

# COPY

(FROM OFFICE OF THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE BOARD OF DIRECTORS)

Boston 15, Massachusetts  
February 20, 1948

## CONFIDENTIAL

Mr. Bliss Knapp  
Longwood Towers  
Brookline, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Knapp:

We are informed by Mr. Heitman that in the course of his interview with you on Friday, January 30, you expressed a willingness to comply with the wishes of this Board in respect to any further publication and distribution of your book "The Destiny of The Mother Church." Mr. Heitman has also informed us of your intention to delete the chapter entitled "The Woman," and the chapter entitled "Prophecy" from any new printing of the book. Such deletion is especially wise as it may prevent any criticism to the effect that you are endeavoring to interpret the book of Revelation. You probably do not know that we have in the Archives a letter from Mrs. Eddy dealing definitely with this subject. The statement in her letter, referring to Revelation, follows: "Revelation should never be meddled with. No one but myself is equal to the first lessons in that." It was because of this statement that the Directors felt obliged to decline to advertise "The Open Book" by the late Irving C. Tomlinson.

We understand that you would like to have us appoint a suitable person to edit your book, for the purpose of bringing the wording of your references to Jesus and Mrs. Eddy more in keeping with the language employed by Mrs. Eddy in her writings; also with that employed by Judge Hanna in his unpublished editorial; and with that used in the report of the Committee of Six appointed by this Board in 1938, to consider Mrs. Eddy's concept of herself in relation to the woman of Bible prophecy.

While we fully agree that such editing should be done, we believe that you, as author of the book, are the one best fitted to do it. We see no objection, however, to your engaging an editor to assist you in working out the proposed revisions. With a view to facilitating such revision, we are inclosing a list of pages from your book on which certain questionable statements appear. We are also quoting

below just a few of the many references in the book to Mrs. Eddy and her place in prophecy, which are not supported by statements in her published works or correspondence. As an example, beginning at the bottom of page 58 and continuing over to page 59, appears a statement credited to your father, which reads as follows: "The recognition of the identity of this Woman in the Apocalypse is just as humanly and divinely essential to the followers of Christian Science today, as it was for the disciples of Jesus to acknowledge his living faith, as exhibited on earth over eighteen hundred years ago."

While in the same paragraph your father has referred to Mrs. Eddy as "the human exponent of the two great wings of faith -- Christianity and Science," nevertheless, this brief reference to her human status is hardly sufficient to avoid the impression that your father conceived of Mrs. Eddy personally as the Woman of the Apocalypse. Inasmuch as this statement is quoted verbatim from a letter, or article, written by your father, the objection might be overcome by an explanatory footnote or deletion of the statement. Similar references to Mrs. Eddy in other parts of your book should be reworded in a way to make plain that Mrs. Eddy personally is not the Woman of the Apocalypse.

It is obvious, that the identity of the individual feminine state of consciousness known to the world as Mary Baker Eddy, was not foreseen by Jesus, John, or the more ancient prophets, as the Woman of Prophecy. These prophets, however, did foresee that the Motherhood of God, as typified by the Woman of Prophecy, would be revealed to the world through a feminine state of consciousness, and that the human identity of this state of feminine consciousness would by her works exemplify in human experience the Motherhood of God, as typified by the Woman of the Apocalypse.

Christian Scientists properly acknowledge Mrs. Eddy as this feminine representative of the spiritual idea of God's Motherhood, precisely as they acknowledge the man Jesus, to quote Mrs. Eddy, as "the masculine representative of the spiritual idea" of God's Fatherhood. The correctness of such acknowledgment is supported by Mrs. Eddy's references to the masculine and feminine representatives of the spiritual idea on page 565 of Science and Health; also by her references to the ideal man and ideal woman on pages 517 and 577 of the same book. Contrary to still another opinion expressed by you in the book, it is our conviction that both Jesus and Mrs. Eddy were obliged to pass through certain preparatory experiences, before they became spiritually equipped to do the

mighty works which establish their divine right to be acknowledged in their respective spheres as the highest human corporeal concepts of the divine idea.

It will be recalled that in her article entitled "The Saviour's Mission," on page 59 of "Unity of Good" Mrs. Eddy states: "We understand Christ to be the divine idea brought to the flesh in the son of Mary." It would be equally appropriate for Christian Scientists to say, the Apocalyptic woman "symbolizes generic man," the compound idea of God, including the male and female of His creation, brought to the flesh in the daughter of Mark Baker. Such statement regarding Mrs. Eddy would no more justify describing the human Mrs. Eddy as generic man, or the Woman of the Apocalypse, than Mrs. Eddy's statement just quoted regarding the son of Mary would justify describing the human Jesus as the Christ. In a word, neither the human identity of Jesus nor the human identity of Mrs. Eddy was known to God or foreseen by the prophets, but as individual states of human consciousness they each in their own way perceived and reflected the Christ, the true nature of God, in such marked degree that they became the human avenues of thought through which prophecy was fulfilled.

We know, of course, that you recognize the distinction between human and spiritual identities, but we feel that in your references to Jesus and Mrs. Eddy you have not clearly stated this distinction in your book; therefore, we have considered it only just to you that we refer in some detail to views for which we do not find any sanction in Mrs. Eddy's writings. The same lack of clarity, we may say, prevails in your use of such terms as the two Lights, the two Witnesses, and the two Rulers. This criticism also applies to your theory that the two great Lights which, as stated in Genesis, appeared on the fourth day of creation, represent Jesus and Mrs. Eddy, and that this appearing on the fourth day and that on the first day constituted "separate acts of the divine will." Furthermore, the implication follows on the same page of your book, that all other ideas, and all other sons and daughters of God, appeared on the succeeding days of creation, and as a consequence these ideas are subordinate in the spiritual realm to Jesus and Mrs. Eddy, who, according to your theory, hold a position superior in that realm to the rest of us.

Inasmuch as you have proposed the deletion of the two chapters in which this line of reasoning is expounded, it seems unnecessary for us to comment in full detail on what we regard as the unsound phases of such reasoning. We will point out, however, that your theory suggests the following questionable conclusions:

1. That an element of time enters into the process of spiritual creation.
2. That gradations of thought exist in the spiritual realm.
3. That God is, so to speak, a respecter of persons.
4. That all the sons and daughters of God do not occupy the same relationship to Him.
5. That the two Rulers whom you identify as Jesus and Mrs. Eddy, are, in effect, mediators in the realm of Spirit, between God and the rest of His ideas.
6. That it is not possible for each of us, as ideas of divine Mind, to express the same spiritual perfection, the same sonship, the same malehood and femalehood, which were conferred by God on the spiritual selfhood of Jesus and Mrs. Eddy.

It seems reasonable to assume that both Jesus and Mrs. Eddy considered that they, through their works, were humanly bearing witness to the true nature of God and His Christ. It also seems correct to assume that because of their works they are rightfully acknowledged today as the two most transparent sources of spiritual light the world has ever known. But let us not forget that the alleged coming and going of the spiritual light, or the Christ, and the apparent gradations of its reflected brilliancy is an experience confined wholly to human consciousness, and has nothing whatever to do with the divine consciousness in which the light of the Christ continuously shines in all of its fulness and is reflected in the same degree of perfection and completeness by all of the sons and daughters of God. We feel that Mrs. Eddy's statements on pages 517 and 577 of the textbook concerning the ideal man and the ideal woman previously mentioned in this letter, relate directly to the male and female of God's creation referred to in the first chapter of Genesis.

We realize that this is a subject to which you have devoted much time and prayerful study. The honesty of your purpose in doing so is fully appreciated, but in all frankness and friendliness, we must say that we not only find ourselves unanimously in disagreement with your expressed views on the points at issue, but we sincerely believe that the publicizing of such views would lead to serious misunderstanding and would give you much to meet.

Now may we say in conclusion, that since you have

indicated a willingness to comply with our wishes in respect to the disposition of your book, we ask that as a first step you request the withdrawal of the book from the Library of Congress. You are justified in making this request on the ground that two chapters of the book in its present form, also the report of the Committee of Six, were previously published and copyrighted by the Trustees of The Christian Science Publishing Society, and that you neglected to secure from the Trustees proper legal authority for including these chapters and the Committee's report in your book. No doubt the Library of Congress would readily agree that the publication of the material in question, without proper permission, would invalidate your present copyright. Moreover, the fact that the chapter entitled "The Church Triumphant" differs substantially from the original article as published and copyrighted by the Publishing Society, might prove embarrassing and might further affect the legality of your copyright privileges. In addition to withdrawing the book from the library, we recommend that, with the exception of such copies as may be essential for the purpose of editing, you call in all copies, so that both the books and the plates may be destroyed by you. The book contains much interesting and useful information, and in the event of its being edited and revised acceptably to us, we will raise no further objections to your having the book published by someone other than The Christian Science Publishing Society, and advertised in The Christian Science Monitor.

Cordially and sincerely yours,

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

By

(Mrs.) Catherine G. Runner  
Corresponding Secretary

# COPY

(FROM OFFICE OF THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE BOARD OF DIRECTORS)

LIST OF PAGES AND PASSAGES REFERRED TO IN A LETTER DATED  
FEBRUARY 20, 1948 FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE BOARD OF  
DIRECTORS TO MR. BLISS KNAPP.

Foreword. We believe the information on these two pages, with the possible exception of the last paragraph on page vi, could be placed to better advantage in one of the historical chapters of the book.

Chapter II. In the earlier edition, a chapter similar to this was credited to your sister Daphne. While the chapter has been rewritten to some extent, might it not be well to make some reference to her contribution, perhaps in a footnote? Incidentally, we believe that the book might well give more space to your mother's work.

Page 41, line 9. The initial letter in "woman" is not capitalized in the first edition of this book, or in the Bible; and in her references to the woman in the Apocalypse, Mrs. Eddy nowhere uses the capital letter. We believe the capital letter should be avoided in this passage and wherever the term appears in your book in this sense.

Page 58, line 5 to page 60, line 5. This passage should be either deleted or revised in accordance with the attached letter.

Page 74, lines 6 to 9. This sentence should be omitted or rewritten.

Page 119, line 20, to page 120, line 3. Inasmuch as we have had evidence that the statement of Mrs. Eddy's technique, when previously referred to by you, was accepted by some as a formula, we recommend that this paragraph be deleted from the book.

Page 126, line 25 to page 128, line 4. This passage should be deleted so as to prevent embarrassment to the Directors in disciplinary action which they have been, or may be, obliged to take under the Manual. You may not know that Paul Revere has used this incident, cited from your first book, in recent publications.

Page 150, line 10 to page 151, line 2. The 1892 Church should not be referred to as a re-organization but as a newly organized church.

These are not necessarily all the passages in the book which need editing or revision to bring them into accord with what has been said in our letter to you, dated today, but we believe it will be helpful to you to have these passages listed.