

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE - IT IS NOT CHRISTIAN AND IT IS NOT SCIENCE!!

Christian Science is a Church headquartered in Boston is famous or infamous for not calling in the doctor. In the United Kingdom, it is the only religious group given the legal right to object to vaccinations even for children on religious grounds, under a 2015 plan to restrict conscientious objections to immunisation.

The Church insists that there is no evil for a good God would not allow it to exist and that it is an illusion.

The doctrine that evil is an illusion means that in reality what is perceived as evil is in harmony with God. God or some aspect of him is mistaken for evil. It leads to the worship of evil. If evil does exist then it is being enabled and adored and helped by those who blind themselves to its presence.

Hypothetically, we have something to discuss. If evil did contradict God and we should wish there was a God even if there were none then that wish comes first for God is a very big thing. Thus we should wish that evil was an illusion even though one consequence would be we end up having no sympathy for those who suffer. We refuse to see that their evil is real and not an illusion. That shows how inherently extremist the doctrine of God is regardless of whether evil is an illusion or not.

The Church uses the teaching that evil is not there at all but only seems to be as a means of effecting healing for they claim that suffering is never God's will to any degree at all. God has no use for it at all while traditional Christianity says he has some use when he lets it happen. The Christian Science reply is that he doesn't for it does not exist. We only imagine it does. Christian Science is to be admired for denying that evil has a use in the divine plan. The traditional doctrine has led to much welcoming of suffering and is extremely offensive.

If evil is an illusion then why do we all have the same illusion? Surely it makes sense to assume that evil is not a mere illusion when so many experience it?

Another problem is how an all-good creator of all things would allow us to be afflicted by the useless illusion of evil. Christians say that evil is not an illusion and is real and God puts up with it because he wants us to be able to choose between loving and doing evil. But if evil is not a mere illusion it is still mostly an illusion. Evil is mistaking the way to do good. It is doing good the wrong way. Jack the Ripper may have thought he was doing good by killing the prostitutes as they would spread disease. The Christians argue that saying evil is a mere illusion that is useless to God is to say God cannot exist. An all-good God has no use for it and it contradicts his love to say he would let it be. Evil then would disprove his goodness or his almighty power. They reason that evil can only exist if God needs to put up with it. God would not be a real God without goodness and without being all-powerful. But if they are right then their own doctrine that evil is largely an illusion is not much of a help either!

Christians say that if evil is an illusion then it is evil to endure the illusion and the existence of the evil illusion would refute the existence of God for it is evil. It is odd that they can say this and then allege that their own understanding of evil agrees with belief in an all-good God. The point is that evil exists not whether or not it is an illusion. Illusion or not it is still real evil. You cannot say evil is useless for a good purpose if it is an illusion but useful if it is real. It is hypocritical for both Christian Scientists and Christians say that evil in itself is worthless and then that God lets it happen. The Christian argument that God brings good out of evil so that he tolerates evil because it brings good denies that evil is really evil. Its cold and insensitive. The Christian argument that God brings good around in spite of evil implies that evil always gets in the way and is no good. That would mean it contradicts God after all.

They may say that if evil is an illusion then God is allowing us to be fooled and so cannot be good. But if evil is real he is still allowing us to be fooled for evil looks good and its apparent good side is what the attraction is. The trouble is that it is not as good as it pretends.

Anyway for Christian Science the answer to the problem of evil is that there is no evil but that it is an illusion. So evil then is not really a problem! The Christian Science solution fails for evil would still exist for it would be a bad illusion. The founder, Mary Baker Eddy wrote a book that she considered the word of God to teach this called Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures. Christian Science denies that she was writing another Bible or a piece of the Bible but some of her writings say otherwise. She wrote in her Christian Science Journal in January 1901 that she would be ashamed to write about Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures if the book had a human origin. She said that God was also its author and that was why she couldn't be too modest of the book. In Science and Health she stated that the gospel as she understood it came not from men but from a revelation from Jesus Christ (page 107).

She revised and changed the book many times which shows that she was not divinely inspired when she wrote the book. The first manuscript was replete with errors according to the man who edited it. The man was a retired Unitarian Minister, James Henry Wiggins. He found that the spelling and the wording and structure was shocking. The book was full of wrong references and contradictions. He confirmed that he had to rewrite the entire thing (page 176, *The Four Major Cults*). God would write better than that especially when God is the opposite of error as she often stated.

Science and Health claims to be the inspired Word of God given to explain the Bible. But the Bible never says that evil does not exist. If it does not exist then there would be no need for a Bible.

Eddy's system forbade the use of medicines and calling in the doctor and people were to treat their maladies themselves by telling themselves that they did not exist. There has been much suffering and death over this.

She said that the Bible was enough to guide one to everlasting life (Science and Health, 126:28-31). Then she inconsistently stated that we should listen to her version of the Bible though the Bible has been altered (139:15-22).

She denied the existence of matter and said there is nothing but Spirit. Her glossary contains eccentric interpretations of various Bible words. Fear is heat and desire. The son of Jacob, Gad, is her doctrine that all is spirit. Evening is tiredness or rest. See page 586 of her book. She said that Jesus came and died to destroy belief in sin. Christian tradition always insisted that Jesus came as a ransom for sinners and to atone for it in death which is an admission that it is real. Also, Jesus is her teacher and the voice behind Science and Health so why did he pull his death on himself which even she forbids saying that we must shun unreality? Jesus would not pull an unreal death on himself. And she says the Bible is her guide. Now, if God wrote the tedious and mammoth Bible to tell us the simple message that there is one spiritual mind and there is no matter or evil or sin or suffering then he was mental. This alone shows she is trying to impose her views on the Bible.

It is not surprising that she has to pretend that Bible words have bizarre hidden meanings to explain how a book that gives a lot of genealogies and unnecessary and repetitive historical details and has people praying to be delivered from suffering instead of convincing themselves that it is not real could be teacher and the word of God to a woman that is so anti-matter and anti-mundane. She says the world is unreal yet the Bible says that God made the world. She would say God did not make the world for the world is an illusion that originates in what is not God. The Bible doesn't even go a bit nearer her view and say that God made an illusionary world. She said that Jesus died an unreal death on a cross and never rose from the dead for there was no death to return from. Why couldn't she or her followers do the same when death is just an illusion?

She said that even an atheist could be healed by Christian Science (page 139) and yet she said that suffering was caused by inability to see that there is no evil but only God and God is good. On the same page she said that Moses proved the power of mind over matter when he did miracles. Moses' miracles were all harmful and she has forgotten that. Her system should say that Moses increased the errors of sin and suffering by his miracles. Her book cannot be taken seriously as a revelation from God in any sense.

As pointed out in *Some Modern Faiths*, Christian Science is refuted when somebody takes something that nobody has heard of and it is poison and gets sick.

Eddy argued on page 177 of her book that if you take some poison and nobody knows it and you don't know it will still harm because most people believe that the drug is poison. But what if it is a poison that was never known? All poisons started off as unknown. And most people disbelieve in the miracles of her system and hold that evil and matter are real so if she is right they should not work. This lady advocates reason or the principle of non-contradiction in chapter 11 of her book entitled, *Some Contradictions Answered*. It is important that her followers keep that chapter in their heads and think for themselves.

A lot of the letters in her *Science and Health* from people allegedly healed by her system seem to have the same writing style and the writers are not actually named. Why would the person from Wisconsin, the author of the letter on page 682 remain anonymous when he or she became a Christian Scientist and was very vague on what was wrong with him or her? A lot of them could have gotten better anyway and this is what Eddy says is evidence for Christian Science! Where are the amputated limbs that grew back?

The Healing Revelations of Mary Baker Eddy by Martin Gardner shows that Eddy was not that nice of a person even after her revelations. If her system were true one would expect it to heal the evil in her soul. This book is a must. Her untruths and plagiarism of a similar system called Quimbyism are well known. The doctor she claimed diagnosed her as dying leaving her to cure herself by using Christian Science denied it under oath. The doctor was Dr Cushing and we read on page 174 of *The Four Major Cults* that he did not say that God had cured her miraculously or that she was unexpectedly cured for there was nothing seriously wrong with her. Yet she had claimed that this healing was what led her to discover Christian Science. She charged \$300 for twelve lessons in Lynn, Massachusetts in 1870 (page 175, *The Four Major Cults*). This does

not sound like a sincere restorer of the gospel of Christ.

She did away with communion in 1908 and replaced it with spiritual communion (page 214). So there have been serious changes in the doctrine of the cult. Christian Science says that there is no such thing as being ill unless you have decided to be. The sick person is blamed for their illness. If they trip and break an arm that is their fault. It is said that believing evil is real causes it. That implies a condemnation for holy communion as practiced in the Christian Churches for it is based around Jesus really suffering and shedding his blood. So communion will spiritually harm you and make you ill, Any spiritual or physical illness you have you have it because you asked for it.

A credible religion it aint!