

On the question of copyright

By Eva-Maria von den Steinen-Wauer, extract from "Information No. 19, Dec. 2003"
Translated by permission: Peter A.W. Rosenthal, July 2004

Let us now turn our attention to the question of copyright. We take up this subject as it requires present comment. The Kappeler Institute above all has the task of providing information in this regard so that no one in the field will have the excuse to say that he or she had been unaware of the issue. Naturally, the subject of *copyright* is far too comprehensive to be given a detailed explanation and treatment here. We therefore give above all a general overview here and the important *spiritual background* to provide the correct viewing angle on the subject.

Just as the *John W. Doorly Trust, London* owns the copyrights of John Doorly and Peggy Brook, and must protect them, it is the task of the *Kappeler Institute* to look after and protect Max Kappeler's rights as author with regard to all his published as well as still unpublished work, in its written and oral or audio-visual or even graphical format, in the widest possible sense. Specialists on international copyright, who pursue this important question also with regard to the Internet, assist us in this task with information, for the Internet too is subject to the law on copyright.

This task, which is new for us, slowly developed out of the logic of events over the past 15 years. I remember that Max Kappeler once expressed the thought in the late 1980s that he might just as well release his copyright into the public domain. Even John Doorly had said something in the same vein. But both dropped this thought again. Both had expressed this thought as a *possibility*, not as any definitive intent or project. Occasionally, there were students namely who, with the enthusiastic statement: "*The work of Max Kappeler/John Doorly belongs to the entire world*", and the argument: "*Mrs. Eddy did not have her textbook copyrighted anymore either in the end*", wanted to influence the course of events accordingly, specifically in order to be able to take over Kappeler's copyright and/or certain exclusive rights from him.

Now the two student statements mentioned above are quite correct. The works of John Doorly and Max Kappeler do indeed belong to the entire world in the sense that they should reach out to the entire world. But this is definitely not meant in the sense that everybody is free to do with their works as they see fit. It is also correct that Mrs. Eddy did no longer copyright her textbook after 1906. Unfortunately, however, the motivation behind the above quoted statements was false. Following presumptuous demands and questions about his copyright, that were raised against Max Kappeler, he asked the counterquestion: why is it that all other writing Christian Scientists (including those that cast doubt on, and/or even injure, the copyrights owned by John Doorly and Max Kappeler) attach the copyright symbol to their own writings.

Misinformation about the duration and type of copyright that, unfortunately, would appear to circulate widely, should not be accepted without correction. The works by John Doorly, for example, have not been released into the public domain after 50 years, as was claimed; rather, they are still protected as before. Anybody can look this up in the relevant legal texts and their corresponding commentaries. The copyright owned by an author will be valid during his entire lifetime and for a further 70 years after his death. Thus, in the case of John Doorly, full copyright protection extends to the year 2020, and, in the case of Max Kappeler, full copyright protection will last until the year 2072. Also, the opinion is circulated that John Doorly's works are not

subject to copyright protection due to the fact that they were originally given as verbatim reports. This is also quite incorrect. We must decisively counter this type of misinformation, irrespective of what gave rise to them.

It is also quite wrong to use Mrs. Eddy's decision to no longer copyright her *textbook* as an argument for breaking copyright law. Here, it is important to understand that Mrs. Eddy only released the textbook after she had given it its final form. Like the Bible, the textbook had become a perfect revelatory text which could no longer be altered and thus could also no longer be falsified, and which had become a text that could no longer be compared with any other book except the Bible.

Some even express the opinion that the *structure of the text contained in the textbook*, as we have been given it by Max Kappeler, could not be subject to his copyright as it was a structure in Being that he had not developed but simply discovered. Naturally, the structure of the textbook is founded in Being itself. John Doorly could glimpse its first rough outlines, Max Kappeler was able to research and work it out in detail and also show the implications of this textbook structure. Whether, due to the discovery of these structures, certain rights have accrued to the discoverers would need to be clarified by legal experts. However, this is not really so very important as anybody may work with these structures if he/she does it scientifically correctly, that is, if he/she quotes the author properly and does not merely copy his words, and/or uses the author's works excessively or illegally, without mention. What is certain is that the individual form, in which the text structures have been cast and expressed by the authors, is protected. Anyone may work with these structures but he/she must quote his source fully and exactly, and he may not alter anything arbitrarily! Indeed, copyright protection does not prevent an honest student in any way whatsoever from working independently and individually. Only those feel hindered and/or restricted who either are not informed about what they may or may not do, and/or who have not informed the copyright owners or asked the same whether they see in the work proposed a violation of their copyright, or whether they would give their permission for the use of the relevant source – and to ask for such permission would really be a not too difficult exercise.

When Max Kappeler had seen through this situation, namely that there appeared to have set in a scramble for the "succession", he very quickly dropped again any thought of releasing his copyright into the public domain. Naturally, there should not be any obstacles for honest students who wished to work with the Doorly/Kappeler works. However, Max Kappeler emphasized that copyright law did not constitute any such obstacle but rather that it protects students who are obedient to the law and able to work scientifically from becoming plagiarists (thieves in the mental/spiritual domain) for reasons of ambition, obstinacy, or egotism; indeed, that it might even drive them forward toward making their own individual contribution.

Unfortunately, there were so-called Christian Scientists everywhere in the field, even on the other side of the globe, who gave good reason to doubt their *loudly reiterated protestations of honesty and devotion to the idea*. Thus, for example, the entire contents of some tape-recorded talks was copied word for word in an inadmissible manner, duplicated and *passed on* to others. Working material for Max Kappeler's summer schools and tape-recorded courses, or graphic illustrations from his books, were photocopied, depicted in an abbreviated fashion, or even changed. Tape cassettes were not returned to the tape library or even copied and - unfortunately, in very poor quality - passed on or given as presents to third parties. In one particular case, the majority of the verbatim content and the structure of a summer school was published by someone as their own

book which - astonishing as it may seem - was then protected by the copyright of that "author". Just to remind ourselves: verbatim notes or other notes taken during a talk or copies *for one's own use* are not subject to this prohibition. However, according to our knowledge and understanding, the "own use" concept is defined very restrictively and narrowly. In any case, distribution to a closer or even wider circle of friends is *not* covered by the "own use" concept. But even in cases of admissible own use, it must be ensured that the material is *not generally circulated or distributed or even sold*, for this would add the legal offence of unfair competition. There is only one exception, namely when the material is used in schools, and here too there applies a legal duty to provide references for the source of the materials used, and this exceptional permission only applies to the number of copies usually used for teaching a particular form or class.

How much safer, easier, and above all more honest is it to ask the copyright owner for permission! Naturally, this also includes a readiness on the part of the enquirer not to feel offended in the event of a refusal to grant permission but to respect the rights of the copyright owner.

A modern catchphrase advertises the free availability of all information (primarily on the Internet). This necessitates the following comment: it is very interesting to note that those who give little respect, or even question, Doorly's and Kappeler's copyright would appear to emphasize very much their own copyright. For example, what is one to think of someone who campaigns vigorously for the Internet movement "Open Source", even designates this movement as a "change in consciousness" – whatever may be meant by this - and compares the same "spiritually" with the Bible but obviously does not see a contradiction in attaching the copyright mark extremely clearly to their own writings and other products?

Max Kappeler also had to experience that not a few subjects as well as phrases he coined and new terms or ideas from his books and talks were simply adopted and integrated into other authors' own publications, without any scientifically correct reference to the source or originator being given, and then placed under those authors' own copyright as if it were a matter of course. Even entire books were translated without permission, although anybody should know that a permission for the translation and/or any editing work must be obtained from the owner of the copyright before work is actually started, and that proof of such permission having been granted must be available for presentation on demand. Thus, whoever does not have any such permission acts contrary to the law, even if he did not know from whom he would have had to obtain such permission. Ignorance is no excuse. Of course, anybody can produce translations, or adaptations, tape transcripts, or copies as much as he likes, *as long as he produces these for himself, and himself only*. But, as was said before, *he must not distribute or circulate them in any way whatsoever!* Not even among his closest friends. No work, and not even just a part of any work, may be reproduced, or processed, edited, duplicated, or circulated electronically, either in full or in part in any form or by any means (photography, microfilm, or any other process) without approval in writing by the owner of the copyright – above all not in secret!

All those concerned really should be aware and know that any actions ignoring the law as it stands represent a flagrant breach of the said law and injure the legal rights of the copyright owners, for whoever expresses himself verbally or in writing – and, in particular, *if this is done in public or for publication* - should be aware of the relevant laws. Otherwise, he should not be surprised if he finds himself accused of having insufficient scientific qualifications or being a

plagiarist. Whoever makes public statements, either verbally or in writing, is free to make mistakes – naturally – but under no circumstances whatsoever must he copy, duplicate, adapt, translate, comment, print, publish, distribute, circulate, copy onto electronic media the works of someone else, or even claim parts of such works for his own, without due and proper permission having been granted. Even those who obtain, purchase, distribute, or use such shoddy efforts become morally guilty of complicity in such infringement of the law. They will wait in vain for the hoped-for “enlightenment” or growth in understanding and knowledge from such “sources”. Divine wisdom, that which is immutably right, does not come to us from right-infringing sources.

In copyright law, it is of the utmost importance *to know how to quote correctly*; and even in all other respects this ability to quote correctly is a first proof and evidence that an author is capable of proper and correct scientific work. Anyone, who claims to work scientifically, and moreover engage in Christian writings, must also know how to quote correctly. Any incorrect or insufficient or even sense-falsifying quoting will disqualify the author. If this happens once or twice, we may choose not to take too much notice; we all are human beings, and human beings make mistakes. But if this insufficient capability to handle quotations correctly becomes noticeable more often, one should stop and put away the relevant publication; for it is to be expected that, in other respects also, the author did not extend the necessary due care and attention to his subject matter either. This aspect of a proper scientific working method cannot be explained in more detail here since this would clearly go beyond the scope of this article. Only that much should be noted: it is no proof of a scientific working method if quotations from other authors are strung together over many pages, and neither is such proof afforded if footnotes or “commentaries” are distributed across a text without any recognizable system and rather arbitrarily.

Max Kappeler always felt saddened when he learned of the infringement of scientific rules or any injuries of copyright law on the part of his students, but he never wanted to engage in disputes or even legal action in respect of any such infringements or injuries; therefore, if it was at all possible, he preferred to remain silent. But for the Kappeler Institute as the trustee for his works, the situation today is different; we must state very clearly what the position is, as otherwise our silence would be taken as tacit agreement, with the risk that the Doorly-Kappeler works could be presented to the general public as something of a hodgepodge and massive mix of proper and improper publications. This has nothing whatsoever to do with the reprehensible method of the Christian Science church organization which uses the label of “unauthorized” literature as a weapon to stigmatize any authors it finds unacceptable. Rather, it is the scientifically legitimate protection which helps to distinguish the authenticity of a work from cases of plagiarism and imitations.

In most cases, Max Kappeler chose not to become involved in anything that was done by others but he always distanced himself immediately and clearly whenever his own name or John Doorly's name were misused. He emphasized however that he needed to leave his students free to take their own decisions. He very often recalled Mrs. Eddy's attitude who had declared that it would be of no value if students only do something, or choose not to do something, just because she (Mrs. Eddy) had said that they should do it (or not do it, as the case might be), even if this happened out of obedience or even love. This only leads to students not learning their lesson and at the next opportunity they fall victim to the same error because they act neither out of an understanding of the divine PRINCIPLE nor out of obedience to the same. In almost all cases, Max Kappeler adopted the same attitude as Mrs. Eddy; for example, in relation to students who copied

his tapes although he had forbidden it as the recordings are also protected by copyright law; or in relation to those students who did not even think of returning any loaned materials (notes, transcripts, books etc) which he had generously loaned to them from his archive; he did not defend himself against this kind of silent "forgetfulness" or the brazen assertion that the material had been given as a gift. When I asked him repeatedly about missing materials from his archive, he affirmed every time that he had never given anything away as a present to anyone but had only loaned such materials to students hoping for the honesty of those students to return his property to him. He always emphasized that students needed to act under their own responsibility and also needed the experiences accruing to them from any dishonest acts.

Although Max Kappeler almost always remained silent with regard to the wrong done to him by some persons, he used every possible opportunity for an impersonal, and yet public, correction - just as Mrs. Eddy used to do. He waited until a subject in Science would itself indicate the necessary correction, and he always emphasized that it would then be the Christ that would correct the error, and that this also entitled and enabled us to carry out such a correction ourselves. Thus, humanly, he very often remained silent for a long time but from within the certainty of a scientific subject he finally took up position to correct the error.

This seems a timely opportunity *to issue a plea and an appeal to all those concerned*, namely, to think again and return to our archive any property of Max Kappeler's that they might possibly still have in their possession. This can also be done by mail and anonymously.

Copyright law governs the right to intellectual (mental) property. Let us now turn specifically to the spiritually scientific background of copyright law. The commandment "Do not steal" is inherent in this law. Naturally, we must be clearly aware that mortal mind tends toward perversion by questioning the property rights to mental values and turning the commandment on its head, giving it an opposite meaning; mortal mind develops and defends the notion that the real owner should not claim his rights but share everything with everybody - as demanded by materialistic communism. Where such a notion leads, we have seen and lived through. The endeavour to level everything down, which is what really stands behind any such notion, is an attack on the right to one's own identity and the correlated duty to identify. The dangers involved in this are more far-reaching than one would at first suppose. If the duty to identify is disregarded, then, in the shadow of anonymity, there will begin to flourish rumours, false witness against one's neighbour, lies, slanders and all the other etc by means of which mortal mind falsifies the honest word and finally even the absolute WORD of TRUTH, which as we all know has ever been the cause for wars, destruction, and immeasurable suffering.

The intent of mortal mind to cause the commandment to be disobeyed is frequently an unconscious one. The roots are envy, greed, jealousy, competitive thinking, an urge for recognition, resentment etc.. Naturally, there are also the "ignorant attempts to do good", and thus one finds oneself confronted with justifications as to why any infringements of copyright law are not really considered to be theft. People like to declare, and with full conviction at that, that they only would like to assist in spreading the idea, and they may even believe that the end possibly justifies the means. But in Christian Science this is not so. To remain honest in the case of material goods and not to steal them is surely much easier than to respect the intellectual/mental property of another person. Proof of theft in intangible property law (as it is also called) is very much more difficult, the temptation therefore correspondingly greater, and the discovery of the

causes requires just that degree of honesty which a thief mentality has not got. The argument, which is basically correct: "But ideas (truths, thoughts) are free and belong to anyone!" is turned on its head and twisted in its meaning. The thief, because he is a thief, does not find them in his own consciousness but takes them from those who – in his eyes - are "in possession" of them. He does not know the true source of the spiritual, and inspiration, he does not know the infinitude of the divine MIND which also flows for him.

The commandments handed down by Moses in the Old Testament provide the basic foundations of our legal system and ethical sensitivities to this very day, even though this is subject to serious discussion nowadays. *Jesus* already gave us ***a new commandment*** and summarized all earlier commandments in this new commandment: "that ye love one another; as I have loved you" (St. John 13:34). As a precondition, this implies, however, that one keeps the ***highest commandment***: "thou shalt love the Lord thy GOD (what is good, what is right) with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind", for only by this will it be possible to love one's neighbour (see Matthew 22). In this way, obedience to the Mosaic commandments has been lifted onto a higher level and at the same time become easier. Whoever keeps the highest commandment will find it easy to keep the new commandment and not to break any of the other commandments. However, those that do not keep the highest commandment will also break all other commandments at the same time. *Jesus* shows that all commandments are interrelated and that to break *one* commandment means that all the others are also broken at the same time. Just as *Jesus* summarized all commandments, the infringements of the same can also be summarized, namely in the violation of the very first and highest commandment by Moses (2 Moses 20:3): "Thou shalt have no other gods before me [SPIRIT]" (467), which Mrs. Eddy calls her most favourite commandment (340). The claim that one has to serve other gods in order to get what one desires is the root of all evil, including plagiarism. Let us consider Mrs. Eddy's attitude in this regard.

Mrs. Eddy's attitude toward copyright law was absolutely clear: she was very strict and unrelenting with regard to copyright infringements. She emphasized very much that Christian Scientists should obey the ten commandments and follow the teachings and example of Christ *Jesus*. (See My. 128/129). In June 1899, she gave a very special Communion Address in which she turns to this subject. She says in this address that Christian Scientists should keep the laws of God as well as the laws of the land [for example, the law on copyright!]. And, furthermore, it is of great importance to her to impress upon her students that they must quote correctly and respect copyright law (My. 130). She stresses that this is a matter of course for any loyal Christian Scientists who keep the commandments.

Her article "***Advice to students***" (Misc. 298) is also very impressive in this regard; this article should absolutely be studied in its entirety as it describes very clearly the understanding she arrived at in respect of the problem of copyright violations which she was having to deal with all her life. She always insisted that the commandments and the golden rule must be kept, and she describes error as something that always strives

"to unite, in a definition of purpose, with TRUTH, to give it buoyancy. What is under the mask, but error in borrowed plumes?" (See Misc. 371)

Naturally, there are also oversubtle arguments by means of which the violation of copyright is intended to be excused. This includes quoting words by Mrs. Eddy that are also found in her

books and that appear to be saying something to the contrary. Thus, the statement at the end of her book "*No and Yes*" is a favourite quotation in this regard:

“Let the WORD [the WORD of GOD, not the word of the plagiarist!] have free course and be glorified. The people clamour to leave cradle and swaddling clothes. TRUTH cannot be stereotyped; it unfoldeth forever.” (No 45)

Indeed, John Doorly as well as Max Kappeler have both used this quotation very frequently; they used it to establish and substantiate their own freedom to think scientifically, to research and to publish the results of such research in spite of being forbidden to do so by the Christian Science church organization. But they never misused this quotation to defend any plagiarism. Some other Christian Scientists, on the other hand, like to misinterpret the relevant quotation in order to provide a reason for the so-called freedom in error. Unfortunately, it is overlooked here that in text interpretation one always has to take into account the overall context in which a statement is made. Thus, two pages earlier, we read (No 43) that Mrs. Eddy accuses “such students” who

“think to build a baseless fabric of their own on another’s foundation...who come... to learn a system which they go away to disgrace.”

Mrs. Eddy’s answer is:

“Stealing or garbling my statements of MIND-science will never ... help humanity”.

Some also like to overlook the fact that Mrs. Eddy denounces right at the start of “No and Yes” dishonesty, conceit, deceit, and envy, the “error that disregards all rights”. There, we read that we must not spread “a patchwork of ideas that in some vital points lack SCIENCE.” And a few lines further on Mrs. Eddy complains about the literary theft (plagiarism) of her works and emphasizes:

“...and such compilations, instead of possessing the essentials of Christian Science, are tempting and misleading.” (No 2/3)

Even Mrs. Eddy’s autobiography “*Retrospection and Introspection*” shows how much she was occupied with the subject of copyright. This book contains an entire chapter on the subject, entitled “Literary theft” (“**Plagiarism**”, p. 75-77). This text must also be considered in its entirety and as a whole in order to be able to recognize how it is misinterpreted in order to give a reason for breaking copyright law. For this purpose, the following is always quoted from this text:

“If one’s spiritual ideal is comprehended and loved, the borrower from it is embraced in the author’s own mental mortal, and is therefore *honest*.”

The convenient but false conclusion is: I love Christian Science, therefore I am honest, and therefore I can use the thoughts of another - even if I do not name him or her at all, or if I name him or her just half-heartedly, or even if I alter and falsify their thoughts. This attitude is so widespread that no law can prevent it. It is called “theft of ideas”. Everywhere, but especially in the advertising sector the activity of “idea hunting” is known; “idea hunters” only ever aim to search for new ideas or concepts or expressions and turns of phrase in order to utilize these for themselves. Today, in almost all cases, the generally used method of provocation is employed for such hunting purposes. Is this honest? No, for it shows clearly that the thief of ideas does not rely on the one divine source of MIND that is GOD in order to be creative in the human also. The theft of ideas that belong to another person is just as wrong as any other conscious or unconscious infringement of the law. What is behind this, is the error of imitation, that stands against the

creative newness of LIFE and GOD-given individuality. Naturally, it is often impossible to realize where an idea or notion has come from, as in our time with its ever increasing flood of information it is surely not possible to trace every idea or notion to its origin. However, that is not necessary. Everyone knows in his heart of hearts what he has received from his prayerful union with the divine Mind, what are simple stimuli coming to him from external sources, or what he has "borrowed" from others. And even if this should happen not to be quite so clear-cut: honesty can always be proven, not least from the entire way of life of a person. A scientific attitude and truthfulness are the two sides of a coin.

The quotation from "Retrospection and Introspection", which we are concerned with here, means - if interpreted correctly and in context - that someone who participates in the mood of Christian Science is *honest* - note the emphasis here - and therefore does *not* do what is described in the preceding text, namely to "persistently misunderstand or misrepresent the author". Mrs. Eddy begins this chapter with the words:

"The various forms of book-borrowing without credit spring from this ill-concealed question in mortal mind, Who shall be greatest? This error violates the law given by Moses, it tramples upon Jesus' Sermon on the Mount, it does violence to the ethics of Christian Science. Why withhold my name, while appropriating my language and ideas, but give credit when citing from the works of other authors?"

If one reads the entire chapter, which comprises just two pages, the predominant tone is the subject of *honesty*. Who understands, cannot be dishonest. In other words: whoever is dishonest cannot have understood Christian Science. The false conclusion therefore is: if someone writes about Christian Science, he must be honest; for, if he were dishonest, he could not write about Christian Science. The nonsense of such a conclusion is immediately apparent. The correct conclusion therefore is: if someone who is dishonest writes about Christian Science, whatever he writes cannot be Christian Science. The only protection against the sin of theft is spiritual honesty. Everything written by dishonest authors about Christian Science is quite simply *not Christian Science!*

Further on, we find another quotation in the text, that is often quoted for the purpose of justifying a violation of copyright law:

"Christian Science is not copyrighted; nor would protection by copyright be requisite, if mortals obeyed GOD's law of *manright*. A student can write voluminous works on SCIENCE without trespassing, if he writes honestly, and he cannot dishonestly compose Christian Science. The Bible is not stolen, though it is cited, and quoted deferentially."

Naturally, the idea of Christian Science is not copyrighted. How could one ever copyright an idea, a content of consciousness? Only Science alone can do this. What is copyrighted, however, is what is stated in writing and verbally, namely *texts, graphical illustrations, figures and images, (illustrations of) structures, talks*, that is, everything giving concrete form to ideas. This quotation is also misinterpreted as soon as one thinks: a student who has written, or writes, (more or less) voluminous works on Christian Science must be honest, otherwise he would not be able to write. Here, too, we have a perfidious twisting of the real meaning, and here, too, there applies what was said above, namely that it is only the context which provides information on how to interpret

a statement correctly. Mrs. Eddy, therefore, closes the chapter on a very serious note, and with the following words:

“I have long remained silent on a growing evil in plagiarism; but if I do not insist upon the strictest observance of moral law and order in Christian Scientists, I become responsible, as a teacher, for laxity in discipline and lawlessness in literature.”

Conclusion: whoever designates himself or herself as a Christian Scientist, should know the works of the founder in relation to such and other questions, and also the laws of his country, and behave accordingly.

After all the above, some students might now ask themselves: *how can we work independently for the idea [of the Science of Christian Science] and, in so doing, act in keeping with the law, if there are so many possibilities for violating the law?* Should we work at all? Do we have any chance at all to make a good contribution, or should we rather stop talking/writing about Christian Science? Naturally, this is an entirely wrong question. Whoever works on the basis of the SPIRIT of GOD knows what he needs to do in order to serve the idea, he allows himself to be used by the idea instead of wanting to make use of the same for his egotistical purposes, and, therefore, he cannot go wrong. And even if he makes mistakes, then he is not high-handed about it, but rather he will be willing to recognize these mistakes as such and to allow them to be corrected. Everyone is not only free to do what is right but he may also make mistakes. Max Kappeler liked to say: Christian Science as a self-controlling system is "error-friendly"; he did not mean by this that we would now be allowed to engage widely and without any conscience in committing errors/making mistakes, or that Christian Science would encourage errors, but he explained that the error-friendliness consisted in the fact that any error or mistake, be it ever so major, seemingly final and not to be repaired ever again, would find its Master in Christian Science. With a scientific attitude, mistakes or errors become exercise areas for Christian Science practice, as SCIENCE is that factor in Being by means of which *any* error will sooner or later be corrected by enlightenment and understanding or by bitter experience. We can – and that is a real miracle for human thought – even correct the errors of the past, for Christian Science teaches that mistakes, error, sin (all this is the same, namely ignorance) are “forgiven”, that is, removed, at precisely that moment that they are given up. “Given up” means: being recognized as error, repented as wrong, with the error being corrected, and as being not of the divine and therefore non-existent.

Perhaps some will now ask: *Are we not allowed to follow the spiritual law instead of human laws?* Are we not allowed to follow the spiritual law which tells us that where the SPIRIT of the Lord bloweth, there is freedom, so that we can do without scruples whatever "the Lord in us" tells *us* to do individually? With regard to this question, it is forgotten that there are different levels of Being on which different laws apply. Max Kappeler explained to us in detail that we will not find the spiritual law and the human law on the same level. Thus, we cannot simply mix the spiritual law with the human law, or set one against the other. Rather, we must understand that there is a vertical dependency (or interdependence) between the levels or dimensions of scientific consciousness. Without a doubt, spiritual law has the predominance here but it translates itself onto the human level by causing laws to arise on that level which bring about order. The human legal

system, better said: the legal systems, are certainly not perfect. But especially the Western Christian legal system, within which we live and which we know, gives rise to many questions and doubts, and, in certain areas, urgently requires modification or adaptation to new circumstances. But it is still better than no legal system at all! The more we know the spiritual laws the easier we will find it to obey current laws on the human level without being hindered in some good and rightful work and without causing injury or damage to others. However, if the voice "in us" tells us to do something that serves our interest and suits us but is neither in agreement with the spiritual laws nor with the moral laws of our sphere of life and modern contemporary ethical standards, then it is assuredly not "the Lord" who speaks to us. Here, we find one of the many major differences between the teachings of Christianity and, for example, hedonism as developed from Greek philosophy. The egotistical striving for one's own well-being, for wealth and beauty cannot be reconciled with the teachings of Christ. Jesus did not shy away from the poor and the ugly, the old and the sick. It is a falsification of Christian Science if, on the basis of outward beauty, physical health, youthful appearance, material wealth and success, we conclude that someone has understood Christian Science. If we are tempted to do something out of our own volition, desire, and ability, which is above all to serve our own well-being, then it is indeed very questionable whether such action is within the intention of the divine idea. The solution is: let us allow the Holy Spirit to do it, not our own ego. The unmistakable standard, which we can always apply to our decisions and our actions, is always the Golden Rule from the Bible, according to which we should do to others as we would be done by them. This is the only true ethics.

Copyright law in its legal aspects is a highly differentiated law with very many subordinate departments, and it demands extensive specialist knowledge. Nevertheless, it is still possible to get into the basics of this law, even as a layman, for there are a number of universal guide publications available for the general public. It is the duty of a teacher and/or author to be informed about the basic rules of this law; if not, he/she should refrain from teaching or writing. Once again: whoever makes public statements must know the appropriate rules and expect to be assessed critically. More than any other subject, Christian Science demands a high ethical standard - from teachers as well as from students. Keeping the commandments should be a matter of course; however, this is frequently more difficult for the human-mortal mind than to go on about theories on ethics and morals. A good study of the textbook and the other writings by Mrs. Eddy would remedy this - indeed, even the knowledge of and adherence to the short Sermon on the Mount would be quite sufficient.

It is clear that the false endeavours of some students still reveal a certain love of Christian Science, an ambitious, jealous, egotistical, and self-related love though, that does not know the *unselfed love* which the textbook already demands on the first page. But it is still love. And we know that love finally always finds the correct path, even if it takes a long time. However, it is such a pity, such a very great pity that so many energies are wasted due to false motives and methods, that cause a not inconsiderable damage and, otherwise, could really serve the idea.

Finally: an offer that we should like to make in order to help all those who are considering to publish something under their own honest responsibility. If special questions on copyright - as it relates to us - arise then we would be gladly available to provide appropriate advice. It is always better to ask *first* than to be forced later to admit to avoidable errors, and perhaps to risk a public

correction or even more. It is also much easier to work with a sense of having done right and to obtain in advance – if one intends to write - the necessary approvals from the owner of the rights.

In the same vein, it is not only recommended but absolutely indispensable to acquire the necessary tools of the trade before one sets out to write, that is, e.g. to learn how to quote correctly, how to use foreign terms and expressions, how to create a table of contents, or how to include footnotes and marginal titles etc. Commentaries should only be attempted by those who have certain and by their own diligent study self-acquired (!) profound specialist subject knowledge. Technical know-how cannot make up for a lack of specialist subject knowledge. Creating indices has become fashionable with the rise of word-processing systems because it is so very easy. But some authors use such indices to throw sand into the eyes of their readers. The expert consideration here is whether a book with a good table of contents and a well-structured text really needs any index at all. A good table of contents is far more informative in terms of the subject matter of the book, because an index only gives single terms and names, that is, it is only helpful in the case of a very voluminous book; and this, moreover, must contain many different names and subject terms from different areas of knowledge.

Working truly scientifically with sound research needs to be learnt as any other skill. To get anyone going, a sufficiently wide range of guide books is available that introduce readers to the more technical aspects of writing. It is worth taking the trouble to study such a guide book as this protects the writer against later embarrassment as a result of his publication and ruining his reputation - usually permanently. Naturally, everyone can decide for themselves in this regard. What however cannot be tolerated is the public damage done to Christian Science.

We should take to our hearts Mrs. Eddy's statement that Christian Science is not less scientific than other sciences. (Cf. 123, marginal title: "Scientific basis") In the SCIENCE of Being, a certain measure of scientific know-how is required as in any other science; a nice creative writing ability on the basis of an eloquent need to communicate or the happy elation felt in respect of one's own insights and one's own importance are *not* sufficient.