lobbying.

¹Also during this time the Seventeenth Amendment was ratified, providing for the election of Senators by direct vote.

The "new" lobbyist by no means neglects his contact with legislators and government officials. But these are mainly aboveboard and a matter of letting the group views be known as persuasively as possible; also of proffering intelligence and research assistance. Elements of the old lobby are still to be found but, according to Turner, "their total impact on the political process is probably not great today."¹

Herring speaks of the new lobby as "coercion through propaganda and the artificial creation of opinion."² Kelley provides a vivid example of the new lobby at work in his portrayal of the political activities of the public relations firm, Whitaker and Baxter, for the American Medical Association.³ Turner points out the significance of the new lobby to group activity:

The continual increase in the efforts of interest groups to win support for their organizations

¹Henry A. Turner, "How Pressure Groups Operate," The Annals, p. 67.

²Herring, p. 46

³Kelley provides a chapter on "Whitaker and Baxter: Campaigns, Inc."

and programs by using the mass media of communication to influence public attitudes is perhaps the most significant recent development in pressure-group activity.¹

The terms, then, used to describe group activity--pressure, protest, coercion, and lobbying--need a broader conception than is sometimes popularly allowed to them. The issue is not so much the status of these group practices in a free society but rather the practice standards.

Methodology

The principal classificatory and analytical device in this study is a set of categories drawn to account for the practices of a group having an impact on the press. These categories, six in number, have already been named as correction, coercion, informational services, publicity, advertising, and lobbying.

There is a discouraging lack of agreement on terms to describe communicative practices generally. There may be a vague consensus on words such as publicity or public relations, but surely in practice

¹Turner, p. 68.

there is no rigor.

Pimlott speaks of the "insoluble problems of definition" and gives up on any attempt to isolate "information," "publicity," and "public relations."¹ Ross provides a number of definitions from the literature for "public relations" but concludes that "No universally accepted definition has ever emerged."²

Descriptions of censorial practices are perhaps less ambiguous. This study takes the "liberal" position, spokesmen of which we have already referred to in our citation of Downs and of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Our solution to the difficulties of terminology is to isolate that part of common communicative terms most relevant to our study. Since our purpose is to analyze a process, namely the impact of the group on the media of mass communications, we shall **isolate** that part of communicative terms about the process from extraneous meanings, such as concerning content. In this we shall not be pretentious, our

¹Pimlott's context is government public relations. Pimlott, pp. 45 and 105.

²Ross, p. 15.

purpose being merely to achieve a modicum of working agreement.¹

We shall reckon this process of group impact according to an initiative-response dichotomy. We shall define each of our categories according to whether the group initiates an act or responds to an act of another. When a group places publicity with a newspaper editor, it can be said that the group takes the initiative. When, however, a group replies to criticism leveled against it, the group is, in fact, responding to the act of another. This initiative-response dichotomy will be assumed to exhaust the ways in which the group acts upon the media of mass communication. The dichotomy will become more meaningful as we next define the six categories.

Correction, as one way a group responds, is to be understood as the direct reply of an organization to public comment about it. This category is to include the group's protests against and criticisms

¹While a polished nomenclature and taxonomy can doubtless be useful in freeing concepts from unintended overtones, other research objectives are evidently more in favor today. See David B. Truman, "The Impact on Political Science of the Revolution in the Behavioral Sciences," Research Frontiers in Politics and Government, p. 213

of the critic as well as the common meaning of correction, the rectifying of factual errors by accurate information.

Coercion, another response, is taken to encompass the uses of police power, litigation, and economic force to impede the message of another before that message reaches the public.

Informational services, a third response, is a phrase coined to embrace the group's responses to requests for assistance from newsmen and authors.

Publicity shall be used to designate those actions a group initiates to make known its purposes and activities and to further them.

Advertising, a further initiative category, is to encompass the publicity that a group purchases.

Lobbying, as a term, is to be employed to account for the group's use of the media in the five other categories to influence government. We shall note that the Committee on Publication responds to the political acts of others more often than it

takes legislative initiative.

Two common terms used to describe communicative behavior are conspicuously absent. One is propaganda. A well recognized meaning defines propaganda in terms of an audience. What is propaganda to one audience may be information or even education to a second.¹ Because audiences are outside our scope, we shall not use the term.

A second term, public relations, is also to be discarded. What little agreement there may be on the precise meaning, the sweep of the term and its applicability to the internal activities of the group make it unusable.² On the one hand, the term can be taken

¹Lasswell points out that "The inculcation of traditional value attitudes is generally called education, while the term propaganda is reserved for the spreading of the subversive, debatable or merely novel attitudes." Harold D. Lasswell, "Propaganda," The Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences XII, p. 522. In another volume, he explains that statements are often information from the point of view of American audiences but propaganda in the eyes of a world audience. Lasswell, National Security, p. 94. On the same point, Blaisdell pithily declares, "One man's information is another man's propaganda." Donald C. Blaisdell, "Pressure Groups, Foreign Policies, and International Politics," The Annals, p. 154.

²These are, for example, evident in Canfield's definition: "Public relations is a philosophy of management expressed in policies and practices

to include several of the above categories--publicity, for instance, and informational services. This comprehensiveness makes it too broad for meaningful use. On the other, the term commonly embraces the need of a group to behave itself according to publicly acceptable standards. An analysis of the group's affairs apart from their impact on the press, particularly the group's internal affairs, lies outside our scope.

The term group is to be used to mean the formal organizations in which individuals band themselves together to make a claim on outside society.¹ In use of the term pressure group, the term "pressure" shall be taken to specify the group's relation to the media,

which serve the public interest. It is also a function of management which appraises public opinion and devises and executes communications which interpret an institution's policies and actions to the public to secure its understanding and goodwill." Canfield, p. 18.

¹Truman indicates something of both the purpose and cohesive force of a group in defining it as a condition of interaction among persons possessing shared interests and attitudes. For him, "an interest group is a shared-attitude group that makes certain claims upon other groups in the society." David B. Truman, The Governmental Process, Political Interests and Public Opinion (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951), p. 37.

namely all the consciously communicated influences, contributive and restrictive, that the group brings to bear upon the media.

Actually, to label all groups as "pressure groups" makes little allowance for the colorful kaleidoscope in their variety. In composition, the group may be made up of any collection of people from businessmen to hobbyists, from consumers to the religious, from veterans to the politically inclined. In purposes, some groups may try to maintain the status quo, others to change it; some may pursue self-interests, others the assumed welfare of "the other fellow"; some may seek to influence public policy, others the division of the national product. In tactics, some groups may seek their objectives by appealing to the public through the press, others by negotiating with opposing groups and public officials. In characteristics that make for success, a group may look mainly to its membership, when it is large, distributed strategically throughout society, and

0

cohesive; to its leadership when both resourceful and possessed of resources; to its ideology and goals when the public already considers these largely its own.

The phrase, mass communications, is to be taken broadly to mean all phases of public expression. It is to include not only the newspaper, magazine, pamphlet, book, radio and television broadcast, and motion picture, but also public addresses, church sermons, and services of public libraries and educational institutions. It is to be assumed that the theory of the free press embraces to a degree all the mass communications--the author's right to write, the newsman's right to report, the publisher's right to distribute, the platform speaker's right to speak, the instructor's right to lecture, and, as the grand end, the individual's right to read, view, and listen--or not to do so--as he may choose.

We have already cited a number of studies to which ours has a relationship. Pimlott has provided one of the best bird's-eye views of the practice of

public relations in terms of the free press and a democratic society. Downs has compiled helpful articles on freedom and censorship. Hocking has provided a theoretical statement on the nature of pressure and the theory of the free press. Kelley and Ross have set forth useful comparative case studies. Blaisdell has portrayed the group as a legitimate participant in democratic processes.¹

Our study both embraces these inquiries and is more narrowly construed than them. We shall focus on the group's impact on the media--not on its relation with the public, the government, or the group's own membership. We shall take as content this impact as a process--not the group's ideology, the products of the press, or an institution's history, structure, internal affairs, or environment. The sociological perspective is the theory of the free press informed by empirical materials--not techniques of public relations and of lobbying or the sociology of an institution. This study through its categories and hypotheses--its woof and

¹"This book is written in the conviction that in politics it is the group that counts." Blaisdell, American Democracy Under Pressure, p. 24.

warp--sets forth a frame of reference to consider the group's entire relationship to the media--not just single aspects or phases.

The Christian Science Committee on Publication was selected as the subject of this study for several reasons. First, the Committee represents a small group that is an active participant in modern society. The Christian Science denomination, which has about 3,300 churches in some 40 lands, holds views that differ at points not only from religious tradition but also from the majority views on methods of healing. The Committee represents the Church as it makes its views known to the public and defends these views in the face of social pressures to conform.

Second, the Committee has across sixty years evolved policies and procedures that have broader reference for the investigator than just the single group. The Committee carries on informational work with all the media of mass communications. This work, it might be assumed, parallels the endeavors of other groups which reach the public through the press. Furthermore, the Committee

0

carries on its activities at the "grass roots" in a variety of environments. It has a representative in every area where there is a Christian Science church and in some other locations.

Third, this grass-roots public relations is centralized in a single head at the church headquarters in Boston. This centralization permits a study of the international agency at a single location. Without centralization of this kind, a study of the agency in its true breadth would hardly have been possible.

Fourth, selection has been dictated by the fact that this church agency was willing to open its files without restriction. Its cooperation afforded a superb opportunity to tap a rich source of communicative activities around the world.

Regarding source material, there is very little recently published material on the Committee. Apart from church publications, almost all material dates back three decades or more or rests on authorities that old. Bird and Merwin¹ cite in their book of readings a three-page comment on the Committee. This comment, however, is drawn from a source published over thirty years ago.² Braden leans

¹George L. Bird and Frederic E. Merwin, eds., The Press and Society, A Book of Readings (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1951), pp. 511-514.

²Edwin Franden Dakin, Mrs. Eddy: The

heavily on material of an earlier period but provides later information as well.¹ The later material, however, has only a limited usefulness, a matter discussed in a chapter on coercion.

Publications of the Christian Science Church provide only a modicum of information on the Committee. A brief report of the activities of the Committee appears once a year. This report, read along with reports of other church offices at the Annual Meeting of the Church in June, is published in the July issue of The Christian Science Journal. An occasional letter from the Committee to an author, editor, or minister is published in the Christian Science Sentinel. Both these sources are far from complete in detail and documentation, and provide little assistance to the academic investigator.

Other than these periodicals, no publications are available that give information on current church activities. None emanates from church colleges.²

Biography of a Virginal Mind (New York, London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929, 1930). See Chapter VII.

¹ Charles S. Braden, Christian Science Today: Power, Policy, Practice (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1958).

² There is only one college that might be called a denominational college, though it is privately

The research burden of this study lies in an analysis of correspondence in the Manager's office, Christian Science Committees on Publication. The lack of published materials required almost complete dependence on correspondence, in some cases augmented by interviews.

As a practical matter, the use of the correspondence files had to be sharply limited. The writer had over 250 file drawers at his disposal, obviously far too many for proper handling in a single study. To narrow selection without sacrificing objectivity, representativeness, and meaningfulness, the writer limited his study to a specified period of time and to pieces that had a bearing on the hypotheses. Essentially, the procedure was to address two questions to the material.

First, did a letter fall within the period of time? Selected was the period from June 1, 1958, to May 31, 1960. Letters judged critical on this criterion were those that had been written between these two dates.¹

administered and supported. This is The Principia at Elsay, Illinois. It does nothing in the way of research support of the Church.

¹When an exchange involved letters both within and outside the period, the case was reported or not according to whether the bulk of the correspondence fell within the period. If only an acknowledgment, for instance, fell within, then the case was not reported.

Pieces bearing earlier or later dates were also reported when especially meaningful on a point.

This period is historically significant. Five books on Christian Science were published in the United States during the period. This made for a spate of publishing activity without parallel in the history of the Church. Furthermore, the first month of the period saw the appearance of the long-awaited report on spiritual healing by the Church of England's Archbishops' Commission. The last month marked the appearance of a pronouncement on the same subject by the United Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Both reports made brief reference to Christian Science and led to action by the Committee on Publication.

Because the period chosen is recent, it has been possible to give a picture of the Committee's activities as they substantially are today. The recency also assisted the writer in obtaining needed material in full. The older case files sometimes proved incomplete.

Second, did a letter serve to explain the hypotheses? Since the hypotheses concern the group's impact on the media, letters deemed critical on this criterion were those exchanged between the Committee and the media of mass communications. Thus the Committee's correspondence sent to writers, authors, editors, publishers, teachers, librarians, ministers, broadcasters, and the like were held critical. All other correspondence, such as between the Committee and individuals or between area Committees and the Manager, were taken as reportable only as background to the critical pieces.

By these two questions, the study has been limited to 25 file drawers of the 250, one out of ten. Most of the 25 drawers bore the major classification, "Public Relations," and a subclassification, "Comments: Books and Periodicals," "Comments: Individuals," or "Comments: Newspapers." These subclassifications embraced all comment about the Church made in outside publications and the Committee's responses to this comment. They did not embrace all of the Committee's communicative initiative--that is, publicity and advertising--, which is more decentralized to the local level and so less reported in the Manager's files than the responses.

The writer investigated these file drawers exhaustively; also memorandums between the Manager and the Executive Office of The Christian Science Board of Directors, and circular letters from the Manager to area Committees. A further significant source was the general instructions provided by the Manager to area Committees--the Handbook of Policies and Procedures.¹

Correspondence quoted in this study is usually documented in a footnote by name of addresser , name of addressee, subject under which a letter can be found, and date; also the writer's case number. In one or two places, the addresser or addressee is kept anonymous to protect the person concerned.

A few abbreviations are used in footnotes:

"CoP" for Committee on Publication, "Man." for Manager of the Committees, "E.O." for Executive Office of The Christian Science Board of Directors, "D.M." for District Manager for Great Britain and Ireland, "M.W.O." for Manager of the Washington, D.C. Office, and "ACoP" for Assistant Committee on Publication.

¹Handbook of Policies and Procedures for Christian Science Committees on Publication, 1960 edition, 250 pp. (mimeographed). This volume will be called by the short title, Handbook.

Full imprints are supplied for all books taken up in the text whether from correspondence or cited directly. Publishing data for newspapers and periodicals cited directly are fully given, but not always for those cited from the correspondence.

There are, of course, certain hazards in using correspondence. A letter writer may have lacked insight and not told the complete story. He may have held unwritten assumptions and organizational mores.

The correspondence cited in this study for the most part gives the Committee's side only. This was made necessary because of the complexity of issues and our limited scope. Other standpoints are heard only inferentially.

While our interest is primarily in a process, namely the group's impact on the media, the content that concerns the group also has a role. In giving meaning to this process, it is as necessary to pay some attention to the internal value content, namely the religion, as to the external value content, the norms of the free press. The one, no more than the other, is to be "proved."

As a final methodological preliminary, it is incumbent upon the investigator to state, so far as he comprehends them, his biases as they touch upon the study, and to provide his methods of control. It is assumed that, while objectivity is an ideal approximated only by degrees,¹ the attempt must be made to achieve objectivity.

The writer is a member of the Church whose public information agency he writes about. He is convinced that the Christian tradition and his particular interpretation of it are supremely important to the welfare and progress of mankind.

Also the writer was once an employee of the church agency he describes. He served with the agency for four years. Along with the danger to objectivity, employment of this nature can be an asset. The writer was able to call on his limited participation and to report significant correspondence that very likely

¹"There is no such thing as complete objectivity in selecting and presenting information, but there are substantial safeguards against abuse." Pimlott, p. 148. Also see H. R. Jelliffe, "A Semantic Slant on 'Objectivity' vs. 'Interpretation,'" Journalism Quarterly XXXIII (Spring 1956), pp. 189-193; Ken Macrorie, "Objectivity: Dead or Alive?", Journalism Quarterly, XXXVI (Spring 1959), pp. 145-150.

would have been missed by an outsider. Furthermore, firsthand participation and intimate familiarity may have led in some instances to a more meaningful interpretation than that open to the outsider.

One control of bias lies in the selection device already discussed. Correspondence is to be reported exhaustively within a specified period of time, between the Committee and editors, authors, newsmen, or other mass communicators, on the responsive variable. No sampling is involved, no selection by "hunch."

A second control lies in the use of the four hypotheses. These hypotheses establish the subject of the study, set up the criteria for reporting exchanges, declare the relevant issues to be analyzed, and serve as a frame of reference for relating the material to outside data and theory. The hypotheses in these ways serve meaningfulness, analysis, and objectivity.

Martin and Nelson point out that

the best check against unconscious bias is "a set of inter-related hypotheses," formulated to be proved or disproved. . . . Unless the preliminary, explicit scheme is used, data may

well be subconsciously selected, or implicit or surreptitious assumptions may enter.¹

. . . .

In the chapters ahead we shall endeavor to understand the meaning of group activity to the free press. Part I takes up the Committee on Publication as a public relations agency. The structure, purposes, and working policies of this agency are discussed. Part II considers the methods by which the group exercises an impact on the press. Each of the six communicative practices will be probed--correction, coercion, informational services, publicity, advertising, and lobbying. Part III sets forth some recommendations on how the Committee on Publication might better serve its role as a partner of the press. Also, provided are areas of further research into the relation of the group and the media of mass communications.

¹L. John Martin and Harold L. Nelson, "The Historical Standard in Analyzing Press Performance," Journalism Quarterly, XXXIII (Fall 1956), p. 459.

P A R T I

AN AGENCY OF IMPACT

CHAPTER I

"TO COMMEMORATE THE WORD"

Midway between Boston's tallest landmark, the fifty-two story Prudential tower, and venerable Symphony Hall--within a little more than a stone's throw of each--stands one of Boston's most visited landmarks, The First Church of Christ, Scientist. While an attraction generally to tourists in this city of history, the Church is especially meaningful to the Christian Scientists, for in their affections it is "The Mother Church."

Who are the communicants of this Church, these Christian Scientists? The editor of The Christian Science Monitor, Erwin D. Canham, probably the Christian Scientist the public knows best, describes them as "very diverse." Some of them, he says, "are very simple people"; some are "highly educated." They come of "many races and historical backgrounds" and "live in 120 lands." "Almost the only thing they have in

common," he states, "is their interest in Christian Science."¹

DeWitt John, the Manager of the Christian Science Committees on Publication, picturesquely describes the diversity. He writes:

Here is a random list of a few I know: a lawyer, a dentist, a professor of physics at a large university, a woman chemist in an atomic laboratory, a historian, a biologist; a carpenter, an automobile mechanic, a farmer, a rancher, a weigher of ship cargoes; an artist, an actor, a leading movie director; a professional football player, a dress designer, a music teacher, a cattle broker; a German baron, a lady-in-waiting in the Japanese imperial court, a British earl; a janitor, a clerk, a laborer; a banker, the president of a topflight advertising agency, a former major-general in the United States Army, a well-known corporation president, a United States senator, a university president, a former medical student.²

The "common denominator among them," he declares, "is the fact that somehow a spark within them has been touched into light."³

¹Erwin D. Canham, Commitment to Freedom, The Story of The Christian Science Monitor (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1958), p. 403.

²DeWitt John, The Christian Science Way of Life with A Christian Scientist's Life by Erwin D. Canham (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962), p. 2.

³Ibid., p. 4.

The Boston Church edifice, which rests on a triangular plot, is actually two buildings--a smaller, spired, architecturally Romanesque "Original" and a larger, domed, Renaissance "Extension." The structure faces across Falmouth Street a broad, trim, church park; across Norway Street the nine-story Christian Science Publishing Society, publisher of the Monitor and other church periodicals; across St. Paul Street the Administrative Building, housing the Church's headquarters. In the last, the Christian Science Committee on Publication, the subject of our study, has its main offices.

The founder of the Church, Mary Baker Eddy, was a New England woman, small in stature, but, to judge from the meaningfulness the Church has for the members, by no means small in ideas. And the Church's activities, including the Monitor and the Committee on Publication, which were by her design, suggest that she possessed no little organizational acumen as well.

The purpose that Mrs. Eddy laid down for the

Church at its founding in April 1879 is often cited as being the purpose of the Church today. (A part of this purpose constitutes our chapter's title.)

To organize a church designed to commemorate the word and works of our Master which should reinstate primitive Christianity and its lost element of healing.¹

A study of the Christian Science Church or its component unit, the Committee on Publication, must reckon with the aspiration suggested in this purpose, namely a link with the tradition of religious healing in first-century Christianity. Two questions might be asked about this aspiration.

The first of these is, did "primitive Christianity" actually have an "element of healing"? According to authorities of the period, the early Christians did claim to heal. Evelyn Frost, in a definitive study that

¹Mary Baker Eddy, Manual of The Mother Church, The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts (Boston: Trustees under the Will of Mary Baker G. Eddy, 1908, 1936), p. 17:10-13. (Since all of Mrs. Eddy's writings cited in this study have the same publisher, the imprints provided will carry only the copyright dates, and these will be the original date and the renewal date for the latest edition. Page numbers bear line numbers as well.)

earned her a doctor of philosophy degree at London University, declares that Christ Jesus, his immediate disciples, and Christians up to the third century accomplished works of healing. She notes that the Gospels--Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John--provide accounts of Jesus' healing the ill and infirm. Unless dismissed as symbolic or parabolic, these accounts clearly establish healing as part of the history of Jesus' life. In many of these healings, the infirmities as described are recognizable today. Regarding Jesus' own healing work, Miss Frost finds that

there are altogether thirty-seven records of Christ healing physical disease. Such diseases as were healed included both organic and functional; there were the lepers, the deaf, dumb, blind, lame, paralytic, those suffering from dropsy, fever, haemorrhage; there was the servant Malchus whose ear Peter cut off, and the three who were brought back from death, besides many others.¹

Miss Frost further reports that healings were accomplished, according to New Testament texts, by Jesus' disciples and their followers--namely Peter, John,

¹Evelyn Frost, *Christian Healing, A Consideration of the Place of Spiritual Healing in the Church of To-day in the Light of the Doctrine and Practice of the Ante-Nicene Church* (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1949 edition), p. 62.

Paul, Barnabas, Stephen, Philip the Deacon, Ananias, and the Apostles in general.¹ Finally, Miss Frost provides "Patristic Evidence" for healing in the early Christian Church up to the end of about the third century, when it died out. She cites on this Quadratus, Justin Martyr, Theophilus of Antioch, Tatian, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, and other Church Fathers.²

If a historical "element of healing" in early Christianity is admitted, a second question is, what do Christian Scientists present to substantiate their claim to be reinstating Christian healing.³ Since our study is of a group's public relations, this is for us essentially a question as to what the group submits to support its claims before the public. The Committee on Publication during 1958, 1959, and 1960 produced a weekly, fifteen-minute, radio-program series entitled

¹Ibid., p. 63, fn. 7.

²Ibid., pp. 64-69, 103-110.

³The harsher academic critics are often willing to concede some similarity. DeNood, for instance, says, "It is not unlikely that Mrs. Eddy unwittingly duplicated some of the ideas of the early Church Fathers." Neal Breaule DeNood, "The Diffusion of a System of Belief," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Sociology, Harvard University, 1937), p. 72.

"How Christian Science Heals." This series featured healing experiences as told by members of the Church. Each healing was brought about by prayer alone. (It is not customary among Christian Scientists to mix their form of treatment with medicine.) The texts of these programs were printed in the Church's weekly periodical, the Christian Science Sentinel, along with the full name of the participants and their home cities.

Of 105 broadcasts between June 1, 1958, and May 31, 1960, 69 carried reports of the healing of a disease or infirmity that had been diagnosed by competent medical authority.¹ The infirmities reported are as follows: six cases of broken bones; four of growths; three each of burns (second and third degree) and tuberculosis of the lungs; two each of asthma, cancer, fibroid tumor, heart ailment, hernia, limbs to be amputated, nervous breakdown, pneumonia, tuberculosis of the bone, stomach ulcers; one apiece of

¹It is no more customary for the Scientist to resort to medical diagnoses than to medical treatment. The diagnoses here were the outcome of special circumstances. Some persons involved were required to undergo a physical examination by an employer or for an insurance policy. Others were hospitalized while unconscious or otherwise unable to exercise a choice. Still others turned to Christian Science from medical care, a frequent source of diagnoses on these programs.

amoebic dysentery, blood disease, Bright's disease, chemical burns, stomach catarrh, cerebral hemorrhage and paralysis, digestive troubles, foot infection, gallstones, hipbone softened, jaundice, ankle ligament torn, knee injury, mauling by lion, organic condition, pelvic deformity, peritonitis, poliomyelitis, spine disease and paralysis, sciatica, typhoid fever, ulcerated colitis, undulant fever. In addition, there were three cases each of deafness, impaired eyesight, and alcoholism, and one case of narcotic addiction.¹

¹The sources of these cases are noted by program title and date in Chapter IX, Table 6. "Testimonies" of Christian Science healing are regularly published in three of the five church periodicals--The Christian Science Journal, Christian Science Sentinel, and The Herald of Christian Science. Some years ago the Manager of the Committees on Publication prepared from the Journal an analysis similar to ours here of healings with medical diagnoses. The analysis went to The American Journal of Sociology in reply to an earlier article in that publication. As published, the Manager's letter in part stated: "The four volumes of the Christian Science Journal on which he [the article-writer] based his investigation report the following healings in which there was medical diagnosis: four cases of cancer, eight of tumor, twenty-one of broken bones, seven of pneumonia, seven of appendicitis, twenty-two of heart disease, twenty-one of tuberculosis, six of asthma, and from one to three of diphtheria, blindness, peritonitis, scarlet fever, arthritis, spinal meningitis, diabetes, gallstones, epilepsy, tetanus, polio, uremic poisoning, pelvic ovaritis, smallpox, pyorrhea, hernia, deafness, curvature of the spine, jaundice, dropsy, bronchial catarrh, abscessed teeth, ulcerated eyes, paralytic stroke, etc." See The American Journal of Sociology,

Convinced of their own approximation to the healing works of the New Testament and the early Church Fathers, Christian Scientists assert that religious healing is not only possible to, but has in fact a normal and essential part in, the Christian ministry. For them the healing wonders of the early centuries were not due to a special divine dispensation limited to time and place, or to a miraculous setting aside of natural law, or to personal supererogation of saints. Rather the healing works were the effects of spiritual law applied to human need--a law, God-ordained, that can and ought to be applied by the spiritually minded even today.

It is in such propositions as universal and systematic applicability that Christian Scientists explain their use of the term "Science" to describe their religious beliefs. They hold their religious teachings in these respects as quite analogous to the laws of general physics and mathematics.¹ Speaking on these matters and the role

LX (September 1954), pp. 184-85. The article to which the letter was a reply is: R.W.England, "Some Aspects of Christian Science as Reflected in Letters of Testimony," LIX (March 1954), pp. 448-453.

¹"To the Christian Scientist, spiritual healing, in order to be scientific, must be based on an understanding of God and His spiritual laws and such understanding calls for more than faith. Just as it is not enough for an engineer to have faith in mathematical and engineering

she believed she had as a Christian discoverer, Mrs.

Eddy wrote:

In the year 1866, I discovered the Christ Science or divine laws of Life, Truth, and Love, and named my discovery Christian Science. God had been graciously preparing me during many years for the reception of this final revelation of the absolute divine Principle of scientific mental healing.¹

Divine revelation in modern times has, this statement suggests, clarified the Christian teachings and set forth rationally-held, spiritual "Principle" and "laws" that call for application and even verification in "healing."

There also is evidently much that Christian Science is not from the adherents' point of view. It apparently is not to be justified in the services rendered. It is not merely or even primarily a means to secure health and personal well-being or to "adjust" to things as they are.

Rather its "emphatic purpose" is "the healing of sin,"²

principles in order to build a bridge--though his understanding of these principles will obviously give him faith in them--so the Christian Scientist considers the divine Principle of Jesus' healings to be the Rock on which his faith rests." Man. to J. Robbins, re Red Book, March 28, 1960. Item #1130.

¹Mary Baker Eddy, Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures (1906, 1934) p.107:1-6.

²Mrs. Eddy wrote: "Healing physical sickness is the smallest part of Christian Science. It is only the bugle-call to thought and action, in the higher range of infinite goodness. The emphatic purpose of Christian Science is the healing of sin; and this task, sometimes, may be harder than the cure of disease; because, while mortals love to sin, they do not love to be sick." Rudimental Divine Science (1908, 1936), p. 2:23-2.

It apparently is not to be just accepted or believed but systematically "understood," and this say the Scientists takes "immense work" and spiritual growth,¹ and separates their teachings and form of healing completely from faith healing.² Likewise, it evidently is not, as the Scientists at the present time have "demonstrated" Christian Science, entirely proved³ and without failure.⁴ In fact the

¹See, for example, Science and Health, p. 322: 9-13. In her Unity of Good (1908, 1936), Mrs. Eddy speaks of "immense spiritual growth" on p. 43:9-11.

²See Mrs. Eddy's Retrospection and Introspection (1892, 1920), pp. 54-55.

³See Science and Health, pp. 254:6-23, 329:7-20, 461:1-7.

⁴On the failures, Peel writes: "Naturally there are failures in the application of Christian Science--failures which Christian Scientists attribute to their own human shortcomings rather than to any fallibility in the teachings they practice." Robert Peel, Christian Science: Its Encounter with American Culture (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1958), p. 151. Also see a "Fact Sheet" which the Manager on March 5, 1959, sent to area Committees for distribution to selected newspapers: "Christian Scientists do not claim that their present understanding and demonstration of God's law is sufficient to have enabled them to cure every case, as Jesus did. But the record shows that virtually all types of disease, including those considered most difficult and malignant, have been healed through the ministrations of Christian Science. Many entire families, over a period of years and sometimes through several generations, have relied exclusively and successfully for their health needs on prayer as taught in Christian Science."

Scientists seem to be generally conservative in their present claims to having all the last answers to all the last questions.¹

Finally Christian Science is not an attempt to make religion out of physical science, which this religious teaching accepts in some aspects and rejects in others.²

Christian Scientists hold themselves to be thoroughgoing Protestants--according to the founder, "intrepid, self-oblivious Protestants in a higher sense than ever before."³ The Manager of the Committees on Publication expanded on this point some years ago in the Christian Science Sentinel:

¹Mrs. Eddy wrote, for instance, "What the person of the infinite is, we know not; but we are gratefully and lovingly conscious of the fatherliness of this Supreme Being." No and Yes (1908, 1936), p. 19:13-15. A few pages later she adds to this by stating she is "ignorant" on "the absolute personality" of man and on eschatological questions. P. 27:23-8. Also see her Miscellaneous Writings (1896, 1924), p. 96:8-16; and Science and Health, pp. 90:30-32 and 573:29-2.

²Mrs. Eddy did not, for example, unlike so many of her contemporaries in religion, utterly reject Darwin. See Science and Health, p. 543:20-21. Yet she drew distinct lines between Christian Science and the natural sciences. See ibid., p.127:30-2.

³Miscellaneous Writings, p. 172:6-7.

The position of the Christian Science denomination might be said to be that we are in the ranks of Protestantism because we accept the basis of the Reformation, which asserts the individual rights of conscience--the individual right to search the Scriptures and draw conclusions from them, as against the dogma of the church of that time to do those things for the individual.

But the "distinguishing features" of "type of service as well as our healing ministry" justify, the Manager stated, seeking a separate classification from "government and other authority."¹

As a practical matter, Christian Scientists share with many Protestants the Authorized (King James) Version of the Bible. Also their Church Tenets (see Appendix) suggest a Protestant orientation.

Like most minority groups, the Christian Scientists have more in common with, than distinct from, their fellow citizens. They share not only a common religious heritage, in Protestant countries at least,

¹William D. Kilpatrick, "Classification of the Religion of Christian Science," Christian Science Sentinel, XLIX (February 8, 1947), p. 249. Kilpatrick's successor in office, George Channing, answered the question whether or not Christian Scientists considered themselves Protestants in A Guide to the Religions of America (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955) ed. by Leo Rosten, p. 23. It is to be noted that Christian Scientists serving as chaplains in the United States military services are classified as Protestant chaplains.

but also common cultural outlooks in favor of free institutions, the rights of the individual, the dignity of labor, the expectation of progress, etc. Their daily newspaper, The Christian Science Monitor, symbolizes this common ground. It is not likely that the Monitor, except as an exponent of the best in the common heritage, could consistently be highly rated among the best newspapers in the United States. In 1957, for instance, weekly editors stated that they read the Monitor more than any other newspaper.¹ In 1961 deans and professors of journalism ranked it second only to The New York Times.² Some public figures are willing to place it even first.³ On its fiftieth anniversary in 1958, the newspaper received the praise of numerous prominent national leaders and public figures.⁴

¹"Reading Habits of Weekly Editors," The American Press, LXXV (June 1957), 10.

²John Tebbel, "Rating the American Newspaper-- Part I," Saturday Review, XLIV (May 13, 1961), 59-62.

³Eleanor Roosevelt in McCall's (LXXXV [May 1958] p. 70), stated, "I would say that for objectivity the best newspaper is The Christian Science Monitor." Item #1095.

⁴See booklet, What They Say about The Christian Science Monitor (no imprint, but published by The Christian Science Publishing Society in 1958).

The Monitor cannot, of course, be separated from the Church whose organ it is. The Monitor represents the Church in the field of journalism and the Church's voice to a degree in public affairs. As a writer in The New York Herald Tribune stated: "Both in theory and in fact it is idle to discuss the 'Monitor' in terms which separate the editorship, the newspaper and the church."¹ It is significant that Mrs. Eddy considered the Monitor her greatest accomplishment next to Science and Health.²

Also, like other minority groups, Christian Scientists hold views that conflict at points with the majority outlook. In their case, the majority-minority disagreement is a conceptual problem, a Weltansicht, with broad implications, turning on fundamental questions of materialism and spirituality,³ especially whether

¹Edgar A. Comee, "Canham of The Monitor," The New York Herald Tribune (January 15, 1961), section 2, p. 3.

²Peel, p. 172.

³"As the ages advance in spirituality, Christian Science will be seen to depart from the trend of other Christian denominations in no wise except by increase of spirituality." Eddy, Miscellaneous Writings, p. 21:11-14.

this dichotomy can meaningfully and practically be defined in terms of human experience. The best known side of the disagreement concerns choice of healing methods. The Christian Scientists as a minority group reject as inferior¹ for themselves what the majority accepts, namely medical treatment.²

The social issue here is broader and more subtle than just medicine versus Christian Science. At stake is whether or not any and all forms of healing, bearing any possible merit, ought to be combined. The Christian Scientist insists that this can never be done successfully. He would not mix his form of treatment with either medical³ or other nonmedical means. He forgoes all medication, surgery, psychiatry, psychotherapy, osteopathy, and chiropractic treatment.⁴

¹Scientists deny that "drugs . . . produce health." Ibid., p. 8:3.

²For aspects of this conflict not taken up here, see the later chapter on lobbying.

³There are a few exceptions, such as sometimes the setting of broken bones (see Science and Health, p. 401:27-7), hypodermic injections to ease violent pain (ibid., p. 464: 13-20), and obstetrical cases.

⁴There is probably some parallel between the Scientists' position against mixing kinds of treatment and the medical profession's ethical stand against professional cooperation with nonmedical healers --

The Christian Scientist argues on pragmatic grounds against mixing his treatment with these other forms of healing. First, he looks upon treatment by prayer in Christian Science and the services of Christian Science practitioners, nurses, nursing homes, and sanatoriums, as providing together a wholly safe and effective system of sick-care and healing. The treatment at his disposal he believes to be just as adequate for him as medicine and its institutions are for others.

Mrs. Eddy provided the advantages of Christian Science thus:

I claim for healing scientifically the following advantages: First: It does away with all material medicines, and recognizes the antidote for all sickness, as well as sin, in the immortal Mind;¹ and mortal mind as the source of all the ills which befall mortals. Second: It is more effectual than drugs, and cures when they fail, or only relieve; thus proving the superiority of metaphysics over physics. Third: A person healed

including the Scientists themselves. See Principles of Medical Ethics--Opinions and Reports of the Judicial Council, a supplement to The Journal of the American Medical Association, CLXVII (June 7, 1958), Section 3, "Association with Cultists."

¹Christian Scientists capitalize "Mind" when using it as a synonym for God, whom they believe to be the sole healing agency. They distinguish the divine "Mind" from the erring, sinning mind of mortals, or "mortal mind." See Science and Health, pp. 469:12-471:21.

by Christian Science is not only healed of his disease, but he is advanced morally and spiritually.¹

Second, the Scientist opposes mixing out of a conviction, he believes born of experience, that mixture tends to vitiate the effectiveness of his and the other system. He perceives mixing to be not only ethically improper but physically dangerous. DeWitt John states that using Christian Science and medicine concurrently is "unfair to both systems and dangerous to the patient."² Peel says, "The stubborn, irreducible facts of experience have shown that under ordinary circumstances any attempt to mix Christian Science and medicine seriously lessens the efficacy of each."³ Mrs. Eddy made the point somewhat more broadly: "The notion that mixing material and spiritual means, either in medicine or in religion, is wise or efficient, is proven false."⁴

¹Mary Baker Eddy, Retrospection and Introspection (1892, 1920), p. 34:10-19.

²DeWitt John, p. 18.

³Peel, p. 162.

⁴Eddy, Message to The Mother Church, June 1901 (1901, 1929), p. 19:12-14.

The radical position of total reliance on prayer for cure of the sick is the single, most distinctive sociological dimension of the Christian Science Church. Other churchmen pray, but the Scientist virtually alone "treats" by prayer in lieu of all other remedies. From this position derive the distinctions between the Christian Scientist and his fellow churchmen, the Christian Science practitioner and the orthodox Christian minister, indeed this minority and the majority. Also from this position social conflicts arise, namely between the Scientist and those who would force medical treatment on him. A social analysis of the Christian Science Church must account for its radical position on treatment by prayer.

Three pioneer academic studies have considered the position in terms of a practical, religious metaphysics. These studies have been made by Steiger,¹ Peel, and Epps²--in that order during the past decade

¹Henry W. Steiger, Christian Science and Philosophy (New York: Philosophical Library, 1948); submitted originally as a Ph.D. dissertation to the Department of Philosophy of Boston University under the title, "A Philosophical Investigation of the Doctrine of Christian Science" (1946).

²Bryan Crandell Epps, "Religious Healing in the

and a half. Steiger's work was from a position in philosophy, Peel's against a backdrop of New England transcendentalism and American pragmatism, and Epps' from a standpoint in contemporary religious healing practices. Steiger states on the subject of his study:

If, however, the question should be asked, What is Mary Baker Eddy's most significant contribution in the history of human culture? it may be answered that it is the introduction of practical metaphysics.¹

Very likely, Christian Scientists today do not find themselves in quite as radical a position as Christian Scientists in Mrs. Eddy's day. There is, for one thing, a strong religious healing movement in the orthodox churches,² especially among the Episcopalians though also among the Methodists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, and Congregationalists. For another, the complexion of medical healing has perceptibly changed with the development of psychiatry and psychosomatic medicine,³ and the recent interest in evolutionary and

United States, 1940-1960: History and Theology of Selected Trends" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate School, Boston University, 1961).

¹Steiger, p. 211.

²Admirably documented by Epps.

³Two researchers from the New York Hospital-

environmental factors.¹ Modern medicine admits to much more than the purely mechanical uses of pills and surgery, even to something of a psychic element (the Scientists would distinguish this from the spiritual element). This tendency away from mechanism in medicine probably has won religious healing some public toleration.²

Cornell Medical Center found the psychosomatic element so prominent in disease that they could draw no distinction between psychosomatic disease and other disease. See United States News and World Report, June 22, 1956, p. 114.

¹That these causes lie behind disease has been urged by Rene Dubos, the renowned microbiologist at the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research in New York City. In his book Mirage of Health, Utopias, Progress, and Biological Change (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), Dubos attributed the great strides in world health not to medical findings and treatment of disease but rather to evolutionary adaptive processes in man beyond the reach of medicine and to efforts of laymen in the cause of sanitation and general raising of living standards. "It is remarkable," he says, ". . . that little practical progress has been made toward controlling the diseases that were not dealt with by the nineteenth-century reformers [i.e., the lay sanitation reform]" (p. 20). He allows no really valid scientific theory of drug action (p. 132). Also see his articles, "Health and Disease," The Journal of the American Medical Association, CLXXIV (October 1, 1960), pp. 505-507, and "Beyond Traditional Medicine," Harper's, CCXXI (October 1960), pp. 166-168.

²Some evidence also suggests that to the medical profession a factor tending to make the Church's position less radical has simply been the practical success of Christian Science healing. Twice on the radio programs of the Church from 1958 to 1960, a church member stated that a doctor had recommended Christian Science (program #273, healing of tuberculosis of an arm bone, as reported

Any greater breadth in religion and medicine, however, has not been entirely an unmixed blessing to the Scientists. While it may have made for a somewhat less hostile environment, it also very likely has drawn away public attention--indeed, has provided something of competition.¹

We might turn from the Church's purpose to its organizational aspects. The Church of Christ, Scientist, as an organization, looks for its legal basis to three trust instruments, all drawn by Mrs. Eddy. It does not have formal state incorporation or a charter.

in the Christian Science Sentinel, LX [December 13, 1958], p. 2188; program #283, healing of fibroid tumor, Sentinel, LXI [February 21, 1959], p. 336). One testifier was guided by a doctor's wife (program #250, healing of typhoid fever, Sentinel, LX [July 5, 1958], p. 1165). According to mimeographed Reports on Fruitage From "How Christian Science Heals" Radio and Television Programs (Boston: Committee on Publication)--an Alabama physician referred a patient to a Christian Science practitioner (March 1957 report), an Ohio doctor himself turned to Christian Science (September 1957), a Texas doctor and a Connecticut doctor supplied Christian Science literature to patients (April 1957 and November 1958 reports, respectively). It is noteworthy that, according to the Monitor's editor, "the largest single professional group subscribing to the Monitor, as far as the paper's admittedly limited statistics on this point shed light, is the physicians." Commitment to Freedom, p. 123.

¹A Methodist minister wrote to one Committee on Publication, "~~The increase of healing in the churches as a whole is going to render the witness of Christian Science in this respect also unnecessary for the simple reason that it will have won its point.~~" R. Sutton to CoP for Western Australia, re Some Distortions of the Christian Faith, December 2, 1958. Item #357.

The first of these--an inter vivos trust deed executed in September 1892--effected the legal status of the Church proper. By this trust, Mrs. Eddy conveyed the land in Boston, on which the earlier of the two edifices of The Mother Church stands today, to trustees whom she designated as the "Christian Science Board of Directors." Under a law that Massachusetts shares with only a handful of other states, officers of a church body may be "deemed bodies corporate" for purposes of holding property without a formal act of incorporation. By this transaction, the Church was constituted a religious body corporate.¹

The second in January 1898, also an inter vivos deed of trust, effected the legal status of The Christian Science Publishing Society. In this transaction, Mrs. Eddy conveyed to a second set of trustees "the singular and personal property, goods, and chattels" connected with the Church's publishing activities and the Church's periodicals--at that time limited to The Christian Science Journal and the

¹This deed of trust is published in the Manual, pp. 128-135.

Christian Science Quarterly.¹

The third instrument was a testamentary trust, the will of "Mary Baker G. Eddy." While the other two trusts were executed in Massachusetts, this was entered into probate--upon Mrs. Eddy's death on December 3, 1910--at Concord, New Hampshire, her home for seventeen of her last twenty years. The Trustees provided under her will are responsible for the residue of her estate, including her copyrights, and through a publisher's agent for the publishing of her writings.²

The three trusts provide the means for the Church to finance denominational expenses. Under the first, gifts and endowments come to the Church; under the second, income from the Church's periodicals and other literature; under the third, income from the sale of Mrs. Eddy's writings.

In 1921 the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts had occasion to rule on the trust conditions as met by the trustees under the first and second

¹Norman Beasley provides this second deed of trust in his The Continuing Spirit (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1956), Appendix 3, pp. 348-352.

²See Will of Mary Baker Eddy (Boston: The Christian Science Board of Directors, n.d.).

trusts,¹ On a finding of Mrs. Eddy's intent in both the trusteeships and the Church Manual, the Court held that The Christian Science Board of Directors had final authority over the Publishing Society--specifically that the Directors had "the power to declare vacancies"² in its Board of Trustees. The decision seemed to imply that the Church is to be considered a single, legal whole, with the reins of all the Church's affairs in the hands of the Board of Directors; also that the Church Manual is the Church's final body of law³ and the Directors are responsible for its implementation.⁴

¹Eustace v. Dickey, 240 Mass. 55. Justice Rugg's decision is provided by Beasley in The Continuing Spirit, Appendix 5, pp. 353-375.

²The wording is from paragraph 10 of the Publishing Society Deed of Trust and also from the Manual, p. 80:14 (Article XXV, Section 3).

³Smith states in regard to the decisions of this and a concurrent suit, "In effect, these decisions fulfilled a prophecy once made by Mrs. Eddy to one of the members of her household, Miss Shannon, that the Church Manual 'will be acknowledged as law by law.'" Clifford P. Smith, Historical Sketches From the Life of Mary Baker Eddy and the History of Christian Science (Boston: The Christian Science Publishing Society, 1941), p. 220.

⁴Messer points out that the Directors are administrators and executives of the Manual bylaws, not lawmakers. Mary Burt Messer, The Science of Society: The Identity of Each as Godlike Embracing All (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959), pp. 124, 127.

The Christian Science Board of Directors has five members. These five fill their own vacancies and appoint the other officers of The Mother Church-- the President (an honorary position), the Clerk, and the Treasurer for one-year terms, and two Readers (one man and one woman) to conduct the worship services in The Mother Church for a three-year term.

The Manual provides under the Board of Directors three additional Boards and three Committees. Of the Boards, the Board of Trustees of The Christian Science Publishing Society has already been named. There is in addition a Board of Lectureship, the members of which branch churches and societies invite to give public lectures in their vicinities. There is a Board of Education which provides for the preparation of Christian Science teachers at the rate of thirty every three years.

In regard to the three Committees, we shall have much to say later about the Committee on Publication. In addition, there is a three-man Committee on Finance to watch over the real estate and funds of the Church. There is a Committee on Business which has as its

purpose prayer for church activities.

A fourth Committee, which is under the Board of Trustees of the Publishing Society,¹ is named once in the Manual.² This is the Committee on Bible Lessons. This Committee compiles readings from the Bible and from Mrs. Eddy's Science and Health which serve all churches as the Sunday sermon and form the basis of juvenile and adult religious education. The Committee on Bible Lessons does not provide interpretation or comment on the readings, only the citations.

The Manual allows that additional "Boards of Trustees and Syndicates" may be established.³ As a result, the Church organization today is somewhat more complex than indicated here.

An unusual feature of the Christian Science Church is the absence of a professional clergy. Mrs. Eddy placed both the church government and the lead of services in the hands of the lay member and left the way open for every member to hold every office. Local

¹See Publishing Society deed of trust, paragraph 7.

²Manual, p. 104:12-18 (Article XXXV, Section 2).

³Manual, p. 27:25-2 (Article I, Section 8).

church offices tend to parallel in name the offices of The Mother Church.

The principal position in the Christian Science Church is to be considered the Christian Science practitioner. The practitioner is the healer, or, better, the healing worker. His is one of two church vocations, the other being the Christian Science nurse. The position is not a church office. In purpose the practitioner is something of a combined minister and doctor. He treats by prayer sickness as well as sin and gives religious instruction--he "heals by teaching and teaches by healing . . ." ¹

The practitioner is an independent professional, ² obligated to The Mother Church--not branch churches-- for the maintenance of standards. He is not, in taking

¹Eddy, Miscellaneous Writings, p. 358:4-5.

²It can be said that practitioners fulfill most of the usual qualifications for a professional. A profession might be defined by tests, such as the professional shares with others in his profession a certain specialized body of knowledge, offers skills to others based on this knowledge, can be distinguished from others on the basis of these skills, assumes an ethical standard for providing high quality service, shares with his fellow professionals a feeling that they are professionals, has prepared for his profession by rigorous study, recognizes room for improvement and so is concerned to advance continually his own knowledge and skills and those of the profession as a whole, is organized with his fellow professionals

up his ministry, passed upon by a local congregation and does not--unless he happens also to hold a church office--pass on acts concerning the congregation. He is not supported or subsidized by either a local church or The Mother Church but must make his way by the services he renders. There are today about 8,500 of these practitioners located in countries around the world.¹

to set standards for professional recognition and ethical practice, supports a licensing of the profession, and accepts a responsibility to teach the next generation. For an authority, see Pimlott, p. 10.

¹In the United States, the Social Security Administration has adopted for tax purposes the following definition of "Authorized Christian Science Practitioner": "Christian Science Practitioners.--These individuals practice spiritual healing through prayer alone in accordance with the teachings of Christian Science. Their income consists of fees received from patients. They are members in good standing of The Mother Church, The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts. A member of this Church whose name is listed in the practitioners' directory of The Christian Science Journal is one who has no other vocation than that of Christian Science practitioner. A member of this Church, however, may practice Christian Science while at the same time pursuing another vocation. His name will not be in The Christian Science Journal, but his earnings from the practice of Christian Science will nevertheless be exempt from self-employment taxes under the provisions of Section 1402 (c) (5) unless he has filed a waiver certificate pursuant to Section 1402 (e)." Legal Department of Church to District Manager, Social Security Administration, Boston, January 16, 1957. Item #2057.

In his professional capacity, the practitioner adds to his name the initials or designation--not degree--"C.S.," meaning "Christian Scientist." Virtually every practitioner has undergone a period of study or "class instruction" with an authorized Christian Science teacher. The teacher, in turn, uses the designation, "C.S.B.," that is Bachelor of Christian Science. This denotes that the teacher has studied in a normal class provided by the Board of Education. In the teacher-pupil relationship, which endures until the pupil himself becomes a teacher, there is a certain similarity to the "pastors of pastors" relation in churches with an episcopacy.

As a matter of professional ethics, the practitioner, like the doctor or lawyer, does not advertise in the public press. He will purchase, however, a listing in the directory of practitioners in The Christian Science Journal and often in the yellow-pages of the local telephone directory. By his Journal listing, he announces to the public that he has met the standards set by the Church for the public practice of Christian



Science and that he is devoting his full time to this practice, in short that he is a duly accredited and recommended Christian Science practitioner.

Besides the practitioner, there is one other religious vocation, the Christian Science nurse. Except that she does not administer drugs, the nurse serves the sick as her sisters in the medical profession do. A number of Christian Science nurses, in fact, were trained originally at recognized medical nursing schools and followed medical nursing before becoming Christian Scientists.

The nurse usually undergoes a course of instruction at one of three Christian Science institutions. This instruction lasts from one to three years, depending upon the nurse's previous experience and training. After graduation, she takes up a career as a private nurse, a member of a visiting nurse service sponsored by Christian Scientists in a community, or a staff member at a Christian Science sanatorium or nursing home.¹

¹Like the practitioner, the nurse obtains a listing in a directory in The Christian Science Journal. The Manual provides for her on p. 49:7-16 (Article VIII, Section 31). According to the directory in the Journal of April 1961, there were 549 listed nurses. There were probably about a hundred in training.

The Mother Church maintains two sanatoriums, which offer nursing services for the sick and provide courses for nurses. One is at Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts, a suburb of Boston, and a second is at San Francisco, California.¹

Also for care of the sick, nursing homes have been established by private groups of Christian Scientists. These are to be found in the United States, Canada, Britain, and elsewhere. In February 1960, there were fifteen nursing homes in the United States that had met standards set by The Mother Church.²

Both the sanatoriums and the certified nursing homes take acute cases. In this they resemble more the hospital than the medical nursing home. The sanatoriums and the nursing homes are operated as nonprofit charitable institutions.³ Beside these facilities,

¹A third nursing school is the Tenacre Foundation at Princeton, New Jersey, a privately owned and operated Christian Science nursing facility.

²E. O. to Man., February 19, 1960. Item #827.

³The Mother Church subsidizes the two sanatoriums at about a million dollars annually. Beasley provides for 1955 the figure \$744,380 as the difference between operating expenses and what guests paid. See The Continuing Spirit, p. 255; for general information about these sanatoriums, see pp. 215-226 of that volume.

there are a number of convalescent and rest homes.

The Christian Science organization is marked by a balance between centralized and local control. There is the relation of the branch churches to The Mother Church. The Church Manual provides that the government of The Mother Church shall be in the hands of a self-perpetuating Board of Directors. The Manual also specifies that local churches shall govern themselves independently and democratically.¹ The Directors maintain Manual standards, including their own observance of general local church independence.² The churches adjust their activities to local conditions, mindful of their obligations under the Manual.

The balance between centralized and local

¹According to the Manual: "The Mother Church of Christ, Scientist, shall assume no general official control of other churches, and it shall be controlled by none other. . . . In Christian Science each branch church shall be distinctly democratic in its government, and no individual, and no other church shall interfere with its affairs," pp. 70:10-13; 74:5-9 (Article XXIII, Sections 1 and 10). Also see pp. 55:5-7; 71:9-19; 104:3-7.

²"If you only knew how often The Mother Church refuses to arbitrate, advise, or reach into the affairs of branch churches because the Manual specifically states that the latter shall be democratically self-governed." Member of the Manager's staff to inquiring author. December 9, 1960. Item #2029.

control is also evident in the organization of the Christian Science Committee on Publication, about which we have not said much so far. Both The Mother Church in Boston and the local churches share in this agency.

The local churches are represented in the appointment of the area Committees. The First and Second Readers of the three largest churches in a state annually appoint a Committee on Publication--one person--from Christian Scientists within the area. The Readers alternate in making the appointment, the set from one church appointing the first year, the second set the next year, and so on. This local determination presumably allows the Readers to choose the best local talent available.

There is also local control of purse strings. The year's appointing Readers along with those from the two preceding years sit as a finance committee to oversee the Committee's income and expenditures. They check the Committee's financial reports,¹ approve his yearly budget, set the "pro rata" contribution to be

¹Each Committee prepares an Annual Report, containing financial information, which he distributes to the supporting church boards. It is commonly read in whole or part to memberships at local church business meetings.

asked of the churches, consult with the Committee on unusual expenditures, and act as his employer in such matters as Social Security. All churches and societies¹ are requested to share in the financing and almost all do.

The Mother Church, for its part, directs the operations of the Committee. Through the Manager of Committees on Publication, The Mother Church oversees the carrying out of the assignment set for the Committee in the Manual and maintains standards of performance. The state Committee, wherever located, serves as The Mother Church's own representative to the press and to state and local government. He does not act as a representative of The Mother Church to local churches or of local churches to the press and government. The state Committee maintains direct official relations with the press, the government, the Manager of Committees in Boston, and his own Assistants, but not generally with the churches in his state except through his Assistants in local church congregations. He is in no sense a regional bishop but in every sense a press and legislative representative.

¹A Christian Science society has met fewer requirements than a church.

The Mother Church not only directs the Committee's activities but also has a hand in his appointment. It accepts or rejects the appointments to the post made by the state Readers. Similarly, the state Committee passes upon his Assistant Committees. A local church or society will provide the name, which the Committee will approve or disapprove.

The Mother Church by itself appoints (1) the Manager of the Committees, who also serves as Committee for Massachusetts; (2) the District Manager, Committees on Publication for Great Britain and Ireland (he sits in London); (3) the Manager of the Washington, D.C., Office; and (4) Assistant Committees where there are no church groups, particularly in overseas areas. These The Mother Church largely finances as well.

A word might be said about the First and Second Readers, who as electors of the Committee and overseers of his purse, obviously are important in the Committee's line of organization. The Readers, who must be members of both The Mother Church and the local church which

they serve, are elected by and from the church congregation for a single term of usually three years. To them is entrusted the conduct of worship services. The First Readers also are assigned by the Manual a watchdog function. They are to report to the Directors of The Mother Church failure of the Committee on Publication-- and other Mother Church officers--to perform his duties; also the Reader enforces "the discipline and bylaws of the church in which he is Reader."¹

As our discussion so far abundantly suggests, Mrs. Eddy constructed her Church along functional lines. Aspiring to "reinststate primitive Christianity," she eschewed the dictates of tradition, such as an ordained clergy. She declared that the bylaws she drew to govern her Church--and so establish the Committee--"sprang from necessity, the logic of events."²

¹Manual, p. 28:25-4 (Article I, Section 9); p. 32:26-4 (Article III, Section 7).

²Miscellaneous Writings, p. 148:14-15. The critical Dakin remarks: "The by-laws which she designed for her church, for example, reveal a mind become suddenly extrovert, dealing with a practical problem in a manner that can only astonish because of its handling of detail, its analytical tracing of cause and effect, its ability to classify, analyze, and resolve." Dakin, p. 370.

It is probable that chief among the "events" behind the formation of the Committee was Mrs. Eddy's own personal experience with the power and influence of the press. Across nearly eight decades (she was seventy-seven on founding the Committee), she had won her way mainly by what she wrote.

Even before she left her childhood Congregational church to found her own, she evidently had some regional reputation as a writer. Her contributions to the press ran to poetry, fiction, political essays, and gossipy news items. Farlow says that she had pieces published in papers at the early age of eighteen.¹ Smith reports that early items written by her have been found in the Belknap (New Hampshire) Gazette, the New Hampshire Patriot and State Gazette, the Portland Daily Advertiser, the Portland Daily Press, the Lynn Reporter, the Connecticut Odd Fellow, the I.O.O.F. Covenant, the Freemasons' Monthly Magazine, and Godey's Lady's Book. "Not nearly all of her writings," Smith says, "have been found or can be identified, for they were not always

¹Christian Science, Historical Facts (Boston: Puritan Press, 1902), p. 17.

signed."¹

Mrs. Eddy's chief mode of expression in her early years was verse. She was a prolific "verse-maker," to use her words.² Many of her poems are published today in a volume, Poetical Works of Mary Baker Eddy.³ A few pieces can be said to excel, and these reach heights more as hymns than as poetry. Studdert Kennedy, in referring to one of her poems, says that in it she "attains to those simple devotional heights which were to make her one of the most effective hymn writers of her time."⁴ This sentiment is shared by Dakin.⁵

Launching on a career as a religious founder, Mrs. Eddy established the faith largely with her pen.

¹Smith, p. 105. Also, see p. 40.

²"From childhood I was a verse-maker."
Retrospection and Introspection, p. 11:1.

³(Boston: Trustees under the Will of Mary Baker G. Eddy, n.d.). This volume carries 49 titles. Verses also appear in her prose volumes.

⁴Hugh A. Studdert Kennedy, Mrs. Eddy: Her Life, Her Work and Her Place in History (Los Gatos, California: the Farallon Foundation, 1947), p. 147; also see p. 424. Studdert Kennedy discusses her prose on pp. 56, 75, 98, 119, 127, 339, 340, 295, 80, 81; her poetry on pp. 56, 65-67, 74, 75, 147.

⁵Dakin, pp. 380-381.

While she taught, promoted, and defended her doctrine from the pulpit, on the platform, and in personal classes, it was through her writings that she mainly won her following. Of her publications, which are numerous,¹ Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures, her magnum opus, stood and stands today for her students as the primary statement of Christian Science. Also, for them it is the first and only standard textbook on the subject of spiritual healing.²

If by her pen she won her way in establishing her Church, her adversaries by the same method vigorously opposed her. It is a matter of history that "one of her earliest expressions of Christian Science" was in response to a published attack. This was on February 3, 1872, in the Lynn (Massachusetts) Transcript. It was a reply to accusations leveled at her by an apostate

¹According to Meehan, there were in 1906 over sixty different publications copyrighted in Mrs. Eddy's name. Michael Meehan, Mrs. Eddy and the Late Suit in Equity (Concord, New Hampshire: Michael Meehan, 1908), p. 28.

²One writer in the Christian Science Sentinel said about Science and Health: "It is not too much to say that the revolutionary character of the book, if its message is to be accepted, surpasses that of any scientific discovery that has gone before." Alfred Pittman, "What Actually Is Christian Science?" LXII (January 9, 1960), p. 45.

student.¹ Very likely this attack and others like it served to promote her views more than hinder them.²

Mrs. Eddy became more controversial as she became more newsworthy. Beasley notes that in the mid-1880s, a decade after the Transcript statement, some of Boston's denominational publications were vigorously denouncing her. He names the Zion's Herald, the Watchman, and the Congregationalist. Also setting forth criticisms were the Homiletic Review, Mind in Nature, and Century.³

¹Smith, p. 110. Beasley in his The Cross and The Crown (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1952) discusses the exchange on pp. 23 and 24 and provides the letter in the appendix, pp. 569-572.

²The Committee for England in 1907 explained in answer to a question about what effect wild charges and stories would have upon the growth of Christian Science: "In a sense I suppose they do good. People become interested in them, investigate them, discover their shallowness and futility and malice, and finally turn to investigate Christian Science itself. In this way many persons learn of the great healing work which is daily going on, and without which Christian Science could never have attained its present and ever-growing dimensions." Quoted by Meehan, p. 293. Mrs. Eddy herself once stated, "Rest assured that the injustice done by press and pulpit to this denomination of Christians will cease, when it no longer blesses this denomination." Mary Baker Eddy, The First Church of Christ, Scientist, and Miscellany (Boston, 1913, 1941), p. 151:12-14. (This volume will be referred to on later pages by the short title, Miscellany.)

³Beasley, Cross and Crown, pp. 114-16, 120, 155, 170.

Mrs. Eddy answered attacks through not only the established lay press but also her own periodical, The Christian Science Journal. This she did by articles, by answers to questions, and by short statements. She issued several pamphlets to reply to criticisms. One in 1885 was entitled Defence of Christian Science, which, as revised and expanded, became her small volume, No and Yes.

Possibly the earliest letter to the press signed by the Committee on Publication was in the Boston Herald of April 29, 1888. The letter explained the Church's position on a court case involving a Christian Scientist, the circumstances for which the Church was being bitterly condemned. The letter carried the signature, "Committee on Publication, Christian Scientist Association."¹

Actually, the great attacks on Mrs. Eddy came after the Committee on Publication was well established. In 1899, in the first year of the Committee, Mark Twain turned on her his satire in The Cosmopolitan.²

¹See Studdert Kennedy, p. 351.

²Mrs. Eddy's reply to Mark Twain, which was originally published in the New York Herald, is reprinted in her Miscellany, pp. 302-303.

Also in that year, an apostate student, Mrs. Josephine Woodbury, who among other bizarre exploits had attributed the birth of her child in 1890 to an "immaculate conception," used the pages of the Arena for an attack which, according to Studdert Kennedy, "for simple violence had hardly been equalled up to that time."¹

A major attack, cited still today, occurred in McClure's magazine during the height of that magazine's muckraking. The articles, which ran as a series from December 1906 to June 1908, were written by Georgine Milmine. In collaboration were the popular writers Willa Cather, Will Irwin, and Burton Hendrick. In 1909 Doubleday, Page and Company published the series as a book.²

¹Studdert Kennedy, p. 412.

²The book was entitled The Life of Mary Baker G. Eddy and the History of Christian Science. Mrs. Eddy answered some of the charges; see Miscellany, pp. 308-316. The Woodbury and Milmine attacks were connected through a Boston lawyer, Frederick W. Peabody, who, according to Dakin, had "made it his life's work to 'expose' Mrs. Eddy." For Mrs. Woodbury, Peabody prosecuted a libel suit against Mrs. Eddy and lost. For Milmine, he collected "a great many" affidavits from people who claimed to have personal recollections of Mrs. Eddy, mostly disparaging. See Dakin, p. 418, fn. 2. The Lutheran scholar and church historian, Karl Holl, describes the Milmine book as "a collection of accusations." He states, "In spite of the verifications adduced, most of the statements are readily recognized as gossip or slander." Der Szientismus (Berlin: Guttentag, 1918; reprinted in Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte, III [Tübingen: I. C. B. Mohr, 1928-1929] pp. 460-479).

On October 28, 1906, a month before the McClure's articles began, Pulitzer's New York World leveled its headlines against Mrs. Eddy. In a series of sensational articles, the World attacked her as physically and mentally incompetent and as controlled by others for their private gain. The first article, under scare headlines, carried a sensational report of an interview that World reporters had had with Mrs. Eddy. About the interview, the biographers Bates and Dittemore observe, "In the light of subsequent events, one may safely say that no more misleading interview was ever published."¹ Studdert Kennedy calls the interview "one of the most amazing travesties that ever was published."²

The World, content not just with the newspaper attack, possibly pressed in fact to vindicate it--and Joseph Pulitzer probably through misinformation was convinced of most of the charges³--engineered in the following spring a suit in equity, popularly known as the "Next Friends Suit." The suit sought to have Mrs. Eddy declared at law mentally

¹Ernest S. Bates and John V. Dittemore, Mary Baker Eddy: The Truth and the Tradition (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1932), p. 398.

²Studdert Kennedy, p. 440.

³Ibid., p. 445.

and physically incompetent to handle her affairs.¹ In August, 1907, after six days of hearings, the suit collapsed, but not before psychiatrists of the day had professionally spoken, denying the charge and affirming Mrs. Eddy's full competence.²

Much of the interested press was from the start with Mrs. Eddy and against the World; the chorus on her side at the finish was full. Studdert Kennedy quotes one of those at the start, the New York Journal:

The New York World continues its personal and vicious hounding of Mrs. Eddy, leader of the Christian Science religion. The account which it publishes of recent events in Mrs. Eddy's home could reflect credit upon no newspaper and upon no man.³

He quotes at the finish the New York American, Detroit

¹Biographers, sympathetic and unsympathetic alike, agree that the World backstage maneuvered the suit. (E.g., Beasley, The Cross and The Crown, p. 420; Dakin, p. 419.) Mrs. Eddy's legal counsel stated at the court hearing, "this suit was instituted by a great newspaper which had hired and paid eminent counsel to bring it. It was primarily an attack upon the religious teachings of a great religious leader." Beasley, The Cross and The Crown, p. 464.

²New York psychiatrist, Dr. Allan McLane Hamilton, stated unreservedly, "For a woman of her age I do not hesitate to say that she is physically and mentally phenomenal." Quoted by Peel, pp. 168-69; also by Smith, pp. 218-219.

³Studdert Kennedy, p. 442.

Free Press, and Omaha Daily Herald. The last declared:

The entire proceeding was disgusting. It was redeemed only by the impressive scene that resulted when Mrs. Eddy was "examined" at her home, where her courtesy and unfailing good nature, no less than the clarity of her thought and the force and vigour of her expressions, put her persecutors to shame. The effect on the enlightened sentiment of the country was such that the dismissal in short order was an inevitable consequence.¹

While the court case was pending, four newsmen had personal interviews with Mrs. Eddy--William E. Curtis of the Chicago Record-Herald, Edwin J. Park of the Boston Globe, Arthur Brisbane of the New York Journal (for Cosmopolitan magazine), and Sibyl Wilbur for Human Life magazine. In their separate reports, the four arrived at conclusions contradicting the World's thesis at all points.

Very likely, then, Mrs. Eddy's firsthand knowledge of the promotional and abusive powers of the

¹Ibid., p. 464. Meehan adds other notable publications including B. O. Flower's Arena, and Pulitzer's St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Said the Post-Dispatch, "The court proceedings against Mrs. Eddy have an uglier significance in the fact that they are based upon an attempt to gain control of her property, but if she were not a distinguished leader in the realm of faith it is probable that they would have made little progress." Meehan, p. 318. Meehan, editor of The Patriot of Concord, New Hampshire, and a non-Scientist, gives over his volume entirely to a report of the suit.

press lay behind her establishing the Committee on Publication. Actually, the Committee's formal organization, as she designed it in 1898, came at a particularly active time in Mrs. Eddy's organizational work. She launched the Committee within a year of founding The Christian Science Publishing Society in its present form, The Christian Science Board of Lectureship, the Christian Science Sentinel, and the Board of Education to train Christian Science teachers.

The Committee on Publication of 1898 (or "Publication Committee" as it was first called) had at least one predecessor from February 4, 1885, to June 12, 1888.¹ It was in the Christian Scientist Association, an organization of Mrs. Eddy's own students founded in 1876, three years before the Church. Smith finds a continuity between this earlier Committee and the later. He states:

The first Christian Science Committee on Publication, formally named as such, was appointed on

¹Smith, who offers the only real authority on the early history of the Committee on Publication, gives these dates in his work, Historical Sketches, p. 165. However, his final date of 1888 may be contradicted by an article attributed to "the Publishing Committee" that was published in the Boston Traveler in 1889 and reprinted in Miscellaneous Writings, pp. 271-72.

February 4, 1885, by the Christian Scientist Association. . . . Apparently there was no regularly appointed Christian Science Committee on Publication between 1888 and 1898. As to the explanation, I am not sure, but it is to be observed that all but one of the persons who were appointed for this work from 1885 to 1888 did not prove to be stable as Christian Scientists. All but one of them dropped out of the Christian Science movement. . . . Possibly, therefore, Mrs. Eddy waited for ten years until she found a Christian Scientist clearly fit for the Committee on Publication work.¹

While arguing a continuity, Smith does not explore the fact that there were two Publication Committees--the one he mentions as being in the Christian Scientist Association, and a second in the National Christian Scientist Association, an organization embracing all Christian Science teachers and their pupils, not just Mrs. Eddy's pupils. When in June 1889 Mrs. Eddy turned over ownership of The Christian Science Journal to the National Association, control was vested in this second Publication Committee.²

Another difficulty in tracing the continuity is that the Committee on Publication is today a church agency. The two Associations, which were disbanded in

¹Clifford P. Smith, "Address to Committees on Publication," October 18, 1933 (typewritten).

²The Christian Science Journal, VII (November 1889), p. 407. See also the Journal, VI (November 1888), p. 425, for earlier data on this Publication Committee. While Smith traces the Publication Committee in the Christian Scientist Association to the Committee on Publication, Loveland seems to assume that the Publication Committee in the National Association was the forebear of the Christian Science Publishing Society. See Miriam E. Loveland, "The Archives of The Mother Church," Christian Science Sentinel, XXXIX (July 10, 1937), p. 901.

the 1890s, were distinct from the Church during the years of their existence.

The Committee on Publication, as it is organized today, had its official birth in a church bylaw that The Christian Science Board of Directors adopted on December 13, 1898, with Mrs. Eddy's knowledge and probably at her request. A "Publication Committee" of three members was formed,

whose duty it shall be to obtain the publication in respectable newspapers or such as she shall select-- whatever the Pastor Emeritus [Mrs. Eddy] commits to them for this purpose outside of the C.S. journal or C.S. Weekly.

It is to be noted that from the first the Committee on Publication was intended to work with and through the lay press. It never had a connection with church publications.¹

On March 10, 1899, the members of this Committee were named--Alfred Farlow, the Rev. Irving C. Tomlinson, and Judge Septimus J. Hanna. At the Annual Meeting of the members of The Mother Church on May 30, 1899, James A. Neal was appointed to replace Tomlinson. On January 11, 1900, the three-man Committee was reduced to a one-man Committee, and Alfred Farlow was appointed

¹See Manual, p. 82:4-6 (Article XXV, Section 8).

to the position. At this time provision was made for the large branch churches in major cities to appoint Publishing Committees.

During the first four months of 1900, most of the provisions establishing the Committee, as we know it today, were worked out. These were published in the Journal, the Sentinel, and the fourteenth and succeeding issues of the Church Manual (Article XXXIII in the final edition). One later provision was added in April 1908 to allow the Committee for London to serve as "District Manager of the Committees on Publication for Great Britain and Ireland." Frederick Dixon, who became the second editor of The Christian Science Monitor to direct it through World War I, was the first District Manager. The final provision for the Committee came in 1910 when California was assigned two Committees.

Alfred Farlow held the post as Manager, Committees on Publication, from 1900 to 1914. He led a career that is representative of those early

followers of Mrs. Eddy who in zealously implementing her decisions contributed immeasurably to the establishment of the Church. The industry Farlow brought to his work as Manager provided a momentum that continues in that office today. We might review briefly his career; also, on subsequent pages that of his successors in office.

Alfred Farlow, born and reared in an Illinois farm, attended for a period a Lutheran college at Knoxville, Tennessee. He evidently did well in his studies and showed some ability in debate and oratory. He had to withdraw before completing his work, however, in order to help support his family. For some years thereafter he pursued his studies at night. Subsequently, the family moved to Beatrice, Nebraska, where Alfred worked as a clerk and taught school for a time.

It was in Nebraska that Farlow, whose family church had been Methodist, became interested in Christian Science. In ill health, he turned from medical care to Christian Science, which benefited him to an extent that led him later to write, "I never knew what

it was to be well until I became a Christian Scientist."¹
In the spring of 1886 he traveled to Boston in order to take a course of instruction under Mrs. Eddy. Later he studied again under her to become a teacher of Christian Science.

It was probably in 1887 that Farlow took up the practice of Christian Science as his lifework in his native Midwest. Apparently he had some success, for in 1908 he wrote that he had "treated" thousands of patients² and that "his success has been quite as uniform with organic troubles as with those which have been called nervous disorders."³

In addition to his healing practice, Farlow gave public lectures on Christian Science, taught classes on it, and was its avid proponent and defender in the press. His activities took him from Nebraska into Kansas and Missouri; also to Colorado and the then territory of Dakota. With his brother he established

¹Alfred Farlow, Replies to Clergymen (Boston: Alfred Farlow, 1908), p. 13.

²Ibid., p. 11.

³Alfred Farlow, "Emmanuel Movement and Christian Science," Boston Sunday American, third installment (December 20, 1908). Other installments on December 6 and 13.

at Topeka, Kansas, the "Kansas Christian Science Institute." In 1895 he located in Kansas City, Missouri, where he established a "Kansas Christian Science Institute."¹ In Kansas City he also helped found "The Mission Church of Christ, Scientist." Under his preaching the congregation grew from 17 to 550 in about six months.

When the Christian Science Board of Lectureship was established in 1898, Farlow was appointed a member. In 1904 he became president of The Mother Church.² In 1907 he was one of the defendants in the "Next Friends" suit.

As Manager, Committees on Publication, Farlow served for fifteen years--until October 1, 1913. He may have remained Manager in name until July 1, 1914. In any case, during the interim period his assistant, Albert E. Miller, carried forward the responsibilities.

During Farlow's career the legislative activities of the Manager's office grew rapidly. Perhaps the extent of this work lay behind its being split off at the end

¹See the advertisements in The Christian Science Journal, vol. VIII (March 1891), p. xiv; vol. XII (February 1895), p. xxxiv.

²Eddy, Miscellany, p. 16:16.

The second Manager of the Committees was Judge Clifford P. Smith. Smith took up the reins of the office on July 1, 1914, and also held the post for fifteen years, until December 31, 1929. A Midwesterner like Farlow, Smith was born and reared in Indiana. He studied at the University of Iowa, where he received his law degree in 1891. For nine years he practiced law in Iowa, and was a district judge from 1906 to 1908. In 1908 he became First Reader of The Mother Church. Judge Smith was one of the three trustees of The Christian Science Publishing Society when The Christian Science Monitor was founded in 1908.¹ He was president of The Mother Church in the year 1937-1938.

Judge Smith's first connection with the Committee on Publication was in 1905. In that year, he and two other Christian Scientists prepared a booklet defending the practice of Christian Science against legislative attempts to outlaw it.² At the time, the Church was embattled in legislatures across the country to preserve the right to depend on spiritual healing.

¹Canham, pp. 26-27.

²Edward A. Kimball, Judge Clifford P. Smith, and Judge Septimus J. Hanna, Christian Science and Legislation (Boston: The Christian Science Publishing Society, 1905, 1909).

Smith served the Committee as an occasional consultant until he himself became Manager in 1914. This position he held until January 1, 1930, when he became editor of the religious periodicals for two years and then editor of the Bureau of History and Records of The Mother Church, a product of the last being his book, Historical Sketches.

As Committee on Publication, Smith the lawyer was a piece of flint against which the harshest critic blunted. He presented arguments well explored, documented, and articulated. While a bit more ponderous and less ingenious than Farlow, Smith had a different set of adversaries. Farlow wrestled with criticisms from the press and pulpit, where a flair before the public wins the day. Smith had greater opposition from legal talent, well financed and organized, in the halls of legislatures. The legal outlook which Smith represented was to dominate the Committee on Publications' press as well as legislative relations up to the past decade.

A second lawyer, C. Augustus Norwood, was picked

to head the Committee on Publication when Judge Smith stepped down. Norwood, a New Englander born in Massachusetts, was graduated from Harvard University and Harvard Law School. From 1917 to 1929 he served the Church as General Counsel. On January 1, 1930, he became Manager of the Committees, a position he held until his death on May 24, 1940.¹

Herbert W. Beck was appointed Manager on June 6, 1940. Beck had served in World War I as one of the few Christian Science chaplains in the United States Army. Beck was secretary to the Manager of the Committees from 1920 to 1926 and a state Committee himself for Northern California beginning in 1938. Beck was Manager from 1940 until June 1, 1942, when he became a Christian Science lecturer.

Arthur W. Eckman, General Counsel for the Church until 1962, succeeded Beck. A Mississippian by birth, Eckman was educated in Texas and obtained a law degree from the University of Southern California. Along with a private law practice in Los Angeles, Eckman was active

¹Biographical data on the Managers are largely derived from announcements in The Christian Science Journal at the beginning and end of their respective terms.

on boards of education, serving several terms on the Los Angeles board and a term on the California state board. Eckman was Manager from 1942 to June 26, 1944, when he became the Church's General Counsel.

For two weeks, June 26 to July 10, 1944, John H. Hoagland, a former public relations and promotion manager for the Louisville Courier-Journal and Louisville Times, served as Manager of the Committees. He left to become Manager of The Christian Science Publishing Society.

William Duncan Kilpatrick, another lawyer, held the Managership from July 10, 1944, until his decease on April 14, 1950. A native of Michigan, Kilpatrick obtained his law degree from the University of Michigan. He practiced law in Owosso, Michigan, and Washington, D.C. He served as Committee for Michigan from 1914 to 1917 and as a Christian Science lecturer from 1917 to 1944.

The first Manager to have extensive newspaper experience was George Channing. Channing was a practicing newspaperman for ten years, two as city editor

of the Seattle Star. A graduate of Brown University, he studied law at Yale and at Boston University. Before becoming Manager of the Committees on May 1, 1950, Channing had served The Mother Church in virtually every capacity--as lecturer, First Reader, trustee of the Publishing Society, editor of the religious periodicals, and Committee on Publication for Northern California. Under his aegis, a "thorough reorganization" of the Manager's office took place.¹

Thomas E. Hurley, a present member of The Christian Science Board of Directors,² followed Channing as Manager, from October 1, 1952, to October 30, 1953. A graduate of Yale, Hurley had served as a lecturer, First Reader of The Mother Church, and Committee on Publication for Kentucky.

The next Manager, the tenth, was Will B. Davis. Starting November 16, 1953, Davis headed the Committee during some of its most experimental years. He saw the Church enter television broadcasting and motion-

¹Man. to C. Zylstra, re Shaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, November 30, 1951. Item #2055.

²It is to be noted that all male members of The Christian Science Board of Directors have served as state Committees on Publication.

picture production. Davis was educated in public schools in Ohio and studied at New York University. An advertising man, Davis resigned in 1931 a position as western sales manager of The Literary Digest to enter the practice of Christian Science. Among other services to the Church, Davis had been a lecturer.

The Manager as of June 1962 is DeWitt John.

A native of Arizona, John received degrees from Principia College (Elsah, Illinois), the University of Chicago, and Columbia University. He is the first Manager to be a newsman by both college training and professional experience. He was graduated from Columbia University's School of Journalism and served on the staff of The Christian Science Monitor¹ from 1939 to 1949. (He had a four-year leave of absence in the Navy during

¹During the period of study (1958 to 1960), there were three former Monitor men on the Manager's staff. Beside DeWitt John, who then was Assistant Manager, there were Theodore Cook, chief of radio, who had served as a Monitor reporter, and Robert Peel, chief of the editorial section, who had been an editorial writer for the Monitor for a decade. Other section heads were: Douglas Russell, chief of newspaper and advertising section; David Whelan, chief of the legislative section; Robert Rowley, chief of television. It is instructive that the Manager's office has increased in size from eight employees in 1930 to forty in 1962. (For the 1930 figure, see address by F. W. Saunders at employees meeting, May 15, 1930 [typewritten].)

World War II.) John and Beck were the only Managers to have had extensive experience on the staff of the Manager before filling that post, Beck serving for about six years and John for thirteen.

It is to be noted that all Managers were Christian Science practitioners upon assuming the post. Most of them had had decades of experience. In addition eight of the ten Managers up to 1962 either were or subsequently became Christian Science teachers. Moreover, most of the Managers had seen service as lecturers. And each had served branch churches in a variety of capacities.

Table 1 provides some statistics on the Committee on Publication as of December 1959. The Table indicates that there were 176 Committees on Publication and Assistant Committees under the Manager and that these were located in forty-six countries.

Table 1 also supplies the number of churches and societies--from which Committees and their Assistants are drawn and by which they are financed. The

count of 3,184 churches and societies is from The Christian Science Journal of December 1959. This figure is 77 below the true number, owing to administrative exigencies, such as new churches that have not had time to obtain a Journal listing. The full figure, as of January 1, 1960, was 3,261--2,450 church groups in the United States and 811 in other countries.

There also were, as of January 1, 1960, 3,735 Assistant Committees serving under area Committees.¹ This figure added to the 176 area Committees and Assistants under the Manager gives a total of 3,911 persons in the Committee's chain of organization.

There were 474 more Assistants (not including the 7 Assistants under the Manager) than congregations, even though each congregation normally has only one Assistant. The reason is that area Committees frequently appoint an Assistant to cover newspapers at a distance from a church or for a special purpose.

¹Interview with Helen Turner, supervisor of the Manager's files, December 17, 1962.

TABLE 1
GEOGRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION
OF
COMMITTEES ON PUBLICATION
(DECEMBER 1959)

Areas	Number of Committees ^a	Number of Churches ^b
Africa^c		
Ghana	1*	0
Kenya	1	1
Morocco	1	1
Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland	1	4
Tunisia	1*	0
Union of South Africa (one in each province)	4	31
Asia		
Ceylon	1*	0
Hong Kong	1	1
Fiji	1*	0
India (one for Assam, Bihar, Manipur, Orissa, Tripura, and West Bengal; one for Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Madras, Bombay, and Mysore)	2	2

^aThe count is from the Manager's mailing list of Committees and Assistants for year beginning October 1, 1959, as corrected by supplements numbers 1 and 2. Asterisks indicate Assistants.

^bCount, which includes churches and societies, is from the church directory in The Christian Science Journal for December 1959.

^cThere are two societies in Egypt, but no Committee there because of the political situation. E. O. to Man., April 25, 1960. Item #956.

TABLE 1 - Continued

Areas	Number of Committees	Number of Churches
Indonesia	1	2
Japan	1	2
Malaya	1	0
Philippines	1	2
Singapore	1	1
Australia and New Zealand		
Australia (one in each state and in Australian Capital Territory)	7	52
New Zealand	1	24
Europe		
Austria	1	2
Belgium	1	2
Denmark	1	3
Finland	1	1
France	1	11
Germany (one for Federal Republic and one [Assistant] for Eastern Zone and Entire City of Berlin)	2 (1*)	101
Great Britain (one for 5 coun- ties of London; one in each of 34 counties of England, 9 counties of Scotland, 5 counties of Wales, 2 counties of Northern Ireland; one in Channel Island; one in Isle of Man)	53	344
Greece	1	1

TABLE 1 - Continued

Areas	Number of Committees	Number of Churches
Ireland	2	2
Italy	1	3
Netherlands	1	15
Norway	1	2
Sweden	1	5
Switzerland (one for French- and one for German- speaking)	2	36
North America		
Bahama Islands	1	1
Bermuda	1	1
West Indies Federation	4 (1*)	4
Canada (one in each province except Prince Edward Island)	9	82
Cuba	1	2
Mexico	1	2
United States (one in each state except for Cali- fornia which has two ^a ; Canal Zone, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico)	55	2424
Central and South America		
Argentina	1	5
Brazil	1	6
British Guiana	1	1
Chile	1	1
Guatemala	1*	0
Peru	1	1
Uruguay	1	2
Venezuela	1	1
	176^b	3184

^aOne Committee represents California above the 36th parallel and a second below the parallel.

^bThe Manual provision for the Committee encourages the appointment of men. Of the 176 Committees, 37 are women. Of 51 Committees in the United States, only 2 are women.

While the number of persons involved is large, the area covered is broad and, more important, none of the Assistants or Committees--except the three Managers appointed by The Mother Church--give their full time to the work. Some Assistants do little more than remain on call should a need arise. Furthermore, the corps of Assistants and Committees is mostly an amateur one. Few come to the work with much prior newspaper or legislative experience, though, if one does have this background, a church very likely will pick him.¹ What Assistants and Committees lack in experience, however, they probably more than make up in motivation. Also, only among the 176 directly under the Boston Manager is there any regular reimbursement, and this is usually

¹The Manager has listed the qualifications he should like to see in a state Committee as follows: "A Committee on Publication should be a seasoned, consecrated Christian Scientist. Successful experience in the Committee work is an important asset. Experience with legal affairs, public relations, education, public affairs or business is valuable. The ability to represent our Cause effectively in dealing with other religionists, legislators, public officials, editors and educators, is highly important. A Committee should have the capacity to make friends and build up good will. He should be a representative Christian Scientist." Man. to Readers of Second Church, Tulsa, Oklahoma, June 15, 1959. Item #956. He must also know English, which is the official language, and be a member of The Mother Church and usually of a branch church or society as well.

modest. The Committee on Publication work seems to be largely a labor of love.

The tasks of the Committee on Publication can be classified roughly in three categories--the dissemination of information, the collection of information, and the performance of special assignments. While each is significant in its own right, we shall be concerned in this study only with the first, the dissemination of information, the Committee's raison d'être. While by no means the Church's sole public information facility--indeed every church member is an informational agent when he gives information to the nonmember--the Committee is specifically established for the purpose. The viewer of television who dials onto a Christian Science program, the newspaper reader who finds an item about a Christian Science activity in his community, the college student who writes for information about Christian Science for a term paper, the legislator who hears officially from the Christian Scientists among his constituents--all have been in touch with the Committee on Publication, though they may not know the name.

Because we shall not give them much attention in later pages, we might discuss briefly the Committee's information gathering and special assignments.

Regarding information gathering, the Committee obtains comments about Christian Science through organized scanning of the press. Committees and their assistants assign among themselves particular periodicals--local, regional, and national. They scan these for comments, favorable and unfavorable. They also check these periodicals to see how the Church's own publicity and advertising appear. And they monitor the Committee's recorded broadcasts for playback quality.

Information comes as well from other church offices and also from the church member. During 1958 to 1960 unfavorable items, for instance, were reported by college students who found comments in their class reading, a teacher who learned of a book at an educational conference, a librarian who was sent a book for inspection, a visitor who was given a pamphlet at a state fair, a woman who picked up a magazine at a

beauty shop, a young woman whose sailor boy friend found a leaflet at a serviceman's club, a church worker who discovered a pamphlet in one of his church's free-literature boxes, a newcomer to the religion whose former pastor sent to him a reprint of a magazine article, a Sunday School pupil who attended a recital at a Baptist church and was given a pamphlet, a person whose neighbor sent a leaflet in a Christmas card, and a church board which received an anonymous mailing.

Committees and their Assistants scan publications for religious comment other than on Christian Science. They watch for items that might serve a department of the Christian Science Sentinel, called "Signs of the Times." This department carries excerpts of articles from other periodicals which bear out the Christian

Science point of view.¹

The Committee also provides information on secular subjects, such as church-state relations, to The Christian Science Board of Directors. The facilities of The Christian Science Monitor add to the flow of information to the Directors.

In regard to special assignments, the Manager and the state Committees are often called upon by other church offices for assistance. In overseas areas, the Committee has been called upon by the Publishing Society to look into import restrictions on Christian Science literature, by the church treasurer to see about exchangedifficulties, and by the legal department to file copyrights. For the Monitor, the Committee has occasionally investigated a situation concerning a writer or advertiser.²

¹The Committee's Handbook sets forth the request, "Editorials, texts of public addresses, special columns, and reports of sermons appearing in newspapers, magazines, and church periodicals should be scanned with this column in mind" (p. 229).

²Canham tells how the Committee on Publication at the Monitor's founding in 1908 assisted significantly in finding to man the paper capable newspapermen who were Christian Scientists. Canham, pp. 29, 30.

A further special assignment is the administration of The Mother Church's Relief Fund. While not a fund-raiser, the Committee does expend church funds to aid the stricken in time of flood, tornado, fire, and other disaster. The Committee's Handbook of Policies and Procedures says on this, "Should a disaster occur in his district, a CoP¹ is expected to start immediately to engage in relief work."²

Each Committee acts in disasters as an agent of the church treasurer. The Committee has authority to spend for immediate disaster relief up to \$200 a claim and to recommend approval for higher payments. The Committee assists local churches to repair or rebuild damaged edifices and aids church members on personal and home losses, though usually not business losses. In a disaster the Committee often coordinates funds from all Christian Science sources in and out of the area.

The Christian Science Church has long had an active relief program. For a small organization it

¹The Committee on Publication commonly abbreviates its name to "CoP."

²Handbook, p. 240.

contributed substantial sums to relief during both World Wars--\$10,000,000 in World War II.¹ Within the past decade the Church has aided in meeting conditions left by the Korean War, by floods in Belgium, The Netherlands, England, and the American Midwest and Far West, by tornadoes in the Midwest, by earthquakes in Morocco and Chile, and by refugee flights from Hungary, Indonesia, Cuba, and East Germany.²

While its first concern has been to help its own, the Church has assisted noncommunicants as well. This aid has gone out through its own representatives, usually the Committee on Publication, or--especially when a catastrophe is widespread--through some reputable relief agency, such as CARE or the Red Cross.

The Committee's information-gathering facilities are especially helpful in apprising the Church of conditions in a disaster area. In 1956 when a destructive tornado struck the American Midwest, Committees in

¹The Church's relief for World War I is told in Christian Science War Time Activities (Boston: Christian Science Publishing Society, 1922) and for World War II in The Story of Christian Science War Time Activities 1939-1946 (Boston: Christian Science Publishing Society, 1947).

²See Treasurer of The Mother Church to Man., April 21, 1961. Item #2071.

thirteen states collected and reported to the Church disaster damage and local needs, some within a matter of hours, others within the week.¹

Beside disaster relief, there are other enterprises of a charitable and welfare nature, sponsored by Christian Scientists. In these the Committee has no part, except occasionally it may represent the sponsors to the press and to government. There are the Christian Science sanatoriums and nursing homes, the homes for the elderly,² institutional work in prisons, mental hospitals, and refugee camps, and general assistance to the needy.

The Christian Science Reading Room might also

¹Man. to E.O., April 6, 1956. Item #882. For one noteworthy account of the Christian Scientists' relief activities, see Texas City Remembers (San Antonio, Texas: The Naylor Company, 1948) by Elizabeth Lee Wheaton, p. 91. Item #608. For another, the Halifax disaster of 1917, see Beasley, The Continuing Spirit, pp. 102-103.

²The Mother Church maintains a home at Concord, New Hampshire. Its expenditures for "senior members" are about \$350,000 a year. (E.O. to Man., March 17, 1960. Item #853.) In addition, groups of Christian Scientists throughout the country contribute to the support of the elderly among them.

be considered a charitable enterprise. Each Church maintains a Reading Room in its community as a quiet place for the public to come, reflect, study the Bible, and pray. When located in a business district, and they usually are in the larger cities, these Reading Rooms can be a very expensive item on a church's budget.

The national, state, provincial, and county Committees on Publication, then, are officials of The Mother Church. The evidence indicates that the Church itself is well informed, meticulous, astute, sensitive, with a respectable membership who know what their religion teaches and perceive this teaching to be of great benefit to mankind. These Committees, which are centrally directed and well organized, serve as the Church's representatives, indeed diplomats, to an outside world, which can at the same time be disdainfully uninterested and subtly curious, encouragingly sympathetic and harshly hostile.

The tasks of the area Committee are broad in scope and call for broad knowledge--as public relations, press relations, legislative representation, radio and

television production, advertising, and so on.

The tasks also call for the deft hand of the statesman. On the one hand, the area Committee has a responsibility for winning good relations among sometimes suspicious newsmen, protecting rights before doubtful public officials and legislators, and gaining understanding in a public highly diverse in its attitude toward Christian Science.

On the other hand, the area Committee applies the professional services of the Manager to an operation that is essentially run by amateurs, namely his Assistants. Also he must at the same time satisfy the churches and churchmen within his jurisdiction and take the leadership on the matter of the denomination's relations with the public.

In each role the Committee learns the niceties of "winning friends and influencing people" and the subtleties of balancing the possible against the ideal. The area Committee faces challenges that are formidable, tasks that are exacting, and a workday that he is never sure will be quite routine.

CHAPTER II

"IMPOSITIONS ON THE PUBLIC"

Along with the other churches, the Christian Scientists receive their share of light attention in the press. In January 1957 an unlikely magazine referred to them in an unlikely connection--Auto Mechanics whimsically mentioned the Scientists in a description of the engine of the first Model T:

It had the simplest known oiling system ever developed, generally known as the "Christian Science System." Dippers on the ends of the connecting rods splashed oil around in the crankcase, and the driver prayed that some of it was hitting up in the cylinders where it would do some good.¹

The Christian Science Committee on Publication takes as its chief assignment the correction of misstatements about Christian Science. While not acting on the Auto Mechanics's comment, the Committee picks up references with a serious intent that it finds false or misleading and attempts to correct these. It will carry its reply directly to the author, directly

¹Auto Mechanics, II (January 1957), p. 21.

to the public, or indirectly by answering without naming the author in its other public communications.

An emphasis on correction is suggested in the Manual bylaw establishing the agency. The work of correction alone is assigned by name as the purpose. The first sentence in the section on "Duties" reads:

It shall be the duty of the Committee on Publication to correct in a Christian manner impositions on the public in regard to Christian Science, injustices done Mrs. Eddy or members of this Church by the daily press, by periodicals or circulated literature of any sort.¹

Most of the Committee's communicative activities have been explained at one time or another by the correction. The Handbook, for instance, suggests that correction is the essence of not only actual replies but also the general news and advertising work.² It might be said that over sixty years the Committee has evolved a "philosophy" of correction which embraces all of its public relations, indeed which establishes correction as its public relations. Mrs. Eddy was surely not the one "who invented corporation publicity," as Dakin asserts.³ But it is possible that she institutionalized in her

¹Manual, p. 97:15-20 (Article XXXIII, Section 2).

²See Handbook, pp. 135 and 157.

³Dakin, p. 392.

Committee on Publication the corrective aspect of public relations as it had never been done before--or has been done as fully since.

The Committee seems to assume two objectives in the corrective work. One is to protect the Church. Through the corrective work, the Committee evidently seeks to create a social climate hospitable to the Church. Not without a fair measure of logic, the Committee has assumed that misinformation and misrepresentation lead to social intolerance and governmental restriction and so disserve the perpetuation and growth of the group which it represents.

The Committee's Handbook provides for this protective purpose:

Prompt, thorough, calm handling of corrective work is vital to the welfare of our movement. . . . We cannot let [false conceptions] go unchallenged. They tend to crystallize into "stereotypes." . . . These in turn would ultimate in repressive legislation, unjust regulations, and public hostility. . . . The purpose of the corrective work of the Committee on Publication is to present honest, genuine, factual information--and in this way to correct false concepts regarding Christian Science, Mrs. Eddy and our church organization.¹

The Committee appears to have, besides this

¹ Handbook, p. 16.

protective purpose, a second more outward-looking objective, indeed an eleemosynary purpose. This rests on the assumption that the Church has something to offer the "other fellow." The Christian Scientists evidently assume, like other churchmen, that they have a spiritual mission to perform in the service of mankind. The Committee's part in this, according to the apparent rationale, is to cut away the brush of misstatement and misunderstanding, the purely artificial barriers, and clear and keep clear the pathway of the seeker after a redemptive teaching, a healing system, and a way of life and service.

On one occasion the Manager's office compared the inward and the outward objectives of its radio broadcasts as follows:

The program itself, each week, tells the listener that the actual experience of healing is presented "to show how the power of God is available today to heal you of sickness, sin, sorrow, and limitation." The programs are missionary, in that sense. We want to help mankind in our own way. At the same time, we hope to present to the public an accurate picture of what Christian Science is, and what it is not. In that sense it is a public relations undertaking.¹

Mrs. Eddy implied an eleemosynary motive when she wrote:

¹"Notes on Radio Activities of The Mother Church," n.d. (ca. July 1955), filed C. S. Braden. Item #304-78.

Posterity will have the right to demand that Christian Science be stated and demonstrated in its godliness and grandeur,-- that however little be taught or learned, that little shall be right. . . . Unless this method be pursued, the Science of Christian healing will again be lost, and human suffering will increase.¹

It is to be noted that the ends in the above quotation are to be achieved by communication, not conversion. The teaching is to be presented in its purity-- the "little shall be right." Just so, the Committee characteristically seems to take as its objective the accurate statement not conversion of the multitude, public understanding not adherents.²

Actually, the conversionary purpose is not institutionalized in the Christian Science Church. The corrective purpose may be but not the conversionary. The Church has no formal missionary branch or activity. There are, to be sure, church activities bearing missionary aspects, such as the publishing activities,

¹Eddy, Retrospection and Introspection, p.61: 26-29, 30-2.

²Pittman points out regarding "the general missionary work of Christian Science" that "the essential purpose. . . is not to persuade, but to ensure that as many people as possible will correctly understand this revolutionary teaching and be in a position to test it and to form their own well-based conclusions about it." Alfred Pittman, Christian Science Sentinel, p.47

the lectures, and the handling of inquiries about membership. However, the Committee does not share at all in these.

The distinction between conversion and the Committee's correction could be somewhat akin to the distinction between conversion and the ecumenical "conversation" or "dialogue" in the older churches. W. A. Visser 't Hooft has been widely quoted for his definition of "ecumenical" as:

that spiritual traffic between the Churches which draws them out of their isolation and into a fellowship of conversation, mutual enrichment, common witness, and common action.¹

At least the Committee's calls on ministers may be taken as a form of "spiritual traffic," and a large proportion of the Committee's calls are on ministers and church writers.²

The parallel between the correction and the ecumenical conversation is alluded to from time to time in the Committee's correspondence. The following excerpts are from letters that the Manager has written to religious writers:

In these days of growing ecumenicity it is important that Christians shall not be arrayed against Christians simply through a failure to

¹W.A. Visser 't Hooft as quoted by Martin E. Marty, A Short History of Christianity (New York: Meridian Books, 1959), p. 339.

²Tables 2 and 3 suggest that the proportion may be over half of all corrections.

communicate properly.¹

This letter is unduly long, but in an age in which the ideal of ecumenicity is steadily growing it seems worth the effort to try to break through the barriers of misunderstanding which unhappily divide Christians from Christians. We Christian Scientists welcome with joy the growth of interest in spiritual healing in the Protestant churches, but healing is of small value unless it is the sign of that inward grace which removes dissension no less than disease.²

The key phrase in the establishing Manual bylaw-- and the title of this chapter--assigns to the Committee "impositions on the public." "Imposition" may be defined as an "unwarranted . . . burden" or a "trick or deception."³ If this is a key phrase, a key question is, How does the Committee define "imposition"? How does it distinguish between what is and what is not an imposition?

The Committee's correspondence and policy statements suggest at least two answers to the question. For one, it would seem that the Committee consciously draws a distinction between the significant and the trivial. The slighting comment not particularly prejudicial is evidently usually left unanswered. The Handbook states on the matter:

Minor references and trivial criticisms should

¹Man. to The Christian Century, August 29, 1958. Item #303-6.

²Man. to W. Gordon Maclean, re The Presbyterian Record, December 9, 1958. Item #1121.

³Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary.

be left to the good sense of fair-minded readers. . . . It does more harm than good to bother an editor about minor inaccuracies, mistakes of capitalization, a debatable choice of words, or even some larger misstatement that is not seriously damaging. . . . [par.] A minor misstatement should never be used as a springboard for a lengthy letter intended primarily to get publicity for Christian Science.¹

Practice seems mainly to square with precept.

Thus the trivial remark about the oil system of the Model T at the start of the chapter brought forth no response from the Committee. A distinction between the significant and trivial was drawn in the following excerpts from letters of the Manager to area Committees:

The mention of Christian Science is probably too incidental to warrant corrective action, but you will at any rate wish to know about it.²

it might seem to some people as though we were a little oversensitive to seek out the writer on such slim grounds.³

The incidental way Christian Science is referred to in this "history of medicine" is unfortunate but hardly surprising in view of the book's strong medical orientation. Fortunately, the references are so slight that they are hardly worth correcting.⁴

¹Handbook, p. 19; see also pp. 138-39.

²Man. to CoP for Southern California, re The Methodist Challenge (Los Angeles), November 23, 1959. Item #1097.

³Man. to CoP for North Carolina, filed Christian Science, Its Encounter with American Culture, August 8, 1958. Item #512-62.

⁴Man. to D.M., re From Witchcraft to World Health, July 10, 1959. Item #112.

We cannot afford to dignify every little foolish reference.¹

The Committee also seems to be aware, to judge from its expressions, that genuine differences may sometimes exist between it and the commentator. As it does not correct the trivial, so the Committee does not often challenge the true difference. Not a little of its correspondence and not a few policy statements tend to distinguish between a difference honestly arrived at and patent injustices and errors, or seem to leave room for this distinction. The imposition which the Committee answers may embrace the factual mistake, the half-truth, the misinterpretation, the misplaced emphasis--in the friendly remark as well as the unfriendly. On the other hand, the Committee sometimes leaves criticism unanswered that stems essentially from antagonistic loyalties and points of view.

In this the Committee's voice seems less a polemical than a communicative one. The purpose seems to be less to debate the validity of religious and theological standpoints and more to cut away misinformation

¹Man. to CoP for New Zealand, re Wanganui Herald, February 26, 1960. Item #1244.

and so expose areas of agreement if not disagreement. While no doubt the Committee looks for its position ultimately to be entirely adopted, its workaday purpose seems to be less than to consider every point of view an "imposition" in need of correction, though the lines are by no means always clear-cut, to be sure.

In the following excerpts from letters the Manager advised area Committees against a correction because a different point of view was involved:

Christian Science and orthodox Christianity certainly put a different interpretation on Scripture, and each naturally considers its own to be the true one. It does not seem a question of misrepresentation here so much as a simple difference of doctrinal opinion.¹

The author makes an unfortunate comparison of Christian Science with Buddhism. However, his remarks are very brief, and except for this comparison they concern theological points on which he sets forth his reasoned disagreement with our position rather than a misrepresentation of it.²

[The sermon presented] an honest doctrinal difference it would be hard to answer him without having to attack his own doctrines.³

¹Man. to CoP for Ontario, re The United Church Observer (Toronto), June 2, 1960. Item #1157 .

²Asst. Man. to CoP for Michigan, re All About the Bible, April 6, 1960. Item #15.

³Man. to CoP for Northern California, re the Rev. Wilder, November 23, 1959. Item #588.

There are two sorts of criticisms we have to meet from theological critics. There are genuine differences on which we can only agree to disagree. Then there are points at which they fundamentally misunderstand what Mrs. Eddy means and on which the disagreement clears up when the misunderstanding has been explained to them.¹

This last case, the Manager noted, along with many others like it was actually a mixture of both.

One letter concerned a church member who had received a criticism of Christian Science from the headquarters of Billy Graham, evangelist. On this occasion the Manager declared:

if she or anyone else has written to the Billy Graham organization indicating that she is a Christian Scientist and asking for information, we cannot complain if that organization writes back giving an honest statement of their view of Christian Science and of the very real theological differences that exist between us. We cannot hope to convert them to Christian Science by writing them a corrective letter, and Christian Scientists should not take offense if they themselves have solicited the views of the Billy Graham organization.²

The Committee's policy statements usually, but not always, allow for the genuine disagreement. In the following the "seldom," "usually," and "possibility" may leave room for it. (*Italics are added.*)

¹Man to CoP for Texas, re the Rev. T.A. Patterson, March 10, 1960. Item #506.

²Man. to CoP for Northern California, re Billy Graham, September 3, 1958. Item #398.

Slanderous attacks are seldom circulated by those who are free of misconceptions regarding Christian Science.¹

When an individual seems to differ with Christian Science, it is usually because he has not fully understood the exact teachings of this religion.²

There are perhaps two things of utmost importance in this work. One is to establish the fact that we practice what we preach--that is, an abiding and deeply felt Christianity. The other is to communicate the possibility that there has been an error of judgment on the part of the critic--an error which we would like to correct in a spirit of objectivity and fair play.³

In contrast an occasional policy statement seems not to allow for the possibility of real differences:

If no one had any false concepts of our religion there would never be a sermon preached against it, there would be no criticism of it, no discriminatory laws would be enacted, and no unfriendly books or pamphlets would be written.⁴

In my entire experience I have never found an actual criticism of Christian Science. [par.] In every instance the objection was lodged against what somebody mistakenly thought was Christian Science, and this leads me to believe that Christian Science itself is not objectionable to any thinking person,

¹Handbook, p.16.

²CoP for Kentucky to The Lexington Leader, re The Presbyterian Record, January 31, 1959. Item #1121-22.

³Man. to CoP for British Columbia, re the Rev. Badger, July 13, 1960. Item #247.

⁴D.R.Lane, "The Balanced Christian Scientist" (unpublished address to the churches used by CoP for Florida in 1960). Item #2022

The bylaw that establishes the Committee on Publication takes into account more than "impositions" on the public" in regard to the teachings, from which the above examples are drawn. The bylaw also allows for "injustices done Mrs. Eddy or members of this Church." Either way, however, the Committee is assigned only the narrow slice of interests directly concerned with the denomination. Unlike some agencies of other groups, the Committee has spoken only very rarely on more general subjects.

The comments the Committee corrects can be classed in four rough categories. These are (1) the teaching, (2) the healing work, (3) the history, and (4) the Church as an institution. Although the categories--healing, history, and the institution--involve events, current and historical, the Committee's experience demonstrates that the record of events can be just as much a matter of dispute as the record of doctrine.

The Committee in its corrections is assisted by a reasonably precise frame of reference. To determine whether a comment is true or false, just or unjust, helpful or harmful, there must be some guideline for judging, some basis for comparison, some standard of authenticity. This the Committee finds in its relation to the Church.

On the teaching, the Committee's standard of authenticity lies in the writings of Mary Baker Eddy. Her 1,800 pages of published prose, including the denominational textbook Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures, constitute the final authority on the teachings of Christian Science. When outside comment occurs on the teachings, the Committee evidently corrects from the assumption that it has an unequaled familiarity with the texts--that through participation in the ideology and recourse to archival material it can speak authoritatively on the comment's accuracy and adequacy.

This assumption seems implicit in a statement of Alfred Farlow's, the first Committee on Publication:

It is quite true that we would better leave the teaching of a particular system to the individual who is its author, since no one knows quite so well what a man believes as the man himself, and it is always unsafe to undertake to put words in the other fellow's mouth, but human nature does not always deport itself in keeping with the ideal methods, and we are all too prone to attack our neighbor's opinions even before we understand what they are.¹

On the healing work, the Committee's standard of correction is provided by thousands of verified reports of healing.² The Committee can turn to the reports published in church periodicals and also to reports which the Committee itself has collected for use on its weekly radio and television broadcasts. The Committee

¹Farlow, "Twenty-Six Years."

²For verification procedures, see p. 269.

can refer to these reports to indicate the qualitative and statistical extent of Christian Science healing.

On the Church as an institution, the Committee's standard rests on the church records. The Committee is the Church's customary voice to the public when current policies, practices, and activities need explanation. With the Church's full administrative and reporting facilities behind it, the Committee inevitably has greater resources to prepare its case before the public than the outside observer.

On the history, the standard arises in the published and unpublished historical material of the Church. Mrs. Eddy, whose life and the Church's early history are, of course, one and the same, left in her writings countless references to the history. She also wrote an autobiography, Retrospection and Introspection. In addition to looking to these, the Committee relies upon the Church-published histories and biographies of Mrs. Eddy. A further source of information is the unpublished materials possessed by the Church, particularly Mrs. Eddy's own unpublished correspondence, which is vast.

The Church's historical standard is in some respects the most difficult for the Committee to maintain. It may be assumed for the doctrinal standard that, as Farlow says, "no one knows quite so well what a man believes as the man himself," and for the standards regarding the healing work and the Church institution that the Committee has an advantage in preparing its case in the abundance of contemporary material at its disposal.

But the Committee's historical standard is squarely opposed by an equally explicit, antagonistic standard that has enjoyed public use through many decades. The critical biographies of Mrs. Eddy diverge widely, indeed wildly, from the Church's biographies--split so sharply from them that, except for names, dates, and places, and not always these, the critical volumes might be about an entirely different person. The differences seem much too great for any mid-course to permit the critical and sympathetic volumes to be harmonized.

The files of the Committee on Publication indicate a recognition of the problem. The Committee has

acknowledged that the historian is faced with a grim welter of contradictory materials, and as a practical matter it has sought from him a fair hearing for its books more than an exclusive hearing. Its efforts after a responsible reporting are suggested by the following excerpts from its letters to authors:

unconscious bias can play the dickens with literary judgment, as we all discover ruefully from time to time. And if one has imbibed only one side of a controversial question one may innocently but misleadingly present as established facts what are only interpretations, hypotheses, half-truths, gossip, or downright fictions. The least the historian can do, it seems to me, is to indicate that alternative interpretations are held by responsible students of the subject.¹

All the myths are not rose-colored, but those which denigrate rather than idealize are sometimes mistakenly accounted more "objective" by the professional student.²

I believe we can agree with your thesis, so clearly outlined in the first paragraph, "that the true record of what has happened in the past is inviolable, that it is a negation of all scholarly method-- indeed, of honesty itself-- to tamper with the facts." [par.] Should it not be pointed out, however, that the title of your essay ["History as You Like It"] works both ways,

¹Man. to Raymond P. Holden, re The Merrimack, January 30, 1959. Item #178.

²Man. to Isidor Thorner, July 15, 1957. Item #1148.

and that the hostile view of any subject is not necessarily more objective than is a friendly view.¹

Students of the Reformation would be in a vulnerable posture if they started from the assumption that among sixteenth century writers on Luther only Roman Catholics could be trusted, while the friends and immediate followers of the great reformer must be automatically discounted as apologists seeking to prove a case. The parallel with present-day critics of Mrs. Eddy is not exact, but it involves the same principle.²

¹CoP for Pennsylvania to Lloyd M. Wallick, September 17, 1954. This is the first letter of a three-letter exchange published in The Lutheran Quarterly, VII (February 1955), pp. 69-76. The exchange concerned an article, "History as You Like It" (VI [May 1954], pp. 135-142) and consisted of three letters-- this first being a reply to the article; the second, a rebuttal by the author, Mr. Wallick; the third, a final rejoinder by the Manager addressed to the Committee for Pennsylvania.

²Man. to CoP for Pennsylvania, November 17, 1954-- the third of the three letters published in The Lutheran Quarterly and cited in the last fn.

Many area Committees on Publication out of Boston have counterparts to the Committee on Business to support their activities.

A second aspect of the "Christian manner," as the Committee interprets it, involves the ethics that the Committee observes, as it represents the Church to the critic. These ethics are indicated in both the Committee's policy statements and its workaday practices.

Policy reaches back to the writings of Mrs. Eddy and the general ethical values she set for Christian Scientists. The following excerpts from Mrs. Eddy's writings suggest some values. Also they indicate the sources of opposition as they evidently were in Mrs. Eddy's time and are even today--the older churches, the medical profession, and medically oriented law.

A genuine Christian Scientist loves Protestant and Catholic, D.D. and M.D.,--loves all who love God, good; and he loves his enemies. It will be found that, instead of opposing, such an individual subserves the interests of both medical faculty and Christianity, and they thrive together, learning that Mind-power¹ is good will towards men.²

-Love all Christian churches for the gospel's sake; and be exceedingly glad that the churches are united

¹By "Mind-power" is meant God-power, Mind being a synonym for God when capitalized.

²Miscellany, p.4:14-20.

in purpose, if not in method, to close the war between flesh and Spirit, and to fight the good fight till God's will be witnessed and done on earth as in heaven.¹

Great respect is due the motives and philanthropy of the higher class of physicians. We know that if they understood the Science of Mind-healing, and were in possession of the enlarged power it confers to benefit the race physically and spiritually, they would rejoice with us.²

Genuine Christian Scientists are, or should be, the most systematic and law-abiding people on earth, because their religion demands implicit adherence to fixed rules, in the orderly demonstration thereof.³

I enjoin it upon my students to hold no controversy or enmity over doctrines and traditions, or over the misconceptions of Christian Science, but to work, watch, and pray for the amelioration of sin, sickness, and death. . . . let your opponents alone, and use no influence to prevent their legitimate action from their own standpoint of experience, knowing, as you should, that God will well regenerate and separate wisely and finally; whereas you may err in effort, and lose your fruition.⁴

¹ Mary Baker Eddy, Christian Science versus Pantheism (1898, 1926), p. 13:13-17.

² Science and Health, p. 151:8-13.

³ Retrospection and Introspection, p. 87:10-14.

⁴ Mary Baker Eddy, No and Yes (1908, 1936), pp. 8:19-22; 9:8-13.

Behind these sentiments lies the force of Manual rules:

A member of this Church shall not publish, nor cause to be published, an article that is uncharitable or impertinent towards religion, medicine, the courts, or the laws of our land.¹

However despitefully used and misrepresented by the churches or the press, in return employ no violent invective, and do good unto your enemies when the opportunity occurs. A departure from this rule disqualifies a member for office in the Church or on the Board of Lectureship, and renders this member liable to discipline and, possibly, dismissal from The Mother Church.²

These ethical values can to a large extent be traced through to the Committee's working policies and workaday cases. As for policies, the Handbook provides in its definition of "Christian manner":

"In a Christian manner" - This standard, given in the Manual provision by Mrs. Eddy, is the keynote of the corrective work.

Never do we denounce persons: we calmly correct erroneous allegations. Never do we show rancor, heat, or antagonism. Every corrective statement must be temperate, fair, straightforward, clear.

A critic who receives one of our corrective letters should feel he has been touched by the Christ--not assailed by a gladiator. Spiritual poise, courage, patience, love,--these will command respect and reach the thought of the critic and others.³

¹Manual, p. 48:6-10. (Article VIII, Section 26).

²Ibid., p. 41:10-18. (Article VIII, Section 3).

³Handbook, p.17 (par.2-2 given in full).

The Handbook expands upon these guidelines at a number of places. It gives lessons on how not to assail as "a gladiator"--to lift the picturesque phrase from the above passage.

Be courteous, fair, honest, friendly--never vituperative, scolding, sarcastic, or suspicious.¹

Never impugn the motives of the critic. We do not judge our critic; we correct his misconceptions.

Don't whip the man who said the wrong thing; attack the error itself and in doing so, try to avoid injuring the man.

Don't embarrass the critic by questioning his character or intellectual or spiritual insights. . . .

Don't write anything about a person you would not be willing to say to his face, across a luncheon table.²

At the risk of appearing tedious, we might cite just one more Handbook policy. This policy acknowledges a need to respect the author's rights whatever the

¹Ibid., p. 28.

²Ibid., p. 29. The Handbook's policy statements can at times seem repetitious and self-evident. This may be because the Handbook was written for representatives around the world who as laymen exhibit (to judge from the correspondence) great diversity among themselves--in a grasp of Christian Science, of democratic ethics, of just common sense. The Manager has commented: "The Handbook is not just a collection of innumerable rules and regulations. Each chapter begins with a discussion of the underlying motives, objectives, the basic approach-- all of which is intended to educate the area Committee on Publication so he can act intelligently on his own. . . ." Man. to author January 15, 1963.

circumstances--even when he turns his back on an offer of assistance.

In dealing with authors we recognize that any author of standing--like any artist or researcher--attaches supreme importance to the integrity of his work, that is, his right to interpret his subject as he sees it. This we respect. But we do ask him to hear our statement and consider thoughtfully our viewpoint. If he is wrong in the facts, we expect him to welcome authentic information. If his interpretation is unfriendly, we ask him to consider additional data. If we cannot remove his prejudices, we can at least command his respect for our methods and win his appreciation of our purposes.¹

In practice the Committee seems to consciously avoid heaping abuse on the critic. The Committee's replies are rarely personal, though its challenge of particular assertions may, of course, raise public doubts about the author. The Committee usually directs its replies at the statement, not the man or his profession or his general achievements--whatever the provocation.

The Manager told one Committee:

Above all, we do not attack the academic standing or integrity of an author or the adequacy of a textbook, but confine our corrective efforts to pointing out specific errors and providing the specific information which corrects them.²

¹Ibid., p. 18.

²Man. to CoP for Tennessee, re The World's Religions, October 20, 1958. Item #320-52.

The Committee's radio and television programs do not attack persons, professions, and denominations. In fact they are usually quite bereft of social criticism, taken in the usual sense. The Manager told another Committee, for instance:

We have been accused by the medical profession of being rough on them in our radio and television programs, and we are doing everything possible to avoid that accusation.¹

A particularly illustrative case occurred several years ago. A writer asked the Manager of the Committees about the book Mrs. Eddy Purloins from Hegel (Boston: A. A. Beauchamp, 1936) by Walter M. Haushalter. This volume asserted that Mrs. Eddy had plagiarized and it provided a reprint of a manuscript that she had allegedly reproduced in Science and Health. The Church has repudiated this manuscript as fraudulent.²

The inquiring writer asked to see the evidence that the Church had to support its claim of fraud. Specifically the writer wished access to the Church's file of correspondence with Haushalter, the book's author, in order to make what he considered a necessary first-hand estimate. The Manager refused his request.

¹Man. to CoP for New York, January 23, 1958, Item #2062.

²The Church has provided its position in the Christian Science Sentinel, XXXIX (April 3, 1937), pp. 611-12; statement was reprinted in The Christian Science Journal, LV (June 1937), pp. 161-62.

A member of the Manager's staff explained in the course of two letters to the writer the reasons for the refusal. Some relevant excerpts from the correspondence are:

our purpose is not to discredit any person or persons but simply to have the fraudulent nature of the manuscript recognized, so we are happy to have any honest investigator arrive at his conclusions on the basis of the internal evidence of the published documents, because we feel that the latter can easily be disproved on the basis of internal evidence alone.¹

Healing, rather than condemnation or self-justification, is always our aim in dealing either with persons or situations. . . . Our earnest aim is to correct injustices and misrepresentations without exposing or denouncing those who may be responsible for them, and to bring healing rather than havoc to these individuals.²

The staff member pointed out that other commentators who had drawn damning pictures of the Church and its founder had come in time to repudiate their views.³

¹Staff member to Charles S. Braden, January 24, 1955. Item #415.

²Staff member to Charles S. Braden, February 21, 1955. Item #415.

³Named as examples were John V. Dittmore and Lyman P. Powell. Dittmore, a deposed director of the Church, worked against the Church for two decades only to recant at the end. See Beasley, The Continuing Spirit, Appendix 5, pp. 376-77. Powell reversed a hostile position he took in 1908 in Christian Science: The Faith and Its Founder (New York: G.P. Putman's Sons) to write in 1930 the friendly biography, Mary Baker Eddy: A Life Size Portrait (New York: Macmillan; now published by The Christian Science Publishing Society, Boston).

He implied that this might again occur. If there were no other way to clear Mrs. Eddy's name, then access might be granted to the correspondence, he said. But as the matter stood, the internal and external evidence that was publicly available was sufficient to do this.¹

The writer could not agree. The available evidence was not sufficient, he maintained, and it was not morally right to fail to discredit where discredit was due. "If in the process of making the truth known," he stated, "some one's reputation should suffer, that is too bad." The deceiver should not be allowed to live a lie. Both the assertions of the Church and the claims of the discoverer of the manuscript "cannot possibly be true."²

The Committee is no more inclined, evidently, to attack and deny the general position of others than to attack an author personally. The Committee seems to prefer to explain the position of Christian Scientists rather than justify or defend this position by drawing unfavorable comparisons

¹The present writer concluded on the basis of the evidence in the subject correspondence, which he has read, that the Committee's arguments are supportable.

²Charles S. Braden to staff member, March 9, 1955. Item #415. The Haushalter claim has been explored by Conrad Henry Moehlman, a professor of the history of Christianity and a Baptist, in his Ordeal by Concordance: An Historical Study of a Recent Literary Invention (New York: Longmans Green and Company, 1955). Moehlman denies the authenticity of the manuscript and so the charge of plagiarism. Braden in Christian Science Today (pp. 32-35) suspends judgment.

between it and another's view. The Committee persuades the critic that he is wrong in his views on Christian Science, not in his general views on Jesus, sin, prayer, the Bible, and so on.

One Assistant Committee spoke of the need to avoid attempting to justify our position regarding spiritual healing in the religious world, instead of presenting a straight forward explanation of our healing theology, thus putting us on a defensive basis.¹

The assumption throughout seems to be that the commentator whose statement needs correction has erred because misinformed, that if approached he will be open to additional information and ready to look fairly and responsibly at the Committee's side. Ignorance, not malice and ill will, is usually presumed.

The Manager explained to one area Committee:

We avoid assuming that the critic to whom we are writing has a conscious desire to misrepresent or discredit Christian Science. Instead we write in the spirit of trying to help him to understand Christian Science better and to inform him of facts of which he may be ignorant. This attitude is in accord with the Manual provision that our corrections should be made "in a Christian manner."²

A Committee in South Africa put it as follows after a

¹F. Salisbury to Man., January 5, 1961. Item #2024.

²Man. to CoP for Western Australia, re the Rev. F. Elliott, May 9, 1958. Item #1167.

call on a minister who had sharply criticized Christian Science:

I approached him on the basis that he would not have done this unless he felt deeply, and loved people enough to save them from what he considered disaster.¹

A third aspect of the "Christian manner," as the Committee seems to interpret it, is an over-all restraint. Prayer and the values to be exercised in dealing with the critic constitute two aspects and restraint possibly a third, particularly restraint in controversial situations.

Some restraint, for instance, seems indicated in exchanges that the Committee has chosen not to draw out. The Committee has not usually continued private exchanges except where the author showed a genuine interest to have it do so. In general it can be said that the Committee encourages an author or editor to correspond, and it will reply so long as his responses indicate that he is open to additional information and explanation. It avoids, however, exchanges for which it might be accused of "hounding" or "badgering."¹ No

¹CoP for Transvaal Province to Man., re Otto Verhoef, March 28, 1960. Item #577.

²Interview with Robert Peel, member of the Manager's staff, May 25, 1962.

case of correction could be found where the Committee sent more than one letter to a critic when no reply was received to the first.

Also, the Committee does not usually carry on drawn-out published exchanges. While grappling directly and publicly with a critic's arguments, it evidently does not generally carry on a running public debate.¹ Only one reply goes for publication unless the rebuttal to this one letter introduces a very serious, new misconception. This policy is borne out in the chapters on correction.

On controversy Mrs. Eddy's writings produce the following comments:

Refrain from public controversy; correct the false with the true--then leave the latter to propagate.²

¹The Committee seems to draw an implicit distinction between the drawn-out controversy, which the Committee eschews, and the controversy of the moment, which results from the Committee's public challenge to comment. This distinction may separate the Committee from the criticism sometimes directed at public relations for avoiding controversy--for putting one-sided content to the public at a time and in a manner that will permit the content to go unchallenged. This, the critic observes, leads to standardization of public opinion, not stimulation of it. See Ross, p.95; Kelley, pp. 74, 229. In criticizing on this point, ~~of course, one must be cautious not to suggest that the~~ marketplace of ideas is no more than a boxing arena, that the demagogue who can stir contention with heat contributes more to public enlightenment than the school teacher, say, who enlightens his pupils in an environment mainly free of contention.

²Miscellany, p. 129: 32-2.

Be temperate in thought, word, and deed. Meekness and temperance are the jewels of Love, set in wisdom. Retrain untempered zeal. "Learn to labor and to wait."¹

The Manager explained his policy on controversy in a reply to a letter from "a liberal Protestant." The writer had objected to the way in which a Roman Catholic magazine had presented Christian Science in an article. She said that the article contained "indifferently disguised innuendos and fractional truths."

In his reply the Manager observed:

As you rightly point out, the Christian seeks to allay controversy, and he does this in part by seeking to correct misinformation and misunderstanding before they become widespread and well established. It is with just this Christian purpose that our office supplies to authors and writers accurate information about the teachings and history of Christian Science and takes up with them factual mistakes that they may make.²

The policy in another aspect was put by Spyros P. Berettas, Committee for Greece:

The relations of our church with the other authorities of our country are very harmonious because we never gave any occasion for complaint, respecting always the laws of our country as I counseled the members of our church to avoid any controversy with members of the orthodox church.³

¹Retrospection, p. 79:22-24.

²Man. to inquirer, re The Lamp, February 24, 1960. Item #583.

³CoP for Greece to Man., re Ekkliissia, November 16, 1959. Item #122.

An area Committee is instructed to stay out of, at least in his official capacity, a debate of issues in his community, unless Christian Science is directly involved. Even on a question where the Church is very much concerned, such as the fluoridation of public water supplies, the Committee does not directly participate, except to supply an official statement if called upon by an editor or public official or to respond if the Church is named and its position misstated.

The Handbook counsels the area Committee:

It is unwise for him to become involved in controversial social or political issues so long as no encroachment upon the religious freedom of Christian Scientists is involved. . . . he does not follow any personal views he may have on political, social, or racial questions . . .¹

The Manager advised a state Committee as follows on one occasion when the press in the Committee's area was giving attention to the subject of euthanasia:

It would . . . be highly inappropriate for a Committee to become embroiled in a debate over a public issue such as this one. . . . a Committee's position is obviously to protect our teachings from public adulteration and legal restriction, not to promote them in an area of public controversy such as this one.²

¹Handbook, p. 44.

²Man. to CoP for Arizona, date unknown. Item #2070.

Farlow referred to the restraint he observed in the Committee work as "forbearance." Noting that his "sole motive" in correcting mistaken press comment about Christian Science was "that justice should prevail,"

Farlow wrote:

I made no effort to effect an untimely introduction of Christian Science in the newspapers or other periodicals, nor to intrude it upon the public in any way.

I held the opinion that the subject should be discussed only where it was welcome

I entertained the opinion that Christian Science would make its way in the world because of its healing efforts, and would be known by its fruits, and that our neighbors would be attracted to it by reason of its good works, and the teaching and preaching were for those who called for it: but I discovered that if misstatements were allowed to remain uncorrected, the tendency was to engender bitterness and crush out toleration.

.

No occupation in the world is better calculated to foster patience and forbearance than the task of introducing new ideas.¹

¹Farlow, "Twenty-Six Years."

CHAPTER IV

"ON ITS OWN MERITS"

Erwin Canham in Commitment to Freedom sets forth the chapter title. Speaking of a characteristic Monitor policy, he explains that each situation as it arises is judged on its own merits and handled according to the circumstances. He points out:

The practice by which Christian Scientists avoid flat, dogmatic rules and seek to work out each case on its own merits is not an easy one for operative journalism. It requires maturity, wisdom, and confidence.¹

Replace in this passage "journalism" with "public relations," and the practice also fits the Committee on Publication. The Committee takes each case as it comes and may act on it according to the merits rather than particular policy. In fact, policy is rarely hard and fast: written instructions appear to serve as guides just as often as formal regulation.

The approach can partly be explained as a matter of expediency--"the art of the possible"--, modified

¹Canham, p. 120.

presumably by the "Christian manner" of the last chapter. Partly, the approach may be a product of the over-all religious outlook. In Chapter I, we noted Mrs. Eddy's functional approach when she dispensed with tradition to draw her church law.¹

The Committee on Publication is itself the outcome of this approach. When formed in 1898, it had the characteristics of a novel, astute measure designed to fit a set of circumstances, namely "to obtain the publication in respectable newspapers . . . [of] whatever the Pastor Emeritus commits to them . . ."²

Mrs. Eddy fostered expediency in her Committee on Publication by giving it something of an open-end assignment. Article I, Section 6, of the Church Manual indicates that the Committee has "special action" not named in the Manual before it:

The manager of the general Committee on Publication in the United States shall order no special action to be taken by said Committee that is not named in the Manual of this Church without consulting with

¹The bylaws "sprang from necessity, the logic of events--from the immediate demand for them as a help that must be supplied to maintain the dignity and defense of our Cause . . ." Miscellaneous Writings, p. 148:14-17.

²By-Law adopted December 13, 1898.

the full Board of Directors of The Mother Church and receiving the written consent of said Board.¹

While the Committee's basic corrective purpose is set forth in Article XXXIII, the means to fulfil this purpose have been justified by Article I. This first Article has been cited as allowing the radio and television broadcasts, the legislative activities, and the finance committee.²

The Committee, in preparing a reply "on its own merits," is in fact engaged in popularizing information. Since the Committee's objective is to supply the commentator with information sufficiently persuasive to convince him of his error, paramount among these factors is popularization in terms of the commentator himself.

For one thing, there is the commentator's standpoint and background. The Committee endeavors to fit terminology and tone to these. Its reply will thus differ from one commentator to another--from clergyman to historian to medical writer; likewise, from Unitarian to Baptist to Episcopalian. On the matter the Handbook provides:

¹Manual, p. 27:3-10 (Article I, Section 6).

²According to file correspondence, the Committee has frequently cited Article I, Section 6, to church members who have inquired about the legitimacy of these activities.

Know the viewpoint of your critic. This applies to all our corrective work. The first essential of a correction is that it should be completely intelligible to the persons for whom it was written. In preparing a correction, always consider the theological, professional, or other special viewpoint of the person to whom you are writing.¹

Expanding on this to an overseas Committee, the Manager remarked:

It is always helpful to try to understand the point of view of the critic and to answer him not in the words that we might use in addressing a group of Christian Scientists but in the words that will meet the particular objections in his thought. . . . [par.] In all such matters as this, perhaps we can find the best way of healing the situation by putting ourselves in the place of the recipient and thinking how our words could sound to someone who knows little or nothing about the real meaning of Christian Science or about its vocabulary.

The Manager also pointed out:

It is not a flat denial or assertion that convinces anyone, but the reasonableness and persuasiveness with which we state our case. . . . As you know, the dignity of Christian Science is usually best conveyed by a simple naturalness of approach.²

Thus the reply is tailored for the critic more than for the criticism. The above Committee was further told:

each such letter is written to answer a particular

¹Handbook, p. 27.

²Man. to CoP for New South Wales, Australia, re The Witness, January 23, 1959. Item #1167.

criticism and cannot safely be used as a model in answering others, even if they may be similar in some respects.¹

From the Committee's standpoint, the problem of popularizing Christian Science is little different in kind from popularizing a technical subject. A specialized terminology, which has arisen to describe specialized concepts, requires explanation. Most of the terms in Christian Science are not unfamiliar to Christian theology, but some specialized shadings of meaning given to the terms are.²

The need to find meaningful equivalents for Christian Science terms was pointed out by the Committee for Southern California to a medical doctor. The doctor had sent to him a manuscript for comment and had used in an explanation of Christian Science the specialized term, "mortal mind." About this, the Committee remarked:

The fourth sentence uses our term mortal mind for which your reader is unprepared, and is like using an abstract medical term to the layman. It means nothing.

Later in his letter and on another point, the Committee drew an analogy with the specialized terminology used

¹Italics added.

²For examples, see the "Glossary" of Science and Health.

by physicists.¹

The chief difficulty in popularizing Christian Science, indeed the religion's chief conceptual problem, is the unique classification of evil, material phenomena, and disease as ultimately "unreal." This classification is a derivative of the religion's distinction--mentioned in Chapter I--between spirituality, taken as fundamentally constituting the only reality, and its opposite, materiality. Mrs. Eddy herself cautioned against publicly pressing too rapidly the classification, evidently because of both a world hostility she believed existed and a spiritual immaturity she saw in her followers.²

The need to place the classification in a proper explanatory context to make it understandable was pointed out in a letter of the Manager's to an overseas Committee. The Manager stated that it was best to establish in a letter "the Christian, spiritual basis of our teaching" before making "strong absolute statements about the unreality" of evil and materiality. The view of evil was difficult for the Christian in the older churches to grasp and often led to misunderstanding.

¹CoP for Southern California to R. T. Barton, April 19, 1955. Item #237.

²Mary Baker Eddy, Unity of Good (1908, 1936), pp. 1:11-19; 4:28-13; 6:10-5.

We need to reassure him that it is because of our conviction of the infinite goodness and power of God as revealed through Christ Jesus that we see everything unlike God as having no divine law to support its reality, legitimacy or necessity.¹

The terminology describing the concept without comprehension of the concept can appear "ridiculous." At least the Committee to whom the above letter was written had put it that way a few months before in a report of an address on Christian Science by an orthodox minister. The Committee lamented that the minister had used in his explanations terminology which he had not in the least understood and that this constituted "a more serious threat than the raging and storming of the older generation." He explained:

Try as I think this man honestly did, he, nor anyone else, cannot possibly get to first base in interpreting our religion if they do not comprehend . . . When discussed in an unenlightened manner, no matter how studiously one tries, statements such as "there is no matter, sin, sickness or death" sound, and are, utterly ridiculous--and so they sounded last evening . . .²

One way to solve this problem of popularization would be to minimize the unique aspect or to drop it

¹Man. to CoP for German-speaking Switzerland, re M. Fiedler, May 17, 1960. Item #386.

²CoP for German-speaking Switzerland to Man., re Rev. Fischer, March 2, 1960. Item #387.

entirely. The Handbook advises against this.

When we are aware of the views of a writer, we can more readily seek out the common ground and find an approach that will waken him to a more enlightened understanding. In our efforts to touch a responsive chord in our critics, however, we must always maintain the absolute standard of Christian Science, neither reducing it to agreement with human belief [i.e., discarding the unique aspects] nor neglecting its relation to human interests.¹

Commenting on the point in regard to radio and television programs, the Manager declared to an inquirer:

We are striving to make the material as acceptable for the stranger as possible, but are faced with the fact that, ultimately, no discussion of Christian Science can convey the spiritual message without some absolute statements [i.e., the unique statements]. Otherwise, we fall into a kind of vague Norman Vincent Pealism!²

While the common and the unique aspects both are to be drawn, they are to be drawn accurately, not fully. Statements which the critic may find hard to understand are to be avoided.

The Manager put the matter on three occasions as follows:

In making such corrections it is important not to go too far. One can hardly expect [an author] to accept the full claims of Christian Science as a revelation,

¹Handbook, p. 28.

²Man. to C. A. Bartholomew, December 1, 1960. Item #2048.

a religious teaching, and a healing system, or to allow his book to be used for a strong, persuasive presentation of Christian Science.¹

It is understandable that outside writers should not consider Christian Science a revelation in the literal (and rational) sense that we do, but I think we have the right to expect that they shall not misrepresent our views of the revelation or the revelator, provided we make these reasonably clear.²

It is certainly important that we give them something of the spirit of Christian Science, but this must be done gently and persuasively, avoiding dogmatic statements.³

And the Handbook states in regard to talks that Committees may be invited to give before outside groups:

Avoid a dogmatic tone. A strong, clear stand must be fitted into an appreciation of what others are doing and what they believe.⁴

Another popularization problem is the characterization of Mrs. Eddy. The Committee names her as she named herself,⁵ namely as the discoverer and founder of Christian

¹Man. to CoP for France, re Les Sectes en France, April 7, 1959. Item #255.

²Robert Peel to Man., "Memorandum on The World's Religions: Revised Edition," n.d. (ca. August 26, 1954), Item #320-44.

³Man. to CoP for Texas, re Mr. Warren's talk to non-Scientists, January 20, 1960. Item #2074.

⁴Handbook, p. 187

⁵See, for instance, Miscellaneous Writings, pp. 381:31-383:15.

Science. The Committee's explanations of her role beyond this are usually modest (as we shall see in later chapters).

This is perhaps in keeping with her counsel:

I even hope that those who are kind enough to speak well of me may do so honestly and not too earnestly, and this seldom, until mankind learn more of my meaning and can speak justly of my living.¹

A further aspect of popularization is the use of quotations. A well chosen quotation in a public explanation may lend clarity and authority. Or it can introduce confusing terminology and irrelevant points that tend to bewilder and to raise more questions than are answered.

As we shall see in the next chapter, the Committee mainly quotes from the Bible and from Mrs. Eddy's writings, only rarely from outside sources. The Handbook provides on the use of her writings:

Avoid sprinkling quotations from Mrs. Eddy's writings through your corrective letter. As the first Manager of Committees, Alfred Farlow, once said, "Don't make Mrs. Eddy defend herself." You write the correction. . . . It is undesirable to use generalized quotations that bring in points irrelevant to your specific purpose, or that are couched in language incomprehensible to the outsider, or that put demands of a denominational nature upon the faith, credulity, or loyalty of the outsider.²

¹Miscellany, p. 264:3-6.

²Handbook, p. 29. Farlow made other comments on the use of quotations beside the one cited here: "You will notice that I seldom quote anything from her [Mrs. Eddy]. The most that I have quoted has been by her

The Manager expanded on the point to two area Committees as follows:

There is a tendency simply to refer critics to passages in our Leader's writings and expect those passages to answer their argument, even though the critics may not understand her terminology at all. [par.] This is what we mean by our frequent injunctions not to put Mrs. Eddy in the position of having to defend herself.¹

Our critics believe they have documentation for the charges they make and if we deny these charges only by quoting her own account, they sometimes retort by questioning her credibility. If we can quote sources in support of her statement we are defending her instead of making her defend herself. It is especially helpful when we can quote disinterested, scholarly, or non-Science writers when questions about her character and life come up.²

Beside the point that overdependence on quotations is not persuasive, they also are not as publishable. The

permission; . . . But as a general rule I would say it is not wise to quote from her writings" (Farlow to Mrs. M. S. Thompson, Grand Forks, North Dakota, December 19, 1900: Letter Press B, p. 574) Item #2000; "The lengthy quotations from Science and Health remind me that recently I learned from Mrs. Eddy that it was her desire not to have us make long quotations from her writings, but to use them as little as possible" (Farlow to James A. Logwood, June 3, 1903). Item #2001. It is to be noted that a policy of using few quotations is followed by the church periodicals and is urged on outsiders writing on the religion.

¹Man. to CoP for Pennsylvania, re J. C. McKirachen, December 23, 1959. Item #477.

²Man. to CoP for New Zealand, November 3, 1958. Item #2023.

District Manager for Great Britain and Ireland remarked:

Committees have learned from experience that profuse quotation discourages publication--editors take it as advertising propoganda for our movement and the published writings.¹

Leaving popularization behind, a further aspect of fitting the reply to the circumstances concerns the sweeping comment. Not infrequently, a commentator in the space of several pages will sweep across all phases of the religion--the teaching, healing work, history, and church--and err in his discussion of each in turn. His scope may lead to comments that fail to plunge very deeply or for that matter very originally. But how is he to be answered?

A writer in The Christian Century put the problem this way:

Sectarian controversy is a type of warfare where the advantage lies overwhelmingly with the aggressor. It is possible to scatter, in the course of three pages, enough charges against an adversary to require of him nothing less than two volumes to refute them--a refutation so long, and that takes so long to prepare, that it is unlikely to be read by those who read the original charges. If he chooses to reply in full, attitudes will probably have been set and the matter forgotten by the time his reply is published; if on the

¹D. M. to Inquirer, re The Church's Ministry of Healing, June 20, 1958. Item #1173-29.

other hand his reply is of similar length to the attack, it is likely to appear incomplete by comparison, so that the reader may assume that the charges have no adequate answer. It is a sorry business, but it must be attempted.¹

According to file material, the Committee in its replies is usually selective in points it takes up. The Committee will choose the few points that seem most significant or stand as the commentator's underlying argument and that it can refute most ably and succinctly. Rarely will the Committee match the sweeping comment point by point.

The District Manager advised an inquirer on the matter:

Committees on Publication are instructed not to try to correct every misconception, but to endeavor to pick out the underlying misconceptions that account for an attack.²

At greater length, the Manager said to the Committee for Italy:

It is impossible in such cases--as you have already found--to make a point by point refutation of all the misstatements included in an article. One has to decide what are the most important ones to

¹E. D. Watt, "Reader's Response, Catholics Down Under: A Second View," The Christian Century, LXXVIII (January 18, 1961), p. 80.

²D. M. to Inquirer, re The Church's Ministry of Healing, June 19, 1958. Item #1173-29.

answer and then let the quiet, rational, factual, and Christian tone of one's letter take care of all other misrepresentations.¹

Likewise, strong argument and evidence are not to be weakened by halting documentation, equivocation, and tangential discussions or to be drowned in verbiage.

The Handbook declares:

Be direct. Deal pointedly with the leading error, the underlying misconception. . . . Answer the substance of the false allegation--don't just quibble over words or subsidiary points. Replace the falsity as a whole with the right idea. . . . Be brief. Clarity and simplicity are the key. Correct what needs correcting and then stop.²

The Committee widely distributes books, pamphlets, and periodicals as the need requires. Especially for the sweeping misunderstanding the Committee will send printed material with a letter. It has a variety of material with which to do this, as we shall see.

If it does not send a book, the Committee may recommend one. Sometimes this is its sole purpose in writing. In order to obtain a further hearing for its own sources, the Committee shows an interest in published bibliographies as well as texts.³

¹Man. to CoP for Italy, March 9, 1959. Item #2025.

²Handbook, p. 28.

³On the last, see Man. to Editor, Encyclopaedia Britannica, February 26, 1960. Item #1207.

The Committee distributes Mrs. Eddy's prose writings. The most frequently offered book is Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures (1906). The other fourteen volumes of Mrs. Eddy's in print are also distributed, mainly to college and public libraries. The titles are:¹

Christian Healing (1908)

Christian Science versus Pantheism (1898)

Manual of The Mother Church, The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts (1908)

Message to The Mother Church, Boston, Massachusetts, June, 1900 (1900)

Message to The Mother Church, Boston, Massachusetts, June 1901 (1901)

Message to The First Church of Christ, Scientist, or The Mother Church, Boston June 15, 1902 (1902)

Miscellaneous Writings, 1883-1896 (1896)

No and Yes (1908)

Pulpit and Press (1895)

Retrospection and Introspection (1892)

Rudimental Divine Science (1908)

¹The imprint is "Boston: Trustees under the Will of Mary Baker G. Eddy."

The First Church of Christ, Scientist, and Miscellany (1913)

The People's Idea of God, Its Effect on Health and Christianity (1908)

Unity of Good (1908)

The Committee distributes biographies published by the Church. The Handbook recommends the following titles:¹

Sibyl Wilbur, The Life of Mary Baker Eddy (1907, 1941)

E. Mary Ramsay, Christian Science and Its Discoverer (1935, 1955)

Clifford P. Smith, Historical Sketches From the Life of Mary Baker Eddy and the History of Christian Science (1934, 1936, 1941)

Lyman P. Powell, Mary Baker Eddy: A Life Size Portrait (1930)

Irving C. Tomlinson, Twelve Years with Mary Baker Eddy (Boston: The Christian Science Board of Directors, 1945)

William Dana Orcutt, Mary Baker Eddy and Her Books (1950)

Erwin D. Canham, Commitment to Freedom, The Story of The Christian Science Monitor (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1958).

The Committee has frequent occasion to distribute

¹"Appendix," Handbook. The imprint, except as otherwise noted, is "Boston: The Christian Science Publishing Society."

church periodicals, published by The Christian Science Publishing Society. These include The Christian Science Monitor, which the Committee distributes for its articles, editorials, and book reviews;¹ the Christian Science Sentinel, for its articles, reports of healing, and texts of radio programs; The Christian Science Journal, for its articles, church statements, annual meeting reports (July issue only), and reports of healing; The Herald of Christian Science, for its articles in eleven languages; and the Christian Science Quarterly, for its sermon citations.

The Committee has an assortment of specially written pamphlets for distribution. The Handbook lists

¹The Monitor, because of the public respect it has won, serves often to precede the Committee's efforts to gain a hearing. One Assistant Committee, who had given several Monitor subscriptions to seminary professors, remarked, "Experience has proven the fact that this is a forerunner to the correcting of false concepts about our theology." ACoP to CoP for Michigan, re What The Sects Teach, August 22, 1958. Item #631. In Victoria, Australia, the Committee found that he needed little introduction at one point to legislators because of their acquaintance with the Monitor. Man. to E. O., December 5, 1958. Item #805. The Committee makes Monitor subscriptions regularly available to editors in exchange for advertising of the paper, to radio and television stations who give public service time for the weekly Christian Science broadcasts, and to legislators as gifts during legislative sessions.

the titles:

"Facts About Christian Science"

"A Potent Force for Good"

"Moving Mountains"

"The A B C of the Christian Science Religion"

"Effective Prayer"

"How Prayer Can Help You"

"Healing Through Spiritual Awakening"

"Wilt thou be made whole?"

"The Healing Power of Gratitude"

"Why Men Can Be Free"¹

The Committee recommends a number of independently published books. Some of these are by church members, others by nonmembers. Their statements of Christian Science coincide, of course, with the Committee's. These books, the Committee holds, have particular usefulness. They deal with special aspects of the denomination and with relationships between the teaching and outside fields of thought. Also, their independence of publication often takes them into corners not reached by the church-

¹The last six were originally prepared for answering responses to Christian Science radio and television programs.

published volumes.

The Committee most frequently recommends among the independently published volumes by Christian Scientists the following two:

Robert Peel, Christian Science: Its Encounter with American Culture (New York: Henry Holt, 1958)

Thomas Linton Leishman, Why I Am A Christian Scientist (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1958)

When the first appeared, the Manager advised area Committees:

It shows the great gulf between Christian Science and the various forms of thinking with which it is often confused. It answers thoroughly and convincingly many of the most frequent accusations
 . . .¹

In advising area Committees at the appearance of the second, the Manager forwarded a review from the Monitor which said that the book

should be especially useful in helping ministers of other denominations to appreciate the deep Christianity of Mrs. Eddy's vision and purpose and the close accord between the Bible and "Science and Health . . ."²

¹Man. to All CoPs, June 5, 1958.

²The Christian Science Monitor, October 23, 1958. To the Peel and Leishman books was added a third in 1962-- DeWitt John's The Christian Science Way of Life with A Christian Scientist's Life by Erwin D. Canham (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962).

The Committee has also distributed two books by Norman Beasley, who is not a Christian Scientist:

The Cross and The Crown (New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1952)

The Continuing Spirit (New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1956)

Then there are a number of books that the Committee has distributed or recommended for the infrequent, special occasion. Several of these are:

Edith Deen, Great Women of the Christian Faith (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959)¹

Vergilius Ferm, ed., Religion in the Twentieth Century (New York: Philosophical Library, 1948); republished as a paperback with the title The Living Schools of Religion (Ames, Iowa: Littlefield, Adams, and Company)²

A. Graham Ikin, New Concepts of Healing (New York: Association Press, 1956)³

Conrad Henry Moehlman, Ordeal By Concordance (New York: Longmans Green and Company, 1955)⁴

¹Discussed in the chapter on "informational services."

²The article on Christian Science in this volume was written by a well-known sociologist and member of the church, Dr. Arthur J. Todd.

³This book, originally published in Great Britain, contains in the appendix of the American edition an article prepared by the Manager, Committees on Publication.

⁴This volume was written by a Baptist professor of the history of Christianity for the purpose of dis-

Leo Rosten, ed., A Guide to the Religions of America (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955)¹

The Committee also has distributed the following: articles appearing in outside periodicals²; a booklet summarizing relevant state and local laws that Committees compile for Christian Scientists in their areas³; published and unpublished copies of past corrective letters.

The Committee turns to the personal interview rather than the letter for many replies, depending upon the circumstances. The personal, face-to-face interview has several distinct advantages.

proving the authenticity of a document purporting to show a plagiarism by Mrs. Eddy.

¹This volume's article on Christian Science was written by the former Manager of Committees, George Channing.

²For instance, the Committee gave wide distribution to an article in the May 1960 issue of Christian Herald. The article was "Christian Science--What Is It?" by Robert Peel.

³In 1960 the Committee for Indiana was asked by the Director of the state's Bureau of Special Health Services for enough copies of his Legal Rights and Obligations of Christian Scientists in Indiana to supply to health officers in the state's 175 health jurisdictions. Man. to E. O., March 21, 1960. Item #861.

The interview can, for one thing, provide an opportunity to establish a close, friendly working relationship.

The Handbook explains that "News work is not an activity that can be handled adequately at a distance . . ." Committees are to come to know "the editors of their leading newspapers" personally. This encourages an editor to turn to the Committee or a local Assistant for information when the need arises--especially for information on the Committee's side to "the occasional ambiguous or unfavorable news item."¹

The Handbook also encourages the Committee to call on radio and television stations, both those which do broadcast the Committee's programs and those which do not. "There is," the Handbook declares, "no substitute for personal contacts with the stations."²

The Handbook further recommends that the Committee conduct his legislative work other than "from behind a desk" and that he become acquainted firsthand with legislators and with lobbyists and state officials who are concerned with legislation in which he has an interest.³

Also, the interview allows for a wider exchange

¹Handbook, p. 136. Also see p. 150.

²Ibid., p. 100.

³Ibid., p. 84.

of views than the letter and may minimize the danger of further misunderstandings. The Manager once explained this point to the District Manager:

I can understand and sympathize with your desire to probe into the reaction of orthodox thought to ideas of this kind. I wonder, however, if such probing could not be carried on more effectively in the course of a conversation, with the friendly give-and-take possible under those circumstances. We find that in our occasional talks with churchmen of other faiths we can learn much from their reaction to the various points we make. . . . it does not seem to us that a corrective letter is the best medium in which to experiment.¹

The interview can serve as an adjunct to a letter. Its personal touch can lay the groundwork for a friendly reception of particularly a long letter.²

The interview may permit a misunderstanding to be found out as well as talked out. Especially is this necessary where a report on a comment is incomplete, ambiguous, or a matter of hearsay, such as is often true of reports on sermons and addresses.

The Committee especially seeks interviews to reply to sermons. As we shall see in the next chapter, the Committee turns on these occasions to the interview

¹Man. to D.M., re J. W. C. Wand, February 13, 1958. Item #2027.

²See Man. to CoP for Ontario, re Christian Science Is it Christian? Is it Scientific? April 3, 1957. Item #66.

three times more often than to letters. Each reply, however, is handled on its merits.

The circumstances differ so widely from minister to minister and from area to area that no general rule can be laid down just when and where an interview should be sought.¹

Interviews are sought not just when trouble is afoot. This is especially so in the work with newspaper editors. According to the Handbook, there is more to good press relations than just protests.

It should never be possible for [an editor] to say that he hears from the Christian Scientists only when something is wrong.²

The Committee calls to place publicity and advertising and also simply to cultivate acquaintances. But these visits are evidently short and selective. An Assistant

¹Man. to CoP for Florida, re Christian Science Tested by Scripture, March 19, 1959. Item #69.

²Handbook, p. 137.

Committee in Massachusetts remarked:

I might point out here that we have used the utmost diplomacy and courtesy in all our contacts and do not pop in and out of the offices, taking up time and making a nuisance of ourselves.¹

The Committee interviews public officials at all levels--national, state, and local. In 1958 a Committee in Canada interviewed the Prime Minister on a legislative subject.² In a South American country, a Committee came to know ranking government officials and attended functions in the Presidential Mansion.³ The Committee for Florida reported that on tours of his state, evidently in 1959-1960, he called on 114 legislators, 101 editors, and 23 radio and television people⁴

One last situation in which circumstances govern the procedure might be mentioned. The Committee before replying to a comment considers whether a letter or interview is likely to accomplish much. When not likely, the Committee often does not act.

¹ACoP for Worcester, Mass., to CoP for Mass., January 30, 1958. Item #940.

²CoP for Ontario to Man., August 28, 1958. Item #954.

³Man. to E. O., May 18 and December 7, 1959. Item #821.

⁴D. R. Lane, "The Balanced Christian Scientist." Item #2022.

Previous correspondence with an author may indicate, for instance, that a further exchange would be fruitless. This proved the case in June 1958 in New York state. A minister, with whom there had been several unsuccessful contacts about a book of his, gave an address on Christian Science as a visiting minister in a different church from his own. The state Committee, who reported that the address was a "studied misrepresentation," wrote to the church concerned to point out that the accusations were unjust and untrue. The letter was passed along to the critic, who replied shortly to justify his comments. After weighing the pros and cons of a further letter, the state Committee decided not to answer.

The Manager concurred in this decision and remarked:

It has been obvious that Mr. M. is eagerly waiting for instances that he can play up, however unjustly, to support his claim of Christian Science "persecution" of critics. Hence we concur with your judgment that an answer to his letter would probably only compound the difficulties. Practically anything one could write, he would twist around in his report of the incident in his next

talks. It is true that he will doubtless interpret silence as an admission of "guilt," but there is just no pleasing Mr. M. whatever one does.¹

The Committee sometimes does not reply when a letter would publicize more than correct a misconception. In May 1960 in Kansas, the Manager advised the state Committee not to reply to an editorial in the Moran Sentinel of May 5. The editorial had charged that Mark Twain's attacks on Christian Science had been suppressed. The Manager noted that:

it would not be helpful to point out that Mark Twain's attacks on Christian Science are available today and have not been withheld from the public, as the editorial assumes.²

The Committee may not reply if it judges there to be a lack of common ground on which to meet. The Committee almost never, for instance, seeks corrections in the publications of the Jehovah's Witnesses, Roman Catholics, and Spiritualists.³

¹Man. to CoP for New York, June 24, 1958. Item #470. This exchange is reported anonymously.

²Man. to CoP for Kansas, May 18, 1960. Item #574.

³"It is not customary to answer critical comments appearing in Roman Catholic, Jehovah's Witness, or Spiritualist publications, but they should be reported to the Manager's Office." Handbook, p. 25.

The publications of these groups do not pay much attention to Christian Science anyway--at least as comments in their publications are reported to the Committee. In the Jehovah's Witness press during 1958-1960, two brief references were reported in issues of Watchtower¹ and one in Awake.² In the Spiritualist press, two articles on Christian Science appeared in The National Spiritualist³ and two minor references in Two Worlds.⁴

In the Roman Catholic press, a book review of the volume, Commitment to Freedom, and its subject, The Christian Science Monitor, appeared in The Critic⁵; an article on the Monitor in Information⁶; and an article on the religion and history of Christian Science in The Lamp.⁷ The Critic review and the Information article

¹December 15, 1958, and March 1, 1960. Item #1163.

²April 22, 1960. Item #25.

³July 1959 and April 1960. Item #1105.

⁴November 8, 1958, and August 8, 1959. Items #579 and #250.

⁵December 1958-January 1959. Item #2012.

⁶October 1959. Item #1070.

⁷February 1960. Item #583.

both praised the Monitor as a "model" for a possible national Catholic daily. The Lamp article was critical. Minor references were reported in editions of Our Sunday Visitor,¹ America,² and Jubilee.³ There were also several Catholic books and pamphlets reported that mentioned or discussed Christian Science.

The Committee on Publication sometimes calls on groups even though past experience with them has not been encouraging. Whether or not any call is attempted depends in these cases entirely on the circumstances.

One of these groups is the fundamentalist bodies. The Manager advised the Committee for New Mexico about a fundamentalist publication:

Frankly, we have been able to make very little headway with obscure fundamentalist groups of the kind that published this book. But we watch their activities closely and approach them in a spirit of brotherly love whenever the opportunity seems ripe.⁴

The Missouri Synod Lutherans are evidently placed in the same category.⁵

¹June 1, June 29, and August 3, 1958. Item #1113.

²June 14, 1958. Item #26.

³February 1960. Item #550.

⁴Man. to CoP for New Mexico, re From House to House, January 7, 1960. Item #109.

⁵See Man. to CoP for Washington State, re

So are the atheist publications. For instance, when The American Rationalist commented on Christian Science, the Manager advised the Committee for Illinois against a reply and reasoned:

The group of atheistic and free-thinking periodicals to which The American Rationalist belongs is just as dogmatic as the fundamentalist sects are in their different way. These so-called free-thinkers generally have pretty closed minds and love to get into arguments. Hence each case in which they mention Christian Science needs to be carefully considered as to whether it offers a favorable opportunity for rational, factual correction.¹

There are a number of further occasions when no correction is sought for a misstatement. Some of these are when there is reason to believe that information on a situation is incomplete²; when a comment "is not so much wrong as inadequate"³; when a criticism is made over radio or television or in a newspaper or magazine that dates back some time⁴; when a reference

The Religious Bodies of America, May 21, 1959. Item #234.

¹Man. to CoP for Illinois, July 3, 1958. Item #199.

²Man. to CoP for Oklahoma, re D. Hause, April 27, 1960. Item #411.

³Man. to CoP for New Mexico, re H. Decker, February 24, 1959. Item #1032.

⁴Man. to E. O., May 18, 1959. Item #525-10. Also, Man. to CoP for New South Wales, January 23, 1959. Item #1167.

appears in a publication of the vanity press¹; when a criticism is made of the Monitor that its editors prefer to handle²; when a reference appears in "the writings of a well-known writer or scholar who is now deceased"³; when "the great majority of readers discount such claims anyway."⁴

¹Memorandum for files, re Invincible Forces. Item #148.

²Man. to CoP Alabama, re Dan Smoot Report, June 1, 1959. Item #553.

³Man. to inquirer, re John Dewey's Challenge to Education, June 2, 1960. Item #87.

⁴Man. to CoP for Federal Republic of Germany, re Wickland, February 24, 1957. Item #2014. CoP for Sweden to Man., re Evangelii Harold, June 26, 1958, and re Allers, April 6, 1959. Item #201.

P A R T I I

MODES OF IMPACT

CHAPTER V**CORRECTION--I: AN EXAMINATION
OF THE GROUP'S RESPONSE
OF DIRECT REPLY**

The scope of the corrective work, as set forth in the bylaw that established the Committee, embraces "the daily press . . . periodicals or circulated literature of any sort." The evidence indicates that the Committee pays careful attention to each in turn--to newspapers, magazines, books, pamphlets; also to verbal statements emanating from the pulpit, classroom, and broadcasting station.

This breadth of activity is indicated in Table 2. According to this Table the Committee on Publication responded to comments on Christian Science on 253 occasions from June 1958 to May 1960.

The Table considers sources of comments. It provides for seven sources: (1) books, periodicals, pamphlets; (2) syndicated material; (3) sermons; (4)

medical talks; (5) classrooms; (6) libraries; and (7) distribution (i.e., publishing, bookselling, broadcasting, etc.). The last is taken as a source since the distributors of comment, those middle men between the author and the public, share at least in the presentation of the author's work and also often in the creation. Each of these sources is to be discussed separately in this and the next chapter.

The Table also takes into account the geographical distribution of the comments responded to and the method of response.

Several conclusions can be drawn from these figures. First, the tabulation indicates the Committee's broad front of activity. The sweep of corrections encompasses virtually every mass communicator and medium of mass communications. It indicates the Committee's involvement with the mass communications and also, more generally, the scope that a comprehensive public relations, or at least corrective, program may have.

Second, the Committee, while responding primarily to the printed word, clearly gives a great deal of attention to the spoken word as well. Over one-fourth of the

TABLE 2

CORRECTIVE RESPONSES BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION, June 1958 to May 1960

Source of Comment	Location of Source		Method of Correction			Total
	United States	Elsewhere	Letters	Calls or Calls and Letters	Unknown	
Books, Periodicals, Pamphlets	51	69	111	9	. .	120
Syndicated Material ^a	17	19	28	8	. .	36
Sermons	29	23	12	37	3	52
Medical Talks	4	. .	3	1	. .	4
Classrooms	6	3	4	3	2	9
Libraries	4	2	1	2	3	6
Distribution (publishers, dealers, broadcasters, theaters, advertisers)	19	7	6	20	. .	26
Total	130	123	165	80	8	253

^aThe responses when The Church's Ministry of Healing appeared can only be approximated. The Manager did not request Committees to report the newspapers to which a statement he had supplied went.

Committee's corrections are of the sermon, the talk, the classroom remark, the broadcast, and the play.

Third, the Committee's chief means of correction is the letter. Two-thirds of its corrections are made by letter. The personal call, however, is the usual response to a sermon. The Committee replied to the sermon three times more often with the interview than with the letter.

Fourth, the Committee's corrective activity in and out of the United States is about equal. This indicates the international nature of the agency.

It is to be noted that the Committee responds to only a small proportion of the comments that are made on Christian Science.¹ Presumably most public comment the Committee judges to be accurate or inoffensive.

In the following two chapters we shall consider in some detail particular cases of correction.

¹The writer by actual count found 779 separate case files in the Manager's file section that contained correspondence between June 1958 and May 1960 concerning books, pamphlets, magazines, sermons, and talks. This count did not include most newspaper "Comments"; also it did not account for occasions when more than one magazine was reported in a case. The file on Christian Science Today, for instance, contained three-dozen book reviews from different periodicals. On the basis of the 779 only, the Committee's replies to 253 comments provide a proportion of one correction to three comments.

Books, Periodicals, Pamphlets

Table 3 presents a case by case list of the Committee's responses to books, pamphlets, and periodicals including newspapers. There were 120 of these responses.

The entries in the Table are given in chronological order. These contain date of reply, name of addresser, name of addressee, source of comment, and nature of addressee's reply--favorable, unfavorable, etc. In a few instances a correction recommended by the Manager but not confirmed by actual copies of a letter or letters sent by a Committee to a commentator was included in the Table figures.

TABLE 3

**CORRECTIVE RESPONSES TO
BOOKS, PERIODICALS, AND PAMPHLETS
--EXCLUDING SYNDICATED MATERIAL--
BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION^a
(1958-1960)**

Date	Correspondence (or interview)	Results ^b
June 1958	Manager to Arnold B. Rhodes, ed., <u>The Church Faces the Isms</u> (New York: Abingdon Press, 1958)	favorable
June 1958	Committee for Norway to editor of <u>Dagen</u>	- - -
June 1958	Committee for Transvaal, South Africa, to editor of <u>The Pretoria News</u>	favorable
July 1958	Committee for Victoria, Australia, to editor of <u>Presbyterian Life</u> (two letters)	favorable
July 1958	Committee for Northern California to editor of <u>San Francisco News</u>	favorable
July 1958	Interview by Committee for Illinois with the Rev. Anton Darms about two articles by him in <u>Leaves of Heal- ing</u> magazine	favorable

^aThe Table lists all corrective letters sent or interviews obtained by the Manager, area Committees, and Assistant Committees from June 1958 to May 1960.

^bResults are classified four ways: favorable, which embraces the friendly reply or friendly acknowledgment from the addressee, his acknowledgment of a book, or the publishing of a corrective letter by an editor; unfavorable reply, which includes the unmistakable rejection; equivocal or noncommittal reply; - - - or no reported reply.

TABLE 3--Continued

Date	Correspondence (or interview)	Results
July 1958	Committee for Illinois offers book to editor of <u>Covenant Weekly</u>	- - -
July 1958	Interview by Committee for Natal, South Africa, with E.M. Darroll about his pamphlet, <u>The Great Physician or Family Doctor</u>	favorable
Aug. 1958	Committee for Hampshire, England, to Rev. C.J.P. Godman, about article in St. Luke's Church parish magazine	- - -
Aug. 1958	District Manager to editor of Children's Page, <u>Church Times</u>	- - -
Aug. 1958	Committee for New Zealand to editor of <u>Parish Notes</u> , St. Mary's Timaru parish magazine	- - -
Aug. 1958	Manager to editor, <u>The Pennsylvania Medical Journal</u>	- - -
Sept. 1958	Manager recommends book to Thomas Ford Hault, author of <u>The Sociology of Religion</u> (New York: Dryden Press, 1958)	- - -
Sept. 1958	Manager to Edward J. Tanis, <u>What The Sects Teach</u> (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1958)	- - -
Sept. 1958	District Manager to Dorothee Hoch, author of booklet, <u>Healing and Salvation</u> (London: SCM Press, Ltd., [first published in English in 1958])	unfavorable

TABLE 3--Continued

Date	Correspondence (or interview)	Results
Sept. 1958	Manager to Samuel G. Kling, author of <u>The Popular Legal Encyclopedia for Home and Business</u> (Garden City, New York: Hanover House, 1957)	favorable
Sept. 1958	Committee for New Zealand to editor of <u>Wanganui Chronicle</u>	favorable
Sept. 1958	Committee for County Antrim, Northern Ireland, to editor of <u>The Irish Evangelical</u>	- - -
Oct. 1958	Committee for Tasmania to the Rev. F. Maling, about comment in his <u>News Letter</u>	unfavorable
Oct. 1958	Committee for Quebec to editor of <u>Montreal Gazette</u>	favorable
Oct. 1958	District Manager to editor, <u>The Public Employees' Journal</u>	- - -
Oct. 1958	District Manager to editor, <u>Stockport Advertiser</u>	favorable
Oct. 1958	Interview by Assistant in Illinois with minister about an article in <u>Herald of Peace</u> church magazine (mimeographed)	favorable
Oct. 1958	Committee for Italy to Luigi Fassio, writer for <u>Novella</u> periodical	- - -
Oct. 1958	Committee for Southern California to Philip E. Wheelwright, author of <u>The Way of Philosophy</u> (New York: Odyssey Press, 1954)	favorable

TABLE 3--Continued

Date	Correspondence (or interview)	Results
Oct. 1958	(Acting) Committee for Transvaal, South Africa, to editor of <u>Die Vaderland</u> newspaper	favorable
Oct. 1958	Committee for Sweden to Herbert Tingsten; second letter in December sent with a book after article by him appeared in <u>Dagens Nyheter</u> newspaper	equivocal
Nov. 1958	Committee for Sweden to editor of <u>Sjuffe Tidningen</u> newspaper	favorable
Nov. 1958	District Manager to editor of <u>Parish Review</u> , St. Stephen's Rochester Row (Westminster)	- - -
Nov. 1958	(Acting) Committee for Transvaal, South Africa, to editor of <u>Heart</u> periodical (The Nurses' Christian Fellowship)	- - -
Nov. 1958	Committee for New South Wales, Australia, to editor of <u>The Witness</u> periodical (Presbyterian Fellowship Union)	- - -
Nov. 1958	Committee for New Zealand to editor of <u>The Press</u>	- - -
Dec. 1958	Manager to Calvin H. Chambers, author of booklet, <u>Christian Science, Is it Christian? Is it Scientific?</u> (Toronto: The Presbyterian Church in Canada, n.d.)	unfavorable

TABLE 3--Continued

Date	Correspondence (or interview)	Results
Dec. 1958	Committee for Washington state to S. C. Eastvold about article by him in <u>The Tacoma Sunday News Tribune and Ledger</u> ; also letter to editor.	- - -
Dec. 1958	Manager to Raymond P. Holden, author of <u>The Merrimack</u> (New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1958)	unfavorable
Dec. 1958	Committee for Southern California to editor of <u>Santa Barbara Daily News Press</u>	favorable
Jan. 1959	District Manager to Rev. F. A. Steer of <u>Parish Magazine</u> , All Saints, Wokingham	- - -
Jan. 1959	District Manager to editor of <u>Church Times</u>	- - -
Feb. 1959	Manager to B. Z. Goldberg about his articles in <u>The Day--Jewish Journal</u>	favorable
Feb. 1959	Committee for Ontario to editor of <u>Maclean's</u> magazine	- - -
Feb. 1959	Manager to Stow Persons, author of <u>American Minds--A History of Ideas</u> (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1958)	favorable
Feb. 1959	Committee for New Mexico recommends book to Herman Decker, compiler of humanities syllabus	- - -
Feb. 1959	District Manager to editor of <u>Ilford Recorder</u>	favorable

TABLE 3--Continued

Date	Correspondence (or interview)	Results
Feb. 1959	Committee for Cornwall, England, to editor of <u>The Cornishman</u>	favorable
Feb. 1959	District Manager to editor of <u>Kent and Sussex Courier</u>	- - -
Feb. 1959	Committee for Italy to writer in <u>Rotosei</u> newspaper	- - -
Mar. 1959	Manager to Bryan R. Wilson about article in <u>Hibbert Journal</u>	equivocal
Mar. 1959	Committee for Brazil to writer in <u>O Cruzeiro</u> magazine	- - -
Mar. 1959	Committee for Georgia to editor of <u>The Atlanta Constitution</u>	favorable
Mar. 1959	District Manager to Geoffrey Murray, author of <u>Frontiers of Healing</u> (London: Max Parrish and Co., Ltd., 1958)	favorable
Mar. 1959	District Manager to Mary Ellison, author of <u>The Adopted Child</u> (London: Victor Gollancz, Ltd., 1958)	favorable
Apr. 1959	Manager to Edmund D. Soper, author of <u>The Inevitable Choice: Vedanta Philosophy or Christian Gospel</u> (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957)	unfavorable
Apr. 1959	Manager to E. Gartly Jaco, ed., <u>Patients, Physicians and Illness</u> (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1958)	- - -

TABLE 3--Continued

Date	Correspondence (or interview)	Results
Apr. 1959	Assistant Committee for Berlin and East Germany to Gert von Natzmer, author of <u>Die geistigen Mächte unseres Jahrhunderts</u> (Berlin: Safari-Verlag, 1958)	- - -
Apr. 1959	Committee for North Dakota to <u>First Lutheran Sentinel</u> (Minot)	- - -
Apr. 1959	Committee for Texas to editor of <u>The Word of Truth</u> (Garland)	- - -
Apr. 1959	Manager to editor of <u>Sunday School Adults</u> (Southern Baptist Convention)	favorable
Apr. 1959	Committee for Western Australia to editor of <u>Melville News</u>	favorable
Apr. 1959	Committee for Ontario to the Rev. L. H. Fowler about article in <u>Toronto Daily Star</u>	favorable
Apr. 1959	Committee for Mississippi to editor of <u>The Summit Sun</u>	equivocal
May 1959	Committee for Cheshire, England to editor of <u>Cheshire Observer</u>	- - -
May 1959	Committee for South Australia to editor of <u>Truth</u> newspaper (Melbourne)	unfavorable
May 1959	Committee for Brazil to editor of <u>Correio da Manhã</u> (Rio de Janeiro)	- - -
May 1959	Committee for Queensland, Australia, to writer in <u>Saint Paul's Post</u>	- - -

TABLE 3--Continued

Date	Correspondence (or interview)	Results
June 1959	Interview by Committee for Morocco with writer in <u>Le Petit Marocain</u>	favorable
June 1959	Telephone call by Committee for Norway to offer a book to Einar Molland, author of <u>Christendom: The Christian Churches, Their Doctrines, Constitutional Forms and Ways of Worship</u> (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959)	favorable
June 1959	Committee for Dunbartonshire, Scotland, to editor of <u>Bearsden Herald</u>	- - -
June 1959	Committee for South Australia to editor of <u>The Adelaide Church Guardian</u>	unfavorable
June 1959	Committee for West Virginia to editor, <u>The Parkersburg News</u>	- - -
June 1959	Interview by Assistant Committee in North Carolina with editor of <u>Durham Morning Herald</u>	equivocal
July 1959	Committee for Austria to editor of <u>Samstag</u>	- - -
July 1959	Committee for Norway to editor of <u>Porsgrunns Dagblad</u>	- - -
July 1959	Committee for Illinois to editor of <u>Rock Island Argus</u>	- - -
July 1959	District Manager to editor of <u>Inquirer</u>	- - -

TABLE 3--Continued

Date	Correspondence (or interview)	Results
July 1959	Committee for Washington state to editor of <u>Prophetic Herald</u> (Spokane)	- - -
July 1959	Committee for Brazil to editor of <u>O Estado de S. Paulo</u>	- - -
July 1959	Committee for Colorado to editor of <u>Baptist Missionary-Evangelist</u> (Denver)	- - -
Aug. 1959	Committee for France to editor of <u>La Libre Santé</u> magazine	- - -
Aug. 1959	Committee for Nebraska to editor of <u>Norfolk Daily News</u>	- - -
Sept.1959	Committee for Illinois to Paddock Publications	favorable
Sept.1959	Committee for New Zealand to editor of Dunedin <u>Evening Star</u> (along with interview)	favorable
Sept.1959	District Manager to editor of <u>British Weekly</u>	favorable
Sept.1959	Manager recommends book to Francis P. Weisenburger, author of <u>Ordeal of Faith, the Crisis of Church-going America, 1865-1900</u> (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959)	favorable
Sept.1959	Manager to the Very Rev. Neophytos Spyros about <u>Greek Orthodox Handbook 1958</u> (New York: Greek Archdiocese of North and South America)	- - -

TABLE 3--Continued

Date	Correspondence (or interview)	Results
Oct. 1959	Manager to editor of <u>Excelsior!</u> (<u>The Vegetarian "Elect"</u>) magazine	- - -
Oct. 1959	Committee for Brazil to editor of <u>Gemeindeblatt</u> (German Evangelical Community of Rio de Janeiro)	- - -
Oct. 1959	Manager to Erdman Harris, author of <u>God's Image and Man's Imagination</u> (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959)	- - -
Oct. 1959	Manager to Richard T. LaPiere, author of <u>The Freudian Ethic</u> (New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1959)	favorable
Oct. 1959	Committee for Norway to editor of <u>Verdens Gang</u>	favorable
Nov. 1959	Committee for Illinois to <u>The Spy</u> (student publication of Second Presbyterian Church, Bloomington)	- - -
Nov. 1959	Manager recommends a book to John Lewis, author of <u>The Religions of the World Made Simple</u> (Garden City, New York: Garden City Books, 1958)	- - -
Nov. 1959	Committee for Washington state to editor of <u>Greenwood-Aurora Outlook</u> (Seattle)	favorable
Nov. 1959	District Manager to editor of <u>The National Message</u> (letters sent on Nov. 26, Dec. 31, and Mar. 4)	favorable

TABLE 3--Continued

Date	Correspondence (or interview)	Results
Nov. 1959	District Manager to editor of <u>One and All</u> periodical	- - -
Nov. 1959	Committee for Hampshire, England, to editor of <u>Bournemouth Evening Echo</u> (letters sent on Nov. 26, Dec. 5, Dec. 17)	- - -
Dec. 1959	Committee for Georgia to editor of <u>Gainesville Daily Times</u>	- - -
Dec. 1959	Committee for Lancashire, England, to editor of <u>Radcliffe Times</u>	- - -
Dec. 1959	Committee for Texas to editor of <u>The Baptist Standard</u> magazine; subsequently to writer of article	favorable
Jan. 1960	Committee for Virginia to editor of <u>Presbyterian Outlook</u>	- - -
Jan. 1960	Manager to editor of <u>Crossroads</u> magazine	- - -
Jan. 1960	Interview by Assistant Committee in Illinois with the Rev. O. F. Jordan about an article of his in the <u>Park Ridge Herald</u>	equivocal
Jan. 1960	District Manager to editor of <u>The Priory</u> parish magazine	- - -
Feb. 1960	Committee for Northumberland, England, to editor of <u>Sunday Sun</u>	- - -
Feb. 1960	Committee for Italy to editor of <u>Orizzonti</u> weekly	- - -

TABLE 3--Continued

Date	Correspondence (or interview)	Results
Feb. 1960	Committee for Western Australia to editor of <u>Kalgoorlie Miner</u>	- - -
Feb. 1960	Committee for New Zealand to editor of <u>Wanganui Herald</u>	- - -
Mar. 1960	Committee for France to editor of <u>Réalités</u>	- - -
Mar. 1960	Committee for France to editor of <u>L'Express</u> weekly	favorable
Mar. 1960	Committee for Northern California to Mrs. Aileen T. Kulchar about her column in <u>San Francisco Call Bulletin</u>	- - -
Mar. 1960	Interview by Committee for Transvaal, South Africa, with the Rev. Otto Verhoef about a three-page mimeographed sheet in Afrikaans on Christian Science by him; subsequent correspondence	equivocal
Mar. 1960	District Manager to editor of <u>Joyful News</u>	- - -
Mar. 1960	Committee for Northern California to editor of <u>Humboldt Times</u> (Eureka)	- - -
Mar. 1960	Committee for Lancashire, England, to editor of <u>Contact</u> (Walton-on-the-Hill parish magazine)	- - -
Apr. 1960	District Manager to editor of <u>British Medical Journal</u>	- - -

TABLE 3--Continued

Date	Correspondence (or interview)	Results
Apr. 1960	Committee for Illinois to travel editor of <u>Chicago Daily News</u>	favorable
May 1960	Manager to executive editor of <u>Together</u> magazine	equivocal
May 1960	Committee for Ohio to Robert Shuler, Sr., about article of his in <u>God's Revivalist</u> (Cincinnati)	- - -
May 1960	District Manager to editor of <u>The Spectator</u>	favorable
May 1960	Committee for Ontario recommends article to editor of <u>Victory</u> magazine	favorable
May 1960	Interview by Committee for Virginia with the Rev. Stuart H. Merriam about church bulletin of his distributed to USO Club	equivocal

TABLE 4

SUCCESS OF CORRECTIONS--BOOKS, PERIODICALS, AND PAMPHLETS

Answers to Corrections	Corrector			Source of Comment			Total
	Manager	CoPs & Assts. USA	CoPs & Assts. Elsewhere	Books	Periodicals	Pamphlets	
Favorable	7 (33%)	10 (33%)	23 (33%)	9 (45%)	30 (31%)	1 (33-1/3%)	40 (33-1/3%)
Unfavorable	3 (14-1/2%)	..	4 (6%)	3 (15%)	3 (3%)	1 (33-1/3%)	7 (6%)
Equivocal	2 (9-1/2%)	4 (13%)	2 (3%)	..	7 (7%)	1 (33-1/3%)	8 (6-2/3%)
No report	9 (43%)	16 (54%)	40 (58%)	8 (40%)	57 (59%)	..	65 (54%)
Total	21 (100%)	30 (100%)	69 (100%)	20 (100%)	97 (100%)	3 (100%)	120 (100%)

Table 4 provides an indication of the Committee's success in its corrective work. The Table compares data from Table 3 in the various classifications, "Answers to Corrections," "Corrector," and "Source of Comment."

A few conclusions might be drawn from this Table. First, there are clearly more favorable than unfavorable responses. Favorable responses, in fact, constitute one-third of the total of all responses. This seems to indicate a degree of success.

Second, neither the corrector nor the nature of the publication involved seems to have much effect on a reply's success. We do not find, on the basis of the chi-square test of significance, that there is sufficient evidence to say that the Manager writes more successful corrections than the Committees in the field or vice versa. Nor can we assert that there is a difference in success between corrections

of books and corrections of periodicals.¹

Third, the Manager's office is not informed on the success or lack of success, reckoned in terms of responses, of its corrective work. The largest category in Table 4 is "No reports." The lack of reports may mean that the addressee did not respond to a letter or that an area Committee failed to report a response to the Manager. Either way, the high proportion of unreported responses makes any evaluation of the Committee's success ambiguous.

¹Chi-square tests are based on the following four-fold contingency tables. The rows of Table 4 are combined and the "Pamphlet" array dropped in order to gain sufficiently high expected frequencies in the cells. (See Quinn McNemar, Psychological Statistics (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1955), p.222.)

	Manager	Area Committees	
Favorable	7	32	Chi-square is .03
Other	13	65	$P < .90$
	Books	Periodicals	
Favorable	9	30	Chi-square is 1.48
Other	11	67	$P < .30$

The test of success, the inquirer is told, is anyway not a favorable response or any response from an addressee.¹ Apparently the Committee writes a letter as something of an end in itself. It is enough, evidently, if the letter wins the attention of an author, puts information at his disposal, and is sufficiently self-contained to save him from writing to the Committee further.

We next turn to some cases of correction, drawn from the Manager's files. Of 120 total cases, 25 are to be presented in detail on the following pages. These include all corrections of authors undertaken by the Manager with the exception of three brief letters sent primarily to convey or recommend a book.² The Manager's office writes nearly all letters to authors of books,³ and advises on the more complex and important corrections that area Committees undertake.

Each case presented in this chapter is serially numbered and presented in two sections--a summary of the correspondence and a discussion. The order of the

¹Interview with a staff member, May 25, 1962.

²These were in September 1958, September 1959, and November 1959. See Table 3.

³The Manager handled all replies to books in the United States except one.

presentation is designed to serve the coherency of discussing the cases.

(1) In early summer 1958 the Manager of the Committees, Will B. Davis, wrote to an editor of a volume prepared by the faculty of a Presbyterian seminary. In his letter, the Manager took up four points that the book had made about Christian Science.

The first point was that Christian Science taught docetism. This is the doctrine that Jesus was superhuman, on the order of a specter, and only seemed to be human and in the flesh. Mr. Davis denied that Christian Science held such a view.

After several introductory sentences (e.g., "You and your collaborators are to be congratulated on the scope and seriousness of your undertaking . . ."), the Manager explained that "Science and Health repeatedly refers to the bodily existence of the Master"--to his full humanity in the flesh. The Manager quoted Science and Health on this as follows:

They who earliest saw Jesus after the resurrection and beheld the final proof of all that he had

taught, misconstrued that event. Even his disciples at first called him a spirit, ghost, or spectre, for they believed his body to be dead. His reply was: "Spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." The reappearing of Jesus was not the return of a spirit. He presented the same body that he had before his crucifixion, and so glorified the supremacy of Mind¹ over matter.²

A second point concerned healing. Christian Science healing is "vastly different," the Manager stated, from "steadfastly affirming that matter does not exist," as the book had asserted. Not such a negative affirmation but rather "the conscious yielding to God's all-power . . . brings healing."

To us the spiritual understanding of God includes a recognition that matter has "reality" only to the consciousness that is alienated from God; but it is the conscious yielding to God's all-power that brings healing. This is certainly a positive rather than a negative process.³

¹"Mind" capitalized is a synonym for God.

²Science and Health, p. 45:22-31. Also cites Science and Health, p. 482:20-25; and part of John 6:63 and Colossians 3:9, 10. (Quotations from the Bible and Mrs. Eddy's writings that appear in letters and are not provided in the text will usually be cited in a footnote as here.)

³Cites Science and Health, p. 1:1-4. On the same point, the Manager told a magazine editor: "Christian Scientists would not agree for a minute that so negative a statement as 'Material substance is an illusion' is their fundamental principle. That would be like saying two and two is not five, instead of two and two is four, as the fundamental fact about two and two." The Manager said that the point properly put would be, "God is All, matter is illusion." Manager to Look editor, re The Story of America's Religions, October 21, 1958. Item #1087.

A third point was about the Christian Scientist's attitude toward the natural sciences. Christian Science does not, the Manager declared, dismiss these sciences, as the book had implied. This conclusion is not justified from the doctrinal teaching about matter.

In the first place,

many Christian Scientists in universities and research laboratories are doing work in the natural sciences, including nuclear physics, with a recognition that until we can demonstrate the total control of all materiality by Spirit, as Jesus did, we must utilize the (constantly changing) methods of material science in many areas of human experience.

Also the natural sciences themselves had undergone "a startling revolution" as to the concept of matter. The Manager cited three authorities in the natural sciences on this.

The fourth point concerned public attitudes toward Mrs. Eddy and Christian Scientists today. Contrary to the book's assertion, by no means "all" churchmen of other faiths would agree, the Manager said, to a derogatory view. Among appreciative churchmen might be numbered Lyman P. Powell, an Episcopal clergyman who

"deeply admired" Mrs. Eddy and wrote a biography of her now published by the Church. Also the well-known Lutheran church historian, Karl Holl, wrote, he said, a "very sympathetic" article to be found in his Gesammelte Aufsätze.¹ A lay writer and Presbyterian, Norman Beasley, has written more recently two books on Christian Science and has gone "even further in . . . appreciation . . ."

The Manager concluded the letter:

Our happy relations with many other clergymen and laymen of the older denominations contribute to our gratitude for the growing Christian fellowship between the churches. I'm sure that a clearer understanding of the theology and practice of Christian Science by the members of your faculty would erase some of the barriers that seem to divide us.²

The editor of the theological work acknowledged Mr. Davis's letter a few weeks later. He said he appreciated the comments and would take them up with the responsible contributors.³

¹For imprint, see p. 93, fn. 2.

²Cites Mrs. Eddy's Pulpit and Press (1895, 1923), p. 22:9-13, 16-19.

³Letters cited are dated June 6 and 23, 1958.
Item #75.

Discussion. The Manager dealt in this letter with four points. There was the assertion that Christian Science was docetism and denied the humanity of the one its adherents hold as "Master" and "Way-shower." A denomination which considers itself Christian would obviously take as very serious a comment that it judged slighted the place and dignity it allowed to Christ Jesus.

The three other points the Manager took up were likewise hardly trivial--that Christian Science healing is mainly a negative affirmation with little attention paid to God; that the religious teaching belittles the natural sciences and their momentous contributions; and finally that the knowledgeable nonadherent has only contempt for Mrs. Eddy and Christian Scientists.

The Manager denied these assertions and cited certain facts and quotations from the basic literature to support his argument. He did not question the motives or purposes of the commentators but, instead, in a final paragraph, identified them and himself in the "growing Christian fellowship."

(2) Docetism again was a subject in a January 1960 letter. The Manager wrote to Dr. John H. Fry, editor of Crossroads magazine, published in Philadelphia. The October-December 1959 issue of this magazine had labeled Christian Science as an example of contemporary gnosticism.

In his denial, the Manager argued:

Christian Science is far closer to traditional Western Christianity than to any of the forms of Gnostic or Docetic thought with which it is sometimes mistakenly identified. It accepts the fact that the Word became flesh and dwelt among us. It accepts the fact that through his crucifixion and resurrection Christ Jesus "abolished death, and . . . brought life and immortality to light."¹

The place and meaning of substance or matter again was at issue. Jesus overcame ills and evils, the Manager said; they therefore

cannot have had the same validity or legitimacy as the spiritual power with which he vanquished them. If a man "full of leprosy" could become in an instant "whole" when confronted by the authority of the Christ,² then this proves that matter itself must be something very different from what it appears to the physical senses to be.

Again the Manager mentioned the "revolution" in physics regarding the conception of substance and noted

¹From II Tim. 1:10.

²From Luke 5:12.

that traditional views had been overturned.

Of course, even a Niels Bohr or a Werner Heisenberg today describes matter in terms that would have been incomprehensible to the naive materialism of the nineteenth century, to which some theologians still cling; but the mere translation of matter into energy does not of itself explain the healings of Jesus--or, for that matter, the healings of Christian Science.

Christian Science denies matter, the Manager indicated, because of a greater reality:

It is the living sense of Spirit as ultimate reality and the allied recognition of matter as a false mode of consciousness (or misconception of reality) . . . ¹

But "particularity" is not ruled out. Christian Science is "immensely concerned" with the "here and now," with the healing of sin and suffering in present human experience. ²

The Manager acknowledged

differences of viewpoint and terminology in our respective positions, but I know that neither you nor [the article writer] would unwittingly misrepresent Christian Science in your pages. ³

Discussion. As in these first two cases, so in the

¹Cites part of John 6:63.

²Cites Science and Health, p. 350:24-27.

³Letter is dated January 7, 1960. Item #1027.

chapter as a whole, a recurring issue in the Committee's replies is the place given to Christ Jesus--his teaching, lifework, and divine status. It is a point that the Committee obviously is sensitive about and that theological critics of the older Christian churches often raise.

Both letters denied a comparison to docetism. Both also explained the Christian Scientists' view of matter. The critics evidently had drawn a connection between the two. They may have been concerned that a view which reduces faith in matter before a faith in Spirit seemed also to challenge faith in the human Jesus as well, particularly faith in the human Jesus as God.

The Manager cited natural scientists in both letters. In the first, it quoted astronomer Sir James Jeans, biologist Edward W. Sinnott, and geologist Kirtley Mather.¹ In the second, it referred to physicists Niels Bohr and Werner Heisenberg. The Manager cited outside authority to indicate the existence

¹Jeans: "The universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine"; Sinnott: "Matter in the old sense indeed has ceased to be"; Mather: matter is "nothing moving very quickly."

of authoritative views on matter apart from the traditional ones. He apparently did not try to support his own particular concept of substance by the outside authority or to identify the natural sciences with his religious beliefs. From the two letters respectively:

The new physics is certainly not Christian Science . . .

the mere translation of matter into energy does not of itself explain the healings of Jesus--or, for that matter, the healings of Christian Science.

(3) Two letters took up the Christian Science view of Jesus and the meaning of death. The first was to Edward J. Tanis about comments on Christian Science in his book, What The Sects Teach.

The Manager directed the letter at the author's interpretation about the doctrinal point in Christian Science that death is ultimately unreal. By this, "we are not denying the dissolution of the physical body," the Manager explained, "but we are denying that this touches the existence of the real, spiritual identity of man." Jesus, through his "spiritual identity," was

empowered to abolish death and to set forth immortality:

We certainly do not deny that Jesus' material body passed through the physical experience of death; but we do say that this could not extinguish for a moment his eternal, spiritual life as the Christ, the Son of God.

That Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead and himself in the Resurrection

pointed to the real immortality of man, despite the apparently conclusive evidence of the material senses that man comes to an end.

Christian Scientists believe, not that man will enjoy physical immortality, but rather that he will awake through the saving Christ to his true spiritual immortality.¹

(4) The second letter went to the editor of a Baptist periodical. A 1959 issue of this magazine had asserted that Mrs. Eddy taught that Jesus at the Crucifixion only acted as though he were dead.

The Manager wrote that this assertion is "truly contrary" to the facts. She held that Jesus passed through physical death

¹Cites John 11:26; 8:51; 11:11,14. Letter is dated September 9, 1958. Item #631.

as fully as has anyone else who was ever killed and buried. But . . . his conscious awareness of immortality--of God as his very Life--was never for an instant extinguished. In this sense he was alive--consciously alive to his oneness with God--even while the body lay lifeless.

Jesus won in the Resurrection "an everlasting victory" for himself and for all mankind, namely that the death of the material body could not affect the true spiritual life of man.¹

The chapter in Science and Health on "Atonement and Eucharist" would, the Manager recommended, throw further authoritative light on the views Christian Scientists have of Jesus.

A few days later the editor acknowledged that a mistake had occurred and expressed his regret.²

Discussion. In both letters, the Manager struck at semantic difficulties. He said in the first:

Disagreements can rest on semantic as well as on doctrinal differences and several of your statements about Christian Science apparently rest on a misunderstanding of our terminology.

The chief semantic difficulty lay in the term "unreality"--the unreality of death. The Manager indicated

¹Cites part of II Tim. 1:10.

²Letters are dated April 16 and 28, 1959.
Item #1144.

that both authors had misinterpreted what the Scientists mean. Christian Science does not deny, he explained, the "physical experience," but does deny that this physical experience has any effect on a higher, positive reality.

The Manager's sensitivity to comment on the religion's view of Jesus was again indicated. In the first of the two cases, the Manager stated about the comment on Christian Science:

since it touches upon our views of the Master I am sure you can understand how concerned we are that this point be stated correctly.

The letters asked that an honest difference of view be granted. From the first:

You may disagree with our interpretation but I do not see how you can call it "deliberate distortion of the Bible" any more than we could call your misunderstanding of our teachings a deliberate distortion of them.

From the second:

There doubtless are differences between our respective interpretations of the Christian message, but we feel that your own Christian spirit would not permit you willingly to misrepresent another's teaching.

(5) The Manager further discussed the "unreal" in

explaining the Christian Scientist's view of evil to the Methodist Together in May 1960. The magazine that month had commented on Christian Science in an article on "How to Explain Hard Luck" by James E. Sellers.

On May 10 the Manager wrote to the magazine's executive editor:

Even though Christian Scientists deny the reality of evil, they do not do this in an offhand or naive way. They are profoundly aware of the concrete appearances of evil in human life . . . There is a deep spiritual logic underlying their conviction that since God did not create evil it is not a real, legitimate, or necessary part of His creation . . .

Christ Jesus "wiped out" evil on the basis of "this divinely true fact." His example Christian Scientists endeavor to follow and

prove by their lives and their healing that God did not attach evil to man as a terrible, incapable reality.¹

A few days later, the associate editor of

¹The Committee's letters usually refer to the experiential proof at some point. Said the Committee for Texas: "when one has experienced the healing power of God, time after time, he leaves the doubts to others. He knows God has healed him." CoP for Texas to editor of The Word of Truth, April 15, 1959. Item #1170. Said the ~~Committee for France~~: "The question for him [the Scientist] is not to possess the Truth but to endeavor to put it into practice, a matter which does not belong to the realm of controversy, but of experience." CoP for France to editor of Réalitiés, March 9, 1960. Item #1185.

Together sent a friendly acknowledgment and said he was forwarding the letter to the author.¹

(6) The nature of evil was the subject of another letter, this time sent in Germany. In April 1958 Helmuth Findert, Assistant Committee on Publication for the Eastern Zone of Germany and Berlin, wrote to Gert von Natzmer about comment in his book, Die geistigen Mächte unseres Jahrhunderts, one of a series on "Die Welt des Wissens."

Herr Findert explained:

It is often said by critics that Christian Scientists ignore the evil in the world, but he who knows the daily paper of our movement, "The Christian Science Monitor"--and it is widely read by persons in public life, and highly valued for its correct news--knows also that it is always ready to uncover the wrong in thinking and acting, so that it may be healed.

By pondering "a great deal the perfect spiritual creation of God," the Christian Scientist overcomes the "oppressing suggestions of material sense."²

The Assistant Committee took up two further points. He denied that delegates ("Abgesandten") from the United States exercise authority over the German churches. Christian Science lecturers, who may be said to have the

¹Letters dated May 10 and 18, 1960. Item #539.

²Cites Science and Health, p. 346:6-13.

character of delegates, lecture by invitation only and "have nothing to do . . . with internal matters of the churches."

Regarding an objection by the author to the word "Science" ("Wissenschaft") in the name of the religion, the Assistant Committee noted that even in English there were difficulties. In both languages "the common usage of the word is far from the exalted meaning given to it by Mrs. Eddy . . ." ¹

Discussion. The Manager had advised the Assistant about the author, "He certainly needs to know that we do not ignore evil but heal it." The Assistant sought to do this by placing the question in the context of church activities. He pointed to the respect with which the Church's daily newspaper is held for its reports on public affairs, the bad as well as the good.

¹Cites Science and Health, p. 349:24-30. Letter is dated April 8, 1959. Item #254. That the Scientists have some success in explaining their view of evil to outsiders was indicated in a report that a Christian Science speaker gave on his address to an outside group. He reported that a member of his audience told him, "I have always been puzzled as to the origin of evil, but I understand your explanation. Christian Science certainly sheds much new light on the Bible." Man. to E.O., July 23, 1959 (talk-report summary).

(7) One letter covered a wide range of subjects. On September 29, 1959, the Manager wrote to The Very Rev. Neophytos Spyros of the Department of Publications, Greek Orthodox Archdiocese in New York City. The Manager wrote about the Greek Orthodox Handbook 1958, which contained a section on "The Church of Christ Scientist or Eddyism."

The Manager in his letter took up five points that he believed were misstated. This time he corrected these mainly by citing quotations from Science and Health. Quotations alone carried three of the points--the divinity of Christ, a point "basic to the teachings of Christian Science"¹; the Resurrection of Christ Jesus, "also basic"²; and angels.³

A fourth point concerned again "unreality"--this time the unreality of sin. Christian Scientists deny sin, the Manager explained, only in the sense they are unable to believe "that sin has been created, ordained, or legitimized by God, the creator of all that is real and permanent." Furthermore,

¹Cites Science and Health, pp. 25:31-32; 26:12-14.

²Cites ibid., p. 317:20-23.

³Cites ibid., p. 299:11-17.

the hundreds of references to sin in Science and Health show that Christian Scientists take very seriously the need of freeing themselves from sin and all error.

A fifth point concerned Jesus. Scientists regard Jesus "as the Saviour who has come to awaken mankind from its involvement in sin and mortality."¹

A sixth point involved the healing work. On this, the Manager explained:

The evidence that Christian Science heals the diseases you name has mounted steadily through the years and has been convincing to many insurance companies and other objective observers.

The Manager referred to a letter of his on the healing accomplishments that had been published in The American Journal of Sociology.²

In concluding, he said he was enclosing a pamphlet which would provide further information on the points taken up in the reply.³

Discussion. Here the Manager handled six points, potentially complex and theologically basic. He chose to rely on quotations to do this, a procedure which is--

¹Cites Ibid., p. 39:4-9.

²See p. 58, fn. 1.

³Letter is dated September 29, 1959. Item #122.

as noted in the last chapter--exceptional. He may have judged that the circumstances warranted the authority that quotations from the official sources might convey. Science and Health, the Manager declared in his letter,

is the authoritative exposition of Christian Science in all matters of doctrinal interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.¹

The Manager very likely selected the quotations carefully in order to avoid extraneous points which might confuse:

You will find some of the terminology unfamiliar, but the meaning should be plain in all cases.

Several sources reported the Greek Orthodox book. One Assistant Committee on Publication in North Carolina learned of it at a talk he gave on Christian Science to an outside group. A Methodist minister attended the talk because, as he explained to the Assistant, he had read the part on Christian Science,

¹The hope is always, of course, to turn the critic to a closer perusal of Science and Health, which, the Committee believes, will stand up under the most critical analysis. On occasion, the Manager has remarked on the aid that quotations in critical literature are. Once he stated: "It is possible that the numerous quotations from Mrs. Eddy's writings may in some cases have a good effect and encourage certain readers to look into Christian Science from its authentic sources." Man. to CoP for New South Wales, re Christian Science and the Christian Scriptures Compared and Contrasted, October 28, 1958. Item #57.

had been "shocked" by it, and was "anxious" to learn of its accuracy firsthand from the Assistant.

(8) The nature of God received attention in several of the Committee's corrections. This was the subject of a reply to Erdman Harris about comment in his book, God's Image and Man's Imagination.

In a letter in October 1959 the Manager explained the religion's view of the Person of God. The aspect for special attention was the "personal encounter" with Him. Christian Science takes God as both infinite Person and divine Principle, the Manager said. He cited the theologian Paul Tillich on the logic of this:

. . . Tillich's point that God's ontological character as being itself is not inconsistent with the personal encounter with Him, and with His nature as Love and Life and Spirit, as learned through revelatory experience, was emphasized many years ago by Mrs. Eddy. Thus she defined God as infinite Principle and as infinite Person, as Being and as Father-Mother.

Also there were lesser issues and "inadvertent slips." The author had misquoted a passage from Science and Health (page 16:27) on the meaning of the

second verse of the Lord's Prayer: not "O Great Father-Mother God," as the author had cited it, but "Our Father-Mother God." He had allowed only one-fourth the actual number of churches in the United States: not 650 churches but 2,450. He had erred in asserting that Christian Science teaches that death takes man immediately from materiality to spirituality: "death changes nothing," only "the step-by-step process" of spiritual growth on both sides of death. He had missed the important distinction Christian Science "draws between mortal man and man in God's image and likeness."¹ And he had misstated the religion's view of the Incarnation, Crucifixion, and Resurrection.

The Manager enclosed a second letter on the last point that he had prepared several years before. He also forwarded to the author a copy of a book and recommended parts in it which explained further the Christian Scientist's view of God as Person.²

Discussion. As in cases #1 and #2, the Manager cited

¹Cites Science and Health, p. 476:13-15, 21-22.

²Letter is dated October 19, 1959. Item #118.

here an outside authority. He did this not to support, apparently, his own particular religious views so much as to suggest that Christian Science is not alone in its challenge to tradition. Tillich also challenges, the Manager indicated, a traditional view that God cannot be both Person and Being.

The Committee narrowly uses outside authority. It thereby largely escapes raising questions as to how the authority and Christian Science differ. Along with any parallel there may after all be vast dissimilarities.

The Committee, as in this case, often sends with a correction a pamphlet, book, or magazine article. This gives recognition to the limitations of a letter. The Manager remarked to a Committee on one occasion about a writer and an editor, "If they would read the article it would correct their misconceptions more than a brief letter could possibly do . . ."¹

(9) Some months before, in April 1959, the Committee for Texas, David E. Sleeper, had also taken up the question,

¹Man. to CoP for Ontario, re Victory magazine, May 18, 1960. Item #1159.

Is God a Person? Writing to the editor of The Word of Truth, a periodical of a Baptist church in Garland, Texas, he explained:

If "person" . . . is meant to indicate that God is a finite personality, shaped like a mortal, with good and evil characteristics, then it is true we do not accept such a concept of God. We regard Him as infinite, omnipresent, immortal Spirit. But it would be profane for us to consider Him nothing more than an influence in men's lives.

Further on the nature of God, Christian Scientists do not take Jesus as God. While they fully accept "the humanity of Jesus," they do not, the Committee explained, "accept the doctrine that the human Jesus was God . . ."¹ They draw a distinction between "the deific

¹Since Christian Scientists are unable to accept Jesus as God, some churchmen dismiss them as Christian. This is, presumably, a theological obstacle to their joining the World Council of Churches, which requires the confession of "our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour," and also The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Not all authorities in the older churches limit the Christian to the one who accepts this confession, however. The Methodist clergyman and professor of history and literature of religion, Charles S. Braden, considers that the Christian Scientists are Christian. In Christian Science Today, he asks rhetorically: "Are they Christian? Of course they are. Traced historically, Christian Science is an offshoot of Protestant Christianity. . . . Any group which makes the Bible the basis of its faith and makes Christ so central as Christian Scientists do can hardly be refused the name Christian. . . . Christian Science is a modern restatement of the Christian faith developed by Mary Baker Eddy" (pp. 9 and 10).

nature of the Christ" and the human Jesus who was "the ideal manifestation" in the flesh of the Christ.¹

(10) One letter on the question whether Jesus is God turned into a highly polemic exchange. During the winter of 1959-1960 the District Manager for Great Britain carried on a running debate in The National Message. It started over a brief remark in an article in the November 1959 issue and led to three published letters by him. Only the third letter, published in April 1960, need be cited here.

The District Manager argued in his last letter to the editor that traditional Christian theology was wrong on several counts. There are, he said,

dissimilarities between Christian Science and traditional Christian theology. There are-- to the exact extent, indeed, that traditional Christian theology itself differs from original Christianity. It should never be forgotten that, by the time the early Fathers finally settled the creeds, "the things of this world" had already so blinded the minds of men that the power to heal by spiritual means alone was already lost to the Christianity they were trying to define.

Thus no reference to the healing practice--the "hallmark"-- of original Christianity appears in the creeds. "Pure

¹Cites Science and Health, p. 334:10-20. Letter is dated April 15, 1959. Item #1170.

teaching " restored will inevitably differ from these.

The District Manager struck at the traditional view of Jesus as God:

by classing Jesus as God rather than the Son of God, have we not all unconsciously excused ourselves from being able to heal as he healed? . . . I deeply understand the yearning for a link between God and man which prompted the belief that God Himself became flesh in Jesus; but it is vastly important that we keep very faithful to the true nature of God, in the beliefs we formulate about Him.¹

Discussion. This letter does not seem to have been strictly in keeping with policy. For one thing, it apparently attempted to defend the religion by attacking another position rather than by explaining Christian Science, a procedure noted in Chapter III as not in favor. The letter asserted that traditional theology is wrong in terms of original Christianity, the later church fathers were blind, and the classification of Jesus as God is no more than an excuse not to heal. Furthermore, this letter, since the last of three, seems to have been part of a drawn-out published debate, which policy disfavors.

(11) Besides remarks on the religious teaching, there is also, of course, a great deal of comment on the history

¹Letter is dated March 4, 1960. Item #1104.

of Christian Science. A letter by the Manager in December 1958, for instance, took up the career of Mrs. Eddy as portrayed in a booklet put out by a denominational publisher. The letter had had a predecessor, a statement by the Manager to the publisher in April 1957. The writer of the booklet replied to this statement in October 1958.

In this, his second and last letter, the Manager answered the author's 1958 reply by questioning the author's sources of information. The author had cited the book, Mrs. Eddy Purloins from Hegel by Walter M. Haushalter¹ to support a charge he made that Mrs. Eddy plagiarized. The Manager in his letter said that this source had been discredited by Ordeal by Concordance by Conrad Henry Moehlman.

The author had also cited Mark Twain, whose criticisms are epitomized in his Christian Science (New York: Harper, 1907).² The Manager countered this source by citing Mark Twain against himself. Mark Twain was

¹The imprint is provided in Chapter III.

²As a contemporary of Mark Twain's, Mrs. Eddy answered him at least once in a letter to the New York Herald. This letter has been reprinted in her Miscellany, pp. 302-303.

evidently not consistent in his attitude toward Mrs. Eddy. While he vigorously criticized her in Christian Science, his biographer also recalls him as saying:

Christian Science is humanity's boon. Mother Eddy deserves a place in the Trinity as much as any member of it. She has organized and made available a healing principle that for two thousand years has never been employed except as the merest kind of guess-work. She is the benefactor of the age.¹

The Manager concluded with the appeal:

I suppose there has never been a religious pioneer in history, from that "pestilent fellow," Paul, through the great Reformers and down to the present day, who has not been painted in very dark colors indeed by those who have misunderstood him. . . . There is still much to be learned from Gamaliel's advice to the Council: "Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought: but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God."²

Discussion. In his reply, the Manager challenged two sources the author had cited. He did this with his own authorities. On the charge of plagiarism, obviously a serious accusation, the Manager could match the author's

¹Albert Bigelow Paine, Mark Twain: A Biography (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1912), III, p. 1271. Paine was Mark Twain's secretary. Mark Twain's daughter, Clara Clemens, provides corroboration in her book, Awake to a Perfect Day (New York: Citadel Press, 1956), p. 19.

²The Biblical quotation is from Acts 5:38, 39. Letter cited is dated December 11, 1958. Item #66.

authority with Dr. Moehlman's full-length study. The responsible writer, the Manager implied, ought not neglect Dr. Moehlman's work. The Manager also cited Mark Twain to contradict Mark Twain. The humorist's fluctuations in his estimates of Mrs. Eddy ought also not to be missed, the Manager indicated.¹

Besides raising these questions of authorities, the Manager put forward an appeal to the author's sense of fitness. It could be assumed that the writer, as a minister of the Gospel, would hardly fail to miss the comparison between Gamaliel's charity toward the first Christians and his own attitude toward adherents of the new religion.

(12) Another correction on the history had a surprising turn from policy. On December 15, 1958, the Manager wrote to an author of a popularly written, regional history of New England. The author had provided in the book a section on Mrs. Eddy, who, of course, was reared in the vicinity of Concord, New Hampshire, and lived most of her life in New England.

¹Mark Twain's inconsistencies in other directions are well known. See Russell Blankenship, American Literature As an Expression of the National Mind (New York: Henry Holt, 1949), pp. 458-471.

In his letter, the Manager referred to the author's acceptance of "the flashy psychological stereotypes of her to be found in certain debunking types of biographies." The author had provided no balance of sources, given no hearing to authorities other than the debunking ones. Among these was to be numbered Mrs. Eddy, The Biography of a Virginal Mind by Edwin F. Dakin. Regarding the author's use of this book, the Manager commented:

There is nothing in your portrait to suggest a suspicion that Dakin had told anything but the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

The Manager objected to specific points. Christian Science healing is hardly "the application of religious ecstasy to the task of healing by suggestion," a description "monumentally inexact." Mrs. Eddy did not seek and is not accepted by her followers as "the embodiment on earth of the female principle of God," an "amazing" assertion "lifted . . . from the Shakers . . . without any concern for mere facts." The author's imputations, the Manager stated, indicate an "uninhibited bias" and "lordly dogmatism."¹

¹Cites Science and Health, p. 561:22-25, to point out that the woman in St. John's Revelation, to which the writer had evidently referred, is not taken as a human person.

pamphlets. Even the "most virulent biographers," Bates and Dittemore,¹

deplore the confusion which previous biographers, including Dakin, have thrown around the subject. This admission of fact from two men who do everything they can to discredit Mrs. Eddy and who accept the Quimby claims in general, should certainly prevent any repetition of that particular falsehood.

The author replied a few weeks later. He denied the Manager's point that from bias he had mishandled his information and his sources. He explained that he fully accepted the accuracy of the Dakin biography; that he had intended no criticism of the Christian Science Church; that he had supposed Christian Scientists held "religious ecstasy" in healing to be "a real achievement"; that he believed he was free from prejudice against Mrs. Eddy; and that to deny the human weaknesses in figures of history, such as Mrs. Eddy, would "make the ultimate achievement of such figures meaningless." He offered to read recommended source materials.

The Manager in a further reply said he had meant to attribute to the author no "conscious desire to misrepresent" but rather only an "unconscious bias" reinforced by the author's imbibing "only one side of a controversial question."

¹Bates and Dittemore, Mary Baker Eddy: The Truth and the Tradition, p. 145.

It is not a question of being "offended" by such references--we don't take offense so easily! It is rather that one regrets seeing old stereotypes and new misunderstandings given further currency by intelligent writers simply through a lack of acquaintance with essential material.

A historian, such as this writer, ought to report, the Manager explained, the views of both sides when his subject, whether a historical figure or a religion, is controversial. Unlike the specialist in a field of knowledge, he ought to report the "diversity" in human life.

When an orthodox theologian, a doctor, a psychologist, or a sociologist of religion gives his explanation of what is involved in Christian Science healing (and the explanation of each is likely to differ radically from all the others) one is at least able to know the presuppositions from which he makes his pronouncement. . . . But if the historian . . . writes from any standpoint, I should think it would be from a sense of the diversity of lives and viewpoints through which his subject flows, and that this would save him from overconfident assumptions and judgments.

In closing, the Manager recommended two further volumes to the author and suggested that he read the chapter on "Prayer" in Science and Health.¹

Discussion. Because of the vast gap between "histories,"

¹Letters cited are dated December 15, 1958, and January 14 and 30, 1959. Item #178.

it is not surprising that an author might choose an un-sympathetic version. He could find a number of materials--whatever their merit--that portray Mrs. Eddy as an "hysteric" who considered herself something of a divine "embodiment," even though to the Christian Scientist this might be character assassination at its worst.¹

The issue in the Manager's letter was not the sources the author had used so much as his failure to indicate that alternative versions existed. The Manager evidently found this hard to understand since the author had announced no position except that of an objective, albeit popular, historian.

This letter had a surprising approach. We noted in Chapter III that the Committee on Publication by policy rules out the personal invective. Whatever may have been the provocation, this policy apparently was not strictly followed here. The author, stung by such epithets as "uninhibited bias," "lordly dogmatism," and "omniscient certainty," must have felt the swath of the gladiator.

¹"Mrs. Eddy was not the first great religious leader to face character assassination." Man, to F. A. Salisbury, re Theology of the Major Sects, February 15, 1960. Item #609.

As to results the author admitted little error. He did not acknowledge, for instance, the Manager's evidence against plagiarism drawn from "virulent biographers." His apologies were for offending, not for misrepresenting or misstating. His reply sounded much like a defense-- perhaps a defense before his publishers to whom the Manager had sent a copy of the first letter. Everything considered, the Manager's letter is probably to be chalked up as a failure.

Another unusual aspect of the exchange is the use the Manager made of the unfavorable Bates and Dittemore biography. The Manager pitted this unfavorable biography against a second, the Dakin volume, probably believing that the book's unsympathetic nature would appeal to the author.

Even as a wide gap exists between biographies put out by the Church and those by outsiders, so the crevasses that divide one outsider's version from another's are not insignificant. The biography by Bates and Dittemore, the Manager said, "deplores" comments by the earlier

Dakin; we might add that the later biography by Studdert Kennedy¹ differs in significant respects from the other two.

(13) The Manager provided another answer to the question introduced in the last letter in regard to Quimby. In February 1959 the Manager wrote to Dr. B. Z. Goldberg about three articles by him on Christian Science in the Yiddish The Day--Jewish Journal. The articles were part of a series on "Religion in Today's American Life."

The Manager's main point in his letter was "the religious nature" of Christian Science. The religious element, he explained, separates "completely" Christian Science from Quimbyism.

It might be that you would see both Christian Science and Mary Baker Eddy in a different perspective if you could recognize more clearly the basic religious nature of her teachings.

Quimby's son, George, who staunchly championed his father, recognized as much when he wrote:

The religion which she [Mrs. Eddy] teaches certainly is hers, for which I cannot be too thankful;

¹Hugh A. Studdert Kennedy, Mrs. Eddy.

for I should be loath to go down to my grave feeling that my father was in any way connected with "Christian Science."¹

The religious aspect is after all the essence, the Manager declared, an essence missed if Christian Science is taken as just a healing system. To Christian Scientists, whatever healing they may have experienced, "the greatest blessing of all is the new understanding of God they have received." Furthermore-- to cite Mrs. Eddy--healing sickness "is the smallest part. . . only the bugle-call" to the "emphatic purpose," namely the healing of sin.²

The Manager sent a recently published book (the writer had earlier sought literature from the Committee on Publication for New York). He concluded:

the pragmatic test of Christian Science extends far beyond bodily healing--and there is no getting away from the fact that religion, as distinct from philosophy, cannot be divorced from its practical consequences.

¹Cited by Horatio W. Dresser, ed., The Quimby Manuscripts (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1921), p. 436. Some, but by no means all, of the manuscripts published in this volume along with further "Quimby manuscripts" are on deposit at the Library of Congress. Most of ~~these are notebook entries by copyists of notes Quimby allegedly made;~~ few are in his own hand.

²Rudimental Divine Science, p. 2:23-27.

The Manager's letter was published, along with friendly comments by Dr. Goldberg, in The Day on February 13 as a fourth article on Christian Science.¹

Discussion. Because Christian Science presents the proposition that prayer can serve bodily healing and human need, some authors draw the conclusion that this religion is more man-centered than God-centered, more a contrivance for fulfilling materialistic goals than a religion for the holy worship of God. The Committee pointed out in this case that the religion's pragmatic call of healing is directed mainly at sins not sickness, salvation not bodily health, "the new understanding of God" not personal gain.

The Manager sought again to put down the redoubtable Quimby question. The Manager argued that the religious element was all important in determining whether Mrs. Eddy truly originated Christian Science or just formalized and

¹Letter cited is dated February 4, 1959. Item #1031.

institutionalized what Quimby had taught. He cited Quimby's son to support his point.

A related issue did not come out in the exchange. While Quimby's son acknowledged that Mrs. Eddy's religion was her own, he contended that she had learned from his father "the treatment of disease mentally." This issue was only peripheral, however, since mental healing hardly began with Quimby and Christian Scientists for their part evidently distinguish between their spiritual healing and psychological or mental healing.

The question of origins is perhaps the most persisting and for this reason most perplexing historical problem that the Committee faces. The teaching Mrs. Eddy put forward has been laid at the feet not only of Quimby but also of Hegel, Fichte, Schopenhauer, Swedenborg, Berkeley, and Emerson, besides little known one-time associates of hers, such as Daniel H. Spofford and James Henry Wiggin.¹

¹Sources which suggest that Mrs. Eddy's teaching has been attributed to some of these are: ~~for Hegel, see the next case (#14); for Fichte, see office memorandum~~

On these an office memorandum noted:

All these attempts help to cancel each other out, and we may reasonably hope that some day historians will come to recognize that, whether they consider Mrs. Eddy's ideas right or wrong, she drew them from her own profoundest intuitions of the Old and New Testaments.¹

(14) In March the Quimby question again was considered. The Manager wrote about it this time to a British writer, Bryan R. Wilson. His purpose was to reply to comment by Wilson on "The Origins of Christian Science: A Survey" in the January 1959 Hibbert Journal.²

The issue was Mrs. Eddy's originality. The Manager argued that her ideas were fundamentally her own, not just her misunderstanding of the insights of others, as the author had implied.

Like many another critic who is compelled by his own thesis to present Christian Science as a

mentioned in fn. 1 below; for Berkeley, see Mrs. Eddy's Message for 1901, pp. 23:23-25:16; for Emerson and Wiggin, see Mrs. Eddy's Miscellany, pp. 304:29-6 and 317-325, respectively.

¹"Memorandum on The World's Religions: Revised Edition," n.d. (ca . August 26, 1954), filed C.S. Braden. Item #320-44.

²B. R. Wilson subsequently published a book taking up Christian Science extensively, Sects and Society, A Sociological Study of Three Religious Groups in Britain (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1961).

misunderstanding of Quimbyism or Hegelianism or something else, you state that "it does not show a clear or complete comprehension of Hegelianism." How could it, and why should it, since it rests on a fundamental postulate utterly different from Hegel's? Christian Science stems from Mrs. Eddy's own understanding of the nature of God and man, not from her misunderstanding of someone else's teaching on the subject.

The author ought to be able to recognize her originality, the Manager said, even though he was unable to accept what he called the "revelatory explanation."

The author in considering her sources should not have so underestimated the Bible. Whether or not he could agree with Mrs. Eddy's interpretation of it, he might have recognized, the Manager pointed out, the fact that she drew from the Bible constantly. "Her thinking was impregnated with the Bible throughout her life."¹

Also, her writings have distinctive characteristics. There are unique aspects despite a certain occasional similarity in thought or even phrase with another author.

I think we might agree, however, that the most important element of any system of thought is that which makes it uniquely different from other systems, rather than the resemblances, real or apparent, which it may have with those others.

¹Mrs. Eddy acknowledged a major debt to the Bible in such words as "the Bible was my only textbook," (Science and Health, p. 110:14). In her published writings she quotes from the Bible about 1,200 times.

The chief distinguishing feature is not, as the writer had provided, a superstitious belief in the reality of "malicious animal magnetism."¹ This is far too "negative a doctrine," the Manager declared.

Do you find it credible that a church which has triumphed over continuous onslaughts of worldly skepticism could be built and perpetuated on so negative a doctrine? The gratitude and devotion of Christian Scientists obviously rest on something more substantial than either a fear of evil or a merely theoretic dismissal of it.²

The Manager concluded:

I believe sincerely that a better understanding of the originality of Christian Science would give you a more accurate perspective on the historical circumstances surrounding its origin.

No reply came from the writer. However, the editor of the Hibbert Journal acknowledged a copy of the letter which the Manager had sent to him.³

Discussion. This was a difficult correction. In the first place the Manager evidently believed that the article bristled with misstatements and misinterpretations. According to his letter, "As to all the other questions

¹" . . . the name of all evil, . . ." Eddy, Miscellany, p. 357:9.

²Cites Eddy, Unity of Good, p. 9:27-7.

³Date of letter quoted is unknown, but probably ca. March 10, 1959. Item #1063.

your article raises in regard to both facts and values, it would take a volume to answer them." The Manager resolved the difficulty by striking at the theme, Mrs. Eddy's lack of originality, which was suggested by the article's title.

The letter challenged a lack of perception on the author's part more than a misconception. The question became, What part, if any, of Mrs. Eddy's doctrine is to be attributed to her originality and what part to her failure to understand the philosophies of others? The Manager did not ask that the author inform himself on the facts this time so much as perceive the facts before him differently and analyze and evaluate them from another standpoint, indeed that he adopt toward them a different point of view. The Manager explained that "my purpose is not to provoke a polemic discussion but to present a point of view."

(15) In two cases the Manager responded to comments that were based on materials purporting to be by Christian Scientists, but in fact were not. The first concerned

a historical survey of ideas that have played a part in American culture.

In a letter to him the Manager questioned the sources the author had used for his pages on Christian Science:

I'm not sure what your sources were for this section but they evidently fail to convey either the "feel" or some of the basic facts of Christian Science.

The author's comments on learning and memory, for example, leave a Christian Scientist feeling rather blank, for they are simply not ideas which appear in our literature or our customary thinking.

Could they have come from some writer's "personal and specialized interpretation"?

Certainly the language and concepts are not central or relevant to any authoritative exposition of Christian Science. It is not so much that they are incorrect as beside the point.

The author had related Christian Science to mesmerism and transcendental idealism. On these subjects the Manager recommended a recently published book.

Shortly the author replied to explain that his paragraphs on learning and memory were paraphrased from a book he took to be an "accurate and acceptable" statement of Christian Science.¹ He spoke of the difficulty

¹Herbert W. Eustace, Christian Science: Its Clear, Correct Teaching (Berkeley, California: Lederer, Street and Zeus Co., Inc., 1934).

of "characterizing briefly movements of thought" and noted:

I am prepared to accept your statement without question as an authoritative representation of the Christian Science position.

The Manager in "just a brief postscript" replied to say that the author's source was not representative. It was a book of the collected writings of a dissident who had left the Church some decades before. These writings were "strictly his own, free-lance interpretation of Christian Science" and were not regarded as "authentic or authoritative expositions within the church."

The author appreciatively acknowledged the information. He stated that in the event of a revision of his own book he would "attempt to make a more accurate characterization . . ."¹

Discussion. In this correction the Manager did some accurate guessing. He detected an outside "specialized" source before knowing its title. That the Committee can pick up what is "beside the point" as well as incorrect,

¹Letters cited are dated February 25, March 6, 10, and 16, 1959. Item #17.

the shadings as well as overt departures, may indicate that the Committee's standard for the doctrinal correction is well defined.

The Manager did not try to discredit the dissident to whom the author had turned. He only pointed out that this dissident had left the Church. Nor did he argue the right and wrong of the dissident's views. Rather the Manager confined himself to drawing the lines between what is and what is not accepted by the Church as doctrine.

The Manager appealed to the author, not for agreement, but rather for accuracy in the presentation of Christian Science. He stated, "I am sure that you want whatever you do say on the subject to be correct . . ."

The Manager also recognized the natural limitations under which the author worked. "I realize," he said, "that Christian Science is only part of a spectrum of thought you are covering and that your time is not unlimited."

(16) In April the Manager wrote to an author about a book which set forth the incompatibility of Hinduism and Christianity. The author had cited in his book John Van Druten, the playwright, who evidently had attempted at one time to link Christian Science with Hinduism. The Manager denied that Van Druten was an authority on Christian Science and that any link could in fact be maintained.

In his letter the Manager pointed out that, contrary to the author's assertion, Van Druten had never been a Christian Scientist, "as his autobiography and the records of our church show." He did not speak as an insider on the religion and so could not stand as an authority in relating it to Vedanta.

Furthermore, Van Druten had erred in his description of prayer in Christian Science. Contrary to his assertion, Christian Scientists "use both petitionary prayer and the prayer of silent, spiritual affirmation."¹

It was simply not true that, as the author stated in his book, a Christian Scientist "feels quite at home" with the Vedantic philosophies.

Cites Science and Health, p. 16:7-11 and Pulpit and Press, p.22:3-8.

On the contrary, it is a simple historical and psychological fact that Christian Scientists feel all forms of Hindu thought to be essentially alien to their own religious position. Wherever and whenever a Christian Scientist has felt any particular kinship with Hindu thought, he has inevitably ended up by drifting away from Christian Science--and usually very far away.

The Manager enclosed an article from The Christian Science Monitor¹ and recommended to the author two books as throwing "considerable light on this subject" of Christian Science and Vedanta.

A few weeks later the author replied. He agreed to change the statement that Van Druten was "a Christian Scientist" to "a student of Christian Science." But this was all. He wrote:

So far as your points of interpretation are concerned, they have to do with quotations from Mr. Van Druten, and I prefer to let them stand.

The Manager promptly sent a further letter. The "small change" proposed by the author "still leaves uncontradicted a radical misrepresentation . . ."

Mr. Van Druten, who hoped to form some sort of syncretism of Christian Science and Vedanta, distorted the teachings of Christian Science in order to force them into this unnatural alliance. It

¹"The Impact of Jesus' Teachings Today, On Religion," February 25, 1957, p. 9.

is not a question merely of "interpretation," as you suggest. The record stands for all to read . . .

The Manager cited in support the chapter on "Prayer" in Science and Health. He also enclosed an article from the Christian Science Sentinel on petitionary prayer, about which he remarked, "It is obvious that this statement in an official publication of our church can hardly be ignored."¹

Discussion. In the last two cases the Manager sought to correct impressions that two authors had obtained from unrepresentative sources. The first author agreed to accept the Manager as the authority on what constituted Christian Science and to correct his comment "to reflect so far as possible the prevailing doctrines of the Christian Science Church." The second author was not willing to do this. He preferred instead to cite as an insider and authority "a student of Christian Science" who had never had any tie with the Church.

To the Manager the assertions by the second author were highly unjust. A denomination which held itself intensely Christian could hardly be happy about being

¹Letters cited are dated April 6, 25, and May 14, 1959. Item #145.

identified with Hinduism.

But evidently most troubling of all to the Manager was the fact that the author based his conclusions not on his own search of original sources but on, as the Manager called it, "a piece of special pleading by an adherent of Vedanta." Van Druten, the Manager pointed out, had been a writer of popular plays. He possessed no special credentials as an authority on Vedanta, Christian Science, or religion generally.

The Manager recognized that he and the author might have religious differences:

You will see that there are differences between your point of view and ours, but they are not nearly as wide as your comment presupposes.

He urged this author to make his own firsthand investigation of original sources, not to accept uncritically secondary sources. To this end he recommended books and sent along articles from periodicals. Finally the Manager appealed to the author's sense of responsibility:

I feel quite sure that you would not knowingly and deliberately quote a piece of special pleading by an adherent of Vedanta and try to pass it off as an authentic statement of Christian Science.

.....

These may seem small matters to you . . . but intellectual honesty as well as Christian fellowship are involved . . .

To this there was no reply.

(17) Medical commentators now and then give attention to Christian Science because of its claims to heal.¹ In April 1959 the Manager wrote to E. Gartley Jaco, editor of Patients, Physicians and Illness, a book of readings on behavioral science and medicine. The book contained a reprint of an article from Medical Economics entitled "Problem Patient: 'The Christian Scientist.'"

The Manager wrote mainly to inform Professor Jaco of two corrective letters that had called attention to the

¹The great public skepticism in regard to Christian Science healing was indicated in a report of a Scientist who addressed an outside group: "The unquestioned acceptance of the belief that materia medica is the only recourse in time of sickness, and the bewildered surprise that it ever occurred to anyone to look elsewhere in time of need, is commonly encountered in these talks." Man. to E. O., re summary of talks, November 5, 1959. To a demurrer to the reports of healing given over the radio and television series, "How Christian Science Heals," the Manager stated: "It is obvious that we could not go on the air weekly with healings, or publish accounts of healing in our weekly and monthly religious publications, if such verified healings were not taking place through Christian Science alone. The same standard of honesty that has made The Christian Science Monitor respected throughout the world is applied in all avenues of our denomination." Man. to Walter W. Kistler, M.D., December 3, 1958. Item #975.

documented¹ reports of healing provided in church literature. One letter was his reply to the Medical Economics article that Professor Jaco had published in his book.² The second was a correction the Manager had sent to the American Journal of Sociology.³

The Manager closed a brief letter with an appeal:

I look forward to the day when sociologists and other academic investigators will be able to approach the subject of Christian Science without the fixed presuppositions which seem too often to blind them to the rich and challenging material it offers.⁴

¹Standards for reporting healings in church periodicals are: (1) every testimony is volunteered--none is solicited; (2) every account published bears the name of the testifier and his home city; (3) validation is provided in the report where possible to the extent of medical diagnosis before, physical examination after (for an insurance policy, say, or for entry into the armed services), and the years since the healing took place as an indicator of permanence; (4) verification is provided by three members of the Church who know of the healing or can vouch for the integrity of the testifier; (5) a 12- to 18-month delay is allowed between receipt of the testimony and its publication; (6) additional, signed statements are obtained shortly before publication from the testifier and verifiers, who attest to the authenticity of the details as provided on the galley proofs and also to the fact that no condition has arisen which would render undesirable the report's publication; and (7) the file on each report is preserved for three years after publication.

²Original article is, Lois Hoffman, "Problem Patient: The Christian Scientist," Medical Economics, December 1956, pp. 265-283. Manager's letter was printed in the January 1957 issue, pp. 52-53.

³For publishing data, see p. 58, fn. 1.

⁴Letter is dated April 6, 1959. Item #209.

Discussion. This appeal for objectivity poses a significant question, how is Christian Science healing to be assessed? The academic literature provides no assessments of rigor, though impressionistic appraisals abound.

The usual study discounts Christian Science healing entirely. This was true of the articles in Medical Economics and the American Journal of Sociology. To the first the Manager said in his published reply, "The unspoken assumption of your article . . . is that Christian Science doesn't heal."

It must be said that neither article was methodologically very sophisticated. The Medical Economics article rested on no more rigor than a few questionnaires sent to doctors around the country.

The article in the American Journal of Sociology arrived at conclusions about the healing work that depended, according to its author, "upon impressions rather than upon objective analysis."¹ The data compiled by the Manager for his reply as published in a later issue cast much doubt on the study's reliability.

¹Page 452.

An interesting study regarding rates and causes of death among Christian Scientists was reported in the Journal of Forensic Sciences for October 1956.¹ The article writer, Dr. Gale E. Wilson, autopsy surgeon for the coroner of King County (Seattle), Washington, compiled death statistics on slightly more than one thousand King County Christian Scientists. He found some variation in causes of death but little in death rates between the Scientists and their fellow citizens. Unfortunately, however, his significant conclusions about causes of death rest on comparisons between the regional death statistics of Christian Scientists and the over-all national averages. It is probably a doubtful procedure not to take into account regional characteristics in findings of this kind.²

When not discounting it entirely, the literature explains Christian Science healing by referral to psychological and psychosomatic factors, the temporary

¹Gale E. Wilson, "Christian Science and Longevity," Journal of Forensic Sciences, I (October 1956), pp. 43-60.

²Recent studies have thrown doubt on the usability of data from death certificates. See The New England Journal of Medicine, CCLXII (January 21, 1960), pp. 149-150.

remission or the spontaneous regression of disease, the natural recuperative powers of the human organism, medical misdiagnosis, lack of medical diagnosis, or the insufficiency of medical knowledge.¹

The Manager in his appeal to Professor Jaco regretted the "fixed presuppositions" involved in academic assessments so far.² He implied that attention ought to be given to the possibility that a theory and practice entirely outside the bounds of modern medical theory might be valid.

A staff member once remarked in a different context to an author:

I am sometimes a little saddened by the intellectual evasions and contortions of hostile critics who do everything possible to minimize, overlook, or rationalize away that stupendous body of Christian healing which Mrs. Eddy's followers have furnished the world as the credentials of their Christian discipleship.³

¹The medically oriented Church of England pronouncement, The Church's Ministry of Healing, makes much over these factors in weighing the evidence of spiritual healing today. Their significance is also pointed out in a popular article on "The Strange Facts About Faith Healing" by Jhan and June Robbins in Red Book, July 1960, pp. 37-38. Item #1130.

²More liberal assessments have been made but not in recent years. See Peel, pp. 141-146.

³Staff member to C. S. Braden, ca. April 1955. Item #415-24.

Pfautz laments the lack of academic objectivity paid to Christian Science. Pointing to no less a sociologist than Talcott Parsons, he remarks:

Even so prominent a sociologist as Talcott Parsons seems unable to maintain a strictly objective attitude regarding Christian Science. . . . [This is due to] both a lack of knowledge respecting the practices and ideology of this group, and a rational bias inherent in the functional analysis of social systems as practiced by Parsons.¹

(18) Christian Science is commonly linked by those who speak from a medical orientation with hypnotism and suggestive techniques generally. The Manager denied the connection in a letter to a social psychologist who had made this assertion in a book.

In October 1959 the Manager wrote to this author to deny that the "background" of Christian Science was hypnotism. There is no quarrel, the Manager declared, "with your knowledgeable contrast between [the] religion and Freudianism." But to attribute a link with hypnotism does violence to the essentially religious character of Christian Science, whose actual "background" is the New Testament.

¹Harold Pfautz, "Christian Science: the Sociology of a Social Movement and a Religious Group" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Sociology, University of Chicago, 1954), p. 28, fn. 1.

A familiar name came up--P. P. Quimby. This time, it was Quimby the hypnotist in the historical wings:

the fact is that the spiritual doctrine and practice which Mrs. Eddy drew from her study of the Bible developed into a system which contrasted sharply with Quimby's suggestive therapeutics.

While Quimby was "in the direct line of development" between Mesmer and Freud, Mrs. Eddy "definitely was not."

Christian Science is not, the Manager asserted, the exercise of human will as in hypnotism. Rather it is the relinquishment of human will to the divine will in accordance with Jesus' words--"not my will, but thine, be done," and "I can of mine own self do nothing."¹ This relinquishment to the spiritual is accompanied by the recognition that the divine will is for man to express God as His likeness:

it is true that on the ethical level Christian Science does consider that the individual is responsible for his own mistakes, but healing occurs as he learns metaphysically that his true spiritual selfhood is innocent because made in the image and likeness of God and hence is incapable of error.

The Manager believed the author's description might more accurately fit "the various forms of New

¹Luke 22:42 and John 5:30.

Thought" than Christian Science. He recommended a book as drawing "some interesting lines of demarcation between the two types of thinking."

A few days later the author replied, "delighted to have your comments." He praised Christian Science and Christian Scientists for fostering the Protestant ethic by encouraging self-reliance, personal integrity, courage to face life's problems, etc.¹

Discussion. The author had endeavored to describe Christian Science in the idiom of his field of study. The Manager recognized the honest groping even while challenging it:

I can appreciate your desire to translate the metaphysics of Christian Science into generally acceptable ethical or psychological terms, yet this necessarily misrepresents its teachings to some extent.

The author, too, recognized the limitations of his endeavor:

the sociological study of religion must inevitably miss the essence thereof, even as the scientific study of organisms fail to uncover the nature of life.

Just as in case #13 he emphasized the religious

¹Letters cited are dated October 20 and 27, 1959. Item #108.

nature to separate Christian Science from Quimbyism, so here the Manager drew the religious line to distinguish it from hypnotism. He explained that, despite the common drugless characteristic, Christian Science is a religion requiring conformance to spiritual demands, not a mental practice resting on mental manipulation and will power.

The Manager did not criticize the author's field of study as he might have. He did not mention that twice a year all Christian Science churches observe a sermon subject denouncing hypnotism--"Ancient and Modern Necromancy, alias Mesmerism and Hypnotism, Denounced." Nor did he point out that a church bylaw forbids members to "learn hypnotism on penalty of being excommunicated . . ." ¹

Observers who draw a connection between Christian Science and hypnotism frequently refer to Quimby because at one time he was a practicing hypnotist. Early in his career he gave public exhibitions as a hypnotist. ² During his last years he set himself

¹Manual, p. 53:15-18 (Article XI, Section 9).

²Smith, Historical Sketches, p. 47.

up as a drugless "magnetic" healer--a career linked to the earlier.¹ Off and on from October 1862 until his death in January 1866 he numbered Mrs. Eddy among his patients. Quimbyism no doubt left some mark on Mrs. Eddy's thinking as did other healing systems she tried in those early years--homeopathy, for instance, which her husband Daniel Patterson practiced.² But Mrs. Eddy's religious position, the Manager argued, wholly separated her teaching from these others.

(19) Two further letters took up the allegation of the link with hypnotism. In one of an earlier date the Manager wrote to The Pennsylvania Medical Journal, which had published an article listing Christian Science among systems "based on hypnotic techniques."

In his letter the Manager emphasized again the

¹A contemporary of Quimby's and early leader in the mental healing movement, the Rev. Warren F. Evans, sympathetically investigated Quimby's practice. Granting that Quimby had been a successful healer, he drew the conclusion, "But all this was only an exhibition of the force of suggestion, or the action of the law of faith, over a patient in the impressible condition." Quoted by Smith, ibid., p. 48.

²The impact of homeopathy on her thought is clearly borne out in her writings. See, for instance, Science and Health, pp. 152:28-15; 156:28-15; Miscellaneous Writings, p. 35:1-3; Retrospection and Introspection, p. 33:1-22; Christian Healing (1908; 1936), p. 11:15-3.

religious element:

Christian Science healing is based on humble, intelligent, systematic prayer to God, as enjoined by the Founder of Christianity. . . . [The article-writer] is entitled to his own views of the healing prayer of Christian Science, but he is moving beyond his competence in discounting the spiritual and religious nature of this healing. . . . to the Christian Scientist himself the gulf between hypnosis and the Christ-method of healing is absolute and unbridgeable.¹

(20) The Committee for France, Marcel G. Silver, wrote to La Libre Santé about an article, "Ce Qu'est La Psychotherapie," which had included Christian Science among psychotherapeutics.

Christian Science is no more psychotherapeutics, M. Silver argued, than the teachings and works of Jesus Christ as recorded in the New Testament. Christian Science does not use "vain repetitions, as the heathen do,"² nor call upon auto- or hetero-suggestion based on the "prestige of a divinity," nor otherwise involve "manipulation of a mental mechanism." Rather it is recourse

to the immanent power of the First Cause of all existence. . . . the operation of the fundamental

¹Letter is dated August 20, 1958. Item #1181.

²Matt. 6:7.

Principle which can only be defined by the scriptural term: Love.

Christian Scientists take disease as "a suggestive or hypnotic phenomenon" and the prayer that heals as a contrary method which awakens the patient from the hypnotic condition "to the absolute reality of his being 'in the image and likeness of God.'"¹

This mode of healing belongs to a purely religious domain for it implies, above physical restoration, redemption and salvation . . . [and] is the application of divine inspiration.²

(21) Not all corrections are weighty. One writer in a vegetarian magazine, Excelsior! (The Vegetarian "Elect"), announced that Mrs. Eddy was one of them--a vegetarian during the last half of her life. Shortly after the magazine's appearance in the summer of 1959, the Manager wrote to the editor that this was historically inaccurate and gave supporting references.³ He further noted that

¹As the Manager told one inquirer, "rationality rather than suggestibility" leads to healing in Christian Science. Staff member to I. V. Kendig, October 3, 1957. Item #975.

²Cites Science and Health, p. 141:13-18. Letter sent in August 1959. Item #1179.

³Science and Health, p. 222:22-6; Irving C. Tomlinson, Twelve Years with Mary Baker Eddy (Boston: The Christian Science Publishing Society, 1945), pp. 70-71; Powell, p. 304, fn. 8 (recent editions).

on the question of vegetarianism each member was "free to follow his own conscience."¹

(22) Besides replying to comment on the teaching, history and healing work, the Committee also answers comment on the Church as an institution, particularly the legal status of the public practice of Christian Science. This status was the subject of a letter the Manager wrote to one writer of a popularly written legal guide.

The Manager pointed out that Christian Science practice ought not to be classified under medical malpractice as the author had done:

there is a great legal distance between a Christian Science practitioner, exercising the care and skill of his profession, and an unregistered practitioner of medicine.

For one thing, The Mother Church maintains "definite standards" that the practitioner must meet before being listed in The Christian Science Journal. These standards guarantee to the person who calls on a practitioner that the practitioner is qualified. Furthermore:

¹Letter undated, ca. October 1959. Item #98.

These practitioners are not required to be registered in any state since they are exempted from the Medical Practice Laws on the basis that they are engaged in a purely spiritual activity and do not (a) physically diagnose disease (b) manipulate patients (c) prescribe material remedies.¹

The author replied a few days later in an appreciative note. He said he would take account of the correct status in the next edition of his book.²

(23) The status of Christian Scientists as parents came up in March 1959. The question was whether they could properly be allowed to adopt children. A British writer gave the opinion in a book on adoption procedures that Christian Science couples were ineligible to do so. They would allow, she held, medical neglect of a child, a criminal offense in Great Britain.

In a letter to her, the District Manager denied this possibility.

¹On "standards" the Manager commented on one occasion: "in the early years . . . the words 'Christian Scientist' were borrowed and used indiscriminately by all sorts of mental healers and fly-by-nights. . . . this last point indicates why The Mother Church-- . . . in the interest of the public--has set up an official directory of Christian Science practitioners." Man. to Frank A. Salisbury, re Theology of the Major Sects, February 15, 1960. Item #609.

²~~Letters are dated September 24 and 26, 1958.~~
The publisher, whom the Manager had sent a copy of the letter, forwarded in December a corrected statement, presumably by the author, for publication in a revised edition of the book. Item #1211.

Christian Science parents, in common with all other parents, are subject to the regulations of the Children and Young Persons Act 1933, and are obedient to them. Therefore, as the "Hospital and Social Service Journal" put it in its issue of December 13, 1957, Christian Science parents call in a doctor "where a reasonably careful parent who is not a Christian Scientist would do so."

As a gratuitous point, the religion gives "a lovely ideal of life," the District Manager stated. It makes for "a natural and safe nursery for children."

Some years ago, he remarked, the secretary of an adoption association had said that his association was not prejudiced against Christian Scientists. The results of adoptions by Scientist families, so far as his association knew, were considered quite satisfactory.

Several weeks later, the author in a friendly note replied that she was glad to have her impression corrected and that in a new edition she would "see if something can be done" to right the misstatement.¹

Discussion. In the last two cases the Committee sought to correct a misconception that would have led at least to public ill will if not actual discrimination. The assertion in the first, that Christian Science healing

¹Letters were sent in March and April 1959; exact dates are not known. Item #11.

is illegal, would surely have prejudiced the uninformed reader--in his role as voter, jurymen, public official, or just neighbor. The assertion in the second, that Christian Scientists do not obey the law with respect to their children, might not only have prejudiced the reader but also have led adoption officials, who took the book as authority, to turn away Christian Science couples. It was necessary to the Church's protection that the Committee correct these misstatements.

(24) A year later the District Manager had another occasion to spell out the legal status. The British Medical Journal for March 26, 1960, carried in its correspondence columns some protests by doctors to a new government ruling allowing Spiritualist healers to call professionally on patients at state hospitals. One letter writer mentioned Christian Science.

The District Manager replied to the letter to say that the ruling had no application to the Christian Scientists. He pointed out that Scientists have their own institutions for care of the sick--Christian Science

Houses these are called--, established under authority of Section 193 of the Public Health Act of 1936. It would therefore be unusual for a Christian Scientist to be in a hospital. If he were, however, "it is entirely orderly . . . for him to have access to the ministry of his religion."

In the second place Christian Science practitioners have no connection with the National Federation of Spiritual Healers.

The ethical procedure governing their relationship to hospitals was worked out quite independently with the Ministry of Health some years ago.¹

Discussion. The District Manager wanted the British doctors in this case to know that the Christian Scientists had no share in the controversy. They had long ago worked out their relation to the government and the new ruling did not affect them one way or the other. The District Manager acted to protect the established relationship against an aroused public of doctors.

It is to be noted that the District Manager did not take sides in the controversy. He did not join in the argument on the side of the medical profession or on

¹Letter is dated April 13, 1960. Item #35.

the side of the spiritualist healers but instead strove to extricate the Church as tactfully as possible from the discussion.

(25) The reputation of Christian Scientists as a whole likewise receives attention. In spring 1960 two biographies on two prominent figures in British politics appeared. Reviews of both books noted that the two figures had shared a common view prior to the outbreak of World War II tending toward appeasement of Nazi Germany. A few reviews connected this with their religion, which was Christian Science.

The two books are:

James R. M. Butler, Lord Lothian (Philip Kerr) 1882-1940 (London: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1960).¹

Maurice Collis, Nancy Astor, An Informal Biography (New York: Dutton, 1960).

Lord Lothian, whose given name was Philip Kerr, served his country in a number of capacities until his death in December 1940. For his final service as British ambassador to the United States at the beginning of World War II, Churchill eulogized him as Britain's "greatest

¹The author is Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, England, and from 1947 to 1954 was Regius Professor of Modern History in that University. Like his subject, Sir James Butler is a Christian Scientist.

Ambassador to the United States."

Viscountess Astor had been active in Britain's political life for many decades. During her years in Parliament, she was one of its most colorful members.

The District Manager did not reply to those reviewers of Lord Lothian who attributed Kerr's appeasement to Christian Science. One reason for his not doing so was that the book itself by implication refuted the charge.

However, when The Spectator of May 6, 1960, drew the connection in a review of the biography on Lady Astor, the District Manager was moved to reply. Referring to the connection as an "odd thesis," he declared:

This odd thesis is confronted by the simple fact that the Christian Science Monitor, through that same period, consistently opposed any form of appeasement.

There were differences of opinion among Christian Scientists, as among members of other religious groups, as to the best way of dealing with Hitler; but it is worth remembering that some Christian Scientists in Germany went to prison and concentration camp for their opposition to Nazism.¹

¹On the persecutions and jailings under Nazism see Beasley's The Continuing Spirit, pp. 238-39, 241-46. Letter cited was published in The Spectator on May 20.
Item #24.

CHAPTER VI

CORRECTION--II

Syndicated Material

Reprints, wire service material, and syndicated articles provide the corrector with special problems. Because their points of publication are usually remote from their essential origins, corrections require both the grass-roots contact to reach the reprinting editor and some centralization to coordinate these endeavors and to get at the source. To some extent a correction of a book review also shares these characteristics.

The Committee on Publication has both the grass-roots outlets and the centralization, its breadth of public relations in fact matching remarkably the breadth of modern mass communications. We now turn to cases where syndicated material plays a star role.

(1) In June 1958 the Church of England published a pronouncement on spiritual healing, a study report called The Church's Ministry of Healing (Westminster:

The Church Information Board). The Archbishops' Commission on Divine Healing, which prepared the report, had called upon the Christian Scientists several times during the four and a half years of the report's preparation. In late 1954 the District Manager for Great Britain and Ireland completed a questionnaire for the Commission. During the next summer he appeared before a Commission hearing.

The published report gave two Appendix pages to Christian Science. The nature of the comment was suggested by the London Daily Express's headline on the day the report appeared:

Church of England Attacks!
Target: Spiritualism and Christian Science
And Already The Clashes Are Starting.

The Committee on Publication replied to the report by distributing a press release containing a 350-word statement by The Christian Science Board of Directors. The statement challenged the Anglican finding that the ministry of healing, while the Christian was obligated to practice it, was by itself insufficient for physical healing.

The report was, the Directors had stated, "a sincere and hopeful document . . . a sign of resurgent spiritual awakening that will hearten every Christian."

However,

the Commission appears to have found it difficult to grant that physical healing can be brought about by spiritual means alone. This limitation is understandable enough at this time, but is naturally regretted by those who have proved that the spiritual rules by which the Master Christian healed are as available now as they were in his day.

To combine spiritual and material (i.e., medical) means of healing is not, the Directors declared, "the way to the Christ-method of healing."

The Directors also commented on the report's criticisms of Christian Science as a theology. Specifically, the Directors affirmed in the face of the report's denial that Christian Science does accept fully "the saving work of Christ Jesus in the flesh."

Furthermore,

time will emphasize that Christian Science differs from traditional Christianity only by virtue of the uncompromising acceptance of the Saviour's words that "it is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing."¹

¹John 6:63. Also quotes Matt. 7:20.

Copies of the Anglican report had been in circulation a few days before its formal release date of June 12. This allowed time for the Directors' statement to be prepared and for the Committee on Publication to distribute the statement simultaneously with the appearance of the Anglican report.

The District Manager, Geith A. Plimmer, who in London was at the point of origin, submitted the statement to "Press Association, Reuters, and to the main National dailies in London, on Wednesday, June 11"; also to the Exchange Telegraph. All the major British newspapers were to have the statement on hand on the morning that the Anglican report was released.

The District Manager submitted a shortened version of the statement on the morning of June 12 "to the News Broadcasting Services of the B.B.C., Sound and Television Service, and also the News Service of the Independent Television Authority."

Lastly, he sent copies of the statement to the Committees for counties throughout Great Britain and Ireland. They, in turn, distributed the statement to

newspapers in their areas. In this way, local papers which did not pick up the statement from elsewhere were accounted for.

The response to the releases was at first "disappointing." On June 13 the District Manager reported that The Times and The Guardian had so far ignored his release. He hoped especially that these two prominent papers would give him a hearing. The Daily Telegraph had quoted only the part about the Directors' holding the report to be "a sincere and hopeful document." Later the Telegraph published a few additional sentences under a New York dateline.

The District Manager noted regarding newspaper comment on the report itself:

Some papers quoted the Report's criticism of Christian Science fairly substantially, but in many cases it was not quoted but just dealt with in a passing reference.

By the middle of the following week the situation had improved. On June 19 The Times carried a letter giving the gist of the release over the District Manager's signature.¹ On the following day The Daily

¹Said the District Manager, "As a letter in The Times is about as near heaven as most mortals on earth can attain, I feel very pleased and grateful that our letter has been published." D. M. to Man., June 19, 1958.

Telegraph published a shorter letter. Other newspapers likewise shortly carried the statement in full or in part, as a letter or an article. Among these were the Cambridge Daily News, Belfast News-Letter, Northern Whig, Birmingham Post, Yorkshire Post, and East Anglian Daily Times.

The District Manager reported the final tally on June 30, two and a half weeks after the appearance of the Anglican pronouncement. Newspapers in nine counties, he reported, had carried the release in full as letters from county Committees. Newspapers in five counties printed the statement in part. Four newspapers printed extracts from the statement which came to them under a New York City dateline from Reuters. Two weeklies in the London area printed part of the release. (Most weeklies ignored the Anglican report entirely.)

Every bit as important as the published statements was the fact that, according to the District Manager, "in the entire press there was no case in which the Report was taken as an opportunity for denouncing Christian Science."

Outside Britain extracts from the District Manager's release appeared in the press of southern France and South Africa. Committees reported their own published replies in South Africa, British Guiana, Australia, New Zealand, and Norway (three replies!).

Although the report attracted less attention in the United States, the Manager in Boston followed about the same procedure as the District Manager had. Simultaneously with the report's release, he furnished the Director's statement to the Associated Press, United Press International, Religious News Service, The New York Times, The New York Herald Tribune, Time, Newsweek, and Christian Century.

The Manager also supplied the statement to area Committees. On the day of the report, June 12, he sent the statement to "All Committees on Publication" for furnishing "to any local paper if it seems necessary or desirable in order to clarify our position."

Committees for twenty-one states reported that newspapers in their areas had carried articles on the

Anglican study. Most of the articles were a wire service item from the Associated Press. The item mentioned the report's criticism of Christian Science and provided a few sentences from the Directors' statement, which did not bear on the criticisms.

The Christian Science Monitor carried the Directors' statement and a column-and-a-half review of the report on June 12. It published an editorial on the report on June 13.¹

Discussion. The Committee on Publication was in this case able to move swiftly on an international scale. Comment on the Anglican Report was distributed by Reuters, Associated Press, United Press International, and other wire services. The Committee countered the communications of these international facilities with its own international public relations in Great Britain, the United States, Canada, and at least six other countries. It also used the wire services themselves: the District Manager noted that for him it was "a new move . . . to canalize the release through international agencies."

The Committee was able not only to match the

¹Quoted passages are mainly from letters of the D.M. to the Man., dated June 13, 16, and 30, 1958. Item #1173.

geographical sweep of the wire services but also their speed. It provided a reply in a number of locations simultaneously with release of the report.

The Anglican study denied Christian Science on two essential points. The study cast doubt on the validity of Christian Science healing. And it provided, according to the Manager, a "characterization of Christian Science as non-Christian."

On few criticisms is the Committee as sensitive as on these two. At the same time, the Committee's point of view and explanation were significant to that public which was endeavoring to inform itself on the meaning of the Anglican report to the general issues of healing and religion.

The Committee directed its remarks at the report's comments on Christian Science, not at the Anglican Church or the study commission. Two days before formal issuance of the report, the Manager sent a draft of the Committee's release to the Executive Office and noted that "any suggestion of criticism of the Church of England" had

been eliminated. In a letter to "All Committees" on June 12 the Manager counseled:

If later discussion in the papers should make it necessary for you to send a corrective letter, it would be well to remember that our purpose is not to criticize the Commission, the Church of England, the doctors, or those who believe in combining prayer and medicine, but to prove our Christianity by our own Christian approach.

(2) While the wire story may call for speed of reply, the reprint requires sure continuity. One magazine may reprint an article that originated months or even years before in a second publication. Particularly among the smaller regional church publications does this occur.

In April 1958, a British Anglican magazine, Church Illustrated, published as one of a series an article on Christian Science. This article was reprinted by three periodicals around the Commonwealth, the last reprint appearing fourteen months after the original article. The nature of the article was indicated by its title, "Creed for the Credulous?" by Richard Tatlock.

The editors of Church Illustrated, while preparing the article, asked the District Manager for photographs of The Mother Church, Mrs. Eddy, and also P. P. Quimby.

The District Manager supplied photographs of the first two and a corrective letter that had gone out on an earlier occasion on Quimby. The editors published the photographs and also a very short statement from the letter. When he saw the published article, the District Manager, believing the article to be misleading, wrote a further letter to the magazine.

The first reprint was five months later. It appeared in September 1958 in a New Zealand magazine, Mission, The Journal of the Auckland City Mission. The Committee for New Zealand called on the Auckland City Missioner to talk about the article. He also prepared and submitted a written correction.

In April 1959, a year after the article's original publication, the second reprint of the Church Illustrated article appeared. This was in a diocesan journal in Canada. The area Committee called on the journal's editor, a woman, and showed to her the copies of the two letters that the District Manager had supplied to Church Illustrated.

The editor, after reading the letters, told the Committee she had not been satisfied with the article when she published it. She had been reared in Christian Science and so knew something about the religion. She had felt obligated to publish the article because she had carried all other articles in the series. She accepted a biography from the Committee and implied that while she was editor the magazine would not carry further derogatory articles of this nature. The Committee did not ask for a published reply.

The third reprint appeared in the June 1959 issue of Mothers in Australia and New Zealand. Like the Canadian Committee, the Committee for New South Wales, in whose area the magazine had been published, sought to place before the editor the two corrective letters that had gone to Church Illustrated. He was unsuccessful in this, however, though he did write to her.¹

Discussion. Two Committees called to lay their cases before an editor without asking for a published correction. The Manager advised the area Committee in Canada that a published reply was not to be sought because the article was a reprint. A visit with the editor was enough. A call

¹Filed Church Illustrated. Item #1020.

"would provide an opportunity for you to make a friendly contact with the magazine, . . . give them a better idea of Christian Science," and help to prevent a recurrence of the incident.¹ The implication was that informed, friendly editors are protection against unjust and erroneous future comments.

The advantages of a centralized public relations and of continuity are illustrated. Because of centralization the Committee could provide the same corrective letters to editors in Britain, Canada, and Australia. Because of the continuity the Committee could do this over a fourteen-month period.

(3) A pamphlet was the source of two reprints in Australia in the summer of 1958. The pamphlet, Some Distortions of the Christian Faith (Melbourne: Methodist Church of Australasia, 1954), by E. Keith Ditterich, provided a chapter on Christian Science, about which the Committee for Victoria had been in touch with the author in 1953.

The first reprint was in the Victorian edition

¹Man. to CoP for Alberta, April 23, 1959.
Item #1020.

of The Spectator, the official organ of the Methodist Church in Australia. When the chapter on Christian Science was published in the July 2, 1958, issue, the Committee for Victoria wrote to the editor. "The criticisms," he said, "all boil down to the author's fundamental misunderstanding" of the Christian Scientists' view of evil. He asked that the letter be published. There is no report to indicate that it was.

A second reprint appeared a few days later, on July 19, in The Methodist of New South Wales. The Committee interviewed the Methodist editor, who granted space for a reply in the August 2 issue. A few weeks later, on August 16, the author of the pamphlet provided a rebuttal in the magazine, which the Committee did not answer.¹

Discussion. This case illustrates the complementary nature of the Committee's several activities.

The Committee sent the editor at about the time of the reprint a copy of the Christian Science Sentinel. The "Signs of the Times" department in this issue

¹Letter quoted is dated July 11, 1958. Item #358.

had published an excerpt from The Methodist.

The Committee for New South Wales had very likely clipped the item from The Methodist and sent it in as a matter of routine some months before. One task of area Committees is to watch for items suitable for "Signs of the Times," an editorial feature which reprints excerpts from other publications, mostly religious, that bear out the Christian Science point of view. It was a coincidence, probably a happy one for the Committee's relations with the editor, that the Sentinel reprinted the item from The Methodist at just the moment when the Committee was seeking a correction in that periodical.

In mid-July, shortly before submitting the correction, the area Committee also sent to The Methodist editor an article from The Christian Science Monitor. Committees frequently send articles to editors which they believe will have an interest. The Methodist editor evidently was interested, for he published an excerpt from the article in the same issue in which the Committee's correction appeared.

(4) One Canadian publication carried an article on

Christian Science that led to reprints or summaries in four other periodicals and to six replies from the Committee.

In December 1958 the Presbyterian Record, the official organ of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, carried an article on "Christian Science and the Ministry of Healing." It was written by W. Gordon Maclean.

The Committee's objections were set forth in a letter to the editor of the Presbyterian Record, published in that periodical's letter column in February 1959. The Committee for Ontario, who signed the letter, denied to the Record the article's assertion that Christian Science rejects the Crucifixion and Resurrection. He also challenged the label of "quacks" that the article-writer had given the Scientists.

I don't believe Dr. Maclean would have called the early Christians "quacks" for following the Saviour's example in healing disease and even raising the dead by spiritual means alone.

The Church's purpose, he said, is "to commemorate the word and works of our Master."¹ There is "a vast body" of healing evidence to show that it is doing just this. Hundreds of casualty insurance companies, he declared, recognize Christian Science treatment in lieu of medical treatment. Christian Science is hardly to be classified as quackery.

A second letter was sent to Dr. Maclean at his home in Manitoba. The Committee for Manitoba, who knew him, also called and presented two books.

A third letter went to the Toronto Daily Star. The Star had compiled some excerpts from the Presbyterian Record and run them on January 17. Alongside this compilation the Star had published an interview with and picture of the Committee for Ontario. The Committee replied to the Star's compilation because he felt it contained misstatements that were not answered in the interview. His letter was published in the Star on January 28.

The Committee for Ontario subsequently let the

¹From Eddy, Manual, p. 17:10-11.

editors of both the Record and the Star know of his appreciation for their printing his letters.

Religious News Service (R.N.S.) distributed a summary of the article to its subscribers. The Lexington (Kentucky) Leader published the summary on January 17. The Committee for Kentucky sent a reply, which the Leader's editor turned into a story and published.

In Minneapolis the Lutheran Herald on January 20 also published the R.N.S. summary. The Committee for Minnesota called on the editor and showed to him the letter to the Presbyterian Record. He did not press for a published correction.

In Philadelphia The Lutheran published the R.N.S. article on January 21. As the Committee for Minnesota had done, a representative of the Committee's office called on the editor to let him read the letter to the Record. He did not ask for a correction to be published.¹
Discussion. It is obviously no light matter for a denomination which considers itself Christian to be

¹Filed "Presbyterian Record." Item #1121.

charged with distorting the true faith with regard to the Crucifixion and Resurrection. Likewise, it is no small thing for a group to be labeled as "quacks." The Committee vigorously challenged these criticisms with four letters and two interviews.

Centralization through the Manager once more was advantageous. Replies to the press and the author could be coordinated through two Canadian provinces and three states in the United States.

Committees again chose to call on the editors without seeking published corrections. The Manager advised the Committee for Minnesota that "such a visit could offer a good opportunity to establish a friendly relationship" with the editor.¹

(5) A United Press International story was the object of correction in late spring 1959. U.P.I. on May 15 distributed to its subscribers an article on Christian Science, one of a series on America's religious bodies by Louis Cassels.

Cassels, a magazine and newspaper writer who

¹Man. to CoP for Minnesota, February 10, 1959.
Item #1121.

specializes on religious subjects and themes, called on the Church in Boston while preparing his article. One of the Manager's staff members helped him obtain the information he was looking for. Later, when the article was released, this staff member wrote to Cassels about "only one actual inaccuracy and one more general misunderstanding."

The inaccuracy was Cassels' assertion that Christian Scientists use the phrase "moral confusions" for sin. This phrase was nowhere to be found in Mrs. Eddy's writings, the staff member explained. Nor was it common to Church literature.¹ Sin was simply called "sin."

The uses of the terms "real" and "unreal" had been misunderstood. By calling sin, disease, and death unreal, the Scientist means that

these forms of evil are not created, sustained, or legitimized by God and therefore cannot affect man's essential, spiritual nature as the image of God.

But surely humans need regeneration--"need to be saved from the sinfulness of their false, material concept of existence, and we therefore regard the Christ as our Saviour from sin, disease, and death."²

¹The phrase was evidently taken from one of the Committee's own pamphlets. It is named in a list of problems to which Christian Science healing might be addressed. See Facts About Christian Science, p. 6.

²Cites Eddy, No and Yes, p. 34:18-28.

Area Committees reported during the following months some forty-four newspapers that carried the article. The Manager counseled against replies to any of these, explaining that

the good in the article greatly outweighs the single misunderstanding of a point which it is often difficult for non-Scientists to grasp.

As a consequence, there was only one reply--from the Committee for Texas to The Corsicana Sun in his state, sent before the Committee received the Manager's counsel.¹

Discussion. The implication conveyed by the U.P.I. article was indicated in The Corsicana Sun's headline: "Denying Reality of Sin Separates Christian Science From Traditions." The Manager pointed out to Cassels that the term "unreal" had a specialized meaning to the Scientists. The Committee for Texas in his reply stated that the Christian Science view of sin "is not nearly so diverse from traditional religion as one might assume from the headline and from the article."²

¹Letters quoted are: staff member to Louis Cassels, May 26, 1959; Man. to CoPs in the United States, Possessions and Canada, May 26, 1959. Item #293.

²Cites Eph. 4:22,24. CoP for Texas to editor of The Corsicana Sun, May 17, 1959. Item #293.

The Committee did not choose to reply to every printing of the article. Mass corrections in this case, unlike those concerning the Anglican pronouncement, were evidently not judged worthwhile.

(6) By any measurement, the most significant case from 1958 to 1960 involved the book, Christian Science Today--Power, Policy, Practice (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1958). The importance of the book was due to its length and detail, its critical focus on the Church as an institution, and the status of the author. Of six books published during the period, this was the only one written by an outsider--and the only one to which the Committee found it necessary to respond.

The author of the book, Charles S. Braden, is an ordained Methodist minister. Before retirement he served Northwestern University as head of the department of history and literature of religions. He was well established as a writer on religion before he wrote Christian Science Today, which was at least his eleventh book.

We shall consider Christian Science Today only for the Committee's replies to newspaper and magazine reviews of it. We shall not discuss the book in terms of the Committee's contacts with the author. Although there were a few letters traded in 1958 and 1959, all the really significant exchanges between the Committee and the author occurred earlier, back as far as 1945 and beyond.

The Manager handled all public replies to the book. He, not area Committees or Assistants, decided which reviews should be answered and how this should be done. About three-dozen reviews and announcements in periodicals were reported. The Manager elected to send corrections only to five of these.¹

The first letter he sent went to the editor of a national, Protestant magazine,² with whom an area Committee had been in touch a few months before about another matter.³ The Manager challenged two points that had been made by the book and had been "accepted . . . in toto" by the reviewer: (a) that the Church is internally a dictatorial institution, and (b) that the Church is undemocratic in

¹Two calls on dealers, one on the publisher, and one on a library were also made. These are discussed in later pages of this chapter.

²The name of the magazine will be kept anonymous.

³The call concerned the Anglican The Church's Ministry of Healing. Man. to CoP, June 16, 1958. Item #1173.

its practices in outside society.

The purpose in writing, the Manager explained, was to acquaint the editor with facts which would enable him "to judge a little better." "We value the good opinion" of the magazine, he said. The Manager had no desire to see the letter printed.¹

The Manager stated that he considered the author's charges "nonsensical."

He is of course entitled to his point of view, however nonsensical it may seem to us. He makes repeated reference, however, to his own "objectivity," though he graciously admits to a "prejudice" in favor of democracy, freedom, and the individual conscience-- a prejudice to which all of us, I am sure, would be happy to admit.

In the first place there is in the Church the "fundamental spiritual democracy, . . . namely, the individual's direct recourse to God through prayer . . ."

Yet objectivity would surely demand that he at least recognize this spiritual dynamic in the life of our church, this conviction that the humblest participant in its activities has direct access to the unlimited power of divine Love . . .²

¹The Manager told the Board of Directors that he did not care to have the letter published in order not to initiate a public controversy. Man. to E.O., August 27, 1958. Item #305-113.

²"Lacking that understanding of the effective spiritual democracy of The Mother Church, any picture of the Christian Science organization is a case of Hamlet without the prince!" Staff member to C.S. Braden, August 1, 1958. Item #305-144.

In the second place the author had depended "almost wholly" on the views of the dissidents.

The trouble is that Dr. Braden has taken his interpretations almost wholly from a few dissidents who have left the church. This seems a curious sort of "objectivity." He seems to assume that the motives, methods, ideas, and statements of any individual who has broken with The Mother Church are necessarily irreproachable and unquestionable.

Also the author had disregarded the fact that these dissidents disagree "sharply with each other."¹

The Manager cited an excerpt from a review of Christian Science Today in the Evanston (Illinois) Review, which also had noted the author's reliance on the views of the dissidents.²

On the second charge of undemocratic social practices there were "puzzling lapses of scholarship." The author had accused the Church of seeking to remove

¹Support for this lies in the fact that Ideas of To-day, the organ of perhaps the largest group of dissenters, the followers of John W. Doorly, now deceased, criticized the book despite the fact that the book had named Doorly in its defense of dissenters. (Vol. VII, Nov. 6, 1958) Item #314-27. Also see Man. to E. O., August 28, 1958. Item #305-112.

²The review, published July 24, 1958, was written by Professor Ney MacMinn, a former colleague of Dr. Braden's at Northwestern University. Professor MacMinn drew a distinction between "the historical aspects" of the book, which he took as "sound," and the conclusions regarding the dissidents, which he held "suspect." The Manager cited the last paragraph of the review.

books from public libraries and had cited in support two items published over thirty years ago in a Christian Science periodical. Yet he failed even to mention, the Manager declared, the Committee's current policy which had been shown to him on a visit to Boston: "No effort should be made to have false or misleading so-called Christian Science literature removed from the shelves of public libraries."¹

Likewise, the author had accused the Church of threatening or exercising a boycott against booksellers who sell books the Church finds unfavorable. Again the author had failed to mention a policy statement which he had read: "In dealings with booksellers Committees should never try to suppress the sale of an obnoxious book."²

The Manager further explained:

I might add that we try scrupulously to enforce the rules I have quoted from our general instructions--though, not being the totalitarian dictatorship Dr. Braden imagines, we cannot always prevent individual Christian Scientists from taking unwise actions.

¹General Instructions for Committees on Publication (the predecessor of the present Handbook), paragraph 109.

²Ibid., paragraph 34.

Linked with the author's presentation of the views of the dissidents was his discussion of the teaching. The author, the Manager said, had widely missed the mark in presenting the religion itself.

Above all, his book seems to miss the point that the hair-splitting metaphysical "controversies" which he attributes to the Christian Science movement are the creation of those who would turn Christian Science, if they could, into mere theory--or theories--instead of seeing it as a Christian teaching whose vitality and authenticity are best tested by the fruits of the Spirit it brings forth in healing, regeneration and brotherly love.

In a parting sentence the Manager said he hoped that the editor would give "at least equal attention to books on Christian Science in which scholarship is balanced by a more sympathetic insight into subject matter."

The editor a few days later sent a friendly acknowledgment. He had read the letter "carefully more than once."

We do seek to adopt a sympathetic and understanding attitude toward your movement ourselves, but, of course, we cannot set bounds on the reviewers of books--or the writers of them.¹

¹The Committee had not asked, of course, that "bounds" be set, only that there be a reporting responsibility of "equal attention" to more sympathetic volumes. A few days after Christian Science Today appeared, the more friendly Christian Science, Its Encounter with American Culture was published. The magazine did not review this book. Four months later Why I Am A Christian Scientist came out. This one the magazine did review--during the summer of 1959.

This concluded the exchange.¹

A second letter was sent to the Rev. Theodore G. Tappert, who reviewed Christian Science Today for the Lutheran, published in Philadelphia. Like the first to the editor, this letter went to a person with whom the Committee had had previous contact. The Committee had been in touch with Tappert about published comment of his own on Christian Science a few years before.

The Manager wrote to convey the excerpt from the book review in the Evanston Review. He remarked on one comment by Tappert--a reference to the book's portrait of "counterattacks of an organized chain of vigilant committees on publication":

I hope that our efforts to reach a better mutual understanding in the past, and to meet on the common ground of Christian respect, have not been regarded by you as "counterattacks." They were not so regarded by us.

The Manager recommended Christian Science, Its Encounter with American Culture.

A week later the reviewer replied that he had only "intended to describe what the author had attempted

¹Man. to editor, August 29, 1958. Editor to Man., September 10, 1958. Item #303.

to do . . ." The point about "counterattacks" was the author's, not the reviewer's.¹

The next letter, the third, did not go out until the following year. It was in reply to a book review in The Times Literary Supplement in London. The June 19, 1959, issue had reviewed the English edition of Christian Science Today (London: Allen and Unwin), which had just appeared.

The District Manager prepared and sent the letter to the Literary Supplement. Of five letters in response to reviews, this was the only one for which publication was sought--and obtained on July 17.

The letter took up two points. First, it challenged the reviewer, who had--as often happens in the Literary Supplement--remained anonymous, for criticizing Mrs. Eddy in excess of Christian Science Today. The book itself had shown her respect.² His criticisms constituted, the District Manager said, a "crude attack" and had "so little authority" from either the book or her actual life.

Your reviewer's dogmatic attribution of the most sordid motives to Mrs. Eddy and the teachings of

¹Man. to Theodore G. Tappert, October 6, 1958. T. G. Tappert to Man., October 14, 1958. Item #198.

²The District Manager's letter cited The New York Times on this: "No Scientist can accuse Mr.

her church utterly disregards the great good this church is doing and the esteem Christian Science has generally won through its courageous insistence on the reinstatement of Christian healing.

Second, the book and the review alike err "in emphasis and interpretation" of the Church's government.

The rules in the Church Manual by Mary Baker Eddy express her determination that the principle of Christian healing which she discovered shall not be lost to the world a second time, through personal pride and intellectual speculation.

This basic intention must be taken into account "to keep the painful problems of dissenters in fair proportion."

The reviewer's failure to provide "some perspective such as this" was a disservice to the readers.

The reviewer, still maintaining his anonymity, replied in a letter published a week later. To his reply the District Manager did not respond.¹

A fourth letter went in December to a reviewer, the Rev. G. F. S. Gray, in the periodical, Theology, published in London. The District Manager had had a previous, friendly contact with this reviewer, and he

Braden of being anything but reverential toward Mary Baker Eddy as an original force in modern Christian experience."

¹Item #310 and #312.

wrote to send him a copy of the first letter above to the Protestant weekly. The purpose for writing Gray, the Manager in Boston advised, was to show him "that we really do operate on a Christian basis here."

The reviewer acknowledged the District Manager's letter appreciatively.¹

The Manager sent a reply to a fifth review in the following April of 1960. It went to Dr. Maurice B. Visscher of the Medical School at the University of Minnesota. Visscher had reviewed Christian Science Today in the November-December 1959 issue of The Humanist. The Manager wrote simply to convey a copy of Christian Science, Its Encounter with American Culture. This book might serve better than the other, the Manager said, to answer

your question as to how a person possessed of any intelligence could find in Christian Science "a positive value that deserves survival."

A few days later the reviewer appreciatively acknowledged the book.²

¹Letter quoted is, Man. to D. M., December 15, 1959. Item #314-43.

²Letter quoted is dated April 18, 1960. Item #1068.

Discussion. The issues in the reviews and the replies were acutely significant. They concerned the status of the Church as a democratic institution in a democratic society.

Despite the importance of the issues, the Committee actually made few replies. It sent only five letters in the face of somewhat widespread reviewing and advertising in the United States and Great Britain. Only one letter went for publication, the letter to the Times Literary Supplement.

Several reasons may have been behind the restraint. In view of the known attitude of the author-- he and the Committee had traded correspondence over several decades--, a published exchange might only have led to a running debate and controversy, which as already noted the Committee has little taste for. This had happened with the author once before.¹

Furthermore, the conclusions of the book were

¹One published exchange between the Manager and Braden was, according to Braden, "so spirited" that it was reprinted and circulated in ten thousand copies. Christian Science Today, p. 197.

not easily answered in the space of a single letter to the editor.¹ The issues were complex and far-reaching, and much detail--not any less one-sided in the Committee's estimation because of the quantity--had been provided.

But probably for most of these reviews, even as for most of the published comment on the Church generally,² the Committee simply judged that the remarks were the best that could be expected under the circumstances and they did not, therefore, warrant correction.

The reason for writing to three of the reviewers was clear. The letters to Tappert, Gray, and the editor of the Protestant weekly went to persons with whom the Committee had had previous contact. The intention evidently was to shore up the understanding assumed gained on the earlier occasions.

The letters to Tappert, Gray, and Visscher were letters of transmittal. Their purpose was to convey further information for those reviewers to ponder--respectively, an excerpt from a published review of the book, a letter that the Manager had sent to the

¹A "near impossible" task, according to a staff member. Interview, May 25, 1962.

²See p. 202.

Protestant weekly, and a recently published book.

All reviewers but one acknowledged the Committee's letter without arguing over the book's issues. The reviewer in the Times Literary Supplement alone challenged the information conveyed in the letter. His review to begin with had introduced criticism in excess of the book and was the only one that the Manager met with a published reply.

Corrections of book reviews are, like those of syndicated material, assisted by the grass-roots contact and centralization of effort. Christian Science Today was reviewed in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States. Advertising of it reached Germany, South Africa, New Zealand, Australia, and other countries.

(7) We turn for a final syndicated case to a second church pronouncement on religious healing. In May 1960 The United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America adopted a report on healing in preparation four years. The report, whose final title was to be The Relation of Christian Faith to Health (Philadelphia:

Office of the General Assembly), provided conclusions about Christian Science similar to those in the Anglican report of June 1958.¹

The Manager in a statement to the press challenged the report for its comments on the Christian Scientists' view of evil--a familiar issue. Noting that the report "contains heartening evidence of the churches's growing response to Christ's command, 'Heal the sick,'" the Manager explained that evil was held "unreal" because "contrary to the sovereign will of God"; that this did not mean mankind needed no redemption; that Jesus is "the Saviour of humanity" because "he revealed and proved for all time that a knowledge of God's will and unreserved obedience to it are the remedy for sin and sickness"; and that similar to

a child in the grip of a nightmare, . . . mortals in the grip of vice, pain, fear, selfishness, and all forms of materialism need to be awakened to the true spiritual status of man as the son of God, as Jesus showed him to be.

This awakening of themselves and others is the "incentive" of Christian Scientists.

¹See paragraphs 63 and 64 of the report.

The encouraging success of these efforts, including the approach of The Christian Science Monitor to contemporary social problems, should be sufficient assurance that Christian Scientists are dedicated, like other Christians, to "the betterment of human conditions."

The Manager acknowledged the presence of differing theological interpretations but was "confident that these doctrinal disagreements will not prevent further progress in the spirit of Christian fellowship . . ."

The events leading up to the statement, which was issued on May 25, 1960, are instructive. The 172nd General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church had convened in Cleveland, Ohio, and had before it the pronouncement. Copies of the pronouncement were given to the press and publicized around the country on May 23 and 24.

Cleveland newspapers reviewed the report locally. The Associated Press and New York Times Service distributed items on the report nationally. The Times Service story, which contained a reference to Christian Science, was published by subscribing papers in Detroit, Kansas City, Dallas, San Francisco, Seattle, Miami, and New York.

The Committee for Ohio, upon learning from Cleveland newspapers about "serious misrepresentations," took the matter up with several Presbyterian leaders. He discussed the points in a series of calls and had an extensive conversation with the writer of the report. The result was that in the final report three sentences were altered by two or three words and two sentences rewritten, causing a sixth sentence to be dropped.¹

The Manager commented about the final version as adopted:

As it now stands, it registers a genuine difference of theological views but not actually a misrepresentation of our teachings.

Because of the wide publicity given the early version, the Manager wrote to Newsweek, Time, The Christian Century, and Religious News Service. He explained that the report as adopted contained modifications in its reference to Christian Science. He forwarded to them his own statement (cited above).

No replies were sent to newspapers which carried the comment about Christian Science. The Manager advised

¹Compare the final report with the preliminary draft, which is entitled Report of The Special Committee on the Relation of Christian Faith to Health.

on May 27 against replies in order not to "stir up afresh a situation which has been greatly improved."

The Christian Science Monitor carried a news story on the Presbyterian report on May 28 and an editorial on June 3.¹

Discussion. The mass communicators in this case were Church leaders. Their medium of communication was a denominational pronouncement that would be significant source-material for ministers, students, authors, and other inquirers for years to come. The Committee believed that something urgently needed to be done about the assertions in the preliminary report. A few comments were very unjust from the Committee's standpoint, such as that Christian Science "undercuts the entire Christian system of ethics . . ." ²

The state Committee appealed to the responsible officials for a just and accurate presentation. Evidently the logic of his argument was convincing, for the

¹Letters quoted are: Man. to E. O., May 27, 1960; Man. to CoPs in the United States, Possessions, and Canada, May 27, 1960. Item #240.

²See paragraph 64 of the preliminary report.

above comment and several others like it were deleted.

The Committee for Ohio remarked in his summary:

One of the impressions that I had from this whole experience is that we need to establish more communication with these ministers of other faiths in order that they may understand our viewpoint sympathetically.¹

The Presbyterian report and the Church of England report had much in common. The Committee's approach to each, however, was markedly different. The Committee distributed to meet the Anglican report what was in fact a pronouncement, signed by The Christian Science Board of Directors. This pronouncement gave the Church's position on a public question--the cooperation of the clergy and the medical profession in religious healing. The pronouncement was distributed to every newspaper that would take it.

The Committee met the Presbyterian report differently. It replied with a Committee on Publication statement, not a pronouncement. The statement did not provide views on a publicly debated question but rather attempted by an explanation of Christian Science to correct comments

¹CoP for Ohio to Man., May 25, 1960. Item #240.

on the religion judged to be inaccurate. The statement was supplied only to a selected few periodicals.

The distinction between correction and pronouncement is a significant one. The Christian Science Church only rarely makes pronouncements. The purpose of the Committee on Publication is to make corrections, not church pronouncements.

State Committees drew upon the personal good will they had with newspaper editors and newsmen. The Committee for Ohio, when the story appeared, telephoned a local church editor about it. He obtained from him a copy of the draft report. Also he called a wire service office to learn whether or not its wire stories had mentioned Christian Science. In Michigan the Committee for the state called a local church editor about the story in his newspaper. Very likely these calls were repeated in other states. The Committee cultivates working relationships with newsmen that permit informal calls back and forth.

Sermons

The Committee replies to the spoken as well

as printed word. About a third of all its corrective responses are to sermons and ministerial addresses.

From 1958 to 1960 the Committee on Publication responded to 52 sermons and ministerial addresses. These responses involved most of the Protestant denominations, mainly the old-line churches:

Anglican and Episcopalian	8
Baptist	7
Church of Christ	1
Congregational	1
Lutheran	1
Methodist	2
Presbyterian	11
Unitarian-Universalist	2
United Church (Canada)	3
Unknown	16

Nearly as many of these calls occurred outside as inside the United States. Twelve were in overseas areas, 11 in Canada, and 29 in the United States.

The Committee's usual reply to the sermon is by interview rather than by letter. Over three-fifths of the responses were by personal call. There were 35 interviews, 12 exchanges by correspondence, 2 replies where both a letter and a call were involved, and 3 where the means are not known.

An interview may be especially useful in correcting a sermon, especially when the only information on a sermon is a hearsay report. The interviewer can both find out and talk out the misunderstandings.

The Committee relies heavily on printed material in its replies to sermons. It gave out books, pamphlets, and periodicals as part of at least 32 of the 52 corrections. The Handbook advises the area Committee on offering source material:

He calls on ministers who preach on Christian Science and offers them authentic data--preferably before they speak; otherwise, afterward.¹

The Committee on learning of a friendly sermon "afterward" has sometimes expressed appreciation by offering a book.²

The Committee apparently perceives there to be a special need to convey "the Christian spirit of our religion" to ministers. This getting the "spirit" across is evidently judged as important, or more important, than

¹Handbook, p. 18.

²See Lynden C. Lawson file. Item #1082.

providing information. The Manager advised one area Committee before a call on a minister:

It might just be that you can touch him with the Christian spirit of our religion--can assure him of the simple Biblical basis of Christian Science and make it clear to him that Christian Scientists prayerfully and earnestly strive to follow the Master in all that he said and did.¹

On another occasion the Manager counseled that ministers "need special reassurance" on "the deeply Christian basis of Christian Science and our devotion to Christ Jesus as Master and Saviour."²

The over-all approach was set forth in a letter that the Manager wrote to the Committee for Montana. The letter concerned an Episcopal minister who had delivered a sermon on Christian Science. In this case a copy of the sermon text had made its way to the state Committee and the Manager.

The Manager recommended first of all an interview. He did not advise, however, that the interviewer go to take up each misstatement.

There is so much factually erroneous in the minister's sermon that it may be best not to try to correct each point, one by one.

¹Man. to CoP for Northern California, re Dr. Wilbur C. Christians, January 7, 1959. Item #1019.

²Man. to CoP for Washington state, re Rev. Harvey Taylor, November 2, 1959. Item #568.

Any point that the minister raised might usefully be discussed, of course. But the purpose of the interview was something else.

The main purpose of the visit, however, should be to try to bring to the minister in a loving and helpful way the Christian spirit of our religion. He should be assured of the great importance of Christ Jesus to us, our complete acceptance of his physical resurrection from the grave, and the tremendous emphasis in Christian Science on the sacrifice and the crowning glory of our Master's work.

Source material ought to be offered him. The interviewer might recommend to the minister that he read the explanatory chapter on "Atonement and Eucharist" in Science and Health. Also, the minister might be offered the book, Why I Am A Christian Scientist, because of its theological orientation.

In reading this book, the minister would doubtless discover for himself a good number of the inaccuracies in his sermon.

Subsequently, the state Committee and his local Assistant called together on the minister. They left the book that the Manager had recommended and also a second. During the course of the conversation, they

learned that the minister had used the Dakin biography of Mrs. Eddy as his authority. According to the Committee, the minister "seemed kind and considerate in our discussion and said that he appreciated that we had called on him."¹

This emphasis on "the Christian spirit" plays a part in calls on seminary professors as well. One Assistant Committee had over a number of years won the respect and good will of a seminary faculty. He described the need as one of stressing the "theology":

when Christian Science is presented as a theology based upon the teachings of Christ Jesus, [these clergymen are open] to the corrective fact that spiritual healing is the natural effect of a correct concept of the Science of true Christian theology. . . . once this point is grasped by these rigid theologians their concept of Christian Science changes from one of contempt to one of respect.²

The evidence indicates that most of the interviews the Committee obtains with clergymen turn out to be friendly calls. The Committee for North Carolina obtained an interview with a minister that turned

¹Letters quoted are: Man. to CoP for Montana, re Rev. Jackson E. Gilliam, February 24, 1960. CoP for Montana to Man., February 8 (March 8?), 1960. Item #395.

²Man. to E.O., January 14, 1960. Item #2015.

into a very agreeable two-and-a-half hour visit. The Committee gave him a book and showed to him a corrective letter that the Committee had sent to a writer whom the minister had used as an authority for public comments on Christian Science.

Toward the end of the interview, the minister told the Committee that he felt there was some cross-bearing on the Committee's part in that the Committee had come to see someone who had said unkind, even slightly hostile, things about his religion. According to the Committee:

This gave me an opportunity to explain that I had come fully protected by my conviction that he would not intentionally harm us and that I was sure he would welcome enlightenment, for he stood for the Truth . . .¹

A noteworthy unfriendly call occurred in Canada. An Assistant Committee in Ontario sought and obtained an interview with a minister who had announced a public sermon on Christian Science. According to the Assistant's report, the minister during the forty-five-minute interview "did nearly all the talking." He had obtained

¹CoP for North Carolina to Man., re Rev. John S. Brown, January 2, 1959. Item #1008.

his information "from unfriendly sources" and had had "unfortunate contacts with some so-called Christian Scientists." The minister did not invite the Assistant Committee to sit down or take off his coat. The Assistant left with him some literature. The sermon preached by the minister turned out unfavorable, with "slanderous statements about Mrs. Eddy."¹

There was one sermon among the fifty-two at which a Committee attempted to correct from the floor. This was not in accordance with the general policy, which evidently is not to challenge an address during its presentation or to heckle a speaker--a policy observed even in countries where these practices are more common than in the United States. Rather the Committee is to interview the speaker before or after his address, personally and privately. No public retraction other than what the minister may volunteer from the platform is sought.

On this one occasion an area Committee attempted to get a hearing from the floor. It was during the second of two talks on Christian Science. The Committee had called on the minister of the church before the first

¹Assistant to CoP for Ontario, re Rev. Norman Coll, February 29, 1960. Item #297.

talk and had left him some pamphlets. Despite his efforts, the address was not favorable.

The second talk, a week later, was given by a substitute minister whom the Committee had not called upon. The minister "rehearsed" much of what the first minister had said. When during the question period the minister gave some misleading answers, the Committee got to his feet and asked if he might speak as a Christian Scientist. The minister consented to this.

In his report the Committee explained that his remarks were given

in a kindly manner and although I had explained that my purpose was simply to offer correct information, with no intention of debating the subject, two persons present reacted discourteously but without noticeable effect.

On learning of the incident, the Manager advised the Committee:

As a general rule, of course, remarks of a corrective nature are not made in a public assembly because of the possibility of a debate being started and feelings running high. But there are rare exceptions to this general rule . . .¹

Two ministers during addresses asked area Committees in attendance for help in answering questions from

¹CoP for Ontario to Man., re Rev. John Short, November 3, 1959. Man. to CoP for Ontario, November 20, 1959. Item #541.

the congregation. Both ministers had earlier met the Committees. They requested assistance because of difficulty they were having with the questions.

One of the ministers, in Switzerland, asked the area Committee to answer a question and then decided to turn the entire question period over to him.¹

The second minister, in Canada, had been "endeavoring to be fair and accurate," according to the Committee, but found during the question period "considerable difficulty in answering." The minister then asked the Committee to provide an answer to a question. The Committee "did so briefly but did not take advantage of this opportunity to make further corrections . . ."²

Committees also give attention to seminaries. They offer books to seminary libraries and accept invitations to address seminary classes. That these endeavors have their effect was indicated by a Baptist minister in Kentucky. During the course of a friendly sermon on Christian Science, he acknowledged appreciatively having heard a talk by the state Committee a few years before

¹CoP for German-speaking Switzerland to Man., re Rev. Fischer, March 2, 1960. Item #387.

²CoP for Ontario to Man., re Rev. Kenneth Barker, March 1, 1960. Item #251.

as a student in seminary.¹

The Committee for Illinois found ministerial misrepresentation in an unexpected place on one occasion. A legislative committee at his state capitol was considering at a public hearing a bill of interest to the Scientists. One of the legislative committee members, an ordained Methodist minister, stated before the twenty-five other members and an audience that Christian Science was not a religion but a philosophy and that there were no Christian Scientists among the chaplains in the Armed Forces. At the invitation of the chairman, the Committee on Publication for the state, who was attending, responded and pointed out that both statements were incorrect. The Committee subsequently presented the minister with a book on Christian Science activities during World War II. Later the minister told the Committee he was sorry to have made the erroneous statement. He said he would be willing to apologize publicly before the hearing, an offer the Committee declined.²

¹CoP for Kentucky to Man., re Rev. James P. McCloskey, November 4, 1958. Item #1096.

²Man. to E. O., August 4, 1959. Item #835.

Medical talks

Committees were in touch with medical doctors on four occasions during the winter of 1959-1960.¹ These doctors had discussed Christian Science in public addresses. The Committees responded with three letters and an interview.

Two of the doctors repeated the familiar assertion of a link between Christian Science and hypnotism. The Manager advised the Committees in their replies to draw a distinction but without attacking hypnotism. The only way to refute the link, the Manager recommended, is to help the doctors "see the Christian and spiritual basis of our religion"² and that Christian Science is "based on prayer and spiritual understanding rather than on human suggestion."³

Both doctors answered the Committee's letters. They indicated a friendliness toward and appreciation of Christian Science but gave little recognition to the distinction that the Manager considered paramount.

¹Filed L. J. West, Item #581; M. E. Bryant, Item #284; M. Fishbein, Item #389; F. G. Rice, Item #530.

²Man. to CoP for Oklahoma, re Dr. Louis J. West, November 19, 1959. Item #581.

³Man. to CoP for Washington state, re Maurice E. Bryant, December 15, 1959. Item #284.

One doctor remarked, "I am thoroughly convinced that any suggestion as long as it is good positive suggestion, is good."

The other, a psychiatrist, had linked Christian Science to hypnotism through Quimby. He replied to the Committee that he was "a great admirer of Mrs. Eddy's," that he believed her to be "an extraordinary woman," that Christian Science "could never have derived from any teaching or practices of Mr. Quimby's," and that the "medical profession would be foolish not to consider the significance of these results" of Christian Science healing. He further noted:

Mrs. Eddy's genius lay in her ability to translate information regarding the effects of human mind upon the body (which are still available to any student of hypnosis) into certain universal truths about man and his relationship to the universe.

Classrooms

The classroom in educational institutions is as significant as the book or the sermon as a source of public information. In the classroom the adult of tomorrow adopts attitudes on any number of subjects



which he will take with him to the grown-up world. The educator bequeaths ideals and truths to guide him--and too, alas, untruths, half-truths, and biases on occasion.

The classroom is a difficult working area for the Committee, perhaps its most difficult. The Committee's calls from 1958 to 1960 were only at college level, and there were few of these as we shall see.

The classroom is a sensitive working area for several reasons. There is, for one thing, the American tradition of the inviolable status of the classroom against outside interference. The Committee evidently recognizes and respects this. The Handbook advises:

Any approach to a school teacher, school administrator, or college professor regarding books used in teaching of classes may involve questions of academic freedom and intellectual integrity.¹

There is also the principle of church-state separation, to which the Committee is committed. The Handbook cites the principle in advising Committees that invitations from public elementary and high schools are

¹Handbook, p. 23.

not accepted unless "other major religious groups are also appearing."¹

The Committee finds that Christian Science is not always justly presented in educational institutions, especially at college level. It is not a question of the Church's receiving a hearing so much as its receiving a fair and accurate presentation when given a hearing.

The Manager has put the problem as follows on two occasions:

the leading source of misrepresentations and distortions regarding Christian Science at the present period is located in the colleges, universities and theological seminaries; in the books, bibliographies and classroom materials used in courses on comparative religion; and, to some extent, philosophy sociology and history.²

The great need at the college level is to counter the books to which college students are exposed. . . . Dakin, Bates-Dittemore, and Braden, as well as various books on sociology and comparative religion which contain critical chapters on Christian Science, are on assigned reading lists in many college courses and are included in many wider lists of suggested reading--often not from any feeling of antagonism but simply because it is

¹Ibid., p. 178. The Manager, not the area Committee, decides when a correction is to be taken up with a school and when an invitation to address a public school classroom is to be accepted.

²Man. to E. O., March 23, 1960. Item #914.

assumed that they represent solid scholarship which needs to be considered in any rounded view of the subject.¹

The Committee indicated the over-all attitude to the classroom to one professor: "I'm sure we both value academic freedom highly and by the same token value academic responsibility."²

The approach, which is analogous to the call on the author, editor, and minister, is to lay information before the instructor. Special care is evidently taken to respect his academic status. The Manager advised area Committees on three occasions:

A professor can always claim that he was not ridiculing Christian Science but simply presenting "facts" which were unacceptable to Christian Scientists in a class. [A correction] should never be presented as a protest but rather as a friendly offer to supply information. It is especially important that the professor in question should not be able to interpret such action as "pressure" exerted on him directly or indirectly through his superior.³

You might point out to him, if it seems appropriate, that although you recognize the inviolable rights of academic freedom as far as he is concerned, it

¹Man. to E.O., February 23, 1960. Item #1028.

²Man.'s suggested wording to CoP for Michigan for sending to F. M. Donahue, February 17, 1959. Item #1034.

³Man. to CoP for Michigan, re F. M. Donahue, February 17, 1959. Item #1034.

①

does seem that the rules of good scholarship as well as of intellectual integrity require any commentator on Christian Science to give as much heed to source books sympathetic in their approach to our religion as those critical of it.¹

I am sure that you know that in approaching a professor, great tact is necessary in not creating the impression that one is trying to interfere with his freedom of presentation. The sole effort should be to offer one's services in providing him with any authentic material that would be useful to him in his course.²

The Committee made few classroom calls from 1958 to 1960--six in the United States and three in Germany--, all at the college level. In each the Committee offered information. Except for once in Germany, the Committee made no more than one call on a professor. The calls in most cases were prompted by a report from a church member, the Committee in effect approaching the professor as the member's representative.

The first call was in February 1959. The Committee for Michigan sent a letter and a book in response to classroom remarks by a professor of religion.³

¹Man. to CoP for Wyoming, re W. Davies, July 31, 1959. Item #364.

²Man. to CoP for Ohio, December 31, 1959.
Item #241.

³Filed F. M. Donahue. Item #1034.

In April 1959 the Committee for Wisconsin interviewed a sociology professor. His purpose, as he explained "at the outset" of the call, was "to clarify some of these points in the event he would be giving similar lecture . . ." He left two books.¹

In August the Committee for Wyoming called on a history professor. During the course of "a nice interview," the professor said that he had used Dakin's book, knew it was antagonistic, but "did not know that there were other books on Christian Science."² The Committee supplied a book.

In November the Committee for Northern California wrote to a professor and sent him a gift copy of a book.³

In December the Manager received a report that a professor in Ohio was "going to devote a week" of lectures to the religion. He advised the Committee to make sure that the college library had all the books it needed and to offer source material to the professor.⁴

¹CoP for Wisconsin to Man., re J. Zadrozny, May 1, 1959. Item #602.

²CoP for Wyoming to Man., re W. Davies, August 21, 1959. Item #364.

³Filed H. N. Smith. Item #549.

⁴Man. to CoP for Ohio, December 31, 1959. Item #241.

In May 1960 the Manager asked the Committee for Nebraska to call on a professor, probably in the field of psychology. The Committee was to supply the professor with the Church's side to a highly critical discussion in a book that he had assigned to a student who was an adherent of Christian Science.¹

Overseas, the Assistant Committee for Berlin and East Germany on different occasions communicated with three lecturers at the "People's Colleges" in Berlin. Upon the announcement of lectures on Christian Science by them, he called on or wrote to each to supply information. The Assistant Committee communicated twice with one lecturer--before a first talk by the lecturer and after a second which had been "confused." Another lecturer, after receiving a letter, visited the Assistant for information and for some literature to distribute at his lecture.²

The Committee on Publication advises but apparently does not represent parents to primary and secondary school teachers. On two occasions parents called on

¹Filed Psychological Healing. Item #438.

²Filed Horst Grothe (October 1958), Wilhelm Knevels (December 1959), and Mrs. Loni (May 1960). Item #244.

their state Committee about criticisms made in classes which their children attended.

In Pennsylvania in November 1959 a parent-- president of his child's junior high school P.T.A. no less!--came to the Committee about such a situation. It seems a teacher had made "some very uncomplimentary statements" on Christian Science in his daughter's class. The state Committee cautioned the parent against protesting to the school administration but advised him instead to "first have a talk with the teacher." The father did so with "very satisfactory results," and the matter went no further.¹

In Massachusetts in October 1958 a mother asked what to do about a like situation. The teacher in a denominational day school was heckling her child about the family religion. The Committee provided two pamphlets and suggested that she send these to the teacher with a "loving" note of transmittal.²

Libraries

For the most part the Committee on Publication

¹CoP for Pennsylvania to Man., November 9, 1959. Item #241.

²Filed May Humphrey Pease, Item #510.

seems to recognize the neutrality of libraries. Libraries after all are depositories of the printed word, designed more to protect published material and make it available than to evaluate it except in a general sense.

The Committee's approach indicates some respect for this neutral purpose. The Committee seeks to add titles--its own books--not to have books suppressed. It evidently answers the unsympathetic volume shelved at a library by placing gift copies of favorable books where they are welcome.

The Handbook provides for the positive protest of hostile books at libraries:

We never take steps, nor do we exert pressure, for removal from library shelves of unfriendly or inaccurate books. Such practices would be unethical. Our purpose in the library work is to provide libraries with authentic books and to encourage their use.¹

¹Ibid., p. 233. The Committee's approach to add to, not subtract from, available titles coincides with such statements of library ethics as the following one by the American Library Association and the American Book Publishers Council: "It is the responsibility of publishers and librarians to give full meaning to the freedom to read by providing books that enrich the quality of thought and expression. By the exercise of this affirmative responsibility, bookmen can demonstrate ~~that the answer to a bad book is a good one, the answer to a bad idea is a good one.~~" Point 7 of a statement prepared by the Westchester Conference of the American Library Association and the American Book Publishers Council, May 2 and 3, 1953. Provided by Downs in The First Freedom, p. 339. (Italics deleted.)

The policy is further set forth in remarks that the Manager made to two inquirers who had asked about unsympathetic volumes at libraries:

We cannot, of course, act as a body of censors in regard to what books shall be carried by any library, but we can make sure that authentic literature is provided for them.¹

It is not appropriate to complain to a library about the books on its shelves. The function of a public library is not to pass judgment on books that are published but to make them available to readers, regardless of what the individual librarian may think about any particular volume.²

Other aspects of the library policy are: The Committee does not hunt down volumes but responds only when an unfavorable title at a particular library is brought to its attention.³ It recognizes that the decision to accept a donation is the librarian's, and so it eschews "exerting pressure on the library."⁴ It does not attempt to guide or influence the librarian on the question of shelving favorable and unfavorable books.⁵ The

¹Man. to inquirer, re Dakin biography, October 2, 1959. Item #333-25.

²Man. to inquirer, re The Catholic Approach to Protestantism, May 23, 1956. Item #2036.

³No survey of unfavorable books was found in any Committee's jurisdiction during the study period.

⁴Handbook, p. 234.

⁵"We do not attempt to segregate good from bad books . . ." Handbook, p.235.

Committee may add a bookplate that lists church books to the authorized volume it donates. But it does not add bookplates to either the unfriendly volume or the non-authorized friendly book.¹

On four occasions from 1958 to 1960 the Committee responded to unfavorable titles shelved at public libraries.

In September 1959 in Argentina a nonmember objected that Christian Science Today was shelved at the library of a Protestant seminary. To his query as to what could be done, the Committee offered three books by Mrs. Eddy to the seminary librarian. These were accepted.²

In March 1960 the Committee for New South Wales, Australia, reported that a government reference library had shelved an inaccurate, though not unfriendly, book-- A Doctor Looks at Miracles (New York: Roy Publishers, 1959) by J.H. Harley Williams. The Manager recommended that Science and Health and one other book be placed.³

The next month, in April, the Manager learned that a military service school in New York state had shelved

¹Ibid., pp. 237, 239.

²See CoP for Argentina to Man., September 13, 1959. Item #303-9.

³See Asst. Man. to CoP for New South Wales, April 11, 1960. Item #589.

in its library a book with a critical discussion--
Psychology, Religion and Healing (New York: Abingdon
Cokesbury Press, 1951) by Leslie D. Weatherhead. The
Manager advised the Committee for New York to see if
several books might be donated.¹

A case in November 1959 had a different twist
to it. An Assistant Committee in Massachusetts asked
for counsel regarding a book by a dissident at a local
public library--Christian Science--Its Clear, Correct
Teaching (Berkeley, California: Lederer, Street and Zeus
Company, 1953) by Herbert W. Eustace. The Assistant
asked if she might "inform the librarian that the book
is not the correct teaching . . ."

The Committee agreed to this but only if she
expressed her opinion without making any demand. He
advised:

It would be quite all right for you to let the
librarian know in a friendly way that this book
is not considered by Christian Scientists to be
a correct, authentic presentation of their teach-
ings; but one should leave it to her own judgment
whether or not she passes this information on to
anyone else. . . . What is most important is to

¹See Man. to CoP for New York, March 27, 1959.
Item #579.

see that books which deal with Christian Science correctly shall be available on the shelves.¹

On most occasions the Committee has given its opinion on books only when asked. Either way, it evidently does not attach demands. When a Boston librarian asked for an appraisal of Christian Science Today, the Manager provided his view of the book by citing the Evanston Review comment. Then, to the librarian's request for a recommendation, he stated:

We have not felt that we could recommend either acceptance or rejection, since that would be a little like a Supreme Court justice passing on a case in which he himself was one of the interested parties.²

In Wyoming an Assistant Committee as an employee in a public library was asked by the librarian to decide on Christian Science Today. Recognizing her awkward position, she wrote to the state Committee who in turn asked the Manager about it. The Manager affirmed the over-all policy:

Under no circumstances should she ask the librarian not to accept the Braden book. . . .

¹CoP for Massachusetts to Assistant CoP, November 16, 1959. Item #382.

²Man. to librarian, September 17, 1958. Item #305-123.

No librarian should be in a position to say that she has been asked by a Christian Scientist not to carry the Braden book--even though the librarian may be a most friendly and well disposed person.

Of course, your Assistant is free, if she is asked, to give her own evaluation of the book, like any other free American; but she should decline to take on herself the responsibility of asking that the book be accepted or not accepted.

The Assistant could, however, find opportunities to take the "positive action" of bringing "accurate, friendly, and helpful books" to the attention of the librarian.¹

If a book is restricted or withdrawn, it may be the outcome of information the Committee has supplied at some point. But it is not the result of demands, protests, or persistent pressure, which are ruled out by the Committee's policy:

If books are withdrawn because they are patently erroneous, it may be due to the corrective facts Christian Scientists supply but certainly not to coercion by them. . . . The constructive work . . . in placing the true facts . . . before the public may be relied upon eventually to counteract such impositions. The advice given by Christ Jesus to let the tares and wheat "both grow together until the harvest" applies.²

¹Man. to CoP for Wyoming, October 2, 1958. The Manager sent this letter to CoPs in the United States, Possessions, and Canada on November 6, 1958, as "strict policy" for them to observe in similar situations.

²Man. to CoP for New York, re Encyclopedia Americana, November 26, 1957. Item #2032. Quotation is from Matt. 13:30.

The Manager's files indicate one exception to the policy of not seeking removal of a book from a library. According to the correspondence, there was on this occasion "no indignant protest," only a "quiet explanation."

The circumstances themselves were evidently exceptional. The book in one chapter violently attacked Christian Science as a "fad and quackery." It was shelved at the biology department library of a public high school and had been reported by a Sunday School pupil who attended the high school. The Committee excludes public schools from its library work¹ in keeping with its support of church-state separation, and so did not exercise the usual "positive" protest of donating a book.

The state Committee faced with these circumstances asked the Manager what to do. The Manager advised him that an Assistant in the locality might call on the head of the school department concerned and discuss the book with him. The question was

the propriety of a public school's displaying a book which badly misrepresents the facts about an established religious denomination and which, in fact, constitutes an all-out attack on us.

¹Handbook, p. 235.

It was hard to understand, the Manager said, how a book "written with so much bias and antagonism" and now thirty years old could be recommended with confidence to high school students.

He advised that the Assistant who called should be "reasonably familiar" with the author's criticisms and ready "to point out some refutations in the published works," if the instructor desired something specific on the book's inadequacy.

In this case, as always, it is important to emphasize to the one seeking the interview that the corrective work is properly done only when accomplished "in a Christian manner." There should be no demanding that the book be removed, no indignant protest, but instead a quiet explanation of why the book is offensive to Christian Scientists and an inquiry as to whether it is the policy of the school to include in its library attacks on a particular religious denomination.¹

According to the Assistant, there was "a very helpful conversation." The instructor expressed his admiration for certain Christian Scientists he knew and also for The Christian Science Monitor. When he learned that the book had been published in 1931 he volunteered to take it off the shelves.

¹Man. to CoP for Illinois, re Fads and Quackery in Healing, January 5, 1960. Item #389.

In one instance in May 1960 the Manager wrote to a reference library service that an encyclopedia publisher maintained for purchasers of its encyclopedia. Over a period of time, the library service had quoted extensively a book that the Committee believed misrepresented the facts about Mrs. Eddy. The Manager sent the head librarian a copy of the letter that he had previously sent to the author of this book. The librarian replied that she did not recall the article and would not have approved use of it. She further stated:

Although your letter naturally was a bit of a shock, we are very grateful to you for bringing to our attention an unworthy piece of work on our part and for giving us the opportunity to right a wrong.¹

Distribution

A comment needs not only its author but also its publisher, dealer, broadcaster, and even play producer to become public information. These middle men, wholesalers of opinion, control whether a comment will be heard by the public at all and also how it will be heard--its form, its attractiveness, the promotion behind it, and the like. The distributors have an essential role in

¹June 17, 1960. Item #1212.

making private comment public for the ultimate purpose of public enlightenment.

The Committee on Publication does not often call on distributors. The Handbook indicates that a letter to or interview with a distributor in preference to the author is the exception. Regarding calls on publishers, for instance, the Handbook provides:

Whatever appears in a book is the responsibility of the author. This is in contrast to newspapers and magazines, where the editor or publisher assumes responsibility. Therefore in corrections to books we normally make our presentation directly to the author rather than to his publisher. Representations to his publisher are likely to be viewed by an author as a form of commercial pressure, though in special circumstances a carbon copy of our corrective letter is sometimes sent to the publisher.¹

The Committee during the study period made eight calls on publishers. Only three of these concerned books, and these were reference texts.

In August 1958 the Manager wrote to Duell, Sloan and Pearce, Inc., (New York) about an Abbreviations Dictionary, written by Ralph De Sola and published by them. The Manager explained that the dictionary's

¹Handbook, p. 18.

designation for a Christian Science teacher, "C.S.B.," did not mean "Christian Science Believer."¹

In January 1959 the Manager wrote to J. J. Little and Ives, Company (New York) about their Complete and Unabridged: The Little and Ives Webster Dictionary. The Manager questioned the entry for "Christian Science" and for "Science and Health."²

In March 1959 the Manager wrote to Crown Publishers (New York) about Thesaurus of Book Digests by Hiram Hayden and Edmund Fuller. The Manager pointed out that the entry for Science and Health contained "certain misunderstandings" and the full title of the book was not given.³

For each the Manager explained his objection by supplying what he thought might serve as an appropriate definition. To one publisher he said about this, "Please understand that we do not wish to be officious or presumptuous but merely to help you toward greater accuracy if a revision of the book should be undertaken at any time." Each publisher acknowledged the Manager's letter with a friendly note.

¹August 12, 1958. Item #1201.

²January 16, 1959. Item #1202.

³March 23, 1959. Item #392.

Of five other publishers, four were religious presses which had published tracts on Christian Science.

The tract titles are:

Charles A. Blanchard, Christian Science and the Word of God (Chicago: Moody Press) (16 pages)

Amzi Clarence Dixon, Christian Science and the Bible (Chicago: Moody Press) (4 pages)

W. T. McLean, Christian Science (Detroit: Central Bible Depot, Inc.) (4 pages)

Paul A. Meigs, Christian Science Tested by Scripture (Nashville: The Sunday School Board) (8 pages)

Calls on three of the above publishers were just to ascertain the status of their tracts. State Committees learned that two tracts were no longer being distributed and stocks of a third were being destroyed. The publisher of the last explained that he was disposing of the tract because it bore the "cross and crown" emblem of the Christian Science Church. This, he had been told on an earlier occasion, was protected as a registered trademark.¹

The fourth tract, which has been widely distributed, led Committees in four states to respond with seven inter-

¹Filed under pamphlet titles. Items #58, #48, and #69.

views. The Committee in no case hunted down the tract but only acted where church members reported copies in circulation. In four of the seven calls, area Committees interviewed clergymen whom they already knew.

The influence of the leaflet was indicated by one state Committee, who judged that it was held:

quite authoritative by Baptist churches in general, and that it forms the basis of many criticisms which find their way into the Baptist pulpits.¹

The Manager in evaluating the tract for a state Committee noted that, while most of the leaflet dealt with "genuine doctrinal differences" which needed no correction, two parts were "clear misstatements." A discussion of Mrs. Eddy in the introduction and of prayer in a later section provided erroneous information, he said. Also, the last paragraph on "Authorities consulted" contained only unsympathetic titles:

in the spirit of the Golden Rule, as well as the rules of good scholarship, it would seem that one or two sympathetic sources should also have been consulted and listed.

In January 1960 a Committee called on an official of the publisher, who, he said, "is a good friend of mine."

¹Filed under pamphlet titles. Items #58, #48, and #69.

The official, the Committee reported, was "very much surprised" at the tract for he did not think such an attack on another denomination was in accord with the publisher's policy. "He promised to see what he could do to get this attack discontinued."

At this official's suggestion, the Committee called on a second official in March. This man "was not familiar with the tract and did not remember ever seeing it." He knew the author as an "outspoken" individual. Agreeing that such attacks were not in keeping with the press's policy, he promised to see if at least the introduction might not be changed. The Committee left with him a book.

The state Committee also called on two other officials of the publisher, whom he knew "quite well." These two likewise disapproved of the tract.

A year earlier, in March 1959, the tract led to a call in another state. When it was prominently displayed at a denominational building on a university campus, an Assistant Committee discussed the tract with

the minister in charge.

In May 1959 in a third state a Sunday School pupil was given the tract when he attended a music recital at a church building of the denomination. The Manager advised the state Committee to have someone call on the minister, point out its character, and offer a book.

In January 1960 a Committee called on a state official of the denomination. The Committee who had received a number of the tracts, visited this particular official "because I had already established this contact." The Committee pointed out to him the misrepresentations and

assured him we would have no concern about a tract which drew any comparison between the correct teachings of his religion and ours, even though it was written to convince the reader that he should be a Baptist.

The official agreed to the Committee's objections and offered to write to the denominational press about the situation.

All these personal calls had not caused circulation of the tract to abate much by June 1, 1960. The Committee

for Florida reported on that date, "The above pamphlet still seems to have quite a circulation in this area . . ." ¹

An eighth publisher called upon was Southern Methodist University. The call did not concern a book but rather an exhibit on bookmaking. At the Texas State Fair during the summer of 1958, the S. M. U. Press sponsored an exhibit featuring Christian Science Today. The exhibit was "a graphic presentation of the thirteen steps in the making of a book." ²

In October 1958, after the fair had concluded, the Committee for Texas wrote to the president of Southern Methodist:

I wonder if you are aware of the fact that at the recent Texas State Fair the SMU Press prominently exhibited a book which Christian Scientists sincerely believe gives a very distorted picture of our church?

Because of their love for the University, ³ "many Christian

¹Letters quoted are: CoP for Texas to Man., May 19, 1959; Man. to CoP for Tennessee, June 4, 1959; CoP for Tennessee to Man., January 11 and March 29, 1960; CoP for Texas to Man., January 13, 1960; CoP for Florida to Man., June 1, 1960. Item #69.

²From an S.M.U. publicity release on the exhibit.

³There is a Christian Science Organization at Southern Methodist University, formed by college students and faculty members who are Christian Scientists there. A College Organization is established under the rules of the college at which it is located and under the Church Manual (p. 73:7-21 [Article XXIII, Section 8]).

Scientists felt a deep sense of regret" over the exhibit.

I recognize, of course, that the SMU Press was fully within its rights in publicizing this book in such a way, as it was in publishing it in the first place. I have abstained from making any comment on the exhibit until the Fair was concluded, in order that my comment might not be construed in any way as an attempt at censorship or suppression.

The Committee had been moved to write not because the press published the book but "because the exhibit featured the book so prominently."

The S.M.U. Vice President replied two days later. He found it "distressing" to learn that the book was not considered accurate. He noted that the writer was thought to have the "very highest" credentials in his field and that the book had been used for the exhibit because it was the S.M.U. Press's latest publication and the printer's materials were all at hand.

The Vice President also stated:

Yours is the first indication we have had of this feeling beyond the occasional comments . . . in a few book reviews. . . . That you have understood our motivation in publishing this and all of our other books is clear in your letter and we are grateful.¹

(The Committee for Texas remarked in regard to

¹Letters quoted are dated October 28 and 30, 1958. Item #311.

this indication of the absence of protests, "This of itself disproves Braden's claim that Christian Scientists seek to suppress books which do not praise our religion."¹)

Calls on bookdealers are no more frequent than on publishers. There were three occasions during the study period--all in overseas areas--when area Committees called on dealers. In each instance the Committee learned of a book on sale and asked the Manager what might be done about it. The Manager suggested a procedure reminiscent of the library work, namely to recommend a favorable title to the dealer. Under no circumstances, however, were Committees to ask that an unfavorable book be removed.

The book, The Christian Science Myth (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1955) by Walter R. Martin and Norman H. Klann appeared for sale at a bookshop in British Guiana. The Committee there asked the Manager what action she might take. He counseled that she could tell the bookseller "about the Leishman and Peel books as recent works which give an

¹CoP for Texas to Man., October 31, 1958.
Item #311.

authentic picture of Christian Science." If this led to a discussion of the Myth, the Committee could point out that this book "is based wholly on hostile sources and presents what Christian Scientists feel to be a very incorrect picture of their religion." Whether or not the title was discussed,

you would not be asking the bookseller to remove these books but simply drawing to his attention that there are other, better informed ones which give a far truer picture.¹

Area Committees raised the same question in South Africa and Australia when Christian Science Today went on sale in their jurisdictions. The important thing, as the Manager told the first, was that the Committee "make it abundantly clear that you are not asking" the dealer to remove the unfavorable volume.²

Clergymen are in a sense bookdealers when they distribute tracts. Three calls on clergymen in regard to their distribution of a tract have already been mentioned.³

¹Man. to CoP for British Guiana, December 3, 1959. Item #470.

²Asst. Man. to CoP for Transvaal Province, September 16, 1959, Item #302-55. Also, see Man. to CoP for Tasmania, October 9, 1959. Item #312-35. The Manager's office was reluctant to have these Committees call on the bookseller at all. Interview with staff member, May 25, 1962.

³See the earlier discussion of calls on publishers of tracts.

The Manager in advising on two of these three calls put forward a distinction between the commercial dealer and the clergyman as a dealer:

Because a minister is not out just to sell books but rather to help his congregation strengthen their sense of Christianity, he can sometimes be shown that an unjust and inaccurate book works against his own Christian purposes.¹

Three further ministers were called upon about tracts they had distributed. The three calls shared the common characteristic of not accomplishing much.

In October 1958 a Committee called on a Methodist minister who had announced an address on Christian Science. The Committee knew him from an earlier call. The Committee sought unsuccessfully to discourage him from distributing a pamphlet which considered Christian Science among Some Distortions of the Christian Faith.²

In summer 1959 a Canadian Committee wrote to a Presbyterian minister in whose church a copy of Christian Science, Is it Christian? Is it Scientific? had been obtained. No reply was reported.³

¹Man. to CoP for Alabama, June 4, 1959. Also Man. to CoP for Florida, March 19, 1959. Item #69.

²Discussed in the earlier section on "Syndicated Material."

³For imprint, see Table 3.

In November 1959 the Committee for Colorado visited a Lutheran minister. The minister had sent a single-sheet reprint of an unfavorable article on The Christian Scientists by L. W. Spitz to someone who had turned to Christian Science for help.¹

Radio and television broadcasters constitute a third class of distributors in mass communications. They provide an especially expeditious route to reach great numbers of people.

During the study period the Committee called on three stations about radio sermons. The Committee, however, declined each station's offer for time on the air to reply.

The first call was in November 1958 in Mississippi. A Baptist minister had discussed Christian Science on the radio in a sermon on "False Prophets."²

The second was in December in Indiana. A Lutheran minister mentioned the religion critically in a radio sermon.³

¹The article is a reprint from The Lutheran Witness, LXXV (February 14, 1956), pp. 60-61. Item #1139.

²Filed Luther H. Parrish. Item #504.

³CoP for Indiana to Man., December 19, 1958. Item #923.

The third call occurred in South Carolina in June 1959. A Church of Christ minister attacked the religion on this occasion.¹

Several reasons appear in the correspondence as to why air time was not accepted for any of these:

A detailed rebuttal to the sermon might only sound like an apology of some kind, whereas the message of our regular programs,² heard week after week, offers challenging food for thought, and correction of misconceptions, to anyone with a receptive heart.³

a public correction over the radio is seldom useful. It may not reach most of the people who have heard the program and it is not wise to raise the particular criticisms which have been made, in order to answer them, since this gives further currency to the original criticisms.⁴

One argument used in approaching stations was that the Christian Science programs "rigorously abstain" from criticizing the beliefs of others.

In our programs we rigorously abstain from criticizing the religious beliefs of others or from undertaking

¹Filed W. N. Jackson. Item #435.

²Each station was broadcasting a weekly Christian Science radio program.

³Man. to CoP for Mississippi, re Luther H. Parrish, December 4, 1958. Item #504.

⁴Man. to CoP for South Carolina, re W. N. Jackson, June 11, 1959. Item #435.

to interpret these religious beliefs. [An unfounded attack is] so strongly out of accord with religious liberty and Christian tolerance in this country.¹

Your station will never have such a problem with the Christian Science program which you carry, for Christian Scientists do not attack other denominations. I am sure you will agree that we are entitled to the same courtesy.²

Other arguments were that the "broadcast does not fairly represent the teachings of Christian Science and is not in keeping with the spirit of the FCC code of broadcasting ethics."

The theater serves as yet another distributor in communications. On two occasions calls were made on play producers. Both concerned amateur productions. Neither call was made with or, by implication, subsequently earned the Manager's approval.

In July 1959 a Committee in Australia called on a local theatrical club which had in production Noel Coward's This Happy Breed. The play contained disparaging remarks. When the producer declined to make any changes in the script, the Committee asked the Manager about the situation. The Manager observed that the playwright him-

¹Ibid.

²CoP for Indiana to radio station WAOV, December 19, 1958. Item #923.

self had not been approached about "his occasional small jibes" in the play. He recommended that the Committee do nothing further.¹

In September 1959 an Assistant Committee in Florida learned that a college drama department was producing an original play, written by a student. The play contained comment on Christian Science. She called on the head of the drama department before consulting her state Committee.

The Manager, upon learning about the situation, advised the state Committee that his Assistant ought to have consulted him first and to have taken up the question with the author if it were really necessary to see anyone. About the call the Manager noted:

As you rightly point out, this could be misinterpreted as smacking of censorship. . . . If the reference were a significant misstatement needing correction, a friendly call on the student author would perhaps have been the best way to handle it.²

The Committee made one call in Hollywood. Twentieth Century Fox was producing a film to help fund-raising campaigns for hospital construction. The original script contained a scene in which a Christian Science prac-

¹Man. to CoP for Western Australia, August 6, 1959. Item #351.

²Man. to CoP for Florida, September 18, 1959. Item #351.

itioner was supposed to say a few words. When the Committee called, the producer explained that the scene had already been deleted because it was recognized that citing a Christian Scientist in the support of an essentially medical promotion would not be acceptable to the Scientists.¹

The newspaper as an advertising medium may also be considered a communications distributor. Like the publisher, dealer, broadcaster, and play producer, the newspaper in its advertising columns usually has little to do with the actual content other than to distribute it.

On three occasions the Committee responded to newspaper advertising. While setting forth its case each time, the Committee did not seek published replies. In two instances it objected to advertising that gave the impression that the voice of the Church was speaking, when actually it was a voice hostile to the Church.

In May 1959 the Hemet News in California carried an advertisement of a fundamentalist body which violently attacked Christian Science. The Committee for the area prepared an answer and asked his Assistant in the locality

¹Man. to E. O., January 5, 1959. Item #351.

to show it to the editor.¹

In July 1959 a newspaper in South Australia, the Centralian Advocate, carried an advertisement conveying "intemperate and irrational views" about the medical profession and signed by a "Seventh-day Christian Scientist." The area Committee promptly sent a letter to the British Medical Association, South Australia Branch, and a second like letter to the newspaper. In these letters, the Committee denied that the Church had any connection with the statement. The Committee also offered to the newspaper editor his newspaper and advertising services.²

In February 1960 an area Committee called on "the editor in charge of religious advertising" on a large metropolitan newspaper. His purpose was to reaffirm a long-standing agreement concerning an advertiser who was not a member of the Church but who advertised himself as a Christian Science practitioner. The understanding was that the editor would require this advertiser to include a statement in his advertisements that he had no connection with the Church. Also, his advertising was not to be placed alongside the Church's

¹Filed Hemet News. Item #1260.

²Letter quoted is, CoP for South Australia to Man., re Jonno Hodgson, n.d. (ca. September 1959). Item #422.

advertising in order that there be no confusion.¹

The Committee also keeps informed on direct mail advertising campaigns to practitioners. A publisher can easily circularize the practitioners by referring to the directory of them in The Christian Science Journal. But the practitioner can just as simply turn to his Committee on Publication for information about the publisher.

Significant mail campaigns to reach practitioners occurred at the appearance of Christian Science Today in the summer of 1958 and at the publication of a friendly article in Look magazine in December 1958.²

Some Conclusions

Correction or reply is one way a group exercises an impact on the press. In the correction the group challenges comment made of itself. We have noted that the Committee replies to books, periodicals, pamphlets, syndicated material, sermons, talks, libraries, publishers, dealers, broadcasters, theaters, and also classroom remarks.

Correction, taken at its best, serves two fundamental purposes. First, by it the group presents further

¹Filed Walter H. Wilson. Item #595.

²See Chapter VIII for a discussion of the Look magazine article. Items #305-31 and #1087.

information and another viewpoint for the public to consider in its judgment, or for an author to put into the balance with his own views. The group presents not only facts but also arguments and persuasive appeals in regard to the larger question of how it is to be judged--for example, whether it is Christian or not.

We have seen that the Committee's corrections deal with such issues as whether Christian Science is Christian or non-Christian, whether it truly heals the ills of mankind or is quackery, whether Mrs. Eddy was a religious heroine or villain, and whether the Church stands to support the democratic society or is antagonistic in practice to it.

The public has a right to hear all the sides. The group has a right to seek to be heard for what it is, or at least seek to be heard in the way it would like. The author or editor might be expected to respect the reply, just so long as it is open, aboveboard, and unaccompanied by coercion--just so long as he is still free, if not wiser, to decide as he will on his message.

These are all normal needs in a democratic society--
a society where differences of opinion are after all



ubiquitous and where the alternative to differences, namely conformity, would strike at cherished traditions and sap the vigor of a free society.

But correction also has a second purpose, namely to police the media of mass communications. Complex as group activities and philosophies often are, it cannot be assumed that an author or editor will always be right in his comment on the group. Correction can right his mistakes--can sweep away falsehood from the intelligent approach to the group and set aright misunderstandings that unnecessarily divide society.

When the Committee called to the attention of different authors a misquotation from Science and Health that was misleading, or an assertion that the Scientists use the phrase "moral confusions" for sin when the phrase appeared nowhere in the basic literature, or a statement that the practice of Christian Science is illegal under law--it was bringing accuracy to the media.

The question is what kind of reply is a part of the normal give-and-take of a free society and what kind approaches the persistent and distorting pressure that subtracts

from effective press freedom. For one answer we can reckon the distinctions a group draws in its policies and actions.

We have noted that the Committee draws distinctions between the inaccuracy and the difference of opinion, the significant and the trivial, the endeavor to gain a fair hearing and the effort after publicity, the direct comment on the denomination and the tangential remark, the call to inform and the several calls to "hound," the reply that indicates respect for the author and the act that is one of "revenge," and the response to a book or article at a particular time and place and the "hunting down" of it wherever it can be found.

The group's working success with the media is probably related to such distinctions. That is to say that the more procedural understanding that the author and the group share, the more success the group is likely to have in its contacts with the author. If the group and the author share, for instance, a common respect for freedom of the press, their relations are likely to be more harmonious than otherwise.

We noted that about a third of the Committee's replies

produce favorable results. There is probably reason to relate this percentage to the distinctions the Committee draws. On the other hand, the Manager received to three of his corrections a clearly unfavorable response. Two replies--cases #11 and #16--were evidently rejected because of the religious differences involved.

In the third unfavorable response--case #12--an author rejected the Committee's reply without indicating that any point of view stood between him and the Committee. A factor which might have played a part, however, was the character of the Manager's letter. The letter departed from the Committee's own policy, for beside challenging the author's information, it questioned the author as a scholar, specifically his objectivity in handling his source materials.

A certain ambivalence in the success of corrections has been suggested but not documented. A correction might at the same time be successful and unsuccessful. It could successfully inform the public and yet offend an author, publicize undesirably a book offensive to the group, and

trouble a publisher to the extent that he would hesitate before printing again anything, either favorable or unfavorable, about the group.

There is a more generalized distinction implicit to our discussions than discussed so far. This is the distinction between adding information and views to the public forum, as in the correction, and in suppressing the information and views of others. If the group endeavors to stem the protests directed against itself in suppressive ways, it jeopardizes the right to protest generally and therefore its own use of the right. The group itself is an important custodian of the right of reply and strengthens or debases the right by its actions. The question of suppression is to be explored in the next chapter.

CHAPTER VII

COERCION: AN EXAMINATION OF THE GROUP'S RESPONSE OF CENSORSHIP

In November 1959 a medical doctor wrote to the Committee on Publication for Washington state. He acknowledged a correction that the Committee had sent to him about comments on Christian Science in an address by him. He explained that his authority had been the biography of Mrs. Eddy by Edwin F. Dakin and said regarding it:

If this book I quoted above has been allowed to have been on the market for some 30 years and that if these remarks in this book are not true then the Christian Science faith should fight this publication until it is destroyed.

The Committee's reply is instructive as to its attitude toward coercion, the subject of this chapter.

Christian Scientists do not fight an author or a publication in opposing or criticizing Christian Science or its Founder. They protest against these misrepresentations by presenting the truth and let it speak for itself. We have found no fair minded person will be adversely influenced when the true facts are made known to him.¹

¹M. E. Bryant to CoP for Washington state, November 14, 1959. CoP for Washington state to M. E. Bryant, November 19, 1959. Item #284.

In one sense all groups "fight" publications every time they reply to or protest a book in public. They "fight" for their views and interests by arguing their cases and by endeavoring to win public support against the publication. This type of "fight" is a legitimate right of the free man.

But a group may also seek to prevent the message of another from reaching the public at all. It may try to inhibit or mute an author before he speaks, rather than challenge him afterward. It would therefore deprive the public of any role in judging the case. We shall call this communicative measure, "coercion," meaning by the term the group's endeavor to force into silence an author other than by meeting and opposing him in the "competition of the market."

The Committee on Publication has rather specific instructions against "censorship, suppression . . . economic boycott, or high-pressure tactics." A section in the Handbook on "Corrective Work Not Censorship" provides in full:

A Committee on Publication does not employ censorship, suppression of free speech and press, economic boycott, or high-pressure tactics.

Every Committee on Publication knows this already--but it deserves repeating because unfortunately a rigidly held opinion has grown up, particularly in the academic world, to the effect that Committees on Publication are somehow engaged in suppressing criticism.

We need to avoid any actions, or statements, which could be misunderstood. This does not mean mere caution. It means clarity. We need to make it clear to authors, editors, ministers, and others that our purpose is solely to offer factual information for their consideration.¹

Elsewhere, the Handbook implies that the problem is one of creation, not censorship--of reaching the public with the Committee's own version, not coercing the opposition into silence. Sections on "Freedom of the Press" and "News Work not Censorship" instruct:

CoPs support the basic right of freedom of the press and recognize that it works both ways--that is, it means that we can have our say in public forums, but it also means that newspapers and magazines can write about Christian Science if they want to. . . . It is not the job of a CoP to discourage references to Christian Science in the press. He helps editors to print correct statements regarding it. A CoP never polices the press; he supplies truthful information to it. He never censors; but he states our position clearly whenever needed.²

¹Handbook, p. 17.

²Ibid., p. 138.

The Manager's correspondence likewise implies creation, not censorship:

Our aim is never censorship nor suppression but a vigorous though friendly challenge to the stereotypes about our faith and history, which have gained currency in intellectual circles.¹

. . . it is not and has not been the policy of The Mother Church to encourage suppression or boycott of any book, no matter how unfair it might be. Our own publishing activities keep us alert to the crucial importance of freedom of the press. At the same time, the purpose of this office is to get correct information about Christian Science to authors, editors, publishers, and others who may unwittingly be presenting an inaccurate picture of it. We certainly "oppose" what we know to be untruths, but we try to oppose them with the truth, not with suppression.²

Recent surveys of censorial groups and practices have little to say about the Committee on Publication. Downs, for example, in his recent authoritative survey, The First Freedom (1960), provides selections that refer twice very briefly to the Committee. This volume was published under the auspices of the American Library Association and draws widely from scholarly sources. The book, which contains 460 pages, refers twice to the Christian Science Church and the Committee on Publication,

¹Staff member to Dr. Jan Ehrenwald, September 15, 1955. Item #2034.

²Man. to J. K. Van Baalen, May 6, 1958. Item #575.

a total of 9 lines out of some 45,000.¹ The slight attention probably suggests that the Committee is not to be considered much of a censorial force among private interests today.

Two other studies might be mentioned. Bird and Merwin in their book of readings, The Press and Society (1951), quote a brief comment by Dakin, who argued that the Committee applies economic pressure on newspaper editors through advertisers.² We have elsewhere noted Dakin's lack of documentation.³ Also, he wrote thirty years ago, a fact which hardly makes his conclusions contemporary.

Braden likewise charges censorship and suppression in Christian Science Today (1958), a volume much discussed already. He criticizes the Church for obstructing the book, Christian Science Class Instruction (Los Gatos, California: Farallon Foundation 1945), by Arthur Corey, a dissenter.⁴

¹One reference concerns the Scientists' response at the appearance of the Dakin biography in 1929; an incident considered later in this chapter. The second mentions a controversy in New York State in 1952, which arose over the Committee's efforts to obtain an exemption for Christian Science children from phases of public school health courses that it found objectionable.

²Pp. 511-514.

³See p. 151.

⁴See particularly Braden's chapter 7, "Arthur

Braden documents his point that there was opposition to this book but makes few distinctions between kinds of opposition. He cites to prove censorship the Committee's published replies to the book, private exchanges with the author, and measures of the Church to advise its own members about the book--all of which seem to be quite in keeping with the "liberal" position, at least as set forth in The First Freedom.¹

His other evidence to show that the Church interfered with the book's distribution is ambiguous in detail and meaning. He provides on page 178 of his book, for instance, what he considers to be an incident of the Church's interfering with a review of the book by Time magazine. This incident, given as follows in full, is one of the most specific pieces of evidence, in terms of names and details, that he offers:

Time thought it would make a good item and, according to a letter from one of Time's executives, a story was set up ready to run--but it was killed at the last moment because of pressures that can only be guessed at.

Corey and Others," pp. 168 to 206. His discussion of other incidents of assumed censorship go back to an earlier period.

¹See especially the statement by the American Civil Liberties Union, pp. 134-138.

As is well known, a national periodical, such as Time, discards at the last moment any number of stories set up in type.¹ There may be many reasons for this. To refer to "pressures that can only be guessed at" is more of an innuendo than documentation.

But more important, of course, it just is not realistic to suppose that a magazine so influential and independent as Time could be coerced by a small minority group. Time would surely take delight in exposing any such attempt.

We shall consider on the following pages coercive activities in three broad classifications--use of economic pressure, resort to state power, and exploitation of distributor relations.

Economic Sanctions

The Committee on Publication's files during the study period failed to indicate any sign of an economic sanction or boycott. The files did, however, suggest this agency's awareness and conscious avoidance of sanctions.

Economic coercion is in part avoided by an overall recognition given to the church member's freedom to choose his own reading materials. The Church has no index librorum prohibitorum--does not direct the member to

¹In 1958 Time prepared to run a review on the Peel and Braden books but never did. Man. to E.O., re Christian Science: Its Encounter with American Culture, August 28, 1958. Item #512-73. In 1962 Time had a review of DeWitt John's book set in type but did not run it. Interview with staff member, March 4, 1963.

buy¹ or not buy, read or not read particular books and periodicals; just so, it evidently does not organize any activities against them.

The point was explained to an Assistant Committee who had asked if the Committee supplies a list of disapproved books:

We are unable to furnish a list of approved or disapproved books, since we do not wish to be in the position of seeming to dictate to Christian Scientists what they shall or shall not read.²

The Church does, however, draw distinctions in regard to books. One is between "authorized" and other publications. "Authorized" literature is made available at Christian Science Reading Rooms and includes the writings of Mary Baker Eddy and the books, periodicals, pamphlets, and leaflets published by The Christian Science Publishing Society.

"Authorized" is not taken as synonymous with "approved." Of the five books written by Christian Scientists and published during 1958 and 1959, only one went on sale

¹Canham points out that the circulation of the Monitor has always been below church membership figures, a fact which indicates that a number of Christian Scientists fail to subscribe to the Church's periodicals. See Canham, pp. 110 and 398.

²CoP for Massachusetts to ACoP, re Christian Science Olass Instruction, July 24, 1958. Item #300.

as "authorized" literature in Reading Rooms--Commitment to Freedom by Erwin D. Canham. The Committee in giving wide distribution to Why I Am A Christian Scientist and Christian Science, Its Encounter with American Culture, was, in fact, distributing literature that is not authorized.

Beside the authorized-nonauthorized distinction, there is also some distinction implicitly drawn between books announced and not announced in The Christian Science Monitor.

The book review in the Monitor is not necessarily looked upon as a church endorsement. Canham points out that the newspaper reviews books to keep the reader informed on "the flow of current literature." He explains that "many books are reviewed not only without recommendation but sometimes with active and outspoken disapproval."¹

The advertisement is, in contrast, a recommendation, for, Canham says, "the reader is encouraged to patronize Monitor advertisers."² The reader does not of course, know the books disapproved by the Monitor.

¹Canham, p. 389

²Ibid.

The files indicate that the Committee not only does not supply a list of disapproved titles but actually plays them down. It does not announce the unfavorable title to the membership, and it supplies only the briefest information to the member who inquires about a book.

The Manager, at the appearance of Christian Science Today, advised Committees that they and their Assistants should not pass along information about the book "to Christian Scientists in general except where they are specifically asked about it."¹ The Manager stayed with the policy even when one harassed Committee twice over a period of six months asked to send a letter to practitioners in his area who were being heavily circularized with advertisements of the book.²

To the member who inquires, the Committee makes clear enough what its opinion on a book is. But it sets no demands. The Manager both explained the policy and illustrated it by the information he supplied in a letter to the Committee for New Mexico. The Committee had asked

¹Man. to All CoPs, May 29, 1958.

²Man. to CoP for New South Wales, January 12, 1960, and July 25, 1960. Items #312-46 and #312-48.



about the book, Christian Science Class Instruction:

As you may know, this book is not an authorized or authentic statement of Christian Science.

The function of the Committee on Publication in relation to a church member is to furnish him, when he requests it, with information that will help him obey the Manual of The Mother Church. I am sure that you are aware we do not dictate what an individual Christian Scientist may or may not read but leave that question up to his own demonstration [i.e., the result or proof of prayer].

On this basis you might tell an inquirer that Mr. Corey has not been a member of The Mother Church since he published the book. Also, an inquirer might like to know that Mr. Corey attributed class notes supposedly used in the book to various teachers and failed to obtain any permission to do so. Furthermore, Mrs. Eddy makes provision in the Manual for the only method of class teaching in Christian Science.¹

The essential elements set forth in this letter are repeated in answers to inquirers of other books. These are (a) whether the book is considered "an authorized or authentic statement"; (b) whether the author is a member of the Church; (c) sometimes a reference to a Manual bylaw or bylaws. On other occasions the Manager has also (d) noted whether or not the book has been reviewed or advertised in the Monitor; (e) explained that all necessary steps to correct the book have been taken--evidently to

¹Man. to CoP for New Mexico, October 1, 1958.
Item #300-9.

discourage the inquirer from taking the matter into his own hands; and (f) cited a passage from Mrs. Eddy's writings which guide the inquirer who is troubled about the book's criticism.

As indicated in the excerpt above, the Committee apparently perceives its function with respect to the member as one of supplying him with information that "will help him obey the Manual." In the above letter the Manager cited the following two bylaw provisions:

The Bible, together with Science and Health and other works by Mrs. Eddy, shall be his only textbooks for self-instruction in Christian Science, and for teaching and practising metaphysical healing.¹

A member of this Church shall neither buy, sell, nor circulate Christian Science literature which is not correct in its statement of the divine Principle and rules and the demonstration of Christian Science. Also the spirit in which the writer has written his literature shall be definitely considered. His writings must show strict adherence to the Golden Rule, or his literature shall not be adjudged Christian Science. A departure from the spirit or letter of this By-Law involves schisms in our Church and the possible loss, for a time, of Christian Science.²

The first provision suggests a distinction between reading materials "for self-instruction" and those for

¹Eddy, Manual, p. 34:12-16 (Article IV, Section 1).

²Ibid., p. 43:21-7 (Article VIII, Section 11).

other purposes. It seems to provide guidance on literature for religious education, rather than on literature for general reading. No file material indicated that the Committee has ever attempted to interpret either of the bylaws.

There was one Manual bylaw that, according to the file correspondence, the Committee at no time from 1958 to 1960 cited. This bylaw, entitled "Obnoxious Books," has in the past aroused some public controversy, as we shall see. The bylaw reads:

A member of this Church shall not patronize a publishing house or bookstore that has for sale obnoxious books.¹

The bylaw itself is not unambiguous. The term "obnoxious" might embrace books that misrepresent Christian Science, or it might be aimed only at pornography and the only less depraved. Furthermore, it is not clear whether the "publishing house or bookstore" must specialize in obnoxious titles to come within the meaning of the bylaw or whether it must just carry a single offensive title.

¹Ibid., p. 44:8-11 (Article VIII, Section 12).

The Church has not interpreted the bylaw. The Christian Science Board of Directors told the Manager of the Committees on one occasion, "We necessarily leave for individual decision the interpretation and application of this By-Law."¹

The Committee for Texas was asked about the "obnoxious books" rule at a talk he gave by invitation to a class of theology students at Southern Methodist University. He explained about the rule:

I explained that while I have no official interpretation of the by-law . . . yet insofar as I know this has never been interpreted to mean books which might offend Christian Scientists because they are misinterpretations of the teachings of our religion. I said I would not go into a restaurant with an immoral atmosphere to eat dinner even though the food there might be good. By the same token I would not trade with a bookstore which had a reputation for dealing with immoral, indecent or otherwise obnoxious books.

He added that he patronized religious book stores which sold books he considered unjust to Christian Science.²

Perhaps more than any other book in some decades, Christian Science Today might have raised a storm of protest and led to boycotting. It was a grievous injustice

¹E. O. to Asst. Man., September 18, 1959. Item #2075.

²CoP for Texas to Man., re Christian Science Today, August 17, 1959. Item #301-6.

so far as the Christian Scientists were concerned. But no instance of an organized boycott against the book was reported in the files.

The Manager did what he could to prevent any adverse reaction among members. In a May 29, 1958, letter he warned area Committees to be alert "to keep the Field from being needlessly stirred."

Four months after publication of the book, the publisher told the Committee for Texas that he had had no indication, except for an occasional book review, of the attitude of Christian Scientists toward Christian Science Today. The implication was that there had been not only no boycott but no protests.¹

The "obnoxious books" rule had a part in a controversy back in 1929. The rule was cited in public criticisms of the Church at that time.

The occasion was the publication of the book, already referred to several times, Mrs. Eddy, The Biography of a Virginal Mind by Edwin Franden Dakin. Church members, evidently in some numbers, along with

¹The exchange with the publisher, Southern Methodist University, was discussed in the last chapter.

a few branch churches¹ protested the book to the publisher and to bookdealers, and some cited the rule to justify a boycott.

The publisher, Charles Scribner's Sons, tells about the role the bylaw played in a sixteen-page account of the affair, entitled The Blight that Failed. Along with concurrent articles by Mussey and Thompson,² The Blight documents economic reprisals and threats of reprisals.

The Church at the time supported the Scientists' right to protest the book as a legitimate exercise of free speech.³ It also, however, cautioned restraint on the basis of "the ethics of our religion" and what was practically wise to keep from publicizing the book unduly.

The Blight cites this church statement and dismisses it as "a dialectic escape from criticism."⁴ The

¹Braden says that nine churches protested the book (p. 202). There were several thousand churches at the time.

²Henry Raymond Mussey, "The Christian Science Censor," The Nation CXXX (February 5, 12, and 26, and March 12, 1930), pp. 147-49, 175-78, 241-43, 291-93. Craig F. Thompson, "The Christian Science Censorship," The New Republic, LXI (December 11, 1929), pp. 59-62.

³"From the Directors," Christian Science Sentinel, XXXII (December 21, 1929), p. 310.

⁴The Blight, contrary to its assertion, does not give the Church statement "in full." It drops three significant sentences concerning the "ethics."

dismissal is not entirely persuasive, however. Even if the call for "ethics" is considered an escape--and The Blight provides nothing conclusive why it should be--, there still remains the argument in the statement about the practical consequences of protests.

The church statement cited by The Blight provides:

Fair and friendly observers may, however, say that protesting against an objectionable book is unwise; that the protests will be misconstrued and used to advertise the book; that they will do more harm than good, by exciting curiosity and causing the book to be read.

The Church foresaw the promotional danger of protests and boycotts even before the book was published. In fact, three months before, on May 17, 1929, the Manager, Clifford P. Smith, counseled the Committee for New York, Orwell Bradley Towne, about the dangers involved. Towne had just made a call on the publisher. Smith advised:

Apparently any further conversation with these men would be useless and might be worse. . . . They cannot capitalize anything that you have said to them, and are now in the position of having declined to consider whether the Dakin manuscript is either authentic or fair.

To this, Towne commented:

Anything we say to interfere with the publication of the book will be used against us.¹

That the publishers did "capitalize" on the protests Christian Scientists later made is amply documented in--and by--The Blight. This pamphlet tells how the publishers quoted the protests in quarter-page advertisements in metropolitan newspapers across the country.² The Blight itself was given wide distribution and so served in the book's promotion.

In Boston, in The Mother Church's own locality, the promotional value of outcries against books was being abundantly demonstrated. The year 1929 marked the midpoint in the "Boston Book War," which Alpert dates from 1928 to 1930.³ That year was climactic in the "roaring 20s." It saw the rise of the bootlegger, the crash of the stock market, and the midway point in Massachusetts court action that suppressed sixty-eight books, mainly

¹Man. to CoP for New York state, May 17, 1929. CoP for New York to Man., May 24, 1929. Items #330-10 and #330-15.

²Thompson provides a fuller discussion of the advertising campaigns.

³Leo M. Alpert, "Naughty, Naughty!," Colophon, Ser. 3, Vol. I (1939), quoted by Downs in The First Freedom, p. 6.

at the instigation of the New England Watch and Ward Society. Among these were Dreiser's An American Tragedy, D. H. Lawrence's Lady Chatterley's Lover, and Upton Sinclair's Oil.¹ New York was in the throes of only slightly less book banning activity.

This book banning only helped to publicize the books involved and make a few bestsellers. Alpert finds that during the period no book of any real merit was successfully suppressed. In nearly every case, the attempt to suppress in the end benefited the book. The adverse publicity attracted public attention and curiosity, which publishers exploited in sales blurbs and advertising.

Alpert declares regarding acts against Dreiser's An American Tragedy, The Genius, Sister Carrie, and other books:

Although statistics are not at hand it would seem an undeniable conclusion that the sale of Dreiser's books benefitted from the tilts.

He further observes:

In general as in particular, it may safely be said that the long-time effect of these battles is to

¹Curtis Bok, Commonwealth v. Gordon, et al., 66 Pennsylvania District and County Reports (1949), quoted by Downs in The First Freedom, p. 106.

ensure a wider distribution, knowledge and sale of the sought-to-be or actually suppressed book. Literary history is proof sufficient.¹

Like these other books, the biography by Dakin was promoted by the protests of Christian Scientists. According to Braden, "The total effect of the whole effort of the Christian Scientists, whether acting officially or only as individuals, was to make a best seller of a book which might otherwise have been limited by its relatively high price to a modest circulation."²

Three other books on Mrs. Eddy, also held as unsympathetic by the Scientists, were published during the next three years.³ Two of these, unlike the Dakin biography, were written by authors with established reputations.⁴ Although they probably have more to recommend them as historical works,⁵ they never approached the

¹Alpert, quoted by Downs in The First Freedom, pp. 6, 8.

²Braden, p. 203.

³According to the Flesh by Fleta Campbell Springer appeared in 1930 (New York: Coward-McCann). Also in 1930, an American edition of Our New Religion by H.A.L. Fisher came out (London: Ernest Benn, 1929; New York: J. Cape and H. Smith, 1930). In 1932, Mary Baker Eddy: The Truth and the Tradition by Ernest Sutherland Bates and John Valentine Dittmore was published (New York: Alfred A. Knopf).

⁴Namely, Fisher and Bates.

⁵The Dakin book aspires to bring psychological

Dakin book in popularity mainly because their appearance was met with no outcry.

The Committee on Publication has on a number of occasions replied to comment citing the Dakin book incident. It has taken the position in these letters that there were "unwise" actions by some church members but that The Mother Church at the time neither directed nor condoned these actions.

The Manager explained this in a letter to one publisher:

It is true that individual Christian Scientists and one or two branch churches did act very unwisely in respect to this book, as a pamphlet put out by Scribners at the time amply documents. But this was not a policy instituted by the organization in Boston. On the contrary, The Christian Science Board of Directors published an official statement

insights of the author's day to bear on Mrs. Eddy. It is instructive in view of this orientation to consider a statement by Professor Allan Nevins of Columbia University, twice recipient of the Pulitzer Prize for Biography. Commenting on the state of biography in the 1920s, he observes in The New York Times: "The subconscious walked into the drawing-room of biography hand-in-hand with the imaginary conscious. Psychoanalysis was applied to the most unlikely subjects and in the most improbable fashion. Older biographers had said at many points, 'We do not know'; the new biographers boasted, 'We know everything.' . . . ~~The most reprehensible aspect of the re-evaluations and the pseudo-psychoanalysis, beyond doubt, was their shifting of the lens from the vital to the trivial--their distortion of the image.~~ "How Shall One Write of a Man's Life?" The New York Times Book Review section, July 15, 1951, p. 1. Item #332.

in the Christian Science Sentinel on December 21, 1929, at the height of the publicity over the Dakin book, in which the right of Christian Scientists to "protest" against what they conceived to be dishonest and unjust was maintained, but was clarified as follows:

"It is highly important, however, that the right of protest should be exercised with the most scrupulous regard for both propriety and wisdom. In the exercise of a right we must not commit a wrong. Our statements should be considerate and not exaggerated; they should be persuasive but not threatening. An author and a publisher may have shown a lack of feeling, or even positive injustice, but as Christian Scientists we must observe the ethics of our religion in all relations and in every situation. We quote again from our Leader's writings (Retrospection and Introspection, p. 79): 'Meekness and temperance are the jewels of Love, set in wisdom. Restrain untempered zeal.'"

Letters in the files of this office show that we repeatedly warned Committees on Publication of the importance of discouraging any action of an intemperate, threatening, or coercive nature by Christian Scientists. The one or two branch churches whose executive boards wrote to Scribners did so without the cognizance or approval of The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston. For a number of years now, the General Instructions for Committees on Publication issued by this office have read, in respect to books which we may consider inaccurate: "Committees should not protest the sale or distribution of such books and pamphlets."¹

¹Man. to R. R. Bowker Company, re Banned Books, May 3, 1955. Item #2032.

In 1959 Grosset and Dunlap (New York) published a paperback reprint of the Dakin book. The Manager on April 8 sent a letter about this reprint to Committees and their Assistants in the United States and Canada. He advised them, as the Sentinel statements in 1929 had, to restrain protests, both for reasons of ethics and because untempered protests led to unfortunate consequences:

In the first place, it is important to understand that unwise attempts to suppress publications usually have the opposite effect of increasing the demand. Moreover, such attempts are not in keeping with the Golden Rule, for if we were to attempt to suppress publications with which we disagree, we could not object if others attempted to suppress authorized Christian Science literature. It is not wise or helpful for individual Christian Scientists to complain to booksellers or to hint at any possibility of economic pressure.

The correspondence files indicate that the paperback passed with hardly a ripple.

The church member today is encouraged to look upon the lodging of protests regarding criticism of the Church as a Committee on Publication, not a member or branch church, responsibility. The member protests on other subjects¹ and, like his fellow citizens, registers

¹He is sometimes encouraged to write protests to editors and legislators in support of his Committee in a legislative endeavor. See chapter on lobbying.

his private protest by not purchasing a volume he finds objectionable. But for the formal protest he mainly looks to his Committee on Publication.¹ To the extent that he forgoes the protest, the question of economic boycott is out of his hands.

The following two excerpts indicate this tendency to centralize protests in the Committee. The first is from the Handbook and the second from a Committee's policy letter to his Assistants:

Verbal or written protests by individual Christian Scientists to authors, booksellers, librarians, publishers, newspaper or magazine editors do not usually serve a helpful purpose. They may be very damaging to us--particularly if they betray an inadequate understanding of the rights of authors and publishers, or of the subject matter of the book, or if they conflict with delicate negotiations already being conducted by the Manager or the CoP in the area. Such protests should be discouraged.²

We cannot always prevent individual Christian Scientists from acting with more zeal than wisdom, but we can try to help them to see that our Leader established the Committee on Publication to take care of the corrective work; and we can

¹See "From the Committee on Publication, Meeting Hostile Attacks," The Christian Science Journal, LXXX (March 1962), pp. 154-55.

²Handbook, p. 24.

be sure that we ourselves perform this corrective work "in a Christian manner."¹

The Committee recognizes, then, the potential danger of a protest doing more to promote than to retard the circulation of a message. But rather than surrendering the protest, the Committee has transformed it into the correction, the subject of a full discussion already.²

Use of State Power

Coercion of an author may be brought about through civil or criminal court action and by recourse to the regulatory and police powers of the state. Judicial sanctions, for instance, may be obtained against the author who trespasses on a copyright or registered trademark.

The Christian Science Church has sparingly sought legal relief. Its chief call on state power, as it concerns us here, has been to protect the writings of Mrs. Eddy, to which it owns the copyrights. File correspondence

¹CoP for North Carolina to all Assistants, re Christian Science Today, July 1, 1958. Item #309-16.

²~~A lively and informative exchange between the Committee and an author over the question of censorship occurred in The Lutheran Quarterly, VII (February 1955), pp. 69-76. Reference is made to the Milmine, Meehan, and Dakin volumes.~~

did not, however, reveal any suits for the protection of copyrights from 1958 to 1960.

The copyrights serve the Church as a guard against plagiarism and therefore any tampering with the texts. It is evidently important to this Church to maintain the integrity and "purity" of the writings by copyright as well as by correction.¹

Protection of Mrs. Eddy's writings has also been sought through trademark registration. Each of her sixteen books in print has on the cover and on the title page a seal which has been registered--a cross and crown emblem within a double circle. Her facsimile signature which appears on the title pages of each book too has been registered.

All the authorized versions of Mrs. Eddy writings, therefore, carry copyright and trademark notations. These notations are, from the Church's standpoint, a further assurance to the reader of the books' authenticity. Registrations have been obtained in a number of countries beside the United States. The church periodicals carry the registered seal as well.

Copyright protection has also been of economic

¹The purpose of correction in preserving the integrity of the doctrine was noted in Chapter II.

benefit to the Church. While little specific information is given out on sales of books, the indication is that sales have climbed over the years.¹ Science and Health has evidently had particularly wide distribution. News stories released on the book's 75th anniversary in 1950 reported that several million copies of Science and Health had been distributed since the book was written.²

In 1962 Congress undertook a review of copyright laws. In the process it extended copyrights which were to expire. Among these was the copyright for Science and Health, which was to expire in October 1962.

¹The annual reports of the Trustees under the Will of Mary Baker Eddy provide this indication. See The Christian Science Journal, LXXVII (July 1959), pp. 344-45; LXXVIII (July 1960), p. 345.

²Item #317-1. Orcutt says that, "With the exception of the Holy Bible, the Christian Science textbook, 'Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures' by Mary Baker Eddy, holds every printing and publishing record" (William Dana Orcutt, Mary Baker Eddy and Her Books [Boston: The Christian Science Publishing Society, 1950], p. 3). While not a Scientist, Orcutt speaks with the credentials of having been for many years the printer of Mrs. Eddy's writings and with a reputation as a maker of books generally. He also is an author of several volumes. Against his estimates, there is, of course, the vast distribution in tens of millions of such books as McGuffey's Reader, Webster's Standard Dictionary, and the Red Cross Standard First Aid Textbook.

The Committee on Publication has two roles in the administration of church copyrights. The Committee serves as a consultant on public relations, and its information-gathering apparatus acts as a source of information on copyright violations.

The copyrights to Mrs. Eddy's writings are controlled by the Trustees under the Will of Mary Baker Eddy. These Trustees also exercise a timeless common-law copyright to her unpublished private letters.¹

Other church copyrights are held by The Christian Science Publishing Society. These include copyrights to the Church's four religious periodicals, to religious pamphlets, to The Christian Science Monitor, and to most of the biographies and reminiscences about Mrs. Eddy. A few biographies are directly owned by The Christian Science Board of Directors.

On occasion the Committee can report the more amusing possible infringements. There was published in 1928, for instance, a book whose title was a parody on the textbook, Diet and Health with Key to the Calories

¹The Church judicially tested the right in Baker v. Libbie, 210 Massachusetts Reports, 599, 605-607.

(Chicago: Reilly and Lee Company) by L. H. Peters.

On one occasion the name of the textbook was borrowed inadvertently in a more serious way. In March 1961 the city of Honolulu, Hawaii, announced plans to create a museum of science and health.¹

Sometimes the Committee requests an author or a publisher not to provide a credit line in order to avoid the appearance of church sanction of a book or article.

To guard against this possibility an interesting distinction is observed, a distinction between "withholding objection" and "granting permission." When objection is withheld, the publisher is asked to give copyright credit to the author but not to the copyright owner.

The point was explained on one occasion as follows:

Where it is not a case of granting permission but of withholding objection if any quotations are used, it is not necessary or desirable for an author to include in a published book a line of acknowledgment to us as the copyright holders.²

¹Man. to CoP for Hawaii, March 22, 1961. Item #226. ~~A duplication of the title of the textbook is not, of course, a copyright violation but may be legally actionable on other grounds.~~

²Man. to Trustees under Will of Mary Baker Eddy, February 20, 1959. Item #215.

The request not to give copyright credit came up on another occasion. The Anglican magazine, Church Illustrated, asked for and obtained from the District Manager for Great Britain and Ireland several copyrighted photographs to run with an article. When the article turned out critical, the District Manager asked the Manager in Boston what he should have done. The Manager replied:

Once or twice when we have felt that the contents might be unsatisfactory we have not made any mention of the credit line, feeling that it might be better to have the photographs appear without this acknowledgment, rather than to create the impression that we had cooperated with the writer or editor and were, thus giving a measure of sanction to the article.¹

The Committee has counseled against suits for copyright infringement on the basis of public relations. It is not, however, possible to know how much weight was given to this counsel in the eventual decisions not to act.²

One occasion of this nature occurred in the spring of 1960. The Manager in counseling against legal

¹Man. to D.M., May 5, 1958. Item #1020.

²Several factors may have been involved. For one thing, the Manual seems to discourage suits generally. See pp. 67:10-16 (Article XXII, Section 9) and 46:19-23 (Article VIII, Section 22).

action provided as his reason:

It is our feeling at present that legal action to restrain [the author] would have unfavorable repercussions from a public relations point of view . . .

And later in the spring about the same book:

In the nature of things, such books . . . are pretty well limited in their circulation, whereas the inevitable publicity attendant on litigation would draw the attention of a much wider circle of readers to the books.¹

Distributor Relations

It is at the point of distribution that the alarms of censorship most often sound. Business coercion, which we have already discussed, and coercion through the community's police power, such as city officials' suppressing a publication, strikes at the author through the publisher, bookseller, and editor who distribute his message.

But there is a third type of coercion which reaches the author through the distributor. This type stems from a long-term design of public relations, namely to sow trust and good will among editors, publishers, booksellers, etc.² Good distributor relations may be

¹Man. to Legal Dept., re W. G. Brown, March 8, 1960. Man. to E.O., April 4, 1960. ItC.M #283.

²Lasswell and Blaisdell in their separate discussions on the creation of public policy point out that groups influence government not so much by the negative threat and act--an "oversimplified notion" according to

counted upon not only to provide the group with opportunities for a favorable hearing but also to intercept and deflect another's message that the group deems unfair. For some groups, the second may be the greater service.

The message itself may be quite correct in facts and interpretation, the group objecting not because of its falsity but because of its hostility--because publication would give a misleading picture in the context of the circumstances.

No coercion of the editor is involved. He may reject an item as one among many because he respects the group, recognizes that the community likewise respects the group, and deems in the interest of responsibility and fair play that the statement ought not to be printed or, at least, ought to be modified.

However, the news source, the writer of the statement, is coerced against his will into silence. Since the distributor will not give him a hearing, he is without access to the public. The truth he has found is stopped at the point of distribution. For him the

Blaisdell--but by more indirect and positive means, by personal friendships, praise, encouragement, and the like-- "We 'accentuate the positive,'" Lasswell asserts. It might be thought that this positive approach is equally as characteristic of the group's influence on the press. Lasswell, National Security and Individual Freedom, p. 179. Blaisdell, American Democracy Under Pressure, p. 39.

group's public relations has become as censorial as the economic boycott or the court injunction, forms of coercion public relations sometimes, as we noted above, discourages. That it is the editor's free choice may shift the responsibility from the group to the editor but it does not change the essential fact of censorship for the author.

Long tells how the Bell System suppressed criticism of itself through its good relations with editors. He quotes one company executive as saying that the firm was able to keep out of newspapers

some very misleading and very damaging statements . . . not only because of the confidence the newspapers had in the company, but also because of the very friendly feeling.¹

Long reports that newspaper editors often showed company managers letters that criticized the company before publishing them. The editors "in many cases" refused to print the letters after the managers told their side of the story. In one instance the company's "very intimate relations" with a national trade journal

¹Norton E. Long, "The Public Relations Policies of the Bell System: A Case Study in The Politics of Modern Industry" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Government, Harvard University, 1937), p. 139.

led the magazine to drop an unfavorable story already set in type.¹

There are indications that the Committee on Publication develops its distributor relations to deflect the unfavorable message. These indications concern only relations with editors, not book publishers or dealers.²

The Handbook sets as the purpose:

When editors know and respect CoPs and their local Assistants, they feel free to turn to them for information when presented with the occasional ambiguous or unfavorable news item regarding Christian Science. Through firsthand contacts of this kind, we can help editors to handle questionable material in a constructive manner.

To win this respect, the Handbook continues, the area Committee and his Assistants are to come to know the editor personally and to find out and supply the kind of news items most useful to him. Furthermore,

It should never be possible for him to say that he hears from the Christian Scientists only when something is wrong. It is always helpful to express positive appreciation where this is merited.³

¹Ibid. The trade journal referred to is Editor and Publisher.

²We noted in the last chapter that the Committee ~~prefers to take up books with their authors rather than publishers.~~ The Handbook provides, "in corrections to books, we normally make our presentation directly to the author rather than to his publisher." Handbook, p. 18.

³Handbook, pp. 136-137.

The objective may be long range, designed to gain for the group a friendly and informed editor who will be less likely than otherwise to print hostile comment in the future.

We noted in the last chapter that when Christian Science Today appeared the Committee sent five letters in response to reviews of the book. It had no desire that four of these letters be published. The purpose evidently was solely to inform an editor or reviewer and reinforce the understanding with him.

The same purpose was implicit in the Committee's handling of reprints of articles from the Anglican Church Illustrated and the Presbyterian Record. Area Committees in interviews asked four reprinting editors to read a letter that had gone to the originating magazines, but they sought no published corrections from them.

The objective, on the other hand, may be more short range than immediate. The Committee may endeavor to intercept a story about an "unfortunate situation"--deaths, court cases, and the like--concerning an adherent of

Christian Science. The Handbook provides on these situations:

Occasionally an unfortunate situation arises which involves Christian Science or Christian Scientists, and there is often a danger that the incident may be magnified far beyond its actual importance.

The intent seems to be to avoid having a situation, such as the death of a Christian Scientist, publicized out of proportion just because he was relying on Christian Science care. The Committee might assume that the same newspaper would not be inclined to give prominent space to a healing of a serious disease in Christian Science and would not recount with similar emphasis the daily deaths under medical care.

When an "unfortunate situation" occurs that may reach the newspapers, the area Committee "immediately" gets all the facts from those involved, counsels them as to "their legal rights and obligations," guides them to seek competent legal assistance, and cooperates with them "to determine a proper course of action which will protect the individual involved as well as our Cause."

The Committee represents the Church to newspaper-

men to "avert false, unfair, or slanted statements from being released by the press." He promptly supplies all the media of mass communications with

factual explanations as to the legal rights and obligations of Christian Scientists. . . . [and] our point of view and our method of healing and its widespread success . . .

In early summer 1959 an "unfortunate situation" occurred which an editor on a large metropolitan newspaper declined to publicize after a talk with the state Committee.

It seems that a man, not a Christian Scientist, had undergone surgery for a brain tumor and had lingered on in a hospital without improvement for some months. When his physicians decided that nothing further could be done, his wife, a Christian Scientist, asked for permission to take him home. With her husband's consent, she thereupon engaged the services of a Christian Science practitioner.

Shortly two of the man's nephews visited the house and demanded of the wife that she return her husband to the hospital. She refused, whereupon the two nephews

¹Handbook, pp. 19-21.

called on a newspaper in their city to gain publicity for the situation. An editor listened to their story and then telephoned the Committee on Publication, whom he knew and whose office was nearby. He asked the Committee to come over and discuss the matter with the two young men in his presence.

The upshot was that "no publicity was given this case in any newspapers."¹

The sequel was the nephews obtained a court order to have the wife answer for restraining the liberty of her husband (she had his consent in writing) and to allow two physicians to examine him. After the examination the physicians reported that the man had improved, and they decided that he was just as well off, if not better, at home. The man died a short time later.

In the same city, a church member was criminally charged and jailed a few months later. In taking steps to protect the name of the Church, the Committee called the four downtown papers and the wire associations. Three of the newspaper editors agreed that the church angle of

¹Man. to E. O., July 30, 1959. Item #806.

the story was incidental and should not be mentioned.¹

Another court case, bizarre in outcome, attracted a good deal of newspaper attention in Chicago. At the end of January 1959 a man entered the office of a Christian Science practitioner and with a light caliber pistol shot the practitioner several times. The assailant then surrendered to the police. It seems that he blamed the practitioner for the death of his ten-year-old daughter, twenty-one years before.

As the Chicago newspapers gave the story sensational play, the Committee for Illinois provided a press statement. In his statement the Committee pointed out that (a) the assailant had caused the arrest of the practitioner in 1937 for the death of the child, (b) the child, a diabetic, had been under the care of physicians, who had said that the case was incurable, (c) seven days before the girl died, an aunt, with whom the girl was staying at the time, chose to stop medical treatment and to engage the services of this practitioner, (d) the municipal court judge who heard the case dismissed it,

¹Man. to E. O., September 10, 1959. Also see Man. to E. O., September 23, 1959. Item #841.

ruling that everything possible had been done medically and spiritually to save the girl's life.

By March 17, after hospitalization, the practitioner was "back in his office."¹ The court case came to trial in May. The jury returned a verdict against the State, finding the assailant not guilty by reason of temporary insanity. As an interesting case-study in the administration of justice, the court thereupon allowed the man to go free without any restriction, such as requiring psychiatric treatment.²

The Manager and the Committee for Illinois working together took several steps from the beginning to meet the inevitable publicity. The Manager on February 5 informed all Committees in the United States and Canada of the circumstances and supplied to them the above statement prepared by the Committee for Illinois. He advised them that they "should watch the situation closely and if adverse editorials begin to appear it may be that immediate corrective statements should be made."

The Committee for Illinois distributed a second

¹Man. to CoPs in the United States and Canada, March 17, 1959.

²Filed William F. Rubert. Item #836.

release beside this statement--a "Fact Sheet" to all newspapers in his state. The release set forth the "Purpose," "Status," "Origin," "Teachings," "Present Fruitage," and "The Publications" of Christian Science. The Manager distributed the release to Committees in North America on March 5.

The Committee intended, of course, that the two releases should deflect the news reports, at least a sensationalized play of them, and also adverse editorials. The Committee was not going to permit adverse publicity to build up without some effort to counteract it among editors.

One further court case, which came to a conclusion during the study period, attracted newspaper attention. It, too, was unique--as the only criminal action of the kind against Christian Scientists in some decades.¹

The case, which began in April 1956 and concluded in November 1958, concerned Christian Science parents who had lost a child under Christian Science care. They had been indicted for involuntary manslaughter. The prosecuting district attorney asked for and obtained a dismissal

¹This absence of criminal actions against Scientists was pointed out in Legal Department to Man., filed R. D. Hunt, December 1, 1960. Item #2050.

on the basis that Christian Science had legal standing in the state and therefore recourse to it could not be held "an act of wanton negligence."¹

Beside the cases discussed, there were a few coroner's inquests into the deaths of Christian Scientists and an occasional court hearing in which county welfare officials or relatives sought to force medical treatment on a Christian Scientist. These were few and atypical, and for the most part attracted newspaper attention only in the locality of the case.

The readiness of the press to play up a case involving a Christian Scientist, or involving one whom the press believes is a Christian Scientist, was illustrated in July 1959 in New York City. It seems that a three-year-old boy was hit by an automobile and taken to a hospital. Shortly his father arrived to take home the boy, who was unconscious, over the protests of the doctors.

Newspapers picked up the story and, according to

¹Commonwealth v. Edward Cornelius, Anna Cornelius, No. 105, April Sessions, 1956, Philadelphia County (Pa.) Quar. Sess., November 5, 1958. For discussion of the case, see Robert L. Trescher and Thomas N. O'Neill, Jr., "Medical Care For Dependent Children: Manslaughter Liability of The Christian Scientist," University of Pennsylvania Law Review, CIX (December 1960), pp. 203-217.

the Manager, "throughout the country stated that [the father] was a Christian Scientist and was relying on prayer to heal his son." Headlines proclaimed:

Father Takes Boy Out of Hospital To Pray For Healing [New York Journal-American]

Injured Son Removed by Christian Scientist [Arkansas Gazette]

The facts of the case, as the Committee subsequently learned, were that the father was of the Jewish faith and had removed the boy to give him homeopathic treatment. Under this treatment, the boy fully recovered, a matter no more widely reported than the correct facts at the start.¹

It probably is a truism that coercion leads to more coercion, not to cooperation. Public relations, at least as the Committee seems to interpret it, has as its objective cooperation. Thus the pressure that an editor would resent is to be avoided.

The point was borne out on one occasion when a Committee was preparing to send a correction to a newspaper. Before mailing it, he remarked to the Manager that the wife of the owner of the newspaper was a church member.

¹Man. to E. O., July 13, 1959. Item #822.

About this the Manager cautioned:

As a general rule, it is better to have such a letter go to the editor and not have it come to him through an owner, advertising manager, or someone not directly responsible for the editing. It is sometimes a cause of resentment when an editor feels that he is having pressure brought on him through someone else.¹

The need to avoid advertising pressure in the interests of good relations was set forth on another occasion in Denver. Two newspapers sensationalized an "unfortunate situation" concerning Christian Scientists. Two church members called on the state Committee to ask him if he ought not to remind the editors involved about the amount of advertising their churches purchased each year. When advised of this, the Manager instructed:

. . . under no circumstances would we consider calling on a newspaper editor and request that he give us special consideration because we spent a considerable amount of money advertising our church activities in his newspaper. If you have any more such inquiries, you can just say that this would be considered a most unethical thing to do and would result in damage to our reputation in the long run since such incidents are inevitably talked about in newspaper circles.²

It may be true, as one critic maintains,³ that

¹Man. to CoP, filed The Presbyterian Record, February 9, 1959. Item #1121.

²Man. to CoP for Colorado, re R. D. Hunt case, January 9, 1961. Item #2007.

³See, for example, Braden, p. 172.

editors occasionally delete comment and publishers reject manuscripts that are hostile to Christian Science. But why they do so is not at all so clear. The critic says it is from fear of the consequences.¹ Such a conclusion, however, does not seem entirely persuasive.

As noted earlier in this section, the Committee's policy statements abundantly call for gaining the good will of editors and providing them with information--not frightening them, indeed if they can be frightened. Furthermore, the Committee wants their cooperation to place its own publicity.²

An alternative is that a publisher or editor rejects or deletes, if he often does, from a modicum of genuine respect. In most instances an editor's sense of fitness and responsibility are at play when he decides on comment about other established community groups. Why should this not be so when he decides on comment about the Scientists?

Perhaps not infrequently the outlook of a communications distributor will coincide with what an

¹Ibid.

²See chapter on publicity and advertising.

Assistant Committee reported after a conversation with a professor of theology. The professor told him, the Assistant reported,

. . . since gaining a more correct view of our theology, ambiguous works on Christian Science by biased authors, some of whom are members of their own denomination, would be of no practical value to them in their future appraisal of Christian Science.

He made a passing comment that perhaps they should assume some responsibility in attempting to curb these spurious accounts of our religion.¹

Some Conclusions

An author can be coerced through at least three kinds of group activity--through the group's organizing an economic boycott, its resorting to state power, and its exploiting its favorable distributor relations. By these means the group opposes messages before they reach the public

Economic boycott depends mainly on the group's membership. If the members tend to be cohesive, a boycott against a dealer or publisher may be readily organized. But the success of a boycott may not come so easily.

¹Man. to E. O., January 14, 1960. Item #2015.

In a pluralistic society the boycott might serve in the outgroup to promote more than suppress a book or article that the ingroup finds offensive. This happened in the case of the biography of Dakin.

The use of state power, such as to protect a copyright, may also tend to publicize and so promote a book. We noted that twice the Manager for reasons of public relations recommended against a suit to protect a copyright. We further saw that on another occasion the Manager did not desire that an editor who was publishing copyrighted material give a credit line. The reason again was one of public relations.

On the other hand, the use of public relations can be an effective means to suppress a message. The group succeeds, not by coercing anyone, but by earning or creating good will and respect for itself among editors and publishers and so turning them against the author. The effect is to make these distributors arbitrators among conflicting interests.

We noted that the favorable relations one Committee had with an editor led the editor to call on him before

publicizing an "unfortunate situation." Two men had approached the editor about the matter. The editor obtained the Committee's side of the story and then, somewhat in the role of a referee, decided against the publicity.

Public relations and the uses of economic boycott and state power are somewhat mutually exclusive. The group often can turn to the boycott only by harming its public relations. It must frequently choose between the two methods.

We observed that the Manager on one occasion advised against the use of advertising pressure. A threat to withdraw advertising had been suggested as a way to curb a newspaper's sensational play of an unfortunate situation. The Manager argued against this method both on the grounds of ethics and the harm this action would do the Church's public relations.

The group's legal and communicative activities come together in the area of coercion. Just the fact that the advantages and disadvantages of legal action

are weighed in terms of the group's public relations indicates this. Furthermore, public relations can complement or replace legal action. We noted that the Committee looked both to correction and the laws of copyright to protect from plagiarism the writings of Mrs. Eddy.

The group's working success with the media has a positive relation to its pursuit of the liberal position. This position allows that the group has the right to instruct its own members on a book, protect the copyrights and trademarks that belong to it, and win its way by persuasion. The position opposes such activities as the economic boycott that is directed against a business rather than a book and is motivated by revenge rather than setting aright a wrong before the public. Self-interest as well as ethics urge the group to conform its working practices to the liberal position.

As one outcome if it does not, the publisher may exploit the situation. He may appeal to the liberal position by representing himself to the public as an embattled publisher fighting for freedom to publish, and

thereby win public sympathy and support. This happened with Lady Chatterley's Lover. This happened with the biography of Mrs. Eddy by Dakin.

CHAPTER VIII

INFORMATIONAL SERVICES: AN EXAMINATION OF THE GROUP'S RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FROM THE MEDIA

Two writers who called upon the Church for information were liberal in their praise of the help given. Their comments are the kind a public relations agency obviously is happy to receive:

In a writing experience which now extends over thirty years I do not recall another instance where someone has gone to such lengths to be helpful.¹

Fortunately, the authorities responsible for the different religions have always tried to make our task more easy and agreeable, but up till now, and just between us, Christian Science takes the record.²

In this chapter we shall consider the Committee's endeavors, such as led to the above, to assist the writer and the newsman who turn to the Church for assistance in gathering information. By informational services we mean the group's responses to the requests of newsmen and authors for information.

¹From a private exchange: D.M. to Man., re Frontiers of Healing, April 27, 1959. Item #488.

²From a published article by Carlos Villar Araujo in Mundo Argentine (Buenos Aires) (August 1958). Item #1103.

The group provides services to meet the call for expert informational assistance in a subject field, a call that offers the group an unexpected opportunity for a public hearing. Kinds of requests are to be considered under three heading: (a) providing information, (b) checking manuscripts, and (c) preparing articles.

Table 5 indicates the requests received and handled by the Manager from June 1, 1958, to May 31, 1960. In each case the request came from a writer, editor, or publisher who named a specific publication.

It is to be noted that 28 different publications are listed. These include 3 newspapers, 4 books, 9 magazines, and 12 encyclopedia and reference works. Four of the encyclopedia publishers made two requests of the Committee during the period.

TABLE 5

**ALL PUBLISHING REQUESTS
HANDLED BY MANAGER^a
(1958-1960)**

Date of Request	Name of Publication	Nature of Request
1958-59	<u>Edith Deen, Great Women of the Christian Faith</u> (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959)	Asks for information, a photograph, and a check of her manuscript.
July-Dec. 1958	<u>Look</u> magazine	Asks for information, photographs, and a check of manuscript.
Aug. 1958	<u>American Educator Encyclopedia</u> (Lake Bluff, Ill.)	Asks for photographs for yearbook.
Aug. 1958 and June 1959	<u>The American Peoples Encyclopedia</u> (Chicago)	Asks for article of 275 words for yearbook.
Aug. 1958	<u>Cosmopolitan</u> magazine	Asks for information on healing work.
Nov. 1958 Oct. 1959	<u>The New International Encyclopedia</u> (New York)	Asks for an article of 240 words for yearbook.
Oct. 1958	V. A. Bradley for <u>Chicago Daily News</u>	Asks for information and photographs on first edition of <u>Science and Health</u> .

^aExcluded are requests actually handled, not just transmitted, by other church offices and by area Committees; requests for a check of a manuscript when no publisher or publication is named.

TABLE 5--Continued

Date of Request	Name of Publication	Nature of Request
Oct. 1958	Stanley I. Stuber, <u>How We Got Our Denominations</u> (New York: Association Press, 1927)	Asks for information to update the part on Christian Science in his book.
Jan. 1959	<u>The World Book Encyclopedia</u> (Chicago)	Asks that articles on Mrs. Eddy and Christian Science be checked and revised.
Mar. 1959	<u>Encyclopaedia Britannica</u> (Chicago)	Asks for an article of 450 words for yearbook.
Feb. 1960	<u>Encyclopaedia Britannica</u> (Chicago)	Asks that manuscripts of articles on Mrs. Eddy and Christian Science be checked.
Mar. 1959	<u>Liberty</u> magazine (Seventh-Day Adventist)	Asks for statement on religion and the public school and on religious freedom.
Apr. 1959	<u>The British Commonwealth</u> (London)	Asks that brief entry be updated for new edition.
Apr. 1959	Roland Gammon for <u>Good Housekeeping</u>	Asks for information on churches and church formation.
Apr. 1959	J. B. Starr for <u>Dartmouth Alumni Magazine</u>	Asks for historical information and a check of his manuscript.

TABLE 5--Continued

Date of Request	Name of Publication	Nature of Request
Apr. 1959 Apr. 1960	<u>World Scope Encyclopedia</u> (New York)	Asks for article of 200 words for yearbook.
May 1959	<u>The Encyclopedia Americana</u> (New York)	Asks for article of 375 words for yearbook.
July 1959	<u>Universal Standard Encyclopedia</u> (New York)	Asks that article be reviewed for a new edition.
July 1959	<u>The Lane Reporter</u> county magazine (Fall Creek, Ore.)	Asks for a check of a manuscript.
Aug. 1959	<u>Indianapolis Times</u>	Asks for a statement on world affairs.
Aug. 1959	<u>Information</u> magazine (Roman Catholic)	Asks for photographs.
Sept. 1959	<u>New Standard Encyclopedia</u> (Chicago)	Asks for an article on Mrs. Eddy to be checked and for photographs.
Sept. 1959	<u>Handbook of The Canadian Nurses Association</u> (Toronto)	Asks for statement on religious observances of interest to the nursing profession.
Oct. 1959	* * * ^b	American publisher asks for "frank appraisal" of book published overseas that he had been considering.

^bKept anonymous to protect the publisher.

TABLE 5--Continued

Date of Request	Name of Publication	Nature of Request
Nov. 1959	John H. Gerstner, <u>Theology of the Major Sects</u> (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Publishing Company, 1960)	Asks for a check of a manuscript.
Feb. 1960	<u>American Institutions and Organizations Interested in Asia</u> (New York)	Asks that entry be updated for new edition.
Mar. 1960	<u>Guideposts</u> magazine	Asks for information on and copies of the Church's periodicals.
Mar. 1960	Jhan and June Robbins for <u>Red Book</u>	Asks for information on healing work.
Mar. 1960	Roland Gammon for <u>Pageant</u> magazine	Asks for information and photographs on church buildings.

Providing information

The Committee as a source of information offers the newsman and the author two distinct advantages. In the first place, the Committee is an authority and a specialist on its subject, namely Christian Science. The Committee knows what facts there are and where they can be found, and it can quickly put at a writer's disposal the information that he needs, a service that sometimes may be more than just a luxury to the writer working under a deadline.

In the second place, the Committee has a widespread apparatus for collecting data, which it can put at the disposal of an author. If the author wants particular information on or a photograph of a distant churchman or site of significance to the Church, whether in Tasmania or Ghana, Tokyo or Berlin, the Committee can usually get it for him and within a short time. Locally, the Committee can make prompt, special arrangements for interviews with church members and for picture-taking.

The Committee's range of services was called upon

by the staff of Look magazine in the summer and fall of 1958. A researcher, writer, editor, photographer, and illustrator were all assisted in their preparation of an article on Christian Science, which appeared in the December 9, 1958, issue of that magazine.

The first call was in early July. A Look researcher visited the Committee on Publication for New York to explain about the coming article and the assistance the Look staff hoped they might have from the Church, and to obtain information on a few points. The Committee in answering his questions loaned him four books, the first of about a dozen eventually borrowed by him.

In early August the writer of the article, Hartzell Spence, visited the Manager in Boston to collect information that he needed. He had several interviews with a member of the Manager's staff and at his own request borrowed fourteen books and booklets.

In the next months until the end of October, the researcher, the writer, and the editor queried the Manager's staff on numerous points--in person and by letter.

The Committee performed a second service besides providing information. It helped the illustrator to collect items for an illustration which was to accompany the article. Fifteen historical items were gathered, photographs taken and sent to the illustrator, and a half-dozen of these objects eventually loaned. Also the Committee provided photographs of the initial-issue cover-pages of the religious periodicals and in addition the editorial page of the first Monitor.

As a third service, the Committee made arrangements for the Look team to obtain the interviews and photographs they wanted. It arranged for the writer to interview Christian Scientists in the medium-size community of York, Pennsylvania, provided an escort in Boston to assist Look staff members to photograph locations of church activities and sites of historical interest to the Church, paved the way for him to take pictures of a New York City Reading Room and of several practitioners in that city, supplied photographs of some branch churches in Connecticut, and obtained publication releases from several persons who

C

had appeared in photographs and also one named in the article itself.

As a fourth service, the Manager's staff checked the article for accuracy. The writer had requested this assistance, reserving to himself the right of final decision as to changes. The staff, on receiving it in mid-September, looked the manuscript over and returned it promptly with comments. The writer responded within a week to say that "my work is done." "I am sure," he wrote, "that [the] wonderful cooperation put me in a most favorable frame of mind from the outset." In mid-October the editor sent the article proofs, which were promptly returned with a "few small inaccuracies" noted.

While its objective was to ease the job of the Look editorial staff as much as possible, the Committee did not meet every request nor answer every question. When, for instance, the photographer and editor desired a photograph of a practitioner and patient appearing together, the Committee requested--for reasons of ethics--that they make the patient unidentifiable. (In the published photograph only the back of the patient as she

faced the practitioner was pictured.) Then, too, a question as to the number of church members was not answered.

In several instances, the Committee made arrangements for the magazine staff through other church offices. For the photographs of practitioners, for example, the Committee consulted two other offices--the Executive Office and the Department of Branches and Practitioners. The Committee in effect served as the middleman between the magazine and the Church.¹

Inquiries received by the Committee come from a variety of sources. There are inquiries from church members in regard to published comment on Christian Science; inquiries from nonadherents moved to write from a religious interest, especially as the result of hearing the radio and television broadcasts; inquiries from those who simply wish to be informed on the Church as one among many denominations on the social scene. Among the last are found the writers and newsmen.

Some inquirers ask about the religious teachings. They mainly have in mind to compare the teachings with

¹Hartzell Spence, "The Story of Religions in America--The Christian Scientists," Look, December 9, 1958, pp. 86-94. Item #1087.

the religious views of others. File correspondence indicates that these inquirers ask for the Church's position on the sacraments, salvation, miracles, and other theological subjects; also on the mission of the Christian Church and on Christian unity. Other inquirers want information on the church organization--on church services, publications, vocations, missionary activities, welfare activities, sanatoriums and nursing homes, youth activities, church schools, and requirements for and social data on the membership. Some inquirers want to know more about the healing work--its relation to church healing generally, to religious counseling and pastoral services, to medicine, obstetrics, dentistry, and psychotherapy. Finally, there are those who ask about the Church's position on social issues. They want statements on issues of the day, such as church-state relations, public schools, nuclear warfare, the racial issue, personal and social ethics, gambling, alcoholism and alcohol education, marriage and the family, birth control, and so on. Also a question that comes up is the relation of religion generally and Christian Science specifically to the biological and physical sciences.

For many inquiries, the Committee evidently keeps its letters brief and simple by allowing the answer to be conveyed by printed literature. It will send an assortment of pamphlets, leaflets, booklists, and sometimes a religious periodical or a pertinent article from the Monitor. On rare occasions it collects a pertinent statement from another church office to send. The Committee may be the interested office if the query is about the Church's stand on freedom of the press or on legislation affecting Christian Scientists.¹

When it cannot send something published, the Committee seems to answer circumspectly. Especially to questions on religious and social issues, the Committee's answers may not be very explicit. There appear to be several reasons for this.

First, the Committee is not the pronouncement-making office of the Church. This is a function of The

¹According to the Handbook, "CoPs are called upon from time to time by the press to comment upon or clarify some aspect of legislative, school, or other public issues involving Christian Science. When our policy is clearly understood, the CoP may go ahead and answer the request. ~~If the question is an unusual one, or our policy is not clearly defined, then the CoP should feel free to consult with the Manager's Office before taking action~~" (pp. 150-51).

Christian Science Board of Directors, who actually make few pronouncements.¹ The Committee distributed only one pronouncement of the Directors during the study period.

This pronouncement, discussed in Chapter VI, was issued at the appearance of the Church of England's report on spiritual healing. Like probably most pronouncements over the years, it concerned the healing practice argued as a social issue. Specifically, the pronouncement provided the Christian Scientists' view on the question of cooperation between the clergy and the medical profession.

The Christian Science Monitor takes hosts of editorial positions on social and economic issues. For instance, the Monitor has taken a stand in favor of racial integration at a moderate tempo in segregated areas. The

¹There has evidently been a great deal of debate among Protestant churchmen generally on the propriety of public pronouncements, at least on social and economic issues. See, for instance, "The Pronouncing Process in the Churches," Information Service, XL (March 18, 1961), published by the Bureau of Research and Survey, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, New York. "The pronouncing process," the issue states, "has often been called one of the more controversial activities of church bodies. Thus one may hear in church circles frequent warm discussions of the ~~authenticity of church pronouncements or of the propriety of pronouncements.~~" On a later page: "Should there be fewer pronouncements? Probably many informed and responsible officials of the churches would answer in the affirmative."

Church, on the other hand, has taken no position. Since the Monitor is clearly the Church's voice,¹ the Monitor's editorial position would seem to serve the Church somewhat in lieu of pronouncements as a means both to relate religion to public issues and to influence the member and nonmember in directions the Church believes progressive.

The Committee has suggested that a reason for no pronouncements on a particular issue is the diversity in the Church's membership. Regarding the racial question, the Manager once advised the Committee for Virginia that the Church took no position because under the Manual local churches are independent.²

The Committee has also reasoned that the individual ought to be left free to apply religious truth according to his own insights. When the Indianapolis Times asked the state Committee for a statement on an issue concerning the United States and Russia, the Committee responded:

The Church of Christ, Scientist, is keenly interested in all efforts designed to further peace

¹Canham points out the close supervision that The Christian Science Board of Directors exercises over Monitor news and editorial policies. See Canham, pp. 163, 285.

²Man. to CoP for Virginia, January 12, 1961. Item #824.

and mutual understanding between nations, but does not take an official position with regard to political questions. Each member is expected to arrive at his own conclusions, according to his concept of what is nearest right under the circumstances.¹

A similar statement was given to an inquirer who wished to know the Church's position on "Religion and Government":

In matters of political and social concern our Church leaves each Christian Scientist free, either as a voter or as a public official, to act on the basis of his own decision and from his own highest sense of right. Our church literature concentrates on arousing in the individual a keener spiritual and moral sense, a better understanding of God and man, which will thereby guide him into more enlightened decisions. It does not deal directly with the question of religion and government.²

Another inquirer, on a different subject, was told:

Also, we avoid official pronouncements on questions of the day because we are convinced that the individual needs not so much policy rulings as spiritual growth in conscious communion with God in order to be guided to a correct answer to these and other burning issues.³

The Committee answers some questions briefly or not at all when an explanation requires more time and

¹Man. to E. O., August 5, 1959. Item #940.

²Man. to Miss P. Evison, October 1, 1959. Item #2038.

³Man. to the Rev. M. J. Heineken, July 15, 1958. Item #2037. (Mrs. Eddy's Unity of Good, p. 5:9-13, was cited.)

space than a single letter allows. This is particularly true when an answer, in order to make sense or be taken as intended, must be preceded with an explanation of Christian Science.

On this point, the last inquirer above was told:

We have found that the big problem in answering surveys of this kind is that the only meaningful answer we could give would have to be in terms of the essential Principle and practice of Christian Science healing. This involves a longer explanation than would be possible in view of the brief answers generally desired.¹

The Manager told a free-lance writer who wished to discuss Christian Science and the prevention and restoration of alcoholics:

A writer who undertakes a popular discussion of Christian Science in relation to a specific problem is faced with the difficulty that his readers do not understand the basic premises and teachings of Christian Science. For instance, the healing of intemperance, which in Christian Science is another belief or phase of evil, cannot be neatly lifted out of the over-all mission of Christian Science and generalized, as an article in a popular magazine ordinarily requires. Such an article can hardly be a metaphysical explanation of Christian Science; yet Mrs. Eddy writes . . . that "if spiritual conclusions are separated from their premises, the nexus is lost, and the argument, with its rightful conclusions, becomes correspondingly obscure."²

¹Ibid.

²Man. to Miss D. Valentry, January 28, 1958. Item #2039. (Quotation from Mrs. Eddy's Retrospection and Introspection, p. 21:28-1.)

There is some information that the Committee does not provide. Like most organizations, the Church has categories of data that are not made public or are done so only rarely. One is membership figures. The Church Manual does not permit the number of members to be made public.¹ Another is statistics on copies of Science and Health printed and sold from 1906 to the present.² A third is information on dissenters, about whom "only the minimum facts" are given out.³

The Committee has not obtained for the researcher access to the Church Archives, which contain the historical manuscript collections of the Church.⁴ Probably the last

¹"Christian Scientists shall not report for publication the number of the members of The Mother Church, nor that of the branch churches. According to the Scripture they shall turn away from personality and numbering the people," p. 48:16-21 (Article VIII, Section 28). Possible Scriptural authority for this is II Sam. 24. It is to be noted that the Church has made membership figures public when required by law, as in the 1936 United States Census.

²See Orcutt, p. 101. Also see Eddy, Miscellany, p. v:19-5.

³Asst. Man. to D. M., August 15, 1958, re Joel S. Goldsmith. Item #397.

⁴There is nothing novel about researchers being denied access to private papers and documents. The Adams papers, which date back to 1755, have only in the last decade been released, the first published volumes of these appearing in September 1961.

outside scholar to have a major access for a full-length work was the Episcopal clergyman, the Rev. Lyman P. Powell, whose biography of Mrs. Eddy was published in 1930.¹ Since that date, no outsider has had substantial access. But, then, it is not likely that many scholars have sought access. At least the Committee's files did not indicate that any had from 1958 to 1960.

In the early 1950s Charles S. Braden sought access. His request for unrestricted access was denied, a matter which he has discussed.² Several reasons that the Committee gave for the denial of access have been provided in Chapter III.³

The Church offered, however, to provide him with information to questions. He queried the Church numerous times for information on church activities but, according to file correspondence, asked little about the controversies he took up in Christian Science Today.

The Committee on Publication has declined to assist the researcher who wishes to experiment with Christian Science healing. Reports of healing, particularly those the Committee publicizes on radio and television broadcasts, draw inquirers who ask for the background history and documentation. The ~~Committee evidently satisfies most inquirers by referring them~~

¹Mary Baker Eddy, A Life Size Portrait. Powell discusses the access granted him on pp. 20-26 of this volume. The book was initially published by Macmillan.

²Braden, pp. ix, 203-204.

³See pp. 159-161.

to the person who had the experience.

However, an occasional researcher wants more than the case history. He will ask to be allowed to conduct experiments which embrace patients undergoing Christian Science treatment before and during a healing or otherwise subject the healing practice to experimental conditions. The Committee has not accommodated these inquirers. Its stated reasons all seem to start with a religious disinclination to "put God to the test."¹

The Christian Scientist, since he attributes religious healing to divine power, apparently considers any experimental hypothesis to test the effectiveness of his healing practice as a test of Deity itself. The Committee pointed this out to one inquirer looking to establish experimental conditions:

inasmuch as Christian Science treatment partakes of the nature of prayer, of a deep, wholehearted attempt to know and obey the divine Principle of the universe, it must avoid any sort of sophisticated self-

¹This disinclination is by no means limited to the Christian Scientists. Geoffrey Hoyland, a British observer, points out in a book edited by the Dean of St. Paul's in London: "We are confined almost exclusively to the historical method, . . . since the higher spiritual forces do not lend themselves to normal scientific treatment . . ." Geoffrey Hoyland, The Resurrection Pattern (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1947), p. 67. Cited by Peel, p. 157.

consciousness of attitude of putting God on trial.¹

The Manager told another inquirer that the test is of one's prayers and spiritual understanding, measurable qualitatively more than quantitatively.² The inquirer wished to study the effect of prayer upon athletic performance.

We do not put God to the test nor judge His omnipotence by mortal measurements. Rather, our understanding of Him is tested, and the results of our prayers gauge the quality of our prayers rather than the willingness of God to respond to them. . . . Thus the fundamental result of prayer as understood in Christian Science would be not the success of an athletic performance so much as the growth in spiritual values.³

Statistical analyses are therefore somewhat superfluous in reckoning the result of prayer. A researcher was told:

The fact that no provision is made for a systematic study of similar cases means that we do not feel that a better understanding of Christian Science is to be gained by such a procedure, which is drawn from the methodology of natural science rather than from our own system of spiritual study and growth.⁴

¹Staff member to psychologist, October 3, 1957. Item #975.

²Reminiscent, perhaps, of Wendell Phillips' "One on God's side is a majority."

³Man. to I. B. Kelsey, July 16, 1958. Item # 975.

⁴Staff member to psychologist, December 17, 1957. Item #975.

The same point was explained to a church member who wished to provide information to a nonmember:

it is perhaps better for him to consider Christian Science healing for himself from the standpoint of God's all-power, here and now, rather than basing his trust on what happened to some other individual. . . . It seems essential that [nonmembers] accept, from the outset, that healing in Christian Science is not the work of a person, nor depend in any way on how many other people have been healed. We find it important to make certain that what is being sought most of all is not mere physical relief, but a genuine humble desire to know God better.¹

A further reason that the Committee has given against experiments is that "the spiritual privacy of the individual" ought not to be subject to the curiosity, examinations, and questions of the researcher. The Committee commented to a researcher, "Your professional interest, I'm afraid, is up against our scrupulous desire to protect the spiritual privacy of the individual."²

The researcher cannot work through the practitioner because the latter is under a Manual injunction to respect the practitioner-patient confidence.³

Experiments would, the Committee has explained,

¹Man. to Mrs. J. H. Compton, August 18, 1959.
Item #2056.

²Staff member to psychologist, November 13, 1957.
Item #975.

³P. 46:12-18 (Article VIII, Section 22).

actually introduce to the healing process elements that would retard it. Where "absolute faith" is required,¹ the note of doubt with which the researcher must approach his subject cannot be allowed to infect the patient. Furthermore, the Christian Scientist believes that medical diagnosis, a normal part of a medical experiment, can cause disease.²

On two occasions medical researchers asked the Church if they might use some cancer patients undergoing Christian Science treatment, not for experimental purposes, but as a control group for evaluating the progress of patients under medical treatment. To one of these researchers--he desired brief diagnoses of the control group at yearly intervals--the Manager stated:

Even the minimal diagnosis that you propose would introduce into Christian Science healing an element essentially foreign to it. . . . it is important that this spiritual method shall not be put on a merely experimental basis, introducing a note of skepticism into either the practitioner's or the patient's thinking. As you well know, there are some natural

¹"The prayer that reforms the sinner and heals the sick is an absolute faith that all things are possible to God,--a spiritual understanding of Him, an unselfed love." Science and Health, p. 1:1-4.

²See, for instance, Science and Health, pp. 370:20-22 and 161:24-29.

processes where the very presence of an observer changes the action being observed; and this analogy will have to serve as sufficient explanation as to why we would not wish a single case of Christian Science healing to be treated as a controlled experiment, however loose the control.¹

Checking manuscripts

Another service that the Committee offers the author, newsman, even publisher is the checking of manuscripts on Christian Science. The Committee on Publication, as something of a specialist on popular misunderstandings as well as on source material, can point out to an author before a manuscript sees print those errors that it believes have made their way into his work.

File correspondence indicates that some of the Committee's recommendations on manuscripts have been minor and some not so minor. It is quite possible that in a few cases the Committee has actually saved an author from embarrassment. In each case the author presumably was not under any more obligation to accept the suggestions

¹Man. to J.B. Graham, August 13, 1957. Also see CoP, Northern California, to Man., re J. Flynn, October 31, 1958. Both researchers explained that doubt had been raised as to the effectiveness of their therapies. Both were sent published reports of cancer healings in Christian Science that contained medical diagnoses.

of the Committee than those of any of his other prepublication readers.¹

When a manuscript is sent to the Church, any number of offices may share in its review. Copyright offices may consider its use of copyrighted material. The Church Archives may review it for historical accuracy according to archival records. And the Committee itself may examine the manuscript for points that the Committee would take up with the author if the manuscript were already in print.

The Church's manuscript checking service was called upon twice by one author. While preparing her Great Women of the Christian Faith (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959) in the spring of 1958, Edith Deen wrote to the Church for information for a chapter on Mrs. Eddy. She explained that she had already used five biographies but now needed recent information on the Church and also a photograph of Mrs. Eddy.

The Manager in a detailed four-page reply answered her questions and mentioned three books of possible interest. Evidently, there was some gratuitous information,

¹Some commentators oddly consider the Committee's offer to check a manuscript "censorship." See The Blight that Failed, p. 4, and Braden, p. 200.

for he remarked, "Not all of the above information may be apposite to your purpose, but I send it along for whatever use it may have for you."

The author from her home in Fort Worth also called on the Committee for Texas in Dallas. When she sent him an early draft of the chapter on Mrs. Eddy, he suggested that she forward it to the Manager in Boston for copyright clearance and for checking against "a wealth of material which I do not have." She agreed to this, remarking: "Don't either of you hesitate to offer suggestions. I welcome criticism before a book comes out. Afterward it is too late."

Upon receiving the manuscript, the Manager sent it to the Church Archives for their review of the points of history. Shortly he received their report and forwarded it, remarking to the author:

In line with our usual practice, we sent it up to our Archives for checking against the historical and factual material we have here. From the enclosed report you can see that they have done this in meticulous detail. We are passing it along to you in toto, although naturally we realize that the style of your book may not require or permit your taking account of all the suggestions in this memorandum.

A few days later the writer acknowledged the report with "gratitude for such cooperation." Subsequently, the photograph she had requested was sent.

A year after the check of the manuscript, the proof pages were sent to the Manager, this time by the publisher at the author's request. The same procedure was followed--the Church Archives checked the text and the Manager forwarded the report. In his letter of transmittal the Manager noted:

we have checked the proofs for historical and factual accuracy. As you can see, the majority of changes on the proofs apply exclusively to corrections of errors of accuracy in the quotations from the writings of Mrs. Eddy. The four or five factual errors in the content are explained on the accompanying memorandum.

Several days later the publisher acknowledged the report, saying that "it means a great deal to us to have your help . . ."

In September the author made a final request, which the Committee for New York handled. In November, the book was released.¹

The Committee seems to follow several rules in

¹Letters quoted are dated May 15 (two), 19, and June 25, 30, 1958; July 30 and August 6, 1959. Item #121.

handling a manuscript. For one thing, the Committee evidently limits its comments--as it does in the corrective work--to the particular passages that mention the religion or quote church literature. No evidence could be found of the Committee's passing on the accuracy or inaccuracy, the adequacy or inadequacy, or the general merit or lack of merit of a manuscript apart from its discussion of Christian Science.

A second, related rule seems to be that the Committee advises only on textual matters. While it endeavors to ensure the accuracy of facts, it declines to give counsel on such matters as the selection of a subject for an article or the finding of a publisher.¹ Its area of responsibility is the accuracy of information on the religion set before the public, not general authorial counsel for either the member or nonmember.

Third, the Committee is guarded not to give outright approval of a manuscript. The reason is evidently not to influence a publisher in his acceptance of a manuscript or to provide an author or a publisher with some-

¹See, for instance, Man. to R. Meigs, re The California Southern Baptist, July 20, 1959. Item #1009.

thing he could use in its promotion. Perhaps for the same reason the Committee has on occasion declined to review a manuscript until the author has found a publisher for it.¹ Also, the Monitor does not accept books for advertising and review until review copies have been distributed.²

These restraints preclude what one writer candidly suggested in regard to her own book, "If a firm could be sure of a favourable report from the Christian Science Press it might enable them to bring it out."³

These matters of restraint in regard to approval of manuscripts are pointed out in the following excerpts from the Manager's letters, the first to an area Committee and the second to another Church office:

It may be that whatever we write to [the author] after reading [the] manuscript may seem a little ambiguous or indirect to you. If so, the reason will doubtless be that it often seems wise not to make unqualified statements of approval which an author or publisher may then use for advertising purposes.⁴

¹E. O. to Man., re Mrs. A. Nederhoed, May 18, 1959. Item #492.

²See E. O. to Man., re Why I Am A Christian Scientist, August 4, 1958. Item #459.

³Author to CoP for Germany (misaddressed), October 8, 1958. Item #432.

⁴Man. to CoP for Texas re Great Women of the Christian Faith, May 23, 1958. Item #121.

We review manuscripts within the scope of our corrective work as an informal service to authors, but we feel that extended correspondence such as in this case may lead an author to conclude that he is obtaining an approval for his book that this office, at least, is not authorized to grant. It would be unfortunate, for example, if [the author] assumed that her book would automatically be acceptable to the Monitor for purposes of advertising, because our office had seen it.¹

That publishers do not need any Church commitment before accepting an author's manuscript on Christian Science was amply demonstrated in 1958 and 1959. American publishers printed four books on the Church and the religion by members and a fifth by a nonmember; and a German publisher brought out a sixth volume by a member with a section on Christian Science.²

The handling of each manuscript is mainly fit to the circumstances. The usual comment is by letter as in the case of Great Women of the Christian Faith. However, on one occasion the Manager suggested to the Committee for France that he might prepare a revised version of a very

¹Man. to Trustees under the Will of Mary Baker Eddy, re H. W. Dow, August 5, 1959. Item #2018.

²Canham (Commitment to Freedom), Leishman (Why I Am A Christian Scientist), Messer (The Science of Society), and Peel (Christian Science, Its Encounter with American Culture) are all members of the Church. Braden (Christian Science Today) is not. The German publication is Das Rätsel Hiob (Karlsruhe, West Germany: C. F. Müller, 1958) by Georg Gemüsch.

short article submitted by an author as "the easiest way of showing him the inaccuracies . . ." ¹

While it does not disapprove, the Committee has on occasion gone to some lengths to discourage. In the summer of 1959 an editor in a western state, friendly to the Church but not a member, forwarded a manuscript for review which he had written for his small county paper. The subject of the article was a visit he had had with a Christian Science practitioner. The Manager, since asked for his views, gave four reasons against publication of the article.

First, the article "would not necessarily convey the deep religious and spiritual significance of Christian Science that you obviously desire to impart." Second, "these experiences would not necessarily be convincing to most readers in terms of their own experience, and would make larger demands upon their understanding and sympathies than the average reader is prepared for." Third, a call on a practitioner is a private and personal affair, as unpublishable as "confidential consultations with a

¹Man. to CoP for France, re G. Dagon, April 7, 1959. Item #255.

doctor or minister or priest." Finally,

the importance of prayer, and the Bible, and our communion with God seemed touched upon inadequately, but we could not attempt to revise the manuscript by putting words into the mouth of the practitioner whom you quote.¹

No attempt was made to edit the manuscript.

The editor did not acknowledge the letter. There was, however, no report of the article's publication.

It is likely that the Manual bylaw--quoted in the last chapter--which prescribes the Bible and Science and Health as the "only textbooks for self-instruction in Christian Science" provides the Committee with a useful criterion in its checking of manuscripts. By implication, an author ought not to presume to be teaching, at least to the extent of trying to replace the "textbooks." The issue seems to be the degree his writing leads either to or away from the basic books.

Attention paid to the bylaw and some ramifications are suggested in the following comments on the book, Why I Am A Christian Scientist. The first is from the jacket of the book, which possibly the author had a hand

¹Man. to T. Straub, September 4, 1959. Item #1080.

in preparing; the second from the review of the book in the Monitor of October 23, 1958; and the third from a letter that the Manager wrote to an inquirer about the book.

It will be evident, however, from the outset that the author does not intend to teach Christian Science, but rather to record the characteristic doctrines and indicate the potentialities of the Science of Christianity.

The book is not presented as a definitive exposition of Christian Science but as the helpful record of what one seeker for Truth has found it.

Most books of this kind, however, set forth what Christian Science has meant to their authors in the way of providing a logical religious outlook and way of life more than they contain specific applications of Christian Science to healing, as our religious periodicals and other authorized literature do.¹

It can be assumed that the Committee not only checks a writer's facts but also, just by the nature of the activity, somewhat guides him in more general ways. The broad areas indicated here may suggest where this guidance leads--to "record the characteristic doctrines" and "indicate the potentialities," and to set forth a "helpful record of what one seeker" has found and what he holds as "a logical religious outlook and way of life."

¹Man. to Mrs. R.L. Burroughs, May 12, 1961.
Item #2017.

Preparing articles

The preparation of articles for the local press is a communicative activity, virtually the sole one, which the Committee shares with the individual church member. Article writing is often a joint activity, the member writing the article requested by a local newspaper and the Committee professionally editing it.

Since the Christian Science Church is a church of laymen, there is no clergy to whom an editor can turn for an article of an inspirational or informative nature. The Committee through editing services, over-all guidance, encouragement, and loan of samples of articles selected across its wide network accomplishes a task for the Christian Science churches similar to that performed by the clergyman in other denominations. When an editor wants an original, signed piece, it is likely that he is not disappointed with the Christian Scientists' contribution. At least, it is the Committee's task to see that he is not.

The newspaper editor may ask for articles for a

regular "sermonette" series or a seasonal series to observe Christmas, Lent, Easter, Thanksgiving, and the New Year. If a seasonal item, the article may be a message from a church, a general discussion on the significance of the celebration, or a signed personal article, such as a "What Christmas Means to Me" essay.¹

Requests from local broadcasters, unlike those from newspapers, are usually handled by the Committee alone. The Manager's office makes available a radio and television script service on which area Committees can draw (discussed in the next chapter).

Generally the Committee prefers that its regular radio and television programs and its regular newspaper releases be published before the specially prepared script or article.

Requests from the national media the Committee handles exclusively. Magazine editors, reference-work editors, and network broadcasters call upon the Committee for original pieces or, in the case of reference works, for updating old articles. Most signed articles name

¹ These types of articles are mentioned in the Handbook and in circular letters the Manager sends Committees.

the Manager, Committees on Publication, as contributor. This was so for the six contributions to yearbooks listed in Table 5. Network speakers are often picked and always assisted by the Committee.

Some Conclusions

The writer may call on the group as a news source. He may ask the group's public relations facility to supply information to questions he has, prepare an article for his use, provide a statement, check his manuscript, set up an interview, or make arrangements for photographs.

The writer in calling on the group gives implicit recognition to such facts as that the news and opinions of the group are important enough to be reported, that the group has a body of specialized knowledge to which he needs access, and that the group can assist him, indeed be his partner, in handling accurately news and information of quantity and complexity.

We saw that Look magazine called on the Committee on Publication for a wide range of services. The editors evidently believed that the information from and the

assistance of the Committee could be useful to them.

The group's informational services would tend to undermine the freedom of press action if it caused responsibility for content to be transferred from the media to the public relations facility. While the burden for not allowing this to happen rests with the media, the group, at least in a pluralistic society, also has an interest in the press's neutrality. It is desirous that its own hearing in the press be free from interference by other groups.

We noted that the Look article writer obtained information from the Committee before and at the time of submitting his manuscript for a check of accuracy. At the same time, he reserved to himself the full right of final decision with regard to his manuscript. The implication was that the Committee fully expected the responsibility to remain with him and made no effort to assume it.

Also in regard to the neutrality of the media, we saw that the Committee does not approve manuscripts. The Committee in its informational services does not approve

if its recommendations are fully followed, just as it does not disapprove if they are not followed. The Committee evidently does not act to influence a publisher to either accept or reject a manuscript.

The Church checked the accuracy of comment about Mrs. Eddy in the manuscript, Great Women of the Christian Faith. It did not, however, approve this manuscript, which was to make its way on what others judged the merits to be, not the Church.

The group's working success with the media is probably related to the group's doing what the media expect of it. Very likely the editor, publisher, and author who receive prompt, reliable information from the group on one occasion are more ready to ask assistance a second time.

We noted from Table 5 that four encyclopedia publishers made more than one request of the Committee between 1958 and 1960. The book, Great Women of the Christian Faith, brought requests to the Committee over a period of time extending from May 1958 to September 1959. These several calls would seem to indicate some satisfaction with the

Committee's service on the part of publishers and authors.

The requests of the scholar present a special problem. He is interested not only in reliable and prompt information but also in thoroughness of the data. This interest of his in thoroughness may clash with the group's interest to keep information about itself private.

On the other hand, the group's public relations awareness may tend in some instances to work against privacy. This would seem true at least to the extent that the group is interested in building good working relations with an author and having him depend increasingly on sources the group deems accurate.

We noted that the Church declined to open its files to one author. This author criticized the refusal. He might, however, have more fully used the opportunities for information that the Church had offered him.

When it speaks for the group, the public relations facility may find itself somewhat on the horns of a dilemma. The facility wishes to serve its press relations. Yet by providing the requested statement it must assume that

unanimity on the statement exists in the group. The facility's restraint in making statements may give recognition to the diversity in the group's ranks and to the place of the individual voice.

We have seen that the Committee does not make pronouncements. It distributed from 1958 to 1960 only one statement that might be called a pronouncement, signed by The Christian Science Board of Directors. The Committee's task is more informational than opinion-producing--more the correcting of comment on the religion on the basis of church records and literature than the creating of official opinion on how social issues are to be viewed.

CHAPTER IX

PUBLICITY AND ADVERTISING: AN EXAMINATION OF THE GROUP'S COMMUNICATIVE INITIATIVE

Walter Winchell in October 1959 quipped to readers of his column about a Christian Science church near the advertising hub of Madison Avenue in New York City. Tongue in cheek, the gossip columnist informed them that "so many bigwigs in advertising attend the Christian Science Church (at 77th and Park Avenue) it is called: 'The BBD&O Church.'"¹

Whatever the degree of truth, the sobriquet does call attention to a noteworthy point. There may be many or few Christian Scientists on Madison Avenue, but the public relations of The Mother Church and so more or less of all Christian Science churches, is not directed from there. Publicity and advertising policies are in the hands of the Boston office of the Manager, Committees on Publication, an office in recent years staffed partly by former Monitor men with traditional newspaper backgrounds,

¹"Walter Winchell of New York" in New York Mirror of October 5, 1959. Item #596.

never--so far as can be learned--by advertising and public relations professionals. If anything, the Church's publicity and advertising have been stodgy rather than on the ballyhoo side.

By "publicity" we mean the communicative measures a group initiates to make known its purposes and activities. Since the overarching purpose is correction, it follows that the Committee reckons publicity in terms of correction. The Committee, in fact, looks upon its newspaper, radio, and television publicity as something of a preventive correction.

The rationale behind publicity as a corrective measure might be put as follows: Many of the comments the Committee challenges in its corrections--at least to judge from those taken up in the chapters on correction--are cast in time-worn molds. They have been repeated many times. Why, the assumption seems to be, should the Committee wait for these comments to be published again and then respond defensively and by denial negatively? Why not rather take to the field to meet them before,

not after, republication?

The Handbook spells out the preventive purpose of church publicity in the opening paragraphs of the "News Work" and "Radio Broadcasting" chapters:

The purpose of the news work of CoPs is to supply sound, constructive information about Christian Science to the press. Our goal is to ensure an accurate understanding of the Christian Science movement--and in this way to correct false impressions before these impressions take form in thought and action.¹

All CoP broadcasts, both radio and television, are corrective in their aim They provide ways of correcting widely-held misconceptions of Christian Science at the very point where they exist--namely, in public thought.²

The Handbook, in fact, considers virtually every activity of the Committee as correction. Even publicity the Committee places but has little or no hand in preparing seems to be linked with correction. The Committee places but does not prepare announcements and articles prepared by branch churches, statements by officers of The Mother Church, addresses of Christian Science lecturers, and the advertising and news copy of other offices of The Mother Church.

¹Handbook, p. 135.

²Ibid., p. 97.

Historically, this placement of publicity material, apart from its creation, does not seem to have been linked to correction. In fact, the assignment of placement may have antedated that of correction. The first Manual bylaw establishing the Committee provided for this task of placement.¹ The present Manual likewise assigns it.²

The Manager specified the objective of the preventive correction to one inquirer as follows:

a novelist may choose a certain character to be a Christian Scientist who is anything but representative of our religion. (This has been done on a number of occasions.) By so doing he distributes to many thousands of readers his own misconceptions of our religion. It is very difficult to correct such a misrepresentation afterwards--in fact, the only effective way to correct it is to do so before it is ever printed.

In other words, we have found that the published misrepresentations and injustices done Christian Science invariably spring from a large reservoir of public misunderstanding as to what Christian Science is. . . . as these conceptions are widely held . . . we must utilize the means of communication which will reach the people in large numbers.³

¹See the first bylaw concerning the Committee as provided on page 99. In the early years there was also an emphasis on the Committee's circulating literature. See articles in the Christian Science Sentinel: "The Publication Committee," V (April 25, 1903), p. 540; "The Committee on Publication," IX (February 16, 1907), p. 439; also Manual, p. 98:14-16 (Article XXXIII, Section 2).

²Manual, p. 98:16-21 (Article XXXIII, Section 2).

³Man. to D. F. Thornton, May 22, 1958. Item #913.

The Committee looks to drain the "reservoir," as it were, by the cumulative effect of positive, educational pieces appearing regularly in the media of mass communications.

The corrective element in the publicity work is indicated by the fact that the Committee strives against publicity on occasion. For instance, the Committee shuns the running public controversy, which is often a prolific source of publicity. Earlier discussions of syndicated materials indicated occasions when the Committee sent a reply to an editor of a religious magazine with no desire to see it printed. The reason evidently was to avoid the drawn-out controversy.¹

Also, the Committee seems to prefer no publicity to incorrect publicity. In the last chapter we noted an instance when the Manager declined the public hearing that a county newspaper editor offered because of the false impression his article might have given. On another occasion, the Manager advised an area Committee, "I am sure it is much better for us not to be mentioned than to be mentioned falsely."²

¹See Chapter VI.

²Man. to CoP for Oregon, re Bible Standard College magazine, November 25, 1959. Item #241.

The issue before the Committee might be put as, not whether the majority of people have heard of Christian Science, but rather whether those who have heard of it have heard correctly. Publicity is no end in itself--not what Mrs. Stevenson had in mind in her remark, "Speak for my son or agen my son but aye be speakin' about my son."

We shall next consider the Committee's publicity in terms of its press relations and in a following section its station relations.

Press Relations

The Committee evidently has two purposes in distributing newspaper publicity. One is to provide the public with information--correct information--about Christian Science. The facts and views of the denomination are to be set forth, and its activities publicized.

The second purpose is to gain and then maintain the respect of editors. An informed and friendly editor, it may be assumed, would be more ready to give the Committee a hearing and also to correct errors about the denomination in news material he publishes from other sources.

This second purpose for publicity is put forward in the following excerpts, the first from the Handbook and the next two from letters by the Manager:

It is essential . . . to remember that one of our most important goals is the establishment and maintenance of friendly co-operative relationships with the press.¹

As you know, our goal is the establishment and maintenance of effective working relations with the press. The number of column inches we obtain must necessarily be a secondary consideration.²

It sometimes happens that an editor receiving these services is not as prone to allow misstatements about Christian Science to be printed in his columns as otherwise.³

The Handbook provides a three-step formula for good press relations. The area Committee and his Assistants are to "cultivate friendly relations"

--by getting acquainted with local news people,
 --by finding out what kind of material local editors need,
 --by endeavoring to supply it in an acceptable form.⁴

As this formula suggests, the Committee endeavors to provide a variety of material to the press. The type

¹Handbook, p. 154

²CoP for Massachusetts to ACoP for 2d Church, Worcester, February 10, 1958. Item #940.

³Man. to CoP for South Australia, re J. Hodgson, August 28, 1959. Item #422.

⁴Handbook, p. 136.

of story, style, and pacing are designed to give an editor an assortment from which he may choose the most suitable items for his newspaper. Some years ago the Manager explained the need for variety in publicity material as follows:

It has been demonstrated very frequently that if an editor will not open his columns to one class of our material, he will open his columns to another class and when he takes some of our material without receiving any criticism from his readers he is all the more ready to take additional material.¹

The variety of material the Committee offers may or may not be as great as that other denominations distribute. However, the number of subjects the Committee publicizes is generally less. For one thing Christian Science churches have virtually none of the social activities of other religious groups--none of the church socials, suppers, bazaars, and public fund-raising campaigns.

For another, ceremonial "display"² and "church shows"³ are not encouraged. Thus a Christian Science church congregation may not give its new building or reno-

¹Man. to Count Helmuth Von Moltke, June 20, 1941. Item #2041.

²Manual, p. 60:23 (Article XVII, Section 3).

³Man. to E. O., January 4, 1960, and E. O. to Man., January 6, 1960. Item #940.

vated structure the publicity a congregation in another denomination would. Also local churches and The Mother Church alike are reluctant to publicize church business.

What news, then, is left? The answer is the religious teaching. The usual Committee release focuses on the teachings, whatever the news peg might be. It is as the 1950 conference of Committees on Publication was told: "We have to realize that Christian Science itself is news . . ." ¹

The newspaper items that the Christian Science Church produces are given in the following list. The Committee on Publication almost always has a role in the production and placement of these. The Committee may take full responsibility for an item, serve as a consultant to the branch church which prepares it, or simply assist the branch church by placing the item and by maintaining the necessary press relations.

(1) Lesson-Sermon news is distributed by the Committee as a weekly newspaper release on the Sunday sermon. The item gives a brief summary of the sermon in the news-

¹"Christian Science Public Relations," p. 9.

lead, names the subject, and provides two quotations from the Bible readings and one quotation from the Science and Health readings.

(2) Annual Meeting news concerns a one-day business and inspirational meeting in Boston each June for members of The Mother Church. The Committee provides an advance announcement and a main story. The main story contains excerpts from a message of The Christian Science Board of Directors to the members and from addresses of the outgoing and incoming presidents. This news story also announces the new appointees--the new president of The Mother Church, new Readers (every third year), and new members of the Board of Lectureship. The Handbook states that the Annual Meeting news is

our best opportunity to obtain international news coverage, because it is the one occasion of the year when The Mother Church issues a statement or message which is of general public interest . . . a message of courage and spiritual enlightenment.¹

The Manager supplies news stories to the wire associations from Boston.

(3) Lecture news marks the year's major public

¹Handbook, p. 140.

event in branch churches. At least once during a year, sometimes more often, each church sponsors a free public lecture in its locality. The church calls upon a member of The Christian Science Board of Lectureship to provide the address. The lecture, the Handbook says:

includes comments on subjects of interest and concern to the public--health, business, world affairs, security, social trends, happy homes. In terms of news value it may be compared to a public address in the community by a prominent representative of any other denomination.¹

The publicity includes pre-lecture announcements, post-lecture news stories, and partial and full texts of the lecture itself. The church, whose responsibility the lecture is, usually calls upon the Committee or an Assistant for counsel in preparing the lecture news and for placing it.

(4) Radio and television news items are distributed by the Committee to publicize its broadcasts. The main release is a periodic program summary.² This gives titles of coming programs, home cities of participants, and two- or three-sentence synopses of each program. Other kinds of releases are supplied when a

¹Ibid., p. 144.

²The program summary was discontinued in 1962. The emphasis subsequently was placed on radio spot announcements.

station first begins broadcasting the regular programs and when special, recorded Christmas and Easter programs, live shows, and network programs are to be broadcast.

(5) Thanksgiving Day services are publicized.

Thanksgiving is the only holiday during the course of a year which Christian Science churches observe with a special service. Christmas is observed in a Sunday sermon but not in a service special for the day. The news stories that are distributed are similar in content to the Lesson-Sermon news items, but both an advance item and a follow-up story are offered. The Manager commented to area Committees on one occasion about the Thanksgiving news:

News about this religious observance--in some areas the only one of its kind--can be of very real interest to the public, and editors generally recognize this fact.¹

(6) Church dedications are formally publicized.

Because churches are dedicated only when free from debt, a dedication may come years after a church is built. The news item provides information on the construction and architectural details of the building and on the

¹Man. to All Committees, September 3, 1958.

activities and history of the church congregation.¹ Like lecture news, dedication stories are the responsibility of the church concerned. The area Committee, however, will often edit the story or stories, and an Assistant will place them.²

(7) "Gems of Thought"³ are filler material--though editors sometimes publish them as a block. A sheet of "Gems" contains five nondoctrinal sayings on a particular topic drawn from writers, past and present, and a quotation from the writings of Mrs. Eddy.

(8) New Committee appointments have been publicized in the press since 1959. The purpose of the release is to

¹A church looking forward to a dedication is advised: "There is need to exercise special care in connection with this newspaper publicity. All terminology and all titles of churches and funds should be correct; membership and attendance numbers and the names of officers should be omitted; and historical data should be accurate." Branch Church Building (Boston: The First Church of Christ, Scientist, 1959), p. 34.

²Church periodicals do not initiate articles about the dedication of edifices pursuant to a bylaw on p. 48: 22-26 in the Manual (Article VIII, Section 29). When a church is dedicated, the Christian Science Sentinel will quote a local newspaper story about it in full or in part.

³"Gems" was the name of a quotation column in early issues of The Christian Science Journal. See IV (October 1886), p. 224.

help "pave the way"¹ for the Committee to meet editors, legislators, and other community leaders with whom his tasks will bring him into contact.

(9) Articles from The Christian Science Monitor are offered by the Committee to editors for reprint. One of these, supplied monthly, is a religious article from the Monitor. Articles on secular subjects are also occasionally drawn to an editor's attention by an area Committee.

The two big newsworthy events each year are the Annual Meeting and the local branch church lecture. The Annual Meeting is the principal yearly event of The Mother Church and is given national publicity. The lecture is the chief, regular event of a local church and is given broad local publicity.

Both events are publicized, as already indicated, by several news releases. Publicity goes to newspapers and also, condensed, to broadcasters. Releases on lectures go to newspapers before and after the occasion, but customarily to broadcasters only before.

The Annual Meeting news release includes photographs,

¹Handbook, p. 147.

with mats for lead casting,¹ of the new president and of the Boston headquarters buildings; also photographs of new Readers and lecturers for distribution in the home areas of these appointees. The material bears a release time, for the information is kept confidential until the hour of the meeting. Biographical data accompany the personal photographs.

Lecture news items are also often accompanied by photographs, with mats, of the lecturer. The lecture text itself is provided as a mat. The Committee oversees the preparation of these; the lecturer distributes them to the churches; and the churches decide on their use and adapt them to the local situation.

The Lesson-Sermon news items evidently bring in the most publicity by column inches. This is, of course, because the item appears weekly as an advance notice of the Sunday sermon, often along with a church's announcement in a newspaper's church directory. Infrequently, the Lesson-Sermon item is used as a follow-up story not unlike sermon reports of other denominations. This news item,

¹From Western, Inc., of Boston, formerly Western Newspaper Union.

the Handbook says, is the source of "the greatest amount of press coverage which CoPs obtain during the year."¹

The radio and television news is perhaps sent to the greatest variety of media. These go to local newspapers, to broadcasters of the Committee's regular program for use as air-spots, to publishers of radio and television program guides, and to the one network under contract, the Mutual Broadcasting System, for its distribution to network stations.

"Gems" are also placed widely. A sheet of six is provided each week to editors not only of regular newspapers but also of the company publication that uses "short items, epigrams, words of wisdom, familiar sayings, and so on."²

News items about area Committee appointments and church dedications, while infrequent, are probably the most newsworthy, in the usual sense, of all the Committee's releases. These items tell of local persons and events, the customary newspaper fare. Both releases are usually accompanied with photographs.

The religious article from the Monitor is supplied for reprinting as a mat with proof--one set a month to

¹Handbook, p. 140.

²Ibid., p. 146.

subscribing editors. The Committee has, in recent years at least, held this release for reprint as no substitute for locally written pieces which editors request. To some extent this reprint is being replaced by local pieces.¹

The Committee maintains a line between its newspaper publicity and its newspaper advertising. This is demonstrated in the Committee's policy on the publication of the full lecture texts.

Novel at least for their length, these texts contain over 5,000 words and, as printed, take some four-fifths of a regular newspaper page.² Despite the length, however, the churches are usually able to find a local weekly willing once a year to print the lecture from a mat.

But newspapers are not to handle the lecture text as advertising. Churches are not to buy space for the

¹The substitution of original pieces for reprints was a subject in a letter from the Man. to CoPs in the United States on November 19, 1959.

²The publishing of lecture texts began in Mrs. Eddy's time, when the printing of the full record of local public meetings was doubtless more common than today. According to one early lecturer, Mrs. Eddy believed that the text's publication in a local newspaper was eighty per cent of the lecture's effectiveness. Carol Norton as quoted by John L. Rendall in an affidavit, January 4, 1929. Item #935.

lecture, pay set-up fees, guarantee copy sales, or allow the text to appear as a separate edition or reprint. They may, however, sell copies of the edition carrying the lecture and agree with the editor to pay for the handling and mailing of special orders, perhaps at an extra five cents a copy.¹

Furthermore, free papers with a paid circulation of less than fifty per cent are not provided with the lecture texts. They may, however, be given advertising, news stories, and partial lecture texts under special circumstances.²

In short, the lecture text is to be published only as legitimate community news in a newspaper that is published within the locality where the lecture is given and in a regular edition that goes to all subscribers.

The Committee discourages editors from stocking and selling lecture texts as a commercial or promotional enterprise. The reason again is to have the texts treated only as real news. A sticker on the lecture mat sets forth this restriction.

¹See, e.g., Man. to 1st Church, Silver Creek, New York, April 5, 1956. Item #935.

²For a discussion of the policy, see Man. to E.O., September 21, 1959. Item #936.

During the period, 1958 to 1960, two weekly publishers engaged in an unauthorized sale of lectures. Area Committees called on both publishers about the sales, and one publisher was persuaded to discontinue.

The first call, an unsuccessful one, was in September 1958. The Committee for Wisconsin visited a weekly publisher who for some years had been stocking a number of different lectures and selling them mostly by mail. This publisher told the Committee that the largest circulation he had ever had for a single lecture text was 3,500.¹ Local churches long ago had withdrawn their advertising from his paper and had refused to provide mats of the new lectures. The publisher adds from time to time new lecture texts, which he presumably sets up in his own shop.²

The second call was on a weekly publisher in California. This publisher had been advertising about a dozen different left-over lectures at ten cents a copy plus postage. In early 1960 the Committee for Southern California called upon him to explain the Church's policy.

¹At ten cents a copy, this is clearly no bonanza.

²CoP for Wisconsin to Man., re Milwaukee County News, September 25, 1958. Item #935.

Although he agreed not to sell further lecture texts, he evidently did so grudgingly, for he announced by circular that he would publish no further lectures at all.¹

Station Relations

The Committee evidently looks to its radio and television programs to reach widely into the public and to provide its communicative activities with a mass breadth. According to the Handbook, the programs "probably reach farther into public thought than any other . . . means of communication."²

The Committee on Publication is well organized for its broadcasting activities. The Manager provides a professional staff to prepare the programs and supervise the negotiations for purchased and public service time on which to broadcast them. Station relations, on the other hand, are mainly cared for by the area Committees and their Assistant Committees.

The Handbook states about station relations generally:

¹Editor, South Pasadena Review, to "Dear Friends," March 11, 1960. Item #935.

²Handbook, p. 109.

There is no substitute for personal contacts with the stations. The CoP should make it a point to keep in touch with executives of stations broadcasting our programs; to call on them when he is in the area; and to cultivate friendly relations with stations not now using our program.¹

The Assistant Committee in each locality has a particularly important part in creating favorable station relations. He may serve as the Manager's agent to local stations in the negotiation for broadcast time; consult with stations on questions and difficulties that arise; handle the delivery of the weekly television films to stations;² make arrangements for a local talent broadcast when a station requests it; and monitor film, disc, and network productions.

The Committee and his Assistants further promote station relations in the releases on the broadcasts that they place with newspapers. These name, of course, the station. They offer stations which give public service time a subscription to The Christian Science Monitor, encourage local church members occasionally to write to stations "genuine expressions of appreciation,"³ and

¹Ibid., p. 100.

²The weekly television series was discontinued in 1961.

³Man. as cited by CoP for North Carolina to his Assistants, May 11, 1959. Item #2064.

handle business matters in a "courteous, prompt, and orderly"¹ manner.

The Committee's broadcasts are entirely religious in character. From 1958 to 1960 the weekly "How Christian Science Heals" programs--for that matter all broadcasts of the Christian Science Church for that period, so far as can be learned--contained no political comment, social analyses, or remarks on other denominations. No appeals for funds were made. Actors and fictional skits were not presented.

The radio and television programs which the Church produces are described briefly in the following list. The Committee usually has a role in the production or placement or both of these programs.

(1) Weekly fifteen-minute programs are the main broadcasting fare provided by the Committee. The series, "How Christian Science Heals," began on radio in September 1953 and on television in September 1955. It terminated in 1961 and 1962, and was superseded--so far on radio only--by a series entitled "The Bible Speaks to You."

¹Handbook, p. 108.

On the "How Christian Science Heals" radio programs a church member told his firsthand experience with Christian Science healing. Next followed a commentary and then a closing hymn.

On the television programs two or more testifiers told of their experiences. A moderator guided the discussions.

The present radio series, "The Bible Speaks to You," features a "host" and a "speaker" who together discuss the role the Bible, in the light of Christian Science, can play in the solution of modern-day problems.

The broadcasts are cited as stemming from the corrective purpose and so evidently were aimed primarily at the listener who is not a Christian Scientist.¹

(2) Special script service is provided by the Manager for stations which provide public service time for live programs. For radio, the Manager's office has made available a variety of scripts, ranging from one to thirty minutes in length. Tape-recordings of one-minute devotionals have been provided. For television, the

¹Ibid., p. 97.

Manager's office has provided scripts for programs of five- and ten-minutes and other lengths. Two programs of the televised "How Christian Science Heals" have been used together for a half-hour telecast.

(3) Network public service broadcasts are handled by the Committee. The Committee has superintended participation on C.B.S. radio's "Church of the Air" and also on N.B.C.'s former "Faith in Action" series. The Church had four programs a year on "Church of the Air" until 1959, when the network cut the time of the series in half and reduced the Christian Science broadcasts to two.

(4) Worship services, when broadcast, are the responsibility of the originating church. The Committee may serve as a consultant and may make the arrangements. Churches usually observe the policy of broadcasting no more than two Sunday services a month.

(5) Lectures, when broadcast, are also the responsibility of the sponsoring church. The Committee again may serve as a consultant and may handle the station arrangements.

(6) Interviews with lecturers, because a part of the pre-lecture publicity, are the responsibility of the sponsoring church.

(7) "Erwin D. Canham and the News" is a Sunday evening broadcast written and delivered over A.B.C. radio by the Monitor's editor. These newscasts provide reports and analyses of current events, not religious discussions; they rarely mention the Church. The Committee, while having no direct part in these public service broadcasts, has done much through its grass-root station relations to encourage A.B.C. affiliates to carry them.

.

The Committee does not encourage the local church broadcasts of worship services and lectures. Both are carried only live and in full, not in part. The Committee holds that these hour-long occasions are neither suited to nor an economical use of the medium;¹ also that broadcasts of at least the services cut down on church attendance.²

The Committee apparently once encouraged radio and television interviews of lecturers as pre-lecture publicity. But it no longer does so.³ The Manager's

¹Handbook, p. 98

²Man. to E.O., June 5, 1959. Item #934. It is to be noted that public relations counsels advise against televised speeches of length by their clients. See Kelley, p.55.

³A paragraph giving guidance on these interviews was deleted from the 1959-1960 and later issues of the

office has assisted lecturers in preparing scripts for radio interviews and also has produced tape-recordings of interviews with the lecturer for him to loan to interested radio stations. In 1958 the Manager's office was supplying a four-page guide to lecturers regarding television interviews. The guide evidently was allowed to lapse.

The basic broadcast of the Church is the weekly fifteen-minute programs. The Manager both produces and distributes these programs.¹

Table 4 lists the titles of the weekly "How Christian Science Heals" programs between June 1958 and May 1960. These programs presented and explained cases of Christian Science healing as told by the persons who experienced them. The Table gives an indication of the experiences related, which ranged from alcoholism to tuberculosis, family upheaval to gasoline burns, career difficulties to cancer.

Lecture Arrangements Bulletin (Boston: The Christian Science Board of Lectureship), a booklet distributed to the churches for their guidance in arranging for a lecture.

¹The Committee in earlier years participated on the air with addresses, devotional programs, interviews with prominent Christian Scientists, readings of selections from the Bible and from Science and Health, and readings of articles and testimonies from the religious periodicals.

Evidently the healings on the programs were not to be taken as ends in themselves. The Handbook explains:

Our testimonies need to show the spiritual impact of Christian Science teachings on the ethics and morals of our people; how they lift human experience above the limitations of materialism; how they offer the individual a dynamic answer to his deep spiritual hunger.¹

¹Handbook, p. 114.

TABLE 6

**"HOW CHRISTIAN SCIENCE HEALS"
RADIO SERIES^a
JUNE 1958 TO MAY 1960**

Program Number ^b	Program Title	Main Problem or Disease
246	Finding Ourselves	drinking
*247	The Healing Leaven of Truth	ulcerated colitis
248	Gaining the Mastery over Grief	family deaths
*249	How Magnifying God Can Bring Healing	mauled by lion
*250	The Healing Effect of Scientific Prayer	typhoid fever
*251	The Healing Power of Spiritual Understanding	pneumonia
252	Freeing Homes from Alcoholism	alcoholism
*253	The Discovery That Heals	jaundice
*254	The Ever-present Christ Heals	amoebic dysentery
*255	The Practical Value of the First Commandment	severe tonsillitis and double pneumonia
256	Establishing and Maintaining Harmony in the Home	adopted sons quarreling

^aInformation is compiled from the weekly reprint of the program in the Christian Science Sentinel.

^bAsterisks indicate reports of healing which included a medical diagnosis or, in the case of alcoholism and drug addiction, where the one healed had been hospitalized.

TABLE 6--Continued

Program Number	Program Title	Main Problem or Disease
*257	Entertaining God's Thoughts Brings Protection	torn ligaments in ankle
*258	Cancer Dissolved Through the Power of Divine Love	inoperable cancer
*259	A Healing of Nervous Breakdown	business crisis
260	Prayer Can Heal Seasonal Diseases	hay fever
*261	Caustic Burns Healed Through Prayer Alone	strong caustic solution on face and eyes
262	The Saving Power of Divine Love	swimmer caught in whirlpool
263	The Way to Unfailing Supply	financial difficulties
264	How Prayer Can Prevent Dishonesty	jacket and wallet lost from airplane
*265	A Life Made Over	drinking, gallstones
*266	Putting Off Burdens of the Past	growth on leg
267	Heart Trouble Healed	severe heart ailment
268	Footsteps Out of Grief	son killed in war
*269	Healing of Deafness Through Prayer	deafness

TABLE 6--Continued

Program Number	Program Title	Main Problem or Disease
*270	Making Right Decisions	stomach ulcers
*271	Health Restored and Happiness Gained	spine disease, paralysis
*272	Not Guilty!	poliomyelitis
*273	No Condition Is Hopeless	tuberculosis of the arm bone
274	Depending on Divine Law Brings Protection	guiding freighter in fog
275	Filling Our Lives with Fresh Promise	purposelessness, foot condition
276	Spiritual Alertness Penetrates a Stone Wall	aircraft design problem
*277	An Encouraging Problem Explained	heart disease
*278	Impaired Sight and Hearing Restored	impaired sight and hearing
279	Fear Overcome--A Growth Destroyed	breast cancer
280	Is It True We Can Be Divinely Directed?	dismantling a mine on Guadalcanal
*281	A Healing of Alcoholism	alcoholic
*282	Bone Structure Renewed	war injury

TABLE 6--Continued

Program Number	Program Title	Main Problem or Disease
*283	A Growth Healed Through Prayer	fibroid tumor
*284	Perfect Health--God's Gift to Man	heart ailment
*285	God Is Right Here!	car-train collision, broken bones
286	Divine Guidance in Business	business difficulty
*287	The Light That Brings Healing	peritonitis
*288	God, the Source of Strength and Health	injured knees
*289	Wake Up to Victory!	arms were to be amputated
*290	The True Standard of Living	sciatica,
*291	Turn to God First!	injuries from falling three stories, broken bones
*292	Divine Love: The Basis for Health and Family Unity	tumor, home divided
293	How a Businessman Was Divinely Guided	threat of bankruptcy
294	Learning to Understand God	rheumatism
*295	Freedom from Slavery to Alcohol	alcoholism

TABLE 6--Continued

Program Number	Program Title	Main Problem or Disease
*296	The Prayer of Spiritual Understanding Heals	automobile accident, head injuries
297	How Lives Can Be Transformed	nervous breakdown
*298	A Very Present Help	Bright's disease
*299	Asthma Healed Through Understanding God	asthma
300	How Can Prayer Be More Effective	growth on face
*301	An Important Question Answered-- A Disease Healed	tuberculous peritonitis of leg
302	A New Purpose Gained--A Home Strengthened	home relations
*303	What Am I Listening To?	deafness
*304	Recurring Disease Healed Through Prayer	asthma (mother and child)
*305	The Immediate Availability of God's Help	cerebral hemorrhage and paralysis
306	"The kingdom of God is within you"	purposelessness
*307	Prayer Brings Healing to a Family	blood disease, crossed eyes

TABLE 6--Continued

Program Number	Program Title	Main Problem or Disease
308	How Religion Can Help Young People	torn muscle, teeth loosened
309	Dominion over Disease	growths on face and head
310	"Except a man be born again"	drinking
*311	Trusting Our Children to God's Care	feet infected
*312	"I will restore health unto thee"	nervous breakdown
*313	God Does Not Afflict	pelvic deformity, invalidism
314	Conquering Fear Brings Healing	skin infection on hands
*315	"The truth shall make you free"	organic condition, body swollen
*316	Spiritual Awakening Brings Freedom	inoperable hernia
*317	The Beatitudes: Their Practical Value	stomach ulcers
318	Divine Protection Available Wherever You Are	private airplane lost in snow-storm
*319	"Be not afraid"	cancer

TABLE 6--Continued

Program Number	Program Title	Main Problem or Disease
*320	A Deep Need Supplied	drinking
*321	Spiritual Understanding Brings Normal Vision	severe astigmatism
*322	Hold Your Ground	lung tuberculosis
*323	Prayer That Heals	softened hipbone
*324	Overcoming Fear of Things Going Wrong	undulant fever
*325	Prayer Will Meet Any Emergency	automobile accident, fractured skull
*326	Firmness and Faithfulness	drenched with oil and set on fire
*327	Some Fundamentals of the Prayer That Heals	fibroid tumor
328	The Perpetual Promise of Christmas	large goiter
329	Overcoming Barriers to Our Progress	career problems
*330	Understanding What Life Really Is	lung tuberculosis
331	Gaining Spiritual Riches	financial distress

TABLE 6--Continued

Program Number	Program Title	Main Problem or Disease
*332	Discovering the Nature of God Brings Healing	large growth
333	Eliminating Strife in Daily Affairs	inharmony on college track team
*334	How Prayer Restored a Woman's Health and Strength	digestive trouble
335	How Prayer Can Help a Businessman	threat of bankruptcy
336	A Child Healed of Hernia	hernia
*337	Freedom from Bondage to Narcotics	drug addiction
*338	How Prayer Alone Healed Severe Burns	cleaning compound explosion
339	A Child Healed Through Prayer	two-year-old trampled by horse
340	Gratitude Cancels Self-consciousness	stutter
*341	Spiritual Awakening Heals a Growth	tumor on face
*342	How Spiritual Awakening Restored Hearing	almost totally deaf
*343	The Ever-present Christ	catarrhal condition of stomach

TABLE 6--Continued

Program Number	Program Title	Main Problem or Disease
344	Sharing in the Resurrection	(talk on Easter)
*345	How Do I See Myself?	gasoline burns on leg
*346	Divine Truth Brings Healing	arm to be amputated
*347	Breaking the Bonds of Limitation	poor schoolwork, poor eyesight
*348	The Spiritual Awakening That Brings Healing	hernia
*349	The Naturalness of Spiritual Healing	dropped 400 lb. casting on foot
*350	Express Your God-given Dominion	lung tuberculosis

TABLE 7

**"HOW CHRISTIAN SCIENCE HEALS":
STATIONS BROADCASTING^a**

Locations	Radio Stations Carrying a Broadcast One Week in February	Television Stations Carrying a Telecast One Week in September ^b
(1958)		
United States	647	158
Canada	40	5
Overseas	<u>43</u>	<u>4</u>
Total	730	167
(1959)		
United States	641	166
Canada	37	3
Overseas	<u>23</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	701	171
(1960)		
United States	605	177
Canada	35	4
Overseas	<u>41</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	681	186

^aStatistics were furnished by the Manager--Man, to author, January 30, 1963.

^bTelevision series discontinued in 1961 and 1962.

Some clue as to the design of the programs is indicated by the determinable socio-economic status of the participants. The Manager's staff, which produced the programs, apparently endeavored to have an equal number of men and women represented. Men appeared singly on 44 programs, women on 46, a husband and wife together on 12, three brothers on 1, and a mother and daughter on 1. (One program, #344, was an address and did not have the usual format.)

The participants on the programs fell mainly into middle-class occupations. At least this was true of 33 adult male testifiers whose occupations could be identified. Sixteen of them had been or were currently employed in business, sales, advertising, and administrative positions; 8 were in engineering and technical fields; one each had been or was in farming, the merchant marine, the military service, pharmacy, railroad work, school teaching, show business, sign painting, and shipyard work.

On 45 programs participants said they had turned to Christian Science for healing without any previous ac-

quaintance with it and had been healed as newcomers.¹

The Committee may have made some effort to get regional representation across the United States. All parts of the country were represented, though not proportionately.

Regions from which participants came are:

East (Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania)	13
Midwest (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, Oklahoma, Wisconsin)	38
South (Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia)	15
West (Arizona, California, Colorado, Oregon, Utah, Washington state)	30

By states California was represented first with sixteen participants and Illinois second with eleven. Participants came mostly from the United States. In addition, however, three testifiers were from Canada, three from England, one from Australia, and one from Sweden.

Listener response to these weekly radio and television programs has been favorable. Each broadcast encouraged inquiries by inviting listeners to write for a

¹~~Pfautz found that 214 out of 420 testimonies he analyzed in the Christian Science Sentinel for 1940 indicated that the testifier had become a Christian Scientist upon being healed. See Pfautz, p. 316.~~

published text of the program or for a booklet on the religion. The Manager received an average of 20,000 pieces of mail a year during 1958, 1959, and 1960 as a result of the programs.¹

The programs also guided listeners to a local Christian Science Reading Room for booklets. The total booklets distributed from all points was about 96,000 a year during the three years.²

The Manager's staff handled the production of the weekly radio series up to the manufacture of the playing discs. It gathered reports of Christian Science healing, obtained and recorded interviews with those healed, prepared from these recordings scripts suitable for broadcast, wrote the moderator scripts, superintended the reading of all scripts onto tapes, and added recorded organ music before and after the script readings and a vocal number by a soloist, or occasionally by a quartet.

This master tape then went to Columbia Records, Inc., of Bridgeport, Connecticut, which produced the playing discs and distributed them to stations regularly taking the program.³ The Manager's office sent the

¹Man. to the writer, January 30, 1963. ²Ibid.

³The Manager took over distribution of the discs in 1962.

discs to irregular broadcasters.

The radio programs were also broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting System. This network was under contract to provide the program weekly to selected stations, the number of which dropped from 129 on April 28, 1959, to 76 on April 25, 1960, and to 58 on April 26, 1961. However, the Committee contracted directly with numerous other Mutual stations to broadcast the programs.

The television programs were filmed about twice a year in Hollywood. The Manager's staff wrote the scripts, rehearsed the participants, and supervised direction and production. The actual filming was done by Cinefilm, Inc.¹ Some two-dozen programs a year were produced in 1958, 1959, and 1960. In 1960, shortly before the television series was suspended, the Manager produced some programs on video tape in New York City.

Nearly all the television films were distributed to stations through Assistant Committees. This enabled the Manager to schedule each film for maximum telecasting. It also facilitated care of the film.

¹Cinefilm, Inc., was formed by two Christian Scientists with long experience in motion picture production--Robert Walker, who served as film director, and Le Roy Smith, who was production supervisor.

Both the Committee's public service and purchased time have, according to the Manager, been "substantial."¹ When the television series began in 1955 virtually all telecasts were on public service time.²

A notable instance of the Committee's success in obtaining public service time on radio occurred in 1960. A special Easter program was presented on the regular radio series. The program went to the regular broadcasters and also was offered to stations not regularly carrying the series. The result was that 544 nonregular broadcasters took the program,³ a total of 1248 stations in all.

The Committee does not accept every offer for public service time. It is reluctant to participate in a weekly program requiring an original script when participation tends to keep off the air the regular program. It does not accept time for nondenominational programs on which reference to Christian Science healing or Mrs. Eddy is barred. It does not take time that approximates the hour of Sunday worship services--10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. in most localities. It does not encourage participation in

¹Man. to the writer, January 30, 1963.

²Beasley, The Continuing Spirit, p. 262.

³Man. to All CoPs, October 4, 1960.

live television programs.¹

The cost of purchased time for the regular series was shared between The Mother Church and the local branch churches. Purchased radio time was mainly financed by local churches--either individually, or collectively through a Radio Fund administered by the area Committee on Publication.² Purchased television time was financed largely by The Mother Church through area Committees, with local churches making contributions and a few paying a station's entire bill.

Area Committees or their Assistants usually negotiated the contracts for purchased time. This was done "strictly on the basis of a client-station relationship."³ The Handbook draws attention to a station's "listening areas, programming policies," "location and strength"; to radio and television "coverage in adjacent area"; to "plans for network coverage," "plans for TV coverage";

¹See Handbook, Chapter 4 and 5.

²Radio and television broadcasts have been probably the single most costly item on the budget of the Manager and area Committees. In Florida, a representative state, one third of the Committee's budget goes for radio. Lane, "The Balanced Christian Scientist," p. 2. Item #2022.

³Handbook, p. 123.

to "local listener habits" and "distribution of population"; to programs on competing stations; to "firmness" of contract against pre-empting; to a station's willingness to promote a program by "spots"¹ and press releases, and to supply periodic reports of the promotion it gives; to a station's providing audience ratings, allowing public-service time for television during summer months, and reducing rates for a period contract, for a religious program, and for a local purchaser--all industry-wide practices. The Committee does not purchase time on UHF television channels or in the early morning hours. It will, however, usually take public service time on both. The businesslike approach is epitomized in the Handbook's counsel, "Our purpose is to cover the maximum area with maximum effectiveness."²

The religious outlook leads the Committee to be watchful of adjacencies to its own programs. The Handbook warns Committees to be on guard against adjacent "commercials for patent medicines, 'spots' for medical funds, tobacco, or liquor" and adjacent programs "of

¹The Committee provides identification slides for spot announcements.

²Handbook, p. 100.

to cover continental Europe and Great Britain, and on Radio Lourenco Marques, Mozambique, to reach particularly South Africa.

The shortwave station, WRUL, whose transmitters are near Boston, carried the program to South America and other areas. Also, there have been broadcasts of the program in English in Cuba and in Spanish as well as English over station Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico.¹

The television series has been broadcast in fewer areas. The Mother Church was buying television time, as of March 1960, in Australia and the Philippines in addition to the United States and Canada.² Also, there have been telecasts on Guam.

In Great Britain the Committee's regular programs, which are produced, of course, in English, are not broadcast at all. (English listeners can pick up Radio Luxembourg, however.) The Committee has had difficulty in obtaining either purchased or public service time in the Commonwealth countries as well. The Committee attributes its difficulties in Great Britain to the role of the state

¹In 1961 broadcasts of the regular program in Spanish began in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

²Man. to CoPs in the United States and Possessions; Australia; Newfoundland and Ontario, Canada; and the Philippines. March 23, 1960.

church as well as public ownership of broadcasting facilities.

The Committee's problem is readily apparent. Despite the nearly 350 churches in Great Britain, Christian Scientists have been allowed--as of November 1960--less than seven hours of broadcast time in some forty years.¹ The stumbling block evidently is the Central Religious Advisory Committee of the British Broadcasting Corporation. This Committee, which is responsible for allotting broadcast time to the various churches, has refused to accept Christian Science within its jurisdiction. Instead, the denomination has been relegated for time to the Talks Department of the B.B.C.

The District Manager for Great Britain publicly protested this policy on one occasion:

Few things are stranger and more unjust than the ruling by which Directors of Religious Broadcasting in Britain are prevented from making any provision for this religion in religious broadcasting time.

¹Presentations By The Christian Science Church To The Committee on Broadcasting (London: District Manager, Christian Science Committees on Publication for Great Britain and Ireland, n.d. [submitted in November 1960]),, p. 5. ~~In this eleven-page statement to a special government body set up to review broadcasting policies in Britain, the District Manager set forth his objections and his recommendations as to what ought to be done.~~

Christian Science radically disputes the arbitrary classification of its teaching as not being "in the mainstream of historic Christianity." Even more so, does it dispute the implication, conveyed by its relegation to the Talks Department, that it is not a religion at all.¹

In the Talks Department it had been resigned to "almost permanent silence."²

The District Manager found no relief in the coming of the Independent Television. The new facility governed itself on the matter of religious time by the classifications set by the Religious Advisory Committee of the B.B.C.

From 1958 to 1960 the Christian Scientists participated on a single broadcast in Great Britain. This was on January 15, 1959. The District Manager and two other Christian Scientists appeared on a televised B.B.C. question-and-answer program, "Life-line."³ Evidently the purpose of the program was to feature discussions of subjects deemed controversial. The program on Christian Science was in the hands of an outsider who was not sympathetic, and from the Committee's point of view his handling of the discussion was far from ideal.

¹Ibid., p. 2.

²Ibid., p. 4.

³Man. to E.O., January 29, 1959. Item #922.

The broadcasting policies of the mother country have been felt throughout the Commonwealth. In South Africa¹ the Committee has been unable to obtain any air time. It has had to broadcast from Radio Lourenco Marques, Mozambique, to reach the area.

In Australia and New Zealand the Committee has succeeded in obtaining time but only in the face of censorship. In Australia in September 1957 a government censorship board ruled that the Committee's programs dealing with physical healing could not be shown on television. This meant that perhaps a majority of the "How Christian Science Heals" programs were ineligible for telecast.

The state Committees in Australia promptly appealed the decision to the Australian Broadcasting Control Board and sent a copy of the appeal to the Prime Minister. In May 1958 the Postmaster-General set aside the decision. The programs have been aired without interference since that time.²

¹South Africa was, of course, still a part of the Commonwealth during the 1958-1960 period.

²Man. to E.O., May 7, 1958. Item #922.

In New Zealand in the spring of 1959 a government broadcasting board heavily censored, for its religious content, a Christian Science lecture which was to be broadcast on radio. The Christian Scientists have been allowed since 1934 the broadcast each year of three lectures, subject to this board's approval of the texts. The lecturer on tour there, Friedrich Preller, a German national, objected to the censoring and gave no broadcasts. The Committee for New Zealand took the matter up with government officials but was unable to have the ruling altered.¹

The only regular, non-English broadcasts during the study period were in Germany. Christian Science programs in German were broadcast five times a year during 1958, 1959, and 1960 over Radio RIAS, Berlin, and every sixth Sunday over the Bayerische Rundfunk (the Bavarian Radio) of Munich and Nuremberg, a station operated by the Länder. The Bavarian station has brought responses from Holland, Switzerland, France, Yugoslavia, Austria, and the Russian zone of Germany.²

¹Man. to CoP for New Zealand, June 5, 1959.
~~Minister for broadcasting to member of New Zealand~~
Parliament, July 31, 1959. Item #922.

²CoP for Federal Republic of Germany to Man.,
June 30, 1960. Item #2009.

Area Committees oversaw the production of programs on both stations. The Berlin program was based on the "How Christian Science Heals" series until 1959, when the station requested that the program be specially written. The Munich programs, which began November 22, 1958, were a German translation of the "How Christian Science Heals" series. The Committee for the Federal Republic, who produced the Bavarian Radio broadcasts, wrote on one occasion, "We guard our programs like a tender plant and spend much time and effort on preparing them."

Films

The weekly television programs, since not broadcast live, launched the Committee into motion picture production. To reach more people with its television films, the Committee began packaging several films together as a motion picture for showing by projector. The package was particularly intended for areas in which telecasts were not possible, such as in Great Britain where discriminatory conditions in broadcasting existed and in rural United States without television. But the film was widely viewed else-

where as well.

The first of these packaged films was entitled The Earth Shall Be Filled. It was a composite of three of the black and white television films with a commentary by the Manager about the television series added. The composite film appeared within the first year of the television series. Showings were sponsored by church groups in over thirty countries--in church auditoriums, rented halls, even regular motion-picture theaters.

A sequel was produced, Ye Shall Know The Truth. Like its predecessor, this film had a wide showing.

The next film venture of the Church was by The Christian Science Publishing Society. It was a half-hour technicolor film about The Christian Science Monitor, produced in observance of the newspaper's fiftieth anniversary in 1958. Called Assignment: Mankind, the film set forth what goes into a day's edition of the Monitor--the newsgathering, editorial and feature writing, advertising, circulation, and production activities around the world. The Publishing Society distributed the film to

Q

Christian Science groups. Irving M. Lesser of New York City, a commercial film distributor, provided the film to outside groups and to television stations.

The first film that the Committee on Publication produced especially for motion picture purposes was somewhat out of its usual bailiwick. The film was directed not at the outsider, for whom the Committee normally prepares its messages, but at the Christian Scientist. Entitled The Mother Church In Action, the film was an impressive, ninety-five minute, technicolor production. The film portrayed activities of the Church in and out of Boston and sketched briefly the Church's history as it would interest the member.

The film's purpose was clearly an integrative one-- to "bring The Mother Church closer to its members around the world . . ." ¹ To effect this purpose the design was inspirational as well as informative.

This documentary, in preparation at least as early as October 1956, ² was written by the present Manager, Committees on Publication, DeWitt John, who at the time

¹Man. to all CoPs, June 16, 1958.

²Lane, "The Balanced Christian Scientist," p. 21. Item #2022.

was Assistant Manager. The filming and production were handled by Cinefilm, Inc., the producer of the television series.

The film's sound track in English was reproduced in French, German, and Spanish--largely through the voluntary efforts of Christian Scientists in the lands where these languages are spoken. In other language areas, a résumé of the sound track was prepared for reading in the local tongue at the time of the showing. The Committee provided the film to church groups in sixteen millimeter and in thirty-five millimeter for theater use.

The first film the Committee produced as a motion picture for the nonmember was The Story of Christian Science. This film was made up of footage on the Church's history and current activities from The Mother Church In Action. Added were two sections setting forth the religious teachings: a moderated discussion between the then Readers of The Mother Church, Arthur P. Wuth and Mrs. Josephine H. Carver; and a brief filmed commentary by the editor of the Monitor, Erwin D. Canham.

Half an hour in length, this film, the Handbook advises,

strongly emphasizes the central importance in Christian Science of the Bible and of the teachings of Christ Jesus. It is designed especially for people of other Christian denominations, but is suitable for more general usage.¹

A second film, seventeen minutes in length, was released shortly after The Story. It was Christian Science: What It Teaches. This film took from The Story the discussion and commentary on the teaching, dropped The Story's historical sections, and added comment on Science and Health. According to the Handbook:

This film is designed especially for classes on comparative religion and seminary groups whose interest is chiefly in the teachings of our religion.²

Both were technicolor, sixteen-millimeter films with sound tracks. The films were shown in outside organizations and also went to Christian Science groups, to Christian Science military chaplains for their use, and to television stations. The Story was further circulated to television stations and private groups by Association

¹Handbook, p. 194.

²Ibid., p. 196.

Films, Inc., of New York City.¹

Libraries

Placing books with libraries and giving gift subscriptions to the Church's periodicals are further activities of the Committee that might be discussed as publicity. By its library donations, just as by its releases to the press, the Committee endeavors to make known the Church's purposes, activities, and history and so to "correct." The Handbook provides, "By supplying sound literature to libraries, a CoP helps to correct misconceptions about our religion."²

Just as its policy is not to protest a book to a librarian,³ so the Committee evidently refrains from pressing its donations upon him. The Handbook's policies and the Manager's correspondence indicate an awareness that the decision whether or not a donation is accepted and how it is shelved belongs entirely to the librarian. "Whether the book is definitely favorable, or unfavorable," the

¹Association Films distributed the film to 63 television stations and 1086 organizations. Interview with Helen Turner, January 15, 1963.

²Handbook, p. 233.

³See Chapter VI.

Handbook cautions, "the CoP should avoid being put in the position where he appears to be exerting pressure on the library."¹

The first book the Committee is interested in placing is, of course, Science and Health. Where this book is given, an authorized biography of Mrs. Eddy is also usually donated. On one occasion or another most of Mrs. Eddy's other writings are also placed--all except her Church Manual, Christ and Christmas (an illustrated poem), and concordances to her writings. Also pamphlets are usually not given. The inquirer who wants to use one of these is expected to do so at the local Christian Science Reading Room.

On placing Mrs. Eddy's writings, the Handbook counsels:

The number of her books which each library should have depends upon the size of the library, the willingness of the library to accept the books . . .²

The Committee also places periodical subscriptions with libraries. First to be offered is The Christian Science Monitor. The religious periodicals--the Journal

¹Handbook, p. 234.

²Ibid., p. 236.

and Sentinel--are placed only where a library has a section devoted to denominational religious journals.

In areas where other than English is spoken the Committee will provide one of The Heralds of Christian Science, which are published in English and eleven other languages. It also donates religious books and histories in translation.

A third category of donations is the friendly volume which has been written and published independently of the Church. The Committee has given wide distribution to the two volumes by Norman Beasley--The Cross and The Crown and The Continuing Spirit. Two further books donated to many libraries have been Christian Science, Its Encounter with American Culture by Robert Peel and Why I Am A Christian Scientist by Thomas Leishman.

The Committee seeks to preserve the independent status of these volumes. For one thing it holds that this independence has special utility in reaching the nonmember.¹

¹Shortly after the Peel book appeared, the Manager advised the Committee for New Jersey against having branch churches officially place the book. Its value as an independent work, the Manager reasoned, "would be lessened if the book were treated as an official publication . . ." Man. to CoP for New Jersey, re R. Peel, June 12, 1958. Item #512. See also Handbook, pp. 238-39.

For another, it evidently respects the fact that some authors might not appreciate the Church's attaching an imprimatur in any way.¹

The Committee does not add to these independent books a bookplate listing the authorized volumes as it often does to the church-published book it places. And it sometimes places a donation through an individual member rather than officially.²

About every two years an area Committee, mainly through his Assistants, will survey in his jurisdiction libraries accessible to the public. The purpose is to determine the number of church-published books that might be placed or replaced because of wear at a library.³ Public libraries are surveyed and also libraries at colleges, clubs, fraternal organizations, and institutions. Libraries at public elementary and high schools are not surveyed.

¹From an interview with a member of the Manager's staff, September 25, 1962.

²See, for instance, Man. to CoP for New York, re Psychology, Religion and Healing, March 27, 1959. Item #579. Also see Man. to CoP for South Australia, March 9, 1960. Item #2059.

³~~The survey form that area Committees virtually~~ everywhere use has a space for surveying authorized literature only. There significantly is no provision for a survey of independently published books, favorable or unfavorable.

Advertising

Advertising, by which we simply mean publicity that is purchased,¹ shares in the larger corrective purpose of the Committee. The Handbook introduces the subject of "Advertising Work" by declaring:

Advertising is one means for giving correct information to the public regarding the activities and teachings of Christian Science.

But the Handbook also cautions:

our appeal must always be to the spiritual yearnings of the individual. Our advertising should inform, not pressure; invite, not push.²

The Committee has virtually no newspaper advertising of its own.³ More than in any other of its diverse communicative activities, the Committee in the field of

¹This agrees with the Handbook's counsel that in their press relations, "Assistant CoPs should be trained to use the word 'advertising' in connection with paid material only" (p. 158).

²Ibid., p. 157.

³The radio and television programs can, of course, be taken, according to our definitions, as either publicity or advertising. When they are broadcast on public service time, these programs qualify as publicity; when they are broadcast on purchased time, they qualify as advertising. We have arbitrarily discussed the programs in this chapter as publicity. The Handbook disclaims a connection between the broadcasts and advertising: the broadcasts "are not intended as a form of advertising"; they may draw inquirers to the Church but "this fruitage is a by-product of the corrective mission . . . not its chief goal or the only gauge of its effectiveness" (p. 97). It

advertising serves as the agent of others. What it does not buy for local churches it places for other offices of The Mother Church.

A branch church may decide to advertise its Sunday services, Wednesday meetings, lectures, Reading Room, and Sunday School.¹ It may buy advertisements for special occasions, such as Thanksgiving, Christmas, Easter, or a community anniversary--for example, a centennial. It may join on these occasions with other denominations in sponsoring advertisements.

For its part, the Committee may advise on, plan, prepare, and place the advertising. It may coordinate for any one occasion the different types of advertising--newspaper advertisements, radio and television announcements, window cards, posters, transit advertising, and direct mail invitations. Where several churches in a locality unite in joint advertising, the Committee may coordinate the advertising and handle the billing. While the Committee may render these services, yet--as the

is to be noted that the Committee's radio and television programs, which are broadcast nationally, receive no national advertising support.

¹Churches may announce these activities at the end of the "How Christian Science Heals" programs. For this purpose an organ postlude was allowed of 15 to 20 seconds on the radio programs and 10 seconds on the television programs (latter discontinued in 1960).

Handbook cautions in regard to worship service advertisements--the Committee "should remember that such advertising continues to be basically a branch church activity and responsibility."¹

The Manager's office provides special assistance on the advertising of radio and television broadcasts. It makes available samples, mats, and proofs of suitable newspaper advertisements and also samples of radio and television spot announcements, and promotional cards for distribution to individuals.

The Manager's office also provides special assistance on the advertising of lectures. In 1958 with the assistance of the Boston advertising agency, Hoag and Provandie, Inc., the Manager's office prepared a lecture advertising booklet, which was distributed to churches through The Christian Science Board of Lectureship. The booklet offered counsel on methods of advertising and provided a selection of samples of professionally drawn newspaper advertisements, radio spots, window placards, invitation cards, and other advertising material.

¹Handbook, p. 163.

In addition the Committee makes available mats, with proofs, of lecture display advertising. Because of the expense, television spot announcements of lectures are not often obtained.¹

The Committee encourages the use of the personal invitation. Printed invitations to lectures and also printed cards bearing the schedules of local radio and television programs are made available for the church member to send to his neighbors and acquaintances. On the effectiveness of the cards regarding the broadcasts, the Handbook declares:

By far the most effective advertising for our radio and television programs is for Christian Scientists to encourage their friends and neighbors to tune in on these programs.²

The Committee frequently serves as the advertising representative for two other offices of The Mother Church. One is the Publisher's Agent of the Trustees under the Will of Mary Baker Eddy, which publishes all of Mrs. Eddy's works.

The Publisher's Agent on occasion looks to the Committee to advise on which newspapers should carry

¹Man. to CoP for Ohio, September 23, 1958.
Item #2065.

²Handbook, p. 161.

advertisements of Mrs. Eddy's writings and to place the advertising. He also calls upon the Committee when churches join with his office in cooperative newspaper advertising of Science and Health and the local church's Reading Room. The Committee coordinates the participation and billing of the churches and places the advertisements.¹

Probably the Church's most ingenious advertising program is the "Monitor Subscription-in-Exchange-for-Advertising." This program is a joint endeavor between the Committee on Publication and the Circulation Department of The Christian Science Publishing Society.

Under the program, the Society's Circulation Department offers to the editors of regular newspapers, weekly and daily, a year's subscription to The Christian Science Monitor. In return the editors publish in their papers during the course of the year an amount of advertising that promotes the Monitor equivalent to the Monitor's subscription price.

The role of the area Committee is to find the editors and approach them about the plan. More than 4,200 newspaper editors receive the Monitor under this plan.² The Handbook holds that the program

¹Churches also, to be sure, advertise Mrs. Eddy's writings independently.

²This figure is according to the Handbook of 1960, p. 165.

promotes friendly relations with editors; . . . gives newsmen a better appreciation of the Monitor, of Christian Science, and legislative and other issues of concern to us; . . . results in many fine references to the Monitor in the local press.¹

Some Conclusions

The group participates in society by the initiative it takes as well as by its responses to the initiative of others. Publicity and advertising represent the communicative initiative of the group.

We noted that the Committee on Publication exercises a communicative initiative in virtually every medium of mass communications. It expresses its initiative through the newspaper, book, radio, television, and motion picture.

The group presumably takes the initiative because of its concern both that its messages need to be heard by the public and that they are not being presented satisfactorily. On the one hand, the group probably ought not to expect "the competition of the market" every time to give it a fair hearing.² On the other hand, it would be

¹~~ibid.~~ It is to be noted that the plan is not offered to radio and television stations, who instead may receive the Monitor by broadcasting the Committee's regular series on public service time.

²"The classical argument is not sustained by an examination of current facts." Hocking, p. 93.

destructive of a free society, as we know it, for the minority voice to be silenced.¹

The net effect of the group's initiative may be either to broaden the scope and usefulness of the press or to add to the superfluity and meaninglessness that already constitute so much press content. The eventual quality of content is, after all, the foremost meaning of the group's impact on the press--of all its media relations, even its corrections, coercion, informational services and publicity. The group can be a partner to the press's contributions or to its failures.

One criterion in this may be the variety of content the group offers to the press. While variety is no end in itself, it might be supposed that the group's providing a diversity of informational material serves the press in its workday task of attracting, informing, and enlightening the public.

We saw that the Committee makes a conscious effort

¹"De Tocqueville made a prophecy. If America ever destroyed its genius it would be by intensifying the social virtues at the expense of others, by making the individual come to regard himself as a hostage to prevailing opinion, by creating, in sum, a tyranny of the majority." William H. Whyte, Jr., The Organization Man (Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1957), p. 438.

within its own limits to provide a variety of publicity materials to the press. Worship service news, lecture news, annual meeting news, church dedication news, and other items go to newspapers. Weekly recorded programs, specially written scripts for studio broadcasts, and network broadcasts are provided for radio and television.

Very likely religious groups make a special contribution to the press to the extent that they provide messages of hope, encouragement, and faith. The press, it might be thought, has some obligation not only to provide the facts but to put forward as well the perspectives that society needs as it goes about solving present problems and building for the future.

Yet such a perspective must above all be relevant to human life and must do more than reinforce complacency. Lacy criticizes religious communications on this:

Even most of the religious programs on the air, the Biblical films, and the popular religious writings are more often than not a sentimental evasion rather than a confrontation of the philosophical and value problems of the mid-twentieth century.¹

While a content analysis is outside our scope,

¹Dan Lacy, Freedom and Communications (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1961), p. 77.

some titles of the Committee's radio programs, as listed in Table 6, suggest a "confrontation." We might name: "A Life Made Over," "Turn to God First!" "A New Purpose Gained--A Home Strengthened," and "Except a man be born again." The problems taken up seem relevant to human life, for instance drinking, domestic relations, grief, meaninglessness, business and financial difficulties, career problems, dishonesty, and healings of physical sickness and injuries.¹

The Committee's newspaper releases also evidently share somewhat in this focus. One area Committee reported on a call she had made on an editor to place some material:

I visited the Press and thanked them for their co-operation, and one SubEditor told me that they had to thank me for giving such a lovely write-up on real religion at such a time when there seemed to be a great stir in politics, religion and racial problems.²

An informed public presumably also needs information on the actual activities of religious groups as participants in society, at least to the extent that these activities

¹The Committee's current radio series, "The Bible Speaks to You," is built around statements, drawn from a variety of secular, social commentaries, that set forth problems facing contemporary society.

²Man. to E.O., May 19, 1960. Item #936.

affect society in important ways.

Among all groups there is, of course, a tendency to present just the achievements. F. Cloud observes in the Christian Century:

One of the prevalent misunderstandings is that "good" public relations involves having the church widely praised, while criticism--explicit or implied--is in itself "bad" public relations.¹

There is little to turn to among the Committee's releases for print or air which gives a satisfactory picture of the Church's activities in society. All radio and television programs and most of the Committee's newspaper releases provide little information on actual events among the churches--on their projects, problems, and accomplishments.

The Annual Meeting news items placed with newspapers perhaps come closest to conveying news of the Church. The Annual Meeting reports in The Christian Science Journal serve to keep the church member somewhat informed on church activities. But the emphasis in both remains very much on the messages and addresses of a spiritual nature.

It is also to be noted that the Committee uses

¹Fred Cloud, "How Shall We Say It?", The Christian Century, LXXVII (October 5, 1960), p. 1147.

none of the regular releases to argue a point with a conflicting interest in a controversy over public policy. For this it turns to the letter to the editor, as we shall see in the next chapter.

CHAPTER X

LOBBYING: AN EXAMINATION OF THE GROUP'S COMMUNICATIVE RESPONSES AND INITIATIVE TO INFLUENCE GOVERNMENT

One inquirer who wrote to the Church for information was a nine-year-old girl. She asked if she might have a "booklet." Her letters tell their own story.

Dear Christian Science. I would like a booklet. I am nine years old. I am trying to get rid of my corn. I go to stores and by [sic] medicine, but still it does not help me. Can you help me? Please let me know. I watch your program every Sunday after church. I like your program very much.

The Manager sent the booklet, a simply written publication for children. Shortly the youngster sent an acknowledgment.

Dear Christian Science. Do you remember me? I am the girl who had the corn. And you sent me the book of Happy Playmates. I got your letter in the morning. And do you know my corn was gone that night. P.S. Thank you for sending me the book of Happy Playmates. Your friend.¹

The young girl in her rather charming appeal was exercising a fundamental right--the right to choose and then to act upon her choice. She chose to try Christian Science and wrote to obtain information about it.

¹From "'How Christian Science Heals' Television and Radio Fruitage Report Number Twelve", June 1960.

Probably no right is more dear to the individual than the right to be left free to exercise his own judgment in living his own life--a right bounded only by what interferes with the welfare of others. The right of the individual to choose Christian Science without restriction or prejudice is the Committee's objective in its lobbying activities, the subject of this chapter.

We shall consider on the following pages this objective and one method the Committee uses to attain it, namely its call on the media of mass communications to influence government. We have already noted that students of government treat this use of the media as an important, modern lobbying practice.¹

We observed in earlier chapters that bodily health and healing to a Christian Scientist are an essential part of his religious worship, though by no means the largest part. Likewise, the Scientist believes that his form of treatment is "the most effective means of healing" for him² and that it cannot be mixed with medicine without diminishing its effectiveness. When ill, he looks to a

¹See pp. 25-29.

²Handbook, p. 43.

variety of sick-care services--the practitioners, the nurses, the sanatoriums, and the nursing homes.

The Christian Scientist would, therefore, consider himself deprived of what he considers the full exercise of his religious freedom if Christian Science treatment were restricted in the interests of public health or if he were forced to undergo medical treatment at the same time as Christian Science treatment.

The Church explained this position to a United States Senate subcommittee which was investigating religious freedom:

Compulsory medical care forces the Christian Scientist to violate the sacred obligations of his religion; it invades his communion with God, and interferes with his method of prayer and worship.

.

What is involved here is the right of the individual to worship God according to his conscience--not the rights or privileges of a religious denomination as such.¹

The Handbook states that because of the position

¹A statement submitted on October 12, 1955, to a United States Senate subcommittee. See Hearings Before the Senate Committee on Constitutional Rights, 84th Congress, 1st Session, 3-6, 8 (1955). To explain the "fundamental teaching" on the matter, the statement cites Science and Health, pp. 145:31-3 and 142:4-10.

he defends the Committee is not a lobbyist "in the usual sense":

A CoP is not a lobbyist in the usual sense. His legislative work is not to seek special privilege or advantage, but to guard (in connection with reliance on God for healing) the fundamental right of all citizens to religious freedom, a right already granted and recognized constitutionally in most free nations.¹

The Committee in its legislative approach is mainly responsive.² It initiates through legislators very little. It responds to moves in government by seeking amendments to pending bills and exceptions in administrative regulations. The occasional legislation it has initiated has been directed at virtually the single purpose of excluding Christian Scientists from some compulsory medical law already on the statute books.³ In contrast to other

¹Handbook, p. 45.

²That is to say, the Committee's legislative approach is mainly defensive. This has been characteristic since Farlow, who wrote in 1900 about his legislative activities: "I have made purely a defense of Christian Science, and have contended only for the Christian's right to depend alone upon God. . . . Make your defense purely a defense of Christian Science and ask only for the one thing,--the right to trust God for yourself and your children, and to abstain from all material remedies, appliances, manipulations, etc." A Farlow to A.F. Hofer, November 12, 1900, in a compilation entitled, "Excerpts from Mr. Farlow's Letters re Correction." Item #2001. See also Luke Eugene Ebersole, Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951), pp. 61, 156, 162, 179.

³Interview with Robert Parker, a member of the Manager's legislative staff, August 10, 1962.

minority groups,¹ the Church has almost never resorted to the courts.

The Committee's method of response to legislation and official regulations can, at some risk of oversimplification, be identified as exemption and inclusion.

Exemption from legislation or regulation is sought in order to maintain or to restore free choice when a health program is binding upon the Christian Scientist. Exemption is a device to allow him to depend upon Christian Science treatment exclusively and to excuse him and his family from compulsory vaccination, physical examination, medical treatment, and medical indoctrination. The exemption does not presumably interfere with the program as it is desired by others for themselves. Exemption is apparently asked only from medical compulsion-- from enforced medical and psychiatric care in its preventive, diagnostic, and therapeutic aspects--, not from sanitation, quarantine, and general public health and safety requirements.²

¹Cf. the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Jehovah's Witnesses.

²On one occasion the Manager noted that there should not be confusion of "sanitary regulations by public authority with medical regulations by public authority. Christian Scientists are enthusiastically in favor of all sanitary

Inclusion, on the other hand, essentially sets up Christian Science treatment and care as an alternative to medicine. The Committee may seek inclusion where medical examination and care have only ancillary roles, such as to set the conditions of eligibility for benefits, and where an exemption from these programs is administratively impractical or would erect a discrimination against the Scientists.

The Committee has succeeded in having Christian Science practitioners included among those who certify for absentee voting and also for sick leave from employment. It has obtained inclusion of Christian Science treatment and care in some programs where a benefit is part of a person's employment, such as in state workmen's compensation statutes and in employee sick and accident plans. There has also been inclusion of Christian Science care in government public assistance and health care plans where the objective is universality and the means of financing is general taxation.¹

regulations." Man. to Monitor's editor, re Medical Health Teaching in New York State, March 10, 1952. Item #912-2.

¹The Handbook distinguishes between payment for Christian Science treatment in these plans and payment for subsistence and nursing care. It does not recommend

Examples of the exemption and the inclusion are provided in the following excerpts from state statutes. The first, an exemption, is from an Ohio act setting standards of medical practice. It was obtained in 1949 and is historically significant as removing for the Christian Scientists the last provision in a medical practice act in the United States that had obstructed to a degree the freedom of their practice:

. . . treatment of human ills through prayer alone by a practitioner of the Christian Science Church, in accordance with the tenets and creed of such church, shall not be regarded as the practice of medicine.¹

The second excerpt, an inclusion, is from the Minnesota Workmen's Compensation Act. Obtained in 1953, it allows an employer to allow in turn an employee to choose Christian Science treatment in lieu of medical treatment under the provisions of the statute.

The employer shall furnish such medical, surgical, and hospital treatment, including nursing, medicines,

seeking tax funds for treatment under the public assistance and health care programs because Christian Science treatment is a religious function. It does, however, recommend that Committees seek to have Christian Scientists included in other provisions of these plans, such as nursing care under Christian Science auspices. See Handbook, as revised October 29, 1962, pp. 72-74.

¹General Revised Code of Ohio, Sec. 4731.64.

medical and surgical supplies, crutches and apparatus, including artificial members, or, at the option of the employee, if the employer has not filed notice as hereinafter provided, Christian Science treatment in lieu of medical treatment, medicine and medical supplies, as may reasonably be required at the time of the injury and during the disability, to cure and relieve from the effects of injury.¹

The Committee seeks, then, an exemption or an inclusion, depending upon the circumstances. It distinguishes between medical compulsion and social welfare, and opposes only the medical compulsion of its own people. However, neither the exemption nor the inclusion is necessarily taken as an end in itself but only as the means to the end, which is the maintenance of the individual's right to rely on Christian Science healing free from restriction and discrimination.²

The Committee on Publication was originally established, as we have seen, to work with and through the press. The legislative assignment came later. Public

¹Minnesota Statutes, 1953, Chap. 439.

²About exemptions as means not ends, the Committee for Texas observed: "Strictly speaking, the law doesn't exempt our practitioners, but rather it gives recognition to the fact that the Medical Practice Act was never intended to apply to religious practitioners. We're free to practice healing, not because of a legislative grant which could be taken away; but because of our basic constitutional right." David Sleeper, "The Meaning and Extent of Our Religious Freedom" (unpublished address to the churches used by CoP for Texas, ca. 1960). Item #900.

information and education are still the more prominent,¹ and, according to the Committee's statements, seem to underlie much of the legislative work, especially in its long-range aspects.

The Handbook states that the "crux" of the legislative work is public education on three essential issues:

. . . the crux of our legislative work must be to establish these facts to the satisfaction of legislators and public:

1. That the practice of Christian Science healing is the practice of religion;
2. That Christian Science is a safe and effective healing method;
3. That the practice of and reliance upon Christian Science for healing does not endanger the public welfare.²

The Committee's weekly radio and television programs suggest these issues just by their titles. The title, "How Christian Science Heals," points to the second and third issues about Christian Science being safe, effective, and of no danger to the public. The present series, "The Bible Speaks To You," suggests the first issue, that

¹As one indication, four sections in the Manager's office are directly concerned with public information and only one section with legislation and governmental regulation.

²Handbook, p. 38.

Christian Science is a practice of religion.

All of the Committee's informational and publicity material likewise are assumed to support the legislative endeavor. The following two excerpts indicate this, the first from an address by the present Manager of the Committees and the second from the Handbook:

. . . when you go to your legislators, you at least have what backing we can contribute by the radio programs and the other publicity that we are producing here in Boston.¹

. . . Christian Science is indeed a safe and effective healing method. We are called upon to convince legislators and the public of this fact. This is obviously the responsibility of the entire Christian Science movement and is long-range in scope. Some of it is the responsibility of the Committee on Publication, and such activities as the radio and television programs, news and corrective work, and the legislative work itself indicate the means by which that responsibility is being discharged. Much of the task, however, depends upon the successful demonstrations [i.e., healing work] of Christian Scientists themselves; and upon the wide and powerful impact which the combined activities of our movement are making upon public thought.²

The emphasis on public education in the legislative work was underscored in a policy paper prepared in October 1958.

¹DeWitt John, "Address on Legislation," given at the conference of Committees on Publication, October 25-29, 1954.

²Handbook, p. 40.

It would seem that the most powerful tools of the Committee on Publication at this juncture are clear reason and Christian persuasion, not legal force, in establishing in public thought and public authority recognition of the fairness, justice, and safety of spiritual healing. Existing laws and regulations restrictive of the free practice of Christian Science can be corrected and new laws can be enacted providing for such free practice only so fast as public thought recognizes Christian Science to be an effective and safe healing system. By no other means will public authority ever come to honor our rights and enact them into law.

The paper further recognized a "conflict between the value standards" and stated:

We must possess a sympathetic appreciation of the dilemma the average citizen and average public official finds himself in with regard to the conflicting values between our concept of health and healing and the popular view Our work, then, consists mainly of correcting the false value standards which under the wrong "value judgments" of public authority result in unreasonable restriction of the full practice of our religion. . . . It would surely seem that our success in the past proves that favorable public opinion is our greatest legislative asset.¹

A serious problem before the Committee's communicative and legislative activities alike is the public tendency to link virtually anyone who refuses medical assistance with the Christian Scientists. We noted in Chapter VII one example of this. The press in New York

¹Inman Douglass, "Policy Regarding Freedom to Practice Christian Science," October 10, 1958. Item #877.

City and in other parts of the country identified as a Christian Scientist a Jewish father who took his injured son out of a hospital for homeopathic treatment.

The problem also has occurred with legislation, specifically legislation directed at the Jehovah's Witnesses. The Witnesses, who otherwise accept all medical treatment, refuse blood transfusions for themselves and their children. In Victoria and New South Wales, Australia, in 1960, legislation was enacted to enable doctors to give emergency blood transfusions to children over the objections of their parents. This allowed for circumventing the usual legal delays of a formal court hearing. The Committees in those areas sought to obtain an exemption for Christian Science children but were unsuccessful.¹

Are the Committee's communicative activities effective as legislative tools? The Committee clearly assumes that they are according to such statements as those quoted on the previous pages. But there is little evidence to turn to for a more

¹The Committee for Victoria unsuccessfully sought an exemption for the Scientists on the grounds of (a) religious freedom, (b) that Christian Science healing is legitimate according to state law, (c) that it constitutes a "positive remedial action" in emergencies, (d) that it is "the most effective healing means for us." Man. to E.O., April 5, 1960. Item #819.

specific evaluation.¹ Area Committees in reports on their legislative work provide information mostly about their contacts with legislators, public officials, and other lobbyists--contacts which appear to be of first importance in the Committee's day-to-day legislative work.

On one occasion, however, the Manager remarked about the interest that several legislators in one state had shown in the television programs. (The Committee endeavored to have the television programs, before they were suspended, broadcast in all capital cities.²) In this instance the Manager explained to an inquirer:

I recall one occasion in a Western state where a bill was pending before the legislature which would have imposed a particular form of medication upon all citizens, including Christian Scientists.

Our Committee on Publication sought the necessary amendment to preserve the right of Christian Scientists to rely wholly on spiritual means for healing and the result was that the bill did not pass in its original form. Christian Science is not particularly well known in this area, and it was significant that several of the legislators told our Committee on Publication their attitude toward our objections had been strongly influenced, favorably so, by the fact that they had seen some

¹The effects of public relations are difficult to ascertain on most occasions. Hill and Knowlton, public relations counsels, conducted a campaign in the mid-1950s on behalf of the natural gas producers against federal price regulation. The president of Hill and Knowlton observed at the end of the campaign, "At the end of two years we couldn't tell you that we had changed opinions two points or ten points or thirty points." Ross, p. 190.

²Man. to CoP for Illinois, September 4, 1958. Item #2009.

of our television programs on the local TV station.¹

The Committee in the legislative skirmish relies mainly on letters, its own and those of church members. It does not press into service for the immediate legislative campaign its regular newspaper releases and broadcasts. The purpose of the regular releases remains, instead, long-range public education. When some public policy of vital interest hangs in the balance, the Committee turns to the letter and telegram campaign to legislators and sometimes editors, but this resort is infrequent.

The policy on letter campaigns has been put as follows:

We feel that the Office of the Committee on Publication should hold to a bare minimum its requests for Christian Scientists to write letters of protest to their legislators.²

It is felt that Christian Scientists should be encouraged to write letters to our lawmakers, as Christian Scientists, only when the right to practice Christian Science might be in jeopardy.³

The Committee for Mississippi called for a letter-

¹Man. to D. F. Thornton, May 22, 1958. Item #913.

²Asst. Man. to CoP for Georgia, re Forand Bill, April 5, 1960. Item #2052.

³CoP for Florida to ACoPs in Dade County, November 6, 1959. Item #2052.

writing campaign to state legislators in the late winter of 1960. His legislature had before it a bill to broaden a compulsory smallpox vaccination law covering school children. The bill would have added compulsory inoculations for typhoid fever, poliomyelitis, and other contagious diseases, and also have required chest x-rays.

The bill had passed the state Senate without an exemption for children from Christian Science families and had gone to the House. The Committee asked the author of the bill to add an exemption. When he refused, the Committee sought to have an exemption introduced from the floor of the House. To support this endeavor, he asked his Assistants to encourage church members to write to their legislators, and he wrote to each member of the House itself. A "flood" of letters resulted.

The Committee's exemption was not reported out with the House bill by the responsible House committee. But later it was added when a joint Senate-House committee took the bill under advisement. The governor signed the bill with the exemption into law in May. The exemption

0

covered not only the inoculations that were to be added but also the long-standing compulsory smallpox vaccination.¹

Some of the reasons why the Committee objects to medical compulsion in public schools for the children of Christian Science families are: (a) medical vaccination, examination, and indoctrination by implication attack as false the healing method that the child has been taught in his family and Sunday School; (b) these, therefore, attack his religion and so breach the public schools' traditional position of neutrality toward religion; (c) these also directly interfere with parental responsibility--the responsibility for the parents to decide on the type of treatment, legal under laws of the state and nation, for their own child; (d) these can, by implanting "pictures of disease and the fear of disease" in the mind of the child, cause disease;² (e) the Scientists are conscientious

¹Man. to E. O., March 1, 23, and 31; April 28 and May 17, 1960. Item #839. A different Committee in a much larger state a few years before reported significant results from a telegram campaign he had called for: "The change in attitude towards us after the receipt of the thousands of telegrams sent was apparent on all sides." One Senate leader, who had evidently opposed the Scientists' legislative position at one time, told him privately on this occasion, "You people don't have to send me any more telegrams: I am for you one hundred per cent." CoP for New York to Man., re Medical Health Teaching in New York State, July 7, 1953. Item #912-64. This legislative skirmish was one of the most significant the Committee faced during the 1950s: hence its resort to the rare letter campaign.

²Handbook, p. 71.

in obeying quarantine and isolation laws, and so their position does not interfere with the rights of others.¹

The Committee has used the mail campaign to support its position on the fluoridation of public water supplies. The Manager on one occasion advised the Committee for Oklahoma, "We have found that one of the best ways to get the issues involved in fluoridation before the people is through a 'letters to the editor' campaign."²

The fluoridation of water supplies has been a controversial issue in a number of communities. Proponents say that fluorides administered in trace amounts--in the ratio of about one part fluoride to one million parts water in water supplies--are beneficial to the dental health of children under the age of about fourteen. They say that the rate of tooth decay in children who receive this treatment is lessened both while they are young and when they become adults.

¹A Church statement provided on this, "quite a few state health officials have said in writing that Christian Scientists as a group are unusually conscientious in respecting and obeying quarantine laws." "Statement of the Christian Science Church to Assembly Education Committee regarding Senate Bill 1111 relating to compulsory chest x rays of school personnel," submitted to the California legislature in 1961 (mimeographed).

²Man. to CoP for Oklahoma, March 8, 1960. Item #903.

The Committee has not passed judgment on the medical merits of fluoridation. The Manager told one inquirer:

It would be as absurd for us to pass judgment on the medical merits one way or another of the fluoridation question as it would be for public health authorities to pass judgment on the metaphysical merits of our religious position.¹

Nor has it argued the point whether fluoride as an additive is to be considered a medicine or a nutrient.²

The Committee has rested its case on "individual freedom and rights of conscience."³ It has argued: (a) fluoridation adds a substance to the water, not to purify the water, but to act directly on the person who drinks it; (b) the use of the water supply in this way, because it involves captive consumers, "establishes a dangerous precedent for mass medication" and for depriving individuals of the right to choose their own means of treatment; (c) there are inexpensive, simple alternatives to fluoridation of the public water supply for the person who wants fluorides

¹Man. to F. B. Riggs, Jr., March 13, 1958. Item #903.

²The Handbook, as revised October 29, 1962, provides, "Fluoridation--Our interest is in opposing compulsory medicine or nutrition" (italics deleted), p. 50.

³Ibid., p. 61.

for his children, namely fluoride tablets, toothpaste, and topical applications; (d) the fluoridation of water supplies is not necessary for public safety and so religious rights on this subject, even as religious rights on other subjects where the public safety is not involved, ought to be respected.

The Committee has opposed fluoridation in several ways beside letters. It has been a source of statistics on the number of communities which have voted against fluoridation. These figures the Manager has been able to collect from area Committees.¹

The Committee has been a distributor of anti-fluoridation literature, some of it taking up the medical aspects as well as the civil liberties issue. It has distributed titles such as: "Resolution on Use of Water Supply as Vehicle for Drugs" by the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, April 12, 1958; "Fluoridation: A Study of Philosophies," by John R. Auchter, a reprint from the American Bar Association Journal for May 1960; The Case Against Fluoridation by Robert Newton, Ph.D.,

¹Man. to All CoPs, September 12, 1958.

(Edmonton, Alberta: Edmonton Pure Water Association, n.d.); "Freedom of Religion and the Water Supply," by Alan H. Nichols, Southern California Law Review, XXXII (Winter 1959) pp. 158-176; Fluoridation Errors and Omissions in Experimental Trials by Philip R. N. Sutton, D.D.Sc., L.D.S. (London and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1959).

The Committee has provided statements to public hearings. The Committee for New York state on March 6, 1957, presented such a statement at a public hearing on fluoridation before the New York City Board of Estimate.¹ The Church's position on fluoridation was also a part of a larger statement that the Manager of the Washington, D.C., Office presented to the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, 84th Congress, First Session, on October 12, 1955.²

The Committee in its infrequent calls for letters encourages church members to protest fluoridation as a measure that deprives them of right of choice. On the other hand, it asks that they not introduce the religious issue, which it reserves for its own statements.

¹Man. to CoPs, May 9, 1957.

²See p. 541, fn. 1, for citation of published source.

The Manager advised area Committees on this in April 1961:

In doing their part to protect and preserve our basic liberties from this medical encroachment, Christian Scientists are advised to by-pass the religious question and rely on the argument that compulsory dental treatment through the water supply violates individual freedom and rights of conscience. Persons from all denominations and walks of life can unite with us on this basis, whereas even our friends are sometimes unable to understand why or how fluoridation violates religious rights.¹

The Committee for New York in the autumn of 1959 launched a letter-writing campaign to oppose efforts to fluoridate the New York City water supplies. The New York City Board of Estimate, which had turned down the proposal two years earlier, was again considering it. Three members of the Board, including the Mayor of New York City and the City Council President, were in favor of fluoridation; two board members were opposed; three were uncommitted.

The Committee asked his Assistants on October 5 to encourage members who were borough residents to write to their representatives and the Mayor. The Committee provided an information sheet for letter-writers to use

¹A further request is made of the members not to participate in the opposition "as representatives of the Church." The Committees themselves "avoid spear-heading the opposition." Handbook, p. 61.

and advised:

It will be helpful if branch church members in the five New York City boroughs, if they are led to do so, write letters to their respective representatives on the Board of Estimate and in the New York City Council. To enable you to aid such members, we are enclosing several copies of an information sheet which you may pass around to those you think will be interested. While a form letter is not desired, the points covered in the memorandum can be stressed in the writer's own words. [par.] The letters should be brief, to the point, and dignified . . .

The information sheet gave as the reasons why fluoridation was objectionable: fluoridation of public drinking water is "compulsory mass medication," which disregards the constitutional right of freedom of religion and the right of the individual to decide what "shall be done to one's own body"; fluoridation violates "the American Way" of voluntary action; fluorides can be "supplied effectively and with greater economy by voluntary controlled methods"; and fluoridation sets "a bad precedent."

During the subsequent weeks, numerous groups lined up in support or against fluoridation. They provided their positions, views, facts, arguments--and at times invectives--to the members of the Board and the press.

On November 28 the three undecided members of the board announced their stand, which was one of opposition. Thus the effort to fluoridate New York City water supplies was once more defeated.

Two days later the Committee recommended another round of letters "to consolidate the present advantage."¹ Those on the Board of Estimate who had opposed fluoridation were to be thanked. Those who had favored it were to be presented a second time with the letter-writer's point of view.²

Area Committees in several states have also supported legislation against fluoridation. The usual bill of this nature would require a referendum before city officials take steps to fluoridate. A public vote on the question more often than not strikes it down.³

In 1958 the Massachusetts legislature adopted the first law of this kind. The Committee supported the bill

¹CoP for New York to Man., December 1, 1959. Item #903.

²Item #903.

³The Man. wrote to Committees on April 21, 1961 that "Fluoridation has been defeated at the polls in over 2,500 communities throughout the United States containing more than 60 million people."

through the final roll calls with a letter campaign.¹ By May 1962 four states in addition to Massachusetts had adopted laws that required referendums. These were California, Maine, Nebraska, and New Hampshire.

Some Conclusions

The Christian Scientists consider themselves to be custodians of the ministry of Christian healing. They look upon this ministry as systematic, complete to itself, and wholly exclusive of medicine.

They oppose any attempt which they judge might restrict or vitiate this ministry or cause those relying upon it to be discriminated against. For Scientists not to oppose these attempts would evidently be for them to betray their most deep-seated convictions about God, the welfare of their fellowman, and their own well-being.

The immediate issue, as it concerns public policy, is the social welfare program which embraces a medical element, either as primary or as merely an incidental. It is no doubt hard for government officials and the public to conceive of a social program without some

¹CoP for Mass. to Assistant Committees, March 28, 1958. See also CoP for Mass. to Assistant Committees, April 17, 1958.

medical premise. The Committee has, to its own satisfaction apparently, met the difficulties posed in the issue by seeking the exemption and the inclusion.

But the essential difficulty remains, namely the place that the public and the government are willing to allow to spiritual healing. The exemption and the inclusion represent recognition of religious rights, minority rights, and right of free choice; but it cannot necessarily be assumed that they also represent recognition of spiritual healing.

The Committee keeps its regular releases at all times focused on this more long-range problem. It does not use these releases to conduct the immediate legislative campaign after the exemption or inclusion. Its main purpose is public education on the point that Christian Science is safe and effective--a point that plainly constitutes a big hurdle for the disbelieving, medically-oriented majority.

The Committee's short-range use of the media is very limited. It consists only of infrequent letter and telegram campaigns to legislators and editors.

It was natural enough that the Christian Science

Church's lobbying activities should devolve upon the Committee on Publication. The Committee has a ready network of representatives around the world whose public relations work could conveniently be extended to embrace legislative relations as well. The example of the Committee perhaps demonstrates a fundamental connection between public relations and legislative relations. The Committee assumes that all of its communicative activities relate to legislation, and it consciously brings them to bear upon legislation.

P A R T I I I

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER XI

THE COMMITTEE AND THE FUTURE

On an A.B.C. telecast of a golf tournament bearing his name, Bing Crosby made a remark about the Christian Scientists to a golfer he was interviewing. Intending to be facetious, he said he would shortly be in a distant city and would need some telephone numbers--of a Christian Science Reading Room and a Christian Science practitioner.

The Manager received several letters from members about the remark. One church member wrote that the quip was a "direct insult." The "wisest procedure," she believed, "would be to write a complaint to A.B.C. network protesting against such liberties." She was leaving the matter in the Manager's hands, however.

Another member wrote that the remark was a "slurring statement about our practitioners" and that it should be taken up with the sponsors.

Committees in various states reported Crosby's statement but did not take it so seriously. The Committee for Pennsylvania had heard "the seeming controversial

remarks" but "did not feel that what he said was offensive." The Committee was led to write to the Manager when he received several letters from members who had taken offense.

The Committee for Northern California did not think that a correction was warranted, at least by him. "His remarks," the Committee observed, "may have been intended to be facetious but most certainly were in poor taste."

The Committee for Alabama said that a church member had told him the remark was made "in a gay, jovial, all-in-fun manner."¹

The responses the Manager received indicate the range of sensitivity--or oversensitivity--with which he must deal. The distance from the member who thought that the quip was a "direct insult" to the one who interpreted it as "jovial" illustrates the diversity within the group for which he must account.

To combat the oversensitivity from within to the trivial, light, or even imagined is probably a major

¹Dates of these letters to the Manager are January 29, 25, 27, 29, and 27, 1960. Item #355.

concern of the public relations facility in most minority groups at one time or another. We shall consider in this chapter how the Committee meets the thrusts of oversensitivity from within its group, particularly the thrusts which are inconsistent with its own norms of activity. We shall also consider some of the Committee's needs in other phases of its workday.

The origins of oversensitivity in a minority may lie in its inferior and defensive position across many years--in the intolerance it has had to face, the ridicule, and perhaps even attempts at law to ban it. The origins may also be attributed to the nature of the group itself--to its restlessness, zealously, and on occasion naive and dogmatic outlook.

Yet it might be supposed that in time the minority gains some acceptance and its outlook matures. The group becomes less defensive and more willing to trust the marketplace to "test" its claims by open debate and trial of their utility. It becomes sensitive less to its inferior position and more to the larger social fabric, where no

group as no individual is above the quip or criticism, and where free institutions guarantee dissent as well as assent, free play even more than fair play, and give-and-take rather than an absolute refuge from the good-intentioned or malicious demurrer. The group comes to accept that every outsider is not hostile, nor every day one of battle, nor every encounter a matter of survival.

Most Christian Scientists who report a book or an article on their religion do so from a belief that it is unfair and inaccurate but without a show of personal agitation. Some typical responses drawn from letters are:

My own re-action is perhaps best summed up by repetition of Jesus' words: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."¹

It seems astounding that such should occur. . . .²
Thank you--for the good work you are doing²

This sort of zeal is not easy to temper,³ but I know you will know what to do about it.³

False statements and misleading implications about Christian Science, such as Dr. L's, not

¹Inquirer to Man., re Christian Science Today, November 18, 1959. Item #303-17. Quotation is from Luke 23:34.

²Inquirer to Man., re Christian Science Today, n.d. (ca. June 1958). Item #305-46.

³Inquirer to Man., re Faith Digest, September 24, 1959. Item #526.

only deprive the public of correct information but raise doubts about the author's knowledge, ability, and integrity in the other parts of his book.¹

But the range of responses embrace the excitable and militant as well:

I checked the book out and became greatly disturbed by its contents.²

Have you seen the enclosed "Booklet"? A number of our local church members are quite upset over it. Can your office take action?³

I would be very unhappy were the gentleman permitted to continue publication of material which cannot reflect helpfully on our Cause.⁴

The tract is so scurrilous, so absolutely false as to be libelous, and I felt sure that if you did not already know about it, you would want to take some sort of appropriate action to correct it.⁵

The Committee has also had to deal with actions produced by oversensitivity.

¹Inquirer to Man., re From Witchcraft to World Health, January 29, 1960. Item #112.

²Inquirer to Monitor, re Mrs. Eddy by Dakin, September 24, 1958. Item #332-29.

³Inquirer to Man., re Brain-Washing booklet, October 18, 1959. Item #32.

⁴Inquirer to Man., re Andrew Fruehauf, June 4, 1958. Item #391.

⁵Inquirer to Man., re Christian Science Tested by Scripture, April 8, 1959. Item #69.

In February 1960 an area Committee reported that a Presbyterian minister had in a church address made adverse remarks about Mrs. Eddy. The Committee wrote to the minister and also sent to him a book. In reply the minister explained that a "representative" from "the local Scientists church" had attended the talk to "observe."

It was obvious that the representative did not come to learn of the Christian Science movement but to note our interpretation of the same.

This he deemed "regrettable." Furthermore, the "representative" had refused to answer questions or "to engage in any form of discussion." The result was

a most unfavorable reaction from our people and thus very poor relations for the local Scientist church and the entire movement. This, in effect, negated our attempts to have our people understand the Scientist Church.

The Manager in a letter to the area Committee regretted the situation. The "representative" ought to have been "able to convey a little more . . . friendliness, even in the face of unfair and unjust criticisms." (There was no indication that the representative was an Assistant Committee.) The state Committee, for his part, ought to

have handled the matter "on the spot by a personal visit of a friendly, helpful sort where there would be less opportunity for misunderstanding." To remedy the situation, the Committee might still, the Manager advised, arrange to have an Assistant Committee interview the minister.¹

Oversensitivity among the Christian Scientists is probably less warranted today than in earlier years. They have found a measure of public acceptance and even widespread appreciation. An indication of the recognition lies in studies of religions in the United States which almost always grant Christian Science a place among the leading dozen-and-a-half religious groups.² And signs of appreciation, especially from churchmen, abound in the Committee's files, as the following excerpts indicate:

In Wisconsin a Methodist minister gave a sermon on "We Confess a Debt to Christian Science." The minister

¹Letters quoted are from the minister to the CoP, February 18, 1960, and from the Manager to the CoP, March 14, 1960. Filed Rev. W. F. Whitley. Item #585.

²For instance, The World Almanac for 1962 lists "Church of Christ, Scientist," among the ten "Leading Protestant Bodies in the United States" (pp. 710-711). Leo Rosten in his A Guide to the Religions of America (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955) lists it among thirteen Protestant bodies (see his "Contents").

had called on the state Committee for information to prepare the talk. The Committee heard the address and commented that it was "the finest sermon" on Christian Science he had ever heard preached in another church.¹

In Australia an Anglican minister gave a friendly address on Christian Science. He advised his congregation to visit a local Christian Science Reading Room and purchase Science and Health to read in connection with the Bible.²

In Massachusetts a Methodist minister attended a Christian Science Wednesday evening meeting at a local church. An Assistant Committee reported that during the period for remarks from the congregation this minister got to his feet and declared that "the Protestant ministers have acknowledged Mrs. Eddy as the discoverer of the Christ healing."³

Another minister provided a similar view at an address that an area Committee had been invited to give to a church group of his. The minister stated, "Every

¹CoP for Wisconsin to Man., re J. E. Kalas, October 19, 1959. Item #441.

²CoP for New South Wales to Man., re Archdeacon Dellbridge, February 18, 1959. Item #1033.

³ACoP for Middleboro to CoP for Mass., re G. F. Emery, September 30, 1958. Item #1041.

Christian religion owes a great debt to Christian Science for bringing to light the healing power. . . . A number of my fellow ministers agree with me on this."¹

In New Zealand a Presbyterian minister discussed Christian Science in a sermon. According to the Assistant Committee's report,

. . . the preacher added that we all know so very little about Christianity: we all have so much to learn. . . . He also said that even if they could not see eye to eye with Mrs. Eddy in many of her statements they should admire the woman who had built up a church which now had some thousands of branches throughout the world, and who had founded a daily newspaper of international repute, which was universally esteemed . . .²

In Australia during a legislative debate on a bill of interest to the Committee, a legislator referred to a statement by a Jesuit writer in a Roman Catholic pamphlet. The Catholic writer spoke of the Christian Scientists as being "eminently respectable."³

From Ontario a minister of the United Church of

¹Man. to E. O. (six-month report on talks), February 2, 1959. Item #2067.

²ACoP to CoP for New Zealand, re A. T. McNaughton, August 8, 1958. Item #131.

³Man. to E.O., December 5, 1958. Item #806. The pamphlet cited is Christian Science by the Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J. (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1957 revision), p. 30.

Canada acknowledged a healing account that he had asked the Manager to send him:

May I say that it is extraordinary healings such as this one which have, by their cumulative weight down through the years, overcome the uninformed prejudice of many members of the established churches and changed it into a warm and immensely appreciative admiration for the ministry of Christian Science. . . . I know of many members of orthodox churches who are addicted¹ to your radio and television presentations.

The Committee's files also contain numerous reports of nonadherents coming to the aid of the Scientists.

One nonmember in Virginia wrote to an author:

Much as I enjoy your book, however, I must demur when you lump Christian Science in with faithhealing, suggestion, hypnosis, etc. Please understand! I am no Christian Scientist but I do pride myself somewhat on being logical. . . . It certainly seems obvious that you have not gone to the original source, that you have not read, with an open mind and a strong sense of logical deduction, Mary Baker Eddy's original work. . . . I would be among the first to admit that by no means all, or even the larger proportion, of professing Christian Scientists have the matter straight. . . . I would like to suggest that you take a full sabbatical year and, with an open and impartial mind, read Mary Baker Eddy's book from beginning to end.²

The Committee has endeavored to combat the thrusts of oversensitivity from within its own ranks and within

¹A. Spraggett to Man., September 23, 1958. Item #1140.

²Private letter, filed Illusions and Delusions of the Supernatural and the Occult, November 30, 1959. Item #143.

the group. In the chapter on coercion we noted the Committee's concern that censorial acts not be perpetrated and some steps it took to ward them off in specific instances.¹ But the Committee also has taken more long-range measures to prevent oversensitivity from leading to unfavorable public incidents.

The Committee has for one thing been liberalizing its own policies. In 1951 the Committee made a major policy shift in its corrective work. Publishers were no longer to be called upon in preference to authors. "Henceforth," the Manager told all Committees on January 3, 1951, "our procedure is likely to be to go first to the author, rather than to the publisher. [par.] The primary responsibility for whatever appears in a book rests with the author."² While this did not rule out appeals to the publisher if an author refused to consider the Committee's position, the Manager did launch in this letter a policy

¹See, for instance, the Manager's advice to Committees at the appearance of the paperback edition of the biography by Dakin, p. 400.

²The old policy held, "As a general rule, publishers of books and pamphlets should be interviewed with regard to correction before the author is called on, because a publisher is responsible for what he accepts for publication from an author." General Instructions for Committees (Boston: Manager of CoPs, October 1, 1950), par. 31.

which, as practiced today, allows very few calls on publishers.¹

The policy change can be considered a liberalizing one because it provided for more direct dealings with an author.

The character of the Committee itself has been undergoing a change. The position of Manager has always been filled by estimable men, enlightened as churchmen and former lawyers and businessmen. Today, however, this office is largely in the hands of newspapermen.

The Christian Science Monitor and the Committee on Publication have undoubtedly always exercised some influence on one another. The Monitor's most obvious influence in recent years has surely been its contributions of able newsmen to the Manager's staff. The Manager, Assistant Manager, and two of the five section heads, as of July 1962, served many years apiece on the staff of the Monitor. More than at any time in its history, the Committee on Publication today has an outlook that coincides with the newsman's in terms of the free press.

¹See pp. 354 to 363.

The shift to a predominantly newspaperman's outlook on the Manager's staff has been accompanied by a professionalization of his staff and by moves to bring this professionalization to the entire system of Committees and Assistants.

One outcome has been the professional editing services that the Manager's office has put at the disposal of Committees, Assistants, and branch churches. We noted in Chapter VIII on informational services that the Committee offered these services to local church members whom a local newspaper might ask to prepare an article. We observed in Chapter IX that the Manager's office made available professionally prepared publicity and advertising material for newspapers and for radio and television.

Another outcome has been the recognition given to the need for professional handling of book corrections. The Manager to provide this handling has assumed almost all corrections. "Highly specialized knowledge," the Handbook provides, "is often necessary in dealing effectively with authors."¹ The Manager's office contained

¹Handbook, p. 22.

both the talent and extensive background material necessary to undertake the task.

The policy whereby the Manager handles book corrections was on the way at least as early as January 1951 when the Manager sent a letter, described earlier, to Committees advising them to take corrections up with authors rather than publishers. That letter also asked Committees to "refer any unfriendly references in books" to the Manager and under normal circumstances to await the Manager's recommendation before acting. At one time the Committee in the publishing capital of New York City evidently made most of the replies to books.

Along with the attempt to bring professional attention to bear, there has also been some centralization. Besides assuming the corrections of books, the Manager began in 1953 to handle comment in syndicated material wherever published.¹ The centralizing of corrections of books and syndicated material means that today virtually all corrections of nationally published material rest with the Manager.²

¹General Instructions, par. 27.

²Overseas the policy varies. The Manager usually ~~directs the corrections of books in Canada, Australia, and South Africa;~~ the District Manager directs the corrections in Great Britain; other overseas Committees prepare their own book corrections in consultation with the Manager. Overseas Committees handle all corrections of syndicated material published in their areas. Handbook, pp. 21 and 22.

Corrections of local newspapers remain in local hands. Local Assistant Committees under the area Committee have the responsibility for the correction of locally published material and for building good relations with local ministers, editors, broadcasters, and other public communicators.

Local churches initiate most newspaper advertising. They also prepare some publicity material. For thirty-six years up to 1953 they had primary responsibility, with the Committee assisting, for calls on libraries. In that year the responsibility was placed with the local Assistant Committee acting under the area Committee.¹ Churches still finance individually most donations to libraries.

The Committee has also sought to check the thrusts of oversensitivity by education of the membership.² The area Committee in his talks and annual reports to churches has an excellent sounding board from which to enlighten the rank and file. Although he is in no sense a "bishop," his reports and letters to churches and to individual

¹Man. to E.O., February 27, 1953. Item #952. Also see General Instructions, par. 97, App. 3-3-53.

²The Handbook states that "protests should be discouraged" by the Committee "in his talks to church members and as other opportunities arise." Handbook, p. 24.

members carry a good deal of weight.

Since he is in no position to dictate, the area Committee must persuade the membership to gain their cooperation. It might be said, at some risk of oversimplification, that his arguments are of three kinds. He may argue that the member's cooperation is needed as a matter of expediency, such as the Church needs to be protected and the harm impassioned protests can do avoided. Or he may put forward an institutional appeal, such as that the Manual establishes the Committee for the special work of correction. Or he may raise a religious or ethical point, such as citing the Golden Rule or the need to support the "basic human right of freedom of expression."¹

Especially the last is relevant here. The Christian Scientists have a special stake in the free press. They have their own very active newspaper and periodical press.² They espouse Protestant Christianity, which has

¹These appeals are illustrated in "From the Committee on Publication, Meeting Hostile Attacks," The Christian Science Journal, LXXX (March 1962), pp. 154-55. The final quotation is from the letter mentioned earlier, Man. to All Committees, January 3, 1951.

²The Manager recognized this when he remarked to an inquirer, "We obviously would not want anyone else to tell us how to run our periodicals." Man. to an

tended to foster free institutions. They look to freedom of religion to practice their beliefs, and freedom of religion and the press very likely stand or fall together.

If it is true, as Muller says, that the cause of religion must be distinguished from the cause of freedom,¹ surely the Christian Scientists have every reason to give both attention.

These factors urge the Committee in its appeals to the member to argue in support of a free press and free institutions, an appeal which cannot be sacrificed to either the argument of expediency or the religious argument. The Church is part of a larger social framework, which requires as well as bestows protection.

The Committee could do more to explain its own purposes and activities to the membership. The member often is not well informed on the Committee's activities. The District Manager remarked on one occasion, "Helping to remove Christian Scientists' misconceptions of the Committee

Inquirer, re Look magazine, April 17, 1959. Item #1087-27.

¹Herbert J. Muller, Issues of Freedom, Paradoxes and Promises (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), p. 95.

on Publication work, and all that lies behind it, seems to me almost as important a part of our work as removing the public's misconceptions of our religion!"¹ The Committee for North Carolina once remarked, "Christian Science is come of age, and it is high time that Christian Scientists come of age." The Manager's files indicate that a few fail to grasp the point that the Committee has as its end the dissemination not suppression of information, and for its means "a Christian manner."

If a minority could allay oversensitivity in its own ranks and end indignant protests and censorial acts, it would have done much to contribute to the maintenance of the free press. But besides putting down negative acts, the group also has the obligation to help strengthen the free press by making its messages meaningful. It is, of course, not enough to defend a position and win public support; rather it is necessary to contribute to the fund of knowledge and views, thoughtfully arrived at, which are the sustenance of a free people.

As already indicated, the Committee has gone far toward solving the problem of oversensitivity within its own ranks. It might be hoped that the Committee would

continue in this trend and in liberalization of its poli-

¹D.M. to Man. re The Church's Ministry of Healing, June 20, 1958. Item #1173-26.

²CoP for North Carolina to his Assistants, December 24, 1958. Item #2069.

cies, professionalization of its activities, and education of the membership on its objectives.

Likewise, the Committee has probably gone far in making its messages meaningful in terms of the problems of the individual and of society in changing times. As we saw in Chapter IX, the series "How Christian Science Heals" aspired to confront, through accounts of healing, problems of "ethics," "morals," "materialism," and the individual's "deep spiritual hunger."¹ The new radio series, "The Bible Speaks to You," possessed a scope that, according to a statement issued at the start of the series, "will not only include physical healings, but will be broadened to include a stronger emphasis on solving the many other kinds of problems challenging the world."²

But the Committee has not been able to go quite so far in meeting basic misunderstandings of Christian Science that require the more introspective analysis. Particularly, it has had difficulty in meeting comment of this kind from the academic level. That it has had some success even there, however, is indicated in Chapter V.

¹See p. 494.

²"New Radio Series," The Christian Science Journal, LXXX (March 1962), p. 155.

The Committee's chief difficulty is that it has had mainly to serve as its own research facility. It has had no outside scholarly facilities to turn to--no church seminaries or church colleges to pit against the scholarly facilities at the disposal of other systems of thought. In addition there has not been much accumulation of scholarship from other sources because of the youthfulness of the Church. The Manager on one occasion stated in a Lutheran publication, "Our own scholarship has not had centuries to ripen, as has the great body of Lutheran learning."¹

This absence of outside scholarship has had an adverse effect on all four corners of the Committee's work.

On one corner, the religious teaching, the Committee has had to face difficult problems of popularization. The difficulty might be underscored by quoting from an exchange between the Manager and a Baptist inquirer who had written about the Committee's weekly broadcasts.

This inquirer believed that there were "inconsistencies" in the programs. He asked how Christian Science could heal sin and sickness since your "distinctive beliefs" are that they "do not really exist for they are only

¹The Lutheran Quarterly. For publishing information, see p. 146, fn. 3.

erroneous ideas of mortal mind." Furthermore:

Would it not be more fair to your listening audience to share with them those distinctive elements of your faith rather than merely couching your terms in phrases that are in keeping with those who are not "Christian Scientist."

He explained that he did not mean to be querulous.

The Manager replied "to make sure that what appear to be real differences of theological opinion are not actually conclusions derived from an incomplete knowledge of what Christian Science is."¹

One communicative difficulty faced by the Committee may be that the "distinctive elements," as the writer put it, are so little known. These distinctive elements, and the common characteristics, help, of course, to establish the relation of Christian Science to other systems of thought--philosophical, religious, and sociological. This analysis is the province of scholarship and is significant to the Committee because its doctrinal corrections mainly involve relationships.

A second corner, the healing work, has been explained best of all. The Committee emphasized this

¹R. L. Goodwill to Man., February 8, 1960; Man. to R. L. Goodwill, February 24, 1960. Item #913.

aspect in the nine-year radio and seven-year television series, "How Christian Science Heals." The programs were designed to further the understanding of the religious teaching as, so to speak, an "applied Science" and to publicly establish, as mentioned in the last chapter, Christian Science treatment as a safe and effective healing method.

The new series, "The Bible Speaks to You," continues to present physical healings that have taken place in Christian Science. But the emphasis is apparently on the broader applications of the Bible teachings and the wider implications of the Christian life, as the Christian Scientists interpret both.

While the Church's evidence regarding healing continues to mount, there has been virtually no rigorous statistical analysis of it. The Manager's letter in The American Journal of Sociology in 1954,¹ while in itself the barest sort of beginning, represents probably the most systematic study of Christian Science healing so far.

The third corner, the history of the religion, is perhaps most badly in need of the scholar. We noted

¹For comment, see pp.58, fn. 1; 269; 270.

in Chapter II on "impositions" that the sympathetic and hostile biographies of Mrs. Eddy were irreconcilable. And in subsequent chapters we observed that the Committee had occasion to make numerous historical corrections.

The day-to-day correction is, however, often only part of a graver problem. As the reverse side of the charge of censorship, the Church has been accused of myth-making. Critics have held that the Church presents its history as a fable and the founder as a divinity, and that the Church suppresses all contrary facts.¹

In this connection, it is significant that neither of the Church's two full-length biographies of Mrs. Eddy was written by a member of the Church. Sibyl Wilbur never joined The Mother Church, and Lyman Powell was all his life an Episcopal clergyman.²

The burden of proof as to what is true and what is false clearly rests with the Church. For one thing, the Church has the largest collection of source materials on Mrs. Eddy. How it can make better use of these materials could be a subject for academic attention-- for "ripened scholarship."

¹This was the charge debated in The Lutheran Quarterly exchange brought about by comment in an article, "History as You Like It."

²Much of the scholarly talent and energy of the

On the Church and its activities, the fourth corner of the Committee's informational work, not much real "news" is given out. As we noted in the conclusion to Chapter IX, current Church activities go largely unreported. The emphasis is on the spiritual message. The regular radio and television programs give no news, unless the very brief concluding tie-in announcements on which local churches mention their services are counted. The Committee's newspaper releases are just as short on real news, except again as announcements. The "Gems of Thought" filler material is, of course, a purely "puff" item.

Academic attention might help the Committee to uncover categories of news that could and ought to be reported. The Christian Science churches, while without the social activities of other churches, probably do not publicize as fully the activities which they do have in common, such as building and renovation programs, charitable enterprises, business meetings, and new officers.

Academic attention might result in papers, articles, and books that could contribute directly to the public

Christian Science Church has undoubtedly been diverted into The Christian Science Monitor rather than into the usual areas of denominational scholarship.

knowledge of the Church. It might uncover and answer questions about the Church organization and the relations of churches and members which have not been clearly seen or have been misunderstood.

Apart from the content, scholarship could assist the Committee in other ways. For instance, the Committee faces some serious biases in its gathering of information and its selection of appeals for its publicity. Oversensitivity and the socio-economic status of the membership are two sources of bias.

We have already discussed the problem of oversensitivity. The Committee probably has this problem mainly under control so far as its public expressions are concerned. But how oversensitivity affects its information gathering may be an unanswered question.

Regarding socio-economic status, the Committee finds itself in a middle-class context.¹ We observed in commenting on Table 6 that the Committee's regular broadcasts mainly present, at least by vocations, middle-class participants. We also noted in Chapter VI that most of the Committee's replies to sermons were made to

¹Both De Nood (p. 239) and Thorner (p. 214) discuss the middle-class tendencies of Christian Scientists.

ministers of the orthodox Protestant church bodies. The Committee made almost no calls on fundamentalist ministers, who, it might be thought, appeal to the lower socio-economic levels. The Committee's files contain a great number of fundamentalist pamphlets that comment on Christian Science; so it probably cannot be assumed that there is any want of comment on Christian Science in the fundamentalist churches.

Academic attention might help the Committee to learn if its middle-class orientation is limiting its voice unnecessarily. After all, there is a vast unchurched body traditionally appealed to by the Roman Catholic Church, the Salvation Army, and the "store-front" fundamentalist churches. Possibly the Committee should be doing more to reach this level.

It is instructive that the Committee has no easy-reading leaflet or pamphlet for the near illiterate. It makes virtually no distinction between answering the typed letter on embossed stationery from the suburban housewife and replying to a scribbled postcard from the Jamaican plantation worker.

The Committee has, however, produced a number of pamphlets in recent years for its own special needs, and it might be supposed that simple reading matter will follow in time.

The Committee has made significant contributions to the free press. While it perhaps can do more to strike down oversensitivity in its own ranks and to make its public messages more meaningful through scholarship, the Committee has marked up some gains.

For one thing, the Committee has urged reportorial competence on author and reporter. That it is not slipshod in its own activities probably has spurred a writer on occasion not to be so either. Whether or not always right in its own replies, the Committee has at least prodded the critic who might be inclined to discuss Christian Science from hearsay or mere superficial acquaintance.

The Committee has been a major exporter around the world of the liberal position in regard to the media, as taken in the United States.¹ Its representatives in forty-six countries, since directed from Boston, tend to reflect the American point of view and to press for this view

¹Simultaneously, the Committee, in its energetic efforts to secure and maintain the right to depend on Christian Science healing, has been an exporter of the American position on religious freedom.

among public officials and the media in their own areas.

We saw an example of this in Chapter IX. In Australia state Committees were successful in a protest of government censorship of the regular television programs. The Australian Committees on this occasion conveyed to their own shores a right to telecast which their fellows in the United States were enjoying.

It might be useful in our evaluation of the Committee to consider the question, What would be the case if all churches, or more generally all groups, had a Committee on Publication?

This question presupposes, of course, that the Committee is unique as an agency in social communications, which it probably is, at least to some extent. Among the various groups, probably no agency represents the corrective purpose of public relations institutionalized to the extent that the Committee on Publication does. Other churches have their missionary society, other groups their publicity departments, but the Christian Scientists almost alone have an agency of press correction. The difference is subtle but plainly profound.

Even so, the agency is only a tool forged for a purpose, not an end by itself to be judged either good or bad. Surely to the extent that a corrective agency represents the ethics of the free press, some true assistance to newsman and author, meaningful messages, and a concern to educate the group according to "The First Freedom," it may represent a contribution. To the extent that a group agency puts expediency before ethics, group interests before respect for basic authorial rights, puffs before meaningfulness, promotion before curbing the member's oversensitivity, it does not necessarily represent a contribution.

The critic might say that any corrective work is suspect--that any letter to or interview with an author represents a form of coercion. The author ought to be challenged, the critic might insist, only in the public arena . . . or only personally . . . or only within the group . . . or simply not at all. The issue is no less, perhaps, than what the line of demarcation is between coercion and right of reply. This study has taken coercion as the concept of opposing a message before not after

publication, and rests on the lines drawn in Robert B. Downs' The First Freedom. It has defined correction as challenging a message after publication.

On balance, then, the Christian Science Committee on Publication can be taken as contributive to a free press. In its somewhat singular way the Committee, whose ethical connections with the press doubtless derive from its practical connections by way of its staffing, manifests a current of social awareness promotive of the values of the free press. This social outlook, it might be hoped, will be fostered in the years to come.

One memorable statement conveying the social outlook was made by the present Manager (then Assistant Manager) in an address to a conference of area Committees. On the broad social role of preserving the right to practice religious healing for all churchmen, he said:

Historically the fact is . . . that human freedom has flowed from the concept of liberty of conscience--that is, freedom to worship God according to the dictates of individual conscience. . . . our position has a very great significance, not only for Christian Scientists, but for all of mankind. In fact, I think it is safe to say that when the history of this century is written--this century in which the battle for human freedom has become paramount-- . . .

it will be recognized that the Christian Science movement has played a vital part in the defense of the rights of the individual--and most particularly, that the Christian Science Committees on Publication, through their unceasing alertness and watchfulness on that issue, have played a most vital part.¹

¹Dewitt John, "Address on Legislation."

CHAPTER XII
FURTHER RESEARCH

"Circular response" is a term used in the biological and social sciences to describe the continuous interaction among factors in any given situation.¹ It identifies the fact that causes are often affected and altered by their own effects and so do not remain causes.

The term, if applied to the subject of our study, would suggest that not only has the group an impact on the free press but the press has an impact on the group as it influences the press. The group's impact on the press, in other words, is more than just cause-effect.

It might be assumed that the concept of the circular response would be as fruitful to pursue in the study of group-press relationships as it evidently has been in other areas of the social sciences. For one thing, its application might tell us the extent to which groups do not enjoy control over their own messages and their communicative behavior generally, an important question for evaluating the group's over-all influence on the press.

¹Blaisdell, American Democracy Under Pressure, p. 269.

We might briefly consider some possibilities of applying the concept of the circular response in a review of the four hypotheses with which we introduced this study and which have underlain the collection and analysis of our data.

The first hypothesis was that the impact of the group on the mass communicator and his medium of communication can be identified as correction, coercion, informational services, publicity, and advertising. Correction, coercion, and informational services were taken to represent the group's response to the content of the press. Publicity and advertising were taken to represent the group's communicative initiative.

As for correction, we have considered the methods one group pursues as it replies to authors, editors, and public speakers, and as it calls on the publisher, book-dealer, library, classroom, and radio station. We have observed the distinctions this group draws in the actions it takes--its tendencies to follow or refrain from certain procedures.

In applying the concept of interaction, the investigator could trace the reply of the group--any group--through to the published content. The editor modifies the reply directly, of course, through editing. But, as the group learns his desires and prepares its copy accordingly, the editor may also exercise an indirect influence. The group on the basis of its estimate of his editing standard actually may come to alter the copy more than he would, an interpersonal relationship which thereby becomes more important than the editor's blue pencil.

As for coercion, we have seen that groups may apply censorship through business boycotts, police and state power, and also indirectly through the group's relations with editors, publishers, bookdealers, and other distributors of comment. We noted that among these alternatives favorable distributor relations may prove most successful in the long run.

The investigator by considering the degrees and kinds of interaction in coercive activity could help to define censorship as it is practiced. The group's reaching the author through the distributor is perhaps one kind

of interaction. The force of economic boycott is another.

As for informational services, we have observed that the newsman and the author call on the group for a number of activities. They may ask the group's public relations facility to provide information, give access to source material, arrange for picture-taking, check manuscripts, and prepare articles.

The investigator could, perhaps, identify more adequately the interrelatedness of the needs of the writer and the communicative activities of the group. What it learns from handling requests of writers, the group may apply to all of its communicative activities. This may even change the focus of these activities.

As for publicity and advertising, we noted that the group, as it endeavors to set forth its messages, considers its press relations as much as its public relations. The two are presumably not separable. The group submits regular releases for the purpose of setting information about itself before the public and also, in the case of a religious group, to provide spiritual messages as its special contribution to society.

The investigator, while he may readily determine that the needs of the media affect the form, style, pacing, even content of the group's releases, might ask further whether this influence helps or hinders the group to voice its special contribution. To some extent popularization is the effort of the group to relate itself more closely to the press as well as the reader, and the press content that results is something of the product of group-press interaction. While his colleagues concern themselves with how much this interaction helps or harms the purposes of the press, the investigator might consider how much this helps or harms the purposes of the group as it takes the initiative to set before the public its goals and contributive messages.

Each of the five kinds of group impact, then, could be considered as types of interaction. While much attention needs to be given to broadening these types to embrace the activities of a variety of groups, the concept of interaction might help to give the findings far-reaching meaning.

Our second hypothesis was that these communicative activities are called forth by the natural needs of a democratic society and by the difficulties of the established media to meet them.

One need is for the group to be heard accurately. The group by its corrections counters the author or public

speaker who errs in presenting the facts about the group to society. Society needs accurate information about the group, even as the group desires to be properly understood.

Another need is for the group to express its views. We noted that the minority frequently owes its existence to a special view and that it participates in society in part by telling about this view. The group may challenge what it sees as a conspiracy of criticism with correction or coercion and what it sees as a conspiracy of silence with publicity and advertising. The alternative to this activity is a nonparticipating, non-contributory, isolated group.

The investigator who considers the role of group-press "circular response" would be able to identify these needs more precisely. But even more important, he could determine how the group and the press work together to satisfy the needs. It is not to be supposed that the groups and the press are always in conflict, a point which brings us to our next hypothesis.

The third hypothesis was that there is no necessary incompatibility between these communicative activities

of groups and a free press.

We have considered the norms of one group as it exercises an impact on the press. That is to say, we have given attention to the distinctions a group drew in its working policies and the consistency with which it lived up to them. The liberal position, as set forth in statements by such groups as the American Civil Liberties Union, provides some starting points to determine norms that are compatible with free expression.

While the norms of many more groups need analysis for adequate theory, the investigator could consider norms which embrace at the same time the group and the press as partners. To know the interactions of the group and the press taken together would probably help to define more adequately the norms of each taken separately, especially since it cannot always be assumed that the behavior of the group is an act of volition.

The fourth hypothesis was that the group's working success with the media is, in fact, related to its pursuit of the standards of a free press.

We observed that the group may be influenced by its own self-interest as well as ethical sense to conform to publicly acceptable work practices. It is to be supposed that methodological conformity of this sort earns for the group a press and public good will that promotes its purposes. We also noted that the group has an interest in the press's neutrality, at least to the extent that other groups do not interfere with its messages.

The investigator in considering interaction might be able to determine more adequately what constitutes the sort of success that is in the group's self-interest. Success and failure are not necessarily static categories; each may even be ambivalent, as we noted in the conclusion to Chapter VI.

What might be a successful venture before the public today may backfire tomorrow. We noted instances where successful judicial suppression of books led to their eventual greater popularity.

What might be a group's good service to the press may not be good service to the public. If the group adds to the meaninglessness of press content, it may satisfy

the newspaper but fail in its duty to contribute to an enlightened public opinion.

In short there is lack of conceptualization of group-press circular response. We have considered in our study primarily the group's impact on the press, only slightly the objectives and practices of the group and of the press as they mingle and synthesize in broader interaction.

A P P E N D I X

0

THE RELIGIOUS TENETS OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE¹

1. As adherents of Truth, we take the inspired Word of the Bible as our sufficient guide to eternal Life.
2. We acknowledge and adore one supreme and infinite God. We acknowledge His Son, one Christ; the Holy Ghost or divine Comforter; and man in God's image and likeness.
3. We acknowledge God's forgiveness of sin in the destruction of sin and the spiritual understanding that casts out evil as unreal. But the belief in sin is punished so long as the belief lasts.
4. We acknowledge Jesus' atonement as the evidence of divine, efficacious Love, unfolding man's unity with God through Christ Jesus the Way-shower; and we acknowledge that man is saved through Christ, through Truth, Life, and Love as demonstrated by the Galilean Prophet in healing the sick and overcoming sin and death.
5. We acknowledge that the crucifixion of Jesus and his resurrection served to uplift faith to understand eternal Life, even the allness of Soul, Spirit, and the nothingness of matter.
6. And we solemnly promise to watch, and pray for that Mind to be in us which was also in Christ Jesus; to do unto others as we would have them do unto us; and to be merciful, just, and pure.

¹Eddy, Science and Health, p. 497:3-27.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

BOOKS, GENERAL

American Jurisprudence, Constitutional Law. Vol. XI.
San Francisco: Bancroft-Whitney Co., 1938.
(with "Cumulative Supplement" for 1956.)

Bird, George L., and Merwin, Frederic E. (eds.) The Press and Society, A Book of Readings.
New York: Prentice-Hall, 1951.

Blaisdell, Donald C. American Democracy Under Pressure. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1957.

_____. Unofficial Government: Pressure Groups and Lobbies. CCCXIX of The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Sciences.
Philadelphia: September, 1958.

Canfield, Bertrand R. Public Relations: Principles, Cases and Problems. Homewood, Illinois: R. D. Irwin, 1960.

Cartwright, Dorwin, Alvin Zander (eds.) Group Dynamics Research and Theory. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Co., 1953.

Cushman, Robert E. Civil Liberties in the United States, A Guide to Current Problems and Experience. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1956.

Q

Downs, Robert B. (ed.). The First Freedom: Liberty and Justice in the World of Books and Reading. Chicago: American Library Association, 1960.

Dubos, Rene. Mirage of Health: Utopias, Progress, and Biological Change. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

_____. "Health and Disease," The Journal of the American Medical Association, CLXXIV (October 1, 1960), 505-507.

_____. "Beyond Traditional Medicine," Harper's, CCXXI (October, 1960), 166-168.

Ebersole, Luke Eugene. Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951.

Frost, Evelyn. Christian Healing, A Consideration of the Place of Spiritual Healing in the Church of To-day in the Light of the Doctrine and Practice of the Ante-Nicene Church. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd., 1949.

Garceau, Oliver. The Political Life of the American Medical Association. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1941.

Herring, Edward Pendleton, Jr. Group Representation Before Congress. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1929.

Hocking, William Ernest. Freedom of the Press, A Framework of Principle. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.

- Kelley, Stanley, Jr. Professional Public Relations and Political Power. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1956.
- King, C. Wendell. Social Movements in the United States. New York: Random House, 1956.
- Konvitz, Milton R. Fundamental Liberties of a Free People: Religion, Speech, Press, Assembly. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1957.
- Laski, Harold J. "Freedom of Association," Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. VI, 447.
- Lasswell, Harold D. National Security and Individual Freedom. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1950.
- _____. "Propaganda," The Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. XII, 522.
- Lewin, Kurt. Field Theory in Social Science, Selected Theoretical Papers. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.
- Marty, Martin E. A Short History of Christianity. New York: Meridian Books, 1959.
- Pimlott, J.A.R. Public Relations and American Democracy. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1951.
- Research Frontiers in Politics and Government, Brookings Lectures, 1955. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1955.

Ross, Irwin. The Image Merchants. Garden City,
New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1959.

Rosten, Leo (ed.). A Guide to the Religions of
America. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955.

Swindler, William F. Problems of Law in Journalism.
New York: Macmillan, 1955.

Truman, David B. The Governmental Process, Political
Interests and Public Opinion. New York:
Alfred A. Knopf, 1951.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

- Comee, Edgar A. "Canham of The Monitor," The New York Herald Tribune, January 15, 1961, sec. 2, p. 3.
- Cony, Edward R. "Conflict - Cooperation Content of Five American Dailies." Journalism Quarterly, XXX (Winter, 1953), 15-22.
- Donnelly, Richard C. "Right of Reply - An Alternative to an Action for Libel," Virginia Law Review, XXXIV (November, 1948), 867-900.
- Gieber, Walter. "Do Newspapers Overplay 'Negative' News?" Journalism Quarterly, XXXII (Summer, 1955), 311-28.
- Martin, L. John, and Nelson, Harold L. "The Historical Standard in Analyzing Press Performance," Journalism Quarterly, XXXIII (Fall, 1956), 456-466.
- Mussey, Henry Raymond. "The Christian Science Censor," The Nation, CXXX (February 5-12-26, 1930; March 12, 1930), 147-149, 175-178, 241-243, 291-293.
- Pittman, Alfred. "What Actually Is Christian Science?," Christian Science Sentinel, LXII (January 9, 1960), 45-47.
- "Reading Habits of Weekly Editors," The American Press, LXXV (June, 1957), 10.
-

- Tebbel, John. "Rating the American Newspaper - Part I," Saturday Review, XLIV (May 13, 1961), 59-62.
- Thompson, Craig F. "The Christian Science Censorship," The New Republic, LXI (December 11, 1929), 59-62.
- Frescher, Robert L. and O'Neill, Thomas N., Jr. "Medical Care For Dependent Children: Manslaughter Liability of The Christian Scientist," University of Pennsylvania Law Review, CIX (December 1960), 203-217.
- Watt, E. D. "Reader's Response, Catholics Down Under: A Second View," The Christian Century, LXXVIII (January 18, 1961), 80-81.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS ON CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

Bates, Ernest S., and Dittmore, John V. Mary Baker Eddy: The Truth and the Tradition. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1932.

Beasley, Norman. The Cross and the Crown. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1952.

_____. The Continuing Spirit. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1956.

The Blight That Failed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.

Braden, Charles S. Christian Science Today: Power, Policy, Practice. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1958.

Canham, Erwin D. Commitment to Freedom, The Story of The Christian Science Monitor. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1958.

Christian Science Committee on Publication. Handbook of Policies and Procedures for Christian Science Committees on Publication. Boston, 1960. (Mimeographed.)

The Christian Science Publishing Society. What They Say About The Christian Science Monitor. Boston: 1958.

Dakin, Edwin Franden. Mrs. Eddy: The Biography of a Virginal Mind. New York, London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930.

- Eddy, Mary Baker. Christian Science versus Pantheism.
Boston: Trustees under the Will of Mary Baker
G. Eddy, 1898 (1926).
- _____. The First Church of Christ, Scientist, and
Miscellany. Boston: Trustees under the Will
of Mary Baker G. Eddy, 1913 (1941).
- _____. Manual of The Mother Church, The First
Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massa-
chusetts. Boston: Trustees Under the Will of
Mary Baker G. Eddy, 1908 (1936).
- _____. Message to The Mother Church, Boston,
Massachusetts, June 1901. Boston: Trustees
Under the Will of Mary Baker G. Eddy, 1901
(1929).
- _____. Message to The First Church of Christ,
Scientist, or The Mother Church, Boston,
June 15, 1902. Boston: Trustees under the
Will of Mary Baker G. Eddy, 1902 (1930).
- _____. Miscellaneous Writings 1883-1896. Boston:
Trustees under the Will of Mary Baker G.
Eddy, 1896 (1924).
- _____. No and Yes. Boston: Trustees under the
Will of Mary Baker G. Eddy, 1908 (1936).
- _____. Retrospection and Introspection. Boston:
Trustees Under the Will of Mary Baker G.
Eddy, 1892 (1920).
- _____. Rudimental Divine Science. Boston:
Trustees under the Will of Mary Baker G.
Eddy, 1908 (1936).

- _____. Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures. Boston: Trustees Under the Will of Mary Baker G. Eddy, 1906 (1934).
- _____. Unity of Good. Boston: Trustees under the Will of Mary Baker G. Eddy, 1908 (1936).
- Farlow, Alfred. Christian Science, Historical Facts. Boston: Puritan Press, 1902.
- _____. "Emmanuel Movement and Christian Science," Boston Sunday American, December 6, 13, 20, 1908.
- _____. Replies to Clergymen. Boston: Alfred Farlow, 1908.
- _____. "Twenty-Six Years in the Public Press, Some Things I Have Learned in My Experience," Boston Sunday Post, March 29, 1914.
- John, DeWitt. The Christian Science Way of Life With A Christian Scientist's Life by Erwin D. Canham. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.
- Kimball, Edward A., Smith, Judge Clifford P., and Hanna, Judge Septimus J. Christian Science And Legislation. Boston: The Christian Science Publishing Society, 1909.
- Meehan, Michael. Mrs. Eddy and the Late Suit in Equity. Concord, New Hampshire: Michael Meehan, 1908.
- Messer, Mary Burt. The Science of Society: The Identity of Each as Godlike Embracing All. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959.
-

- Mochlman, Conrad Henry. Ordeal by Concordance: An Historical Study of a Recent Literary Invention. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955.
- Orcutt, William Dana. Mary Baker Eddy and Her Books. Boston: The Christian Science Publishing Society, 1950.
- Peel, Robert. Christian Science: Its Encounter with American Culture. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1958.
- Powell, Lyman P. Mary Baker Eddy: A Life Size Portrait. New York: Macmillan, 1930. Now published by Christian Science Publishing Society, Boston.
- Smith, Clifford P. Historical Sketches From the Life of Mary Baker Eddy and the History of Christian Science. Boston: The Christian Science Publishing Society, 1941.
- _____. Christian Science: Its Legal Status, A Defense of Human Rights. Boston: The Christian Science Publishing Society, 1914.
- _____. Christian Science Healing Not Medical Practice. Boston: The Christian Science Publishing Society, 1918.
- _____, Kimball, Edward A., and Hanna, Judge Septimus J. Christian Science And Legislation. Boston: The Christian Science Publishing Society, 1909.
- Steiger, Henry W. Christian Science and Philosophy. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948.

3
The Story of Christian Science War Time Activities
1939-1946. Boston: The Christian Science
Publishing Society, 1947.

Studdert Kennedy, Hugh A. Mrs. Eddy: Her Life,
Her Work, and Her Place in History. Los
Gatos, California: Farallon Foundation,
1947.

C

UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS

- DeNood, Neal Breauale. "The Diffusion of a System of Belief." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Harvard University, 1937.
- Epps, Bryan Crandell, "Religious Healing in the United States, 1940-1960: History and Theology of Selected Trends." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate School, Boston University, 1961.
- Long, Norton E. "The Public Relations Policies of the Bell System: A Case Study in the Politics of Modern Industry." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Government, Harvard University, 1937.
- Pfautz, Harold. "Christian Science: the Sociology of a Social Movement and a Religious Group." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago, 1954.
- Thorner, Isidor. "Christian Science and Ascetic Protestantism; a Study in the Sociology of Religion, Personality Type and Social Structure." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Social Relations, Harvard University, 1951.

OTHER SOURCES

Office of the Manager, Christian Science Committees
on Publication. Personal interviews with
the Manager and his staff, 1961-62.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Name: Lee Zeunert Johnson

Date and Place of Birth: July 1, 1930; Great Falls, Montana

High School: Havre High School, Havre, Montana.
Graduated 1948

College: Montana State University, Missoula, Montana, B.A., 1952

Graduate Work: Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, M.S., 1955. New York Press Association Fellowship, 1955-1956