

Some years ago there was in Toronto a young man in a far advanced stage of pulmonary tuberculosis. There had been several severe hæmorrhages, and the young man was bed-ridden for some time. As the spring came, he improved a little, and was able to take short walks on the streets.

At this stage of his case he sought the treatment of a well-known Christian Scientist, who gave him the most positive assurance that the case could be cured. The young man was inflated with false hope, and under this stimulus he told his friends he was rapidly gaining in strength, and would soon be well. He made himself take long walks. A few weeks later he died of his disease.

It can be seen at once how a powerful mental impression may cause one to appear much better than they are. In the moment of discouragement the person feels worse than they really are. Some wonder-working "cure" is sought, and at once the person feels much better than the true conditions justify. Here is the foundation for the claims that a "cure" had been effected.

The other case of "cure" that we wish to refer to is the claim a Christian Scientist had successfully treated a dog. As the dog could not take part in the treatment, the "cure" must have been due to the influence of the scientist. This would come within the definition of a miracle, as no other than mental or spiritual forces were made use of.

But there is a far more rational way of viewing the improvement in the case of the dog. Dogs, like man, do not die every time they are sick. Many illnesses are quite temporary. When the "treatment" was begun the dog was getting well; but the case was claimed as a victory for Christian Science.

All this is just as grossly ignorant as that of the "Indian cure" by looking at a white goat or lamb skin nailed to a tree; or a piece of red flannel for smallpox; or the laying on of the King's hand; or the "healing" power of the seventh son of the seventh son. It is on all fours with the "demonology" and "witchcraft" "cures" or "curses" of bygone days.

Here let us cite a very interesting case. A young woman consulted a member of the staff of one of the eye departments of a hospital in London, Eng. He made a careful record of her range of vision. She then claimed she was almost blind. She fell under the influence of some mind healer. She came back to the same hospital with the statement that she was now almost cured. She was again carefully examined by another member of staff, who found the range of vision as on the former test. Here is, then, the case of one who was self-deceived, and thought she was improved when she was not.