



TENACRE: A Chronicle of Prayer and Listening

An Account of Its Demonstration
Between
1912 and 1968

2016-2021 Edition

Table of Contents

Preface		i
Chapter 1	“...that others may be blest”	1
Chapter 2	“...as we go along”	13
Chapter 3	“...during the war”	29
Chapter 4	“...the result of two prayers coming together”	43
Chapter 5	Conflict and Resolution	53
Chapter 6	“...unity, liberty, charity”	65
Epilogue		I

Preface

This little book is a tribute to, a grateful cherishing of, the people, events, and issues that comprise the ongoing unfoldment of a spiritual idea. It is not intended to be a manual for how a Christian Science nursing home should be started and run. It is not a how-to book. It could not be. Rather, it is merely a description written essentially in the words of the eyewitnesses of the peculiar-to-the-times unfoldment of just those issues and events that have gone into the story that we know as Tenacre.

This book is a book of ideas. It is a record of how a number of Christian Scientists working together over the years managed to look beyond themselves, beyond limitations of sometimes staggering proportions, to their God. Answers to questions of supply, staffing, government relations, government programs, Christian Science nurses education, and official oversight, are explored but only in part. Each of these topics deserves even closer attention than is afforded them by this treatise.

There is much left out in this account. There are dimensions to this story that are discovered only by examining the lives of every individual who has made some sort of contribution to the lively unfoldment of this spiritual idea. But this is excusable, for just as healing very often goes unreported because words fail to fully portray what is essentially a holy and unutterable experience, so too, the sort of selflessness expressed in lives dedicated to loving Christian Science is best left alone, save for deepest gratitude for the silent prayer and bedside practice that has strengthened countless individuals' relationship to God.

Interestingly, this book is not the first attempt to sift through the written record and present this story. Shortly after the close, in 1980, of Tenacre's Development Center (the entity designed to produce the video and audio tapes on Christian Science nursing training and techniques between 1973 and 1980), Tenacre's archives were first organized. From that group of memos, talks, letters, brochures, and photographs arose the first attempt at presenting this story. That effort was put aside. It was revitalized in the late 1980s. Board member Don Honicky conducted a lengthy series of tape-recorded interviews with Burwell Harrison. A transcript was made of their time together and became an integral part of the archival holdings.

Paul Wesman, one of the early members of the production team of the Development Center and who later served as a member of the Board of Trustees, was hired to write the definitive story. His effort was hamstrung on two counts. First, Burwell had kept aside several key documents that

together described in detail how the period of reorganization actually began. These documents did not surface until after Mr. and Mrs. Harrison moved to Palm Desert, California in the early 1990s. Second, Burwell instructed Paul to use his (Burwell's) name as little as possible in an attempt to depersonalize the effort. Paul's writing, titled, "Lessons from a Laboratory," became the account to which any number of Tenacre's friends and family have been referred since its completion in 1992. But it never passed final muster, due to the fact, that even though it avoided reference to Burwell as often as was possible, his name was prominent enough that it never quite met with his or the Board's approval.

This current effort did not have to labor under such limitations. To do so would have been as though one had been asked to write the story of the Exodus from Egypt but had been told to write it without any reference to Moses. Burwell Harrison would be the first to admit that he was certainly no Moses, but the gap made by not using his name would have been both too large and totally inexplicable. But as the reader will see, this is really not about Burwell Harrison. Burwell himself often downplayed the effect of his own effort. In a 1987 interview he related:

I was listening very hard and was doing things that I wondered how I happened to do them. There were many times when I wanted to do something desperately, and I felt the place would close up if we didn't do it, and I was stopped from doing it. Later on I found out that if we had done it, we would have gone bankrupt. Other times there were things that I didn't want to do and was forced to do them against my better judgment, and then discovered that we had done them at just the right time, and if we hadn't done them, some disaster would have occurred financially. So, I said don't talk to me about me doing a good job here - this is way over my head, but we're listening. The only credit we can take is that we pray and we listen.¹

And we would like to have referred to Martha much more than we have. Her contribution to Tenacre's success lies in the countless ways in which she directly contributed to the happiness of each guest she worked with during the Harrisons' fifty-year residence here. But Burwell was right. Tenacre's legacy is not about them. It is about Tenacre. It is about how a handful of Christian Scientists who consistently embraced Mary Baker Eddy's vision of what might be possible for Christianity to look like, and did so in an institutional setting in the woods outside of Princeton. This is what it is, and you are most welcome to discover it for yourself.

¹ Interview, May 1987, Horacio Omar Rivas of J. B. Harrison, p. 7.

"that others may be blest"

Chapter 1

" ... that others may be blest"

*"... blessed is that man who seeth his brother's need and supplieth it,
seeking his own in another's good."*

Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures
Mary Baker Eddy, p. 518:17-19

Today's Tenacre is the result of the prayer and demonstration of sincere Christian Scientists for over 80 years. The first owners, George and Kathryn Barmore,¹ described their family business in one of their brochures from around 1930:

In 1922 TENACRE was opened as a Rest Home for Christian Scientists and for those turning to Christian Science for help. The home has been a blessing for many, and as the result of the healing accomplished, it has steadily grown and developed.

This little publication stylishly depicts the modest grandeur of a well-appointed sylvan estate with photographs of the awning-covered windows of Main House, lush gardens, lily ponds, a gazebo, a circular driveway, a clay tennis court, and comfortable, homey accommodations. George Barmore provided the most complete description currently available of Tenacre's early years in a letter to J. Burwell Harrison.² His letter arrived in March of 1959 with a snapshot of Main House as it was when they purchased the gentleman's farm in 1912. He wrote, in part:

We purchased the property in the fall of 1912 from an artist – Malcolm Stewart, and moved there at that time from our home in New York. During the first few years we did extensive landscaping of the grounds, raised the stream to make the little pond, drilled the artesian well, etc.

As Mrs. Barmore and I had been in Christian Science since 1901, upon coming to Princeton, as there was no Science activity there at the time, we were interested in helping to form a Society, which together with five other Scientists we succeeded in doing, as I recall, around 1914. At about this time Mrs. Barmore entered her name in The Christian Science Journal and opened an office in the First National Bank building to carry on her practice. Within a year or so I took the same step and opened an adjoining office.³

Until about 1920 we had never thought of such a thing as starting a rest home. The idea really came to us in connection with our practice, for we often invited those we were helping in Science and other Christian Science friends from out of town for short visits to Tenacre.

"...in connection with our practice." This direct connection to the public healing practice of Christian Science is the very root, the true origin, and sustaining impetus of Tenacre's legacy of care. The Barmore letter continues:

As we were occupied with our practice and generally had to be at our office part of each day, we could not leave the guests alone with the servants, so another first step was to engage a Christian Scientist for companionship or to give light [Christian Science] nursing care.

“that others may be blest”

It was thus that Christian Science nurses began to appear, and in the process, became a welcome and indispensable part of Tenacre’s unique expression of service to the Christian Science movement.

A significant step was the construction of the original North Hall for the care of “mental cases”.⁴ He describes the challenges:

Only after this branch was well launched did we fully realize the heavy responsibility it placed entirely upon us because of our private ownership of the place. After a few unfortunate happenings we decided we could no longer carry it alone, besides it had been our wish to have the work perpetuated if it could be so worked out. It was then [1935] we set up the Foundation under a Board of Trustees and transferred deed to the property to the Foundation.

In an interview, Burwell Harrison describes what he understood those early unfoldments to be.:

Tenacre started in 1921 as a “mom and pop” operation, the “pop” being a listed [Christian Science] practitioner. I understood it was Judge Green [C.S.B. and member of the Board of Lectureship, of Louisville, KY] who suggested to them that there were people in New York and Philadelphia who would love to come to this place, Tenacre Farm. They had such a lovely home that they could take paying guests if they wanted to. So, they began.

By 1928 they were in the full-fledged [Christian Science] nursing business, but mainly mental patients. And in 1928, they sold fifty \$1000 bonds to Christian Scientists. With the bonds they built a building especially equipped to take mental patients. They became quite professional as they went along in the care of the mentally ill. But let me mention – they were very much appreciated by the New Yorkers and Philadelphians, and then they began to get mental patients from all over the country. They were literally a mental hospital.⁵

The importance of Christian Science nursing emerged during this foundational period. One Christian Science nurse in particular proved indispensable to these early unfoldments. The Barmores’ own dedication to Tenacre was at least matched by Alberta Fielder’s singular consecration. She came to Tenacre soon after it opened. She described in a 1981 interview the direct role she played in the acquisition of the New Jersey state license:

I myself went over to Commissioner Ellis in 1927 at the State House. I asked him for a license for mental cases. He said, “You couldn’t prove to me that it could heal physical and mental cases. I just can’t see it.” So I took my Sentinel that had my testimony in it about [my] healing of polio.⁶ After my lovely freedom, my dad wrote to Dr. Osler who was connected with Johns Hopkins University Hospital, and I showed that letter to the Commissioner in Trenton when I was trying to get this license.⁷ He handed the letter back to me and said, “Miss Fielder, you are telling what is true, aren’t you!” I got the license on the strength of my testimony.⁸

Once the license to operate as a “mental hospital” was received in 1927, it was also seen that something would have to be done to accommodate the increasing number of requests to accept cases. Planning for this needed expansion, raising money for the construction of the “mental care” building was the most obvious of these concerns. To accomplish this, Tenacre changed its form of business in 1928. The Barmores relinquished their rights to Tenacre proper by transferring their ownership to Tenacre, Incorporated, with a Board of Directors, a corporation operating for-profit under the laws of New Jersey.

This action provided extensive but nevertheless still limited protection from total personal liability for the new Board, on which Kathryn served as President and George as Treasurer. Once this was accomplished, Tenacre, Inc. approached the Princeton Bank and Trust Company and

"that others may be blest"

arranged for the issue of \$50,000 worth of \$1000 ten-year bonds, the proceeds of which were used to pay off the remainder of the Barmore mortgage and to begin construction of the new building.⁹

The new building, North Hall, was an important landmark. It became the setting where many healings took place and which established Tenacre's unique ability to provide a legally-recognized setting for the care of those deemed mentally ill. Rarely were these healing accounts used by Tenacre to affirm its validity or to encourage admissions. Rather, it was held that individual healings were entirely the concern of the guests and their practitioners. Tenacre's role, from the foundational years to the present, would be to provide an atmosphere conducive to healing.

Alberta Fielder shared an example of one healing which should be included here, because it is an indication of the valuable role the Christian Science nurse plays in the sustenance of that "atmosphere conducive to healing."

In [Clock Cottage] we put up a strong, heavier screening. This dear man...got out of the screening that night. They buzzed me about 2 o'clock in the morning in December in Main House. I put on my robe and slippers and went out in the snow. We didn't have the large light bulbs on the roads like there are now; we just had lanterns.

Over by the Chapel, out beyond there, it was quite woodsy then. I must have gotten quite close to him in my walking, but I didn't see him yet. I heard him say, calling my name out, "Ho! Miss Fielder!" The dear man – he just had on his pajamas; he didn't even put on a robe because he just went out his window. So he called out and said, "Miss Fielder, here I am!" He started to get up and I took the hymn – it came to me right away – I said, "Mr. So-and-so, let's use the Hymnal and say, 'Come walk with Love.'" [Hymn 139] Here it was 2 o'clock in the morning with me in the snowstorm. He came and walked right along with me. We went in those little steps to go back to his room.

In ten days he was free and fine. He had been a lawyer in New York City. His wife came to get him; she had the car there and he came out...and he shook my hand. I can still feel it as if it were today, such a sincere, beautiful thing. He said, "You know, Miss Fielder, I was healed the minute I looked up and saw you in a snowstorm, and the thought came to me, 'God goes before her every step, and every step with me.' And then you said, 'Come, walk with Love along the way.'" That man had been there for I don't know how many months and months, and he was free."¹⁰

The "oil", or inspiration, of her own healing experience can easily be seen as the light burning in the lantern held aloft for the benefit of that gentleman. Another view of Tenacre, by someone who benefited by a stay in one of its halls, is seen in a heartfelt poem. Olive Hyde Foster had also been a guest during the Barmores' tenure and wrote this poem, which was published with her permission as part of the 1930 brochure.

TENACRE

Tenacre! – But a name, when forced to find
A refuge from the city's grinding care,
From fear of illness and of overwork
That threatened to engulf, lest one beware.

A name that sounded pleasant, led to thoughts
Of sunlit fields, a cottage by a brook,
And friendly people holding out their hands
In welcome to their home and fireside nook.

"that others may be blest"

And then the vision more than realized!
A dream of beauty, outward as within,
Where nature at her best is but surpassed
By spiritual gifts that help to win.

Where a wild duck, pausing in his flight,
Found a domestic mate, — his son to stay
Content on narrow stream and shallow pond
Where quietness and Love divine hold sway.

Tenacre — now no longer a mere name —
Basks in the light, a haven of real rest
Where worldly cares, anxieties and ills
O'ercome, — one leaves that others may be blest.

The sweet and natural harmony reflected in this poem and in Miss Fielder's experience with the guest in the snowstorm, expressive of the gratitude typical of those who stayed at Tenacre, was of itself insufficient to prevent the grind of the "worldly cares" of that age from marring the good name of this bucolic retreat. The rustic religious haven with "a name that sounded pleasant" would have its share of unpleasantness.

George Barmore was sued for malpractice, and although Tenacre won the case, the cost of the suit made a hollow victory. The financial pressure due to the expenses of the court case seriously eroded the organization's ability to pay its debts not only to local suppliers, but also to those who had purchased the bonds. And all this was played out against the dim background of the national Depression.

It must have seemed to the Barmores that there was no way out of the bind in which they found themselves. The financial pressure did not relent, nor did official scrutiny. To assuage the former, another step was taken. In 1935, Tenacre, Inc., a for-profit, incorporated business, was dissolved. A new, non-profit corporation with a Board of Trustees, known as Tenacre Foundation, was then formed. Though the Barmores' personal liability was again decreased, the real strength of the change was that it increased the likelihood that individuals might want to contribute to the support of a non-profit organization run by a Board of Trustees, rather than to individual proprietors of a for-profit business. Two letters from the new Board of Trustees sent out in 1935 gently informed the Christian Science field of the reasons for the change. The first of these clearly set forth in layman's language precisely what the changes were. In part, the letter read:

May 10, 1935

Dear Friend:

We call to your kind attention the following information contained in this circular letter to the Field which we believe will be of interest to all Christian Scientists.

Tenacre — a sanatorium for Christian Scientists and those turning to Christian Science for healing is now known as TENACRE FOUNDATION and is owned and governed by a Board of Trustees, the members of which are loyal Christian Scientists. TENACRE FOUNDATION operates under a charter from the State of New Jersey, as a corporation "not for pecuniary profit". Therefore no individual or group of individuals can profit financially by its success.

The former owners of Tenacre who started this work thirteen years ago and established it up to its present point of development, desired to have it founded in a way that would insure its perpetuation free from personal ownership or control. Toward the accomplishment of this they

“that others may be blest”

have set up this FOUNDATION, vesting their ownership of the properties and work of the institution in this Board of Trustees who now hold title and will manage its affairs.

The second letter, mailed some five months later, let the field know that contributions were welcome:

October 7, 1935

Dear Friend:

In establishing Tenacre Foundation as a non-profit organization for the care of Christian Scientists or those turning to Christian Science for healing, it is the ambition of its Board of Trustees to maintain and perpetuate a model institution expressing the highest ideals and equipped in every detail to minister to the welfare of those needing for a time the haven it provides.

After again mentioning its capacity for mental care, a direct appeal for funds was made:

In addition to Tenacre Foundation being a non-profit organization it is desired to make it partly charitable by caring for a percentage of deserving cases not otherwise provided for. To further this, financial assistance in the form of endowments or gifts of any sum will be welcome. A fund has been established to be used solely for this purpose.

Since Tenacre was set up in May of this year as a non-profit organization under the name of Tenacre Foundation, after having been conducted as a private enterprise for over thirteen years, its advancement has continued to a gratifying degree. Your interest in furthering in any way the work of this much needed institution will be appreciated.

As informative, kind, and careful as these letters were, they did not meet with the sort of response that could lift Tenacre out of its financial woes. While there likely was some response, the extent of the response will never be known, as those records no longer exist. What is known is that the appeal fell far short of its intended goal. Formal bankruptcy proceedings began in November 1938.

Declarations of bankruptcy were commonplace during that era and were often deemed the only solution to difficult business problems in a difficult time. The 1930's saw much of this affliction, and on a worldwide scale. Bankruptcy was a hard and bitter blow for the Christian Science couple who had dedicated their lives, talents, and property to the venture. Burwell Harrison commented on this situation:

By November 1938, they went into formal bankruptcy, and a Receiver was operating it in the name of the creditors. They owed the \$50,000 bond issue of which they themselves owned several thousand – \$3,000 to \$5,000. And the local creditors were owed in excess of \$12,000. Receivership was holding the place for the local creditors and the bondholders.

...Very interesting, the Receiver had been trying to sell [Tenacre]. The whole property would not sell for \$15,000 at that time. We were in the bottom of the Depression.¹¹

One last legal step, agreed to in 1935, was taken. With little to show for their twenty-six-plus-year ownership of their beloved Tenacre Farm, the Barmores signed an agreement, in December of 1938, whereby for the consideration of \$1.00, they would be released forever from any form of liability in connection with Tenacre. They moved to Maine, where eventually they settled in the seacoast city of Portland.

Things could not have been more difficult for the Christian Science sanatorium they left behind. If all that remained were a gathering of buildings, a pile of unpaid bills, and nine patients with their Christian Science nurses, then perhaps the doors should have closed behind them. But there was much more to the place than the place itself. It is a truth that adversity has sweet uses, for

in the throes of this seeming disaster, stock was taken of assets. Though there were considerable liabilities, they were outweighed by considerable strengths, albeit not the kind normally found on a balance sheet.

Tenacre had demonstrated much good in its ministrations to Christian Scientists who availed themselves of its services. Not only were Olive Hyde Foster's poem and the gentleman-in-the-snowstorm healing related by Alberta Fielder testament to this, but also many others had benefited from the Christian Science nursing atmosphere in this rustic setting. Lessons had been learned in the care of the mentally ill. Further, there was tangible state recognition of this effort in the form of a license granted to an institution recognized for this form of care. This license was something that no other Christian Science nursing facility had been granted. If Tenacre closed its doors even for one day, it was felt this treasured license would have been exceedingly difficult to regain. As it was, the bankruptcy declaration caused the Department of Institutions and Agencies to suspend Tenacre's license. No further guests were to be admitted to Tenacre until the bankruptcy was resolved.

Two other elements must be included in Tenacre's roster of good. These elements found expression in the letters from Tenacre's Board of Trustees in 1935. The first was the simple desire that the work be perpetuated. The second was that Tenacre remain a "model institution" to embody the highest ideals of Christian Science, fully equipped and capable of "ministering to the welfare of those needing [it] for a time...."

The severity of Tenacre's troubles also attracted the attention of The Christian Science Board of Directors in Boston. It was at their urging that Norman E. John again became involved and began to do what he could to prevent Tenacre and its unique state license as a mental hospital from disappearing and also to assure that Tenacre's good standing in the business and Christian Science communities would be reinstated. He contacted a pupil of his own, Howard Graham Bleakly, who was familiar with the situation in New Jersey. Mr. Bleakly, himself a Christian Science practitioner and teacher, had been a lawyer, and still had many friends in the New Jersey legal and legislative community. One of the first steps he took in rectifying this situation was to employ the Newark, New Jersey legal firm of McCarter and English. They quickly hammered out an agreement with the Bankruptcy court that gave the friends of Tenacre some breathing space, a brief moratorium. Burwell Harrison commented on this crucial time:

I became involved while that was going on. I used to take Mr. Bleakly to the state institutions on Fridays.¹² I would do the driving, because he was elderly. One day we drove in here. You see, the Barmores didn't go bankrupt. It was Tenacre Foundation, the Christian Scientists, who went bankrupt. That's what got all the publicity. And so, as far up as East Orange, all I knew about Tenacre was that it was a disreputable thing that wasn't any credit to the Movement at all. So, when my teacher asked me to bring him here, I wondered what in the world he was doing. That was one Friday. The next Friday he wanted to come back here, and he never did tell me what it was all about. But on the way home the second Friday he told me. I said, "Well, if there is anything I can do to help you out with it, let me know."

In all of Tenacre's annals, few words bearing such fruitful consequences have ever been spoken. His account continues:

So, he called me Sunday. He had talked to the other three people whom he had involved toward forming a Board of Trustees. He said they had talked it over and would be glad if I would join them. So, I joined them....

On May 19, 1939, the Court gave it into the hands of this new Board of Trustees. I, being the youngest in that group of people, but not included in that original Board of Trustees though being very much part of them, I was the one coming here and taking the thing over. We formally took it over on June 15, 1939.¹³

"that others may be blest"

What followed the June transfer of management, in lightning succession, was a series of meetings with officials of the Department of Institutions and Agencies and with State Senator Alfred Driscoll. Tenacre's new manager, Burwell Harrison, entered into these meetings secure in the knowledge that his efforts were fully supported by the Board of Trustees. Mr. Bleakly was also able to give him the benefit of his years as an attorney familiar with the ways and means of the New Jersey legislature and of the bureaucratic maze in Trenton. Burwell nevertheless found that his best early efforts at raising Tenacre's unique license from bureaucratic limbo would be stiffly challenged. He later spoke of those days:

They had to give me the license if I applied for it, but they could put me under intense scrutiny after they gave it to me. When I went down and I talked about Tenacre, etc., I got the impression that they didn't have much respect for Tenacre or Christian Scientists. When Miss Howell began to question me, I must have said, "I'm a Christian Scientist, and I wouldn't do a thing like that" or words to that effect, and she actually said, "Mr. Harrison, excuse me if I've got my tongue in my cheek" – she used that term – "because the Christian Scientists we've dealt with have not been forthright and honest with us." So I said, "It's up to me to earn my spurs with you." ¹⁴

This meeting was mentioned in the Monthly Reports of the Department of Institutions and Agencies. The entry is a model of official reserve.

An application has been made by the committee reorganizing the finances of Tenacre Sanatorium for a license to continue operation of the [Christian Science] nursing home which license was formerly held by the previous managing superintendent. Decision is withheld, pending receipt of information from reference furnished by the new group.¹⁵

Steps were taken to provide the Department with exactly what they needed. A letter of reference was sent to the Department signed by one Joseph A. Brohel, a businessman from northern New Jersey, who refers to Mr. Bleakly in his letter, and who may also have known Burwell from his membership in the Kiwanis Club in East Orange.¹⁶ Brohel's letter, familiarly addressed to "John" Ellis — an indication perhaps that he was acquainted with the Commissioner — did receive a prompt reply, but it was cold comfort. William J. Ellis assured him that they were fully apprised of the situation, and coolly continued:

We have known this institution over a period of years during which time it has been involved in many difficulties. ...It is, therefore, quite necessary that we must be assured of their competency to carry out this work before granting a license.¹⁷

Telephone calls were made to Senator Alfred Driscoll to see what might be done to further support the plea for reinstatement. Letters that again confirmed the urgency of the need followed these. Many of the concerns contained in Burwell's blunt, straightforward note of Sunday, July 9, 1939, were met the following Monday in a letter from Senator Driscoll to Mr. Bleakly.¹⁸ It reads as follows:

July 10, 1939

Dear Uncle Bleakly:¹⁹

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 4th together with enclosure. I have had one or two telephone conversations with Mr. Harrison and also saw him in Trenton last Thursday.

I have likewise had a conference with the head of the Department of Institutions and Agencies and, as a result, have been advised that the patient, whose [Christian Science] nurse is temporarily on vacation, may come on from Boston and be admitted to Tenacre.

"that others may be blest"

I see no reason why the new license will not be granted in the very near future and should additional cases arise prior to its issuance, I feel sure that you will find the Department co-operative and willing to make a special ruling in each instance.

Mr. Harrison has made a splendid impression with the Department.

May I also say that, in my opinion, it was a very wise move for you to retain Dr. McCorkle?

I will follow this matter to its final settlement.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Very truly yours,

Alfred E. Driscoll

This letter provides us with the very first mention of Dr. McCorkle. Exactly when he began to have a hand in Tenacre's affairs is not entirely clear. What is known is that all such homes as Tenacre were required to have professional medical oversight, even at the time when Tenacre's first license was issued by the state in 1927. Interestingly, many of Tenacre's Christian Science nurses were medically-trained Registered Nurses. This was not at all an uncommon occurrence then. There simply was no formal training for Christian Science Nurses until the Benevolent Association opened its doors in 1919. Young women who were Christian Scientists sometimes elected to have medical nursing training – as did Alberta Fielder. And it was not uncommon for Registered Nurses to convert to Christian Science once they learned of its healing efficacy – as did the young woman who nursed Alberta Fielder at Hahnemann's Hospital in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. With such trained Christian Science nurses on the staff, the Christian Science home was able to neatly sidestep the requirement for professional medical oversight even as they complied with it. The Christian Science nurses' medical credentials and presence on the property were accepted in lieu of there being a physician on the staff. Burwell wrote in his July 19, 1939 memo to Mr. Bleakly:

He [Commissioner Ellis] agrees with our thought about having the head Christian Science nurse responsible and I know from my own experience already that this was one of the most serious things that was wrong.²⁰

It is apparent by this note that Burwell agreed with Commissioner Ellis' assessment that the head Christian Science nurse had erred in accepting certain cases for admission. It is likely that, under the terms of Tenacre's licensure, only the individual in whose name the license had been issued was responsible for admissions. It was a duty that could not be relegated. Whatever the specific error had been, it was clear that the new Board of Trustees and its Manager were willing to continue with Dr. McCorkle's participation in the admissions process. What is interesting is that there was no sense of penalty attached to this compromise, as Dr. McCorkle was very helpful in explaining the flexibility within the admissions requirements. Burwell continued:

I have read the other paragraphs [pertaining to the limitations placed by the Department of Institutions and Agencies] to Dr. McCorkle and he says that with the permission granted in the last paragraph on the first page, "Patients suffering from mental disorders must be limited to the nervous and mild mental type. Aged and chronically ill may also be accepted", we are permitted to accept any type of case that has ever been acceptable at Tenacre.

Of course the commissioner says that they should be examined by Dr. McCorkle "preferably before admitted" – this is not mandatory and with the doctor's co-operation, we will have them examined on the same day they are admitted. In addition we will make very sure ourselves before we let them come down that they come within our sphere of operation.²¹

“that others may be blest”

Tenacre clearly was blessed by its association both with Alfred Driscoll, who later would become Governor of New Jersey, and with the individuals in the Department of Institutions and Agencies. Still, its real strength and motivating power would always come from that most valuable of human footsteps – the practice of prayer. Again Mr. Harrison commented:

The license just did not come through, did not come through. I wasn't worrying about it, but I figured they might be worried about it, and I figured that I had opposition down there. One morning in doing the mental work about it, it came to me, “Why, those people aren't against Christian Science. They don't know what Christian Science is. How can they be against it? They're against what they think Christian Science is. I know what it is” – and whatever I went to mentally from there, I don't know, but I got the license two days later.²²

In point of fact, the Department of Institutions and Agencies initially required that Tenacre undergo a three-month observation period, dated from the management change on June 15. They wanted to see how the new Board of Trustees would deal with the various problems they noted with the physical plant. Questions of competent staffing and the development of a working relationship with those within the Department responsible for inspecting facilities like Tenacre were satisfactorily worked out. Once all these qualifying conditions were met, Commissioner Ellis' concerns were fully assuaged. The license was finally granted. The entire process took a whole month less than the Department predicted would be required for the reinstatement of the license to operate. Burwell discovered what caused the license to be issued just two days after his prayer in support of the licensing process:

The next time I saw Miss Lockwood, she said, “You know, about your license, it's very interesting. We're not in from the field [the New Jersey nursing home field] except on certain days of the week, but this afternoon there were messages out to everybody for us to come in to a meeting the next morning. We went in, and it turned out to be an emergency meeting on another very minor incident. We were through with it in less time than we thought it was going to take. So, somebody said, “Is there anything else we can accomplish while we're here?” Somebody said, “What about the Tenacre license? Let's consider it. Does anybody know why we shouldn't issue it?” Nobody could say anything about not issuing it.

She told me this. And she said, “So, we put it in the mail that day.” And that was the day, within forty-eight hours of my mental work, that I saw clearly that there wasn't any opposition. If they knew what Christian Science was, they would want it as much as I did. So, that's another milestone along the way.²³

Mr. Bleakly received the reissued license along with a letter from the Commissioner dated July 16, 1939. It was given to Burwell for his response. He wrote:

Your letter of July 16th addressed to Mr. Bleakly has been left with me for detailed reply.

I want, first of all, to express our sincere gratitude for the permission granted to us to continue the operation of Tenacre. We have always realized the standpoint from which you must scrutinize a matter of this kind. In it all we have only desired to be allowed to prove ourselves in your eyes.²⁴

His letter carefully reiterated all of the things that had been undertaken in order to qualify for the license finally granted in Burwell's name. He reassured the Commissioner that two maintenance men had been hired to maintain the level of efficiency that Tenacre had resumed. The kitchen had been refurbished and a new cook was in place. He then quoted from the *Manual of The Mother Church*, citing that volume's reference to Christian Science nurses. Ever ready to seize the opportunity to have friends see Christian Science and Christian Science nursing as he saw them, Burwell then wrote:

“that others may be blest”

So, you see, a Christian Science nurse must have the qualifications that you would deem necessary as well as the ones that are important from our viewpoint.²⁵

He ended the letter on a note that, though obviously directed toward Commissioner Ellis and his Department, pointed to what would be his own mission on through the next fifty years:

I feel that my interest in Tenacre is prompted by the purest of motives; to be of service to mankind in serving the cause of Christian Science. In the light of the things I have learned thus far I feel that one of the highest services I can render will be the re-establishment of Christian Science and Christian Scientists in the high place that they should hold in the thought of your department.

During the two-month “spurs-earning” period, the state had prevented Tenacre from accepting any new guests, with the exception of the guest from Boston mentioned in Mr. Driscoll’s letter to “Uncle Bleakly.” With this restriction, the flow of income Tenacre received was also limited. This stalemate, too, was finally broken with the receipt of the new license.

Burwell added at once another memory to his recollection of his initial encounter with the Board of Directors of The Mother Church, and another telling slant to the story:

They said, “It’s important to have the place retained in the hands of Christian Scientists, and that the license be protected. But you cannot raise money...”²⁶

Clearly it was the Board of Directors’ intent not to have the New York-New Jersey and surrounding Field financially burdened as Tenacre continued to right itself. Thus they asked that Tenacre refrain from any sort of direct appeal for financial support. This never fazed Burwell, as he simply had no knowledge of fundraising other than adding his envelope to the Sunday collection. Rather, it was his experience that any organization worth its salt would be self-supporting. He knew as well that the only way available to fund the struggling Christian Science home was through inspiration. Just how its continued existence was to be funded, let alone how it was going to fulfill its own pledge to pay back its creditors 100 cents on the dollar, is another chapter in this story. Suffice it to say that Tenacre had indeed earned its spurs. The license was reacquired. Their doors were again open to accept guests. They learned to work in a friendly, collegial manner with the state government in Trenton. And a unique and enduring relationship with The Mother Church began.

Thus, the founders’ fondest hopes, that their work would be perpetuated and that the organization would be a model institution embodying the highest ideals of Christian Science was fulfilled. Their hopes were being sustained and borne anew by the same selfless devotion and desire to serve the Christian Science Movement that originally impelled Tenacre’s doors to open in 1922.

¹ George Barmore and Kathryn Lyon married in 1911. They moved from their home in New York and moved to Tenacre in the fall of 1912. They were in their early 30s at the time. The extant brochure of Tenacre Poultry Farm, c. 1916, indicates George Barmore as manager of this prosperous concern. The photos depict the full extent of the operation. In his letter to Mr. Harrison, in which he described the founding of Tenacre as a facility for Christian Scientists, George makes slight mention of the poultry farm: “Until about 1920 we had never thought of such a thing as starting a rest home. The idea really came to us in connection with our practice for we often invited those we were helping in Science and other Christian Science friends from out of town for short visits to Tenacre. At such times the remark would sometimes be made to us (in substance) “Oh! if there was only such a lovely place of a private character where a few Christian Scientists could be accommodated for rest and study periods.” The suggestion rather appealed to us both although we gave it no serious thought for some time. Then after a period of prayerful consideration we concluded, as we had no children, it would be a helpful thing to

share the home now and then with a few Christian Scientists who would feel the need of such a haven, but we never thought or planned to accommodate more than three guests. ...Our next step after operating for about two years was to remodel the tenant house which gave us four additional bedrooms. And we gave up our large room in the main house and moved to the little building which I had formerly used as an office when for a few of our first years at Tenacre I had the poultry farm."

² Correspondence between Justice Burwell Harrison and George Barmore, 1958-1959.

George Barmore's letters to Burwell Harrison were not always part of Tenacre's archives and in fact almost never became part of its written record. After Burwell and Martha retired to California, Burwell rediscovered the correspondence and sent it off to Christine Irby Williams, then the President of Tenacre. They were handed to an office assistant for copying. Somehow those letters were misplaced and disappeared until Wendy Lanning, a longtime Tenacre Christian Science nurse and administrator, in the process of culling some miscellaneous papers, discovered a large brown envelope with the assistant's name written on a post-it. She opened the envelope and thus the three typewritten letters were rediscovered!

Justice Burwell Harrison shared stories of his own background in several interviews. He was born in Canada of American parents; Wilhelmina (Minnie) Gosselin Harrison and H. Franklin Harrison. They were both in the hotel business, and Burwell was raised working, first as a bellhop and then as a kitchen worker. His formal schooling ended at the eighth grade level, and he eventually became educated in all phases of running a successful hotel. At age 32, when he first began to volunteer his time as Tenacre's Manager, he operated, with the assistance of his father and his wife Martha, the 100-room Hotel Martine in East Orange, New Jersey. Though he had nothing to do with Tenacre's formative first years 1922-1938, he did much to collect, preserve, and augment Tenacre's remarkable written record that has provided almost the entire research base for the writing of this book. Burwell and Martha Harrison devoted 50 years of their lives to Tenacre. After their marriage in 1934, they each took Christian Science Class Instruction from Howard Graham Bleakly who himself dedicated much time and effort to Tenacre, including eighteen years of service as Chairman of Tenacre's Board of Trustees.

³ According to The Mother Church records, Kathryn Lyon joined in 1902. She was then 20 years old. George Barmore joined the same year and was 19 years old. *The Christian Science Journal* listed Kathryn as First Reader of the Princeton Society in 1916-1917, and George as First Reader from 1918-1920. Her *Journal*-listing as a Christian Science practitioner was from January 1919 - April 1920 when she withdrew her name from listing to assume the position of Manager of Tenacre. When the Barmores left Tenacre for Portland, Maine, she renewed her listing in 1943 and remained in the public healing practice of Christian Science until her passing in 1951. George Barmore's listing began in May 1922 and continued until his decease in 1959. He remarried after Kathryn's passing. He passed away just two months after sending the last of three letters bearing the details of Tenacre's founding to Mr. Harrison. The two men never actually met.

⁴ In a 1973 contribution letter to Tenacre, an early worker, F. Kelsey, reminisced, "I can remember Mrs. Barmore saying to me, 'Tenacre is being builded by not one single human brick'."

⁵ Rivas/Interview of JBH, 1987, pp. 1,2.

⁶ Alberta Fielder's testimony is published in *The Christian Science Sentinel* of April 24, 1920. She may also have shown the Commissioner the newspaper articles titled, "She Walks Again After Six Years" from the *Long Branch Daily Record*, March 18, 1914 and another article, titled, "Long a Cripple, She tries Faith and Walks Again" (source unknown). She carried both articles with her wherever she went. Eventually both were donated to Tenacre.

⁷ Letter, William Osler to Mr. Fielder, reads: "March 28, 1914, Sir William Osler, Oxford, England [to] H.C. Fielder, Esq., 146 Read Street, New York, USA. From the Regius Professor of Medicine, Oxford [England.] Dear Sir, I am delighted to hear that the lassie is getting well. It is indeed good news,

particularly as these cases very rarely show signs of improvement when the paralysis has lasted for so long. Give her my love and best wishes. Sincerely yours, Wm. Osler."

⁸Wesman/Fielder Interview, 1981, p. 2.

After the healing in March 1914 at age 17, Alberta was accepted in June as a member of The Mother Church. She desired to help others and enrolled in medical nurses training at the very same hospital where she had been a patient as there was no special course available for Christian Scientists. She majored in mental nursing and obstetrics. After graduation she was a private nurse on cases at a Christian Science home, House of the Pines, in Catonsville, Maryland, operated by two women, Edith Emmons and Helen Russell. While there (c. 1922), Alberta received a call to nurse a case at Tenacre. She stayed on at Tenacre and served as 'supervisor' for 12 years. Her RN license was part of the licensing arrangement in which the Department of Institutions and Agencies waived the requirement of a resident physician. In the Christian Science movement, there were more than a few medically-trained nurses who were Christian Scientists and nursed exclusively Christian Science cases. Alberta was listed in *The Christian Science Journal* until she withdrew her advertisement in 1923 after settling at Tenacre and being no longer available as a private nurse. She was later listed as a Christian Science practitioner, from 1946 until her passing in 1990. She resided in Massachusetts for a while and then spent years in Concord, New Hampshire. She returned to live in Princeton, NJ in 1967.

⁹ Eighty percent of the bonds issued were purchased by Christian Scientists whom Tenacre had served or their families. Barmore letter of March 5, 1959, p. 2. The Barmores held some bonds and Alberta Fielder herself was a bondholder, owning two bonds.

¹⁰ Wesman/Fielder, 1981, pp. 3, 4.

¹¹ Interview, Honicky/JBH, 1987, p. 4.

¹² J. Burwell Harrison was a pupil in Mr. Bleakly's 1934 Class.

¹³ Honicky/JBH, p. 5.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 21.

¹⁵ Monthly Reports, Department Institutions & Agencies, June 1939, p. 11.

¹⁶ Brohel Letter to Commissioner Ellis, June 26, 1939.

¹⁷ Letter, William Ellis to Jos. Brohel (undated.)

¹⁸ Letter, JBH to Alfred Driscoll, July 9, 1939.

¹⁹ In a June 1999 conversation with Ewan MacQueen, Mr. Harrison related that Mr. Bleakly had courted Mr. Driscoll's mother before she married Mr. Driscoll's father. The whole family continued to hold Mr. Bleakly fondly in their affections and thus the salutation. It is affectionate, but not familial. Whenever Mr. Harrison needed Driscoll's help, he would tell Mr. Bleakly who would then call Driscoll's mother, a resident of Haddonfield, NJ, who then called her son. He invariably made room on his calendar after such a call.

²⁰ Memo, JBH to H.G. Bleakly, July 19, 1939.

²¹ Ibid, page three.

²² Honicky/JBH, p.21.

²³ Ibid, p. 22.

²⁴ Letter, JBH to William J. Ellis, July 29, 1939, p. 1.

²⁵ Ibid, p. 3.

²⁶ Ibid, p. 50.

"as we go along"

Chapter 2

"...as we go along"

*"As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another,
as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.
If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God;
if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which
God giveth: that God in all things may be glorified
through Jesus Christ, to whom be
praise and dominion for ever and ever. Amen."*

I Peter 4:10, 11

As dark and portentous as the cloud of bankruptcy may have seemed, it was no match for the prayer-guided efforts of Tenacre's new manager and Board of Trustees. Through the process of laboring to reinstate Tenacre's good name, another, more enduring quality gradually emerged and eased its way into its rightful place in the forefront of the organization's active vocabulary. Stewardship became Tenacre's watchword for reform. The dictionary indicates that it is the work of the steward to manage another's property or financial affairs; that he or she would administer any domestic concern of another as their duly appointed agent, including buying or obtaining food, directing the servants or staff. This was not alone the stewardship Tenacre's concern, but, as well, the stewardship the understanding of which is more readily found in the text of Peter's inspired, rousing epistle to the early Christian communities of Asia Minor, where they were addressed as *"good stewards of the manifold grace of God."* The new Board faced the need to rise to both the practical and spiritual meanings of stewardship.

On that first day of the takeover, June 15, 1939, a check came in the mail regarding an elderly guest who had passed on at Tenacre a few months before. She had come in February of 1938. Upon her arrival, she entered into what essentially was a life-care contract. In exchange for control of a trust fund and some securities, the contract provided that she would receive some monthly pocket money and care, food, and lodging in the Christian Science Home. On her passing, both the trust fund and securities became the property of Tenacre. Her humble fortune blessed Tenacre not alone for its modest bounty, but especially for its timing. Thinking back to that time, Burwell Harrison described the beneficence of its bestowal in an interview:

One day I was musing about Tenacre and knew that there were so many days when [Tenacre] might not have survived, that there were so many contributions by so many different people whom I consider were God-sent at the very moment they were involved in Tenacre's affairs.

For instance, when we first took over after the bankruptcy and the court had given it into our hands, there wasn't anyone involved who could put money into the kitty. There wasn't a dime in petty cash when we took over that day. But coincidental to that day, we received notice that a lady, by the name of Catherine R. Clymer who had stayed at Tenacre with the Barmores at some point, she had put Tenacre in her will for \$2500. Right out of the blue we had funding money to open a bank account.¹

“as we go along”

It seemed to be “pennies from heaven” to the new management. The bequest arrived precisely at the time it was needed. A sizeable sum of money was urgently needed to pay for the costs of the much-needed building improvements and the legal fees incurred by the petition for reorganization that had been filed with the Bankruptcy court. The abundance of the need was now equaled by the abundance of supply.

A letter from the Department of Institutions and Agencies to Mr. Bleakly dated Monday, July 18, 1939, spells out several things with which the Department was not pleased:

The physical plant is in need of repair in many vital points, such as roofs, furnaces and especially the kitchen. Mr. Harrison outlined a plan, which if carried through would remedy some of the conditions... The kitchen needs new equipment before long and we understand that the stoves are to be replaced shortly. The utensils will also need replacement. The organization of this department has always been awkward and we believe that a close consolidation of kitchen, refrigeration and food storage will make for a more economical administration.

Without the sum from the bequest comfortably in the bank, Mr. Harrison would have been unable to outline his plan for the upgrade to the physical plant to which the Commissioner referred. He reported in the next day’s memo to Mr. Bleakly on what had already been accomplished with the bequest:

We can tell him that we have already ordered the shingles to start on the first roofing job and will proceed with them as quickly as possible. I am endeavoring to find out all I can about the furnace situation and will present my findings to the first possible Board meeting.

We can say that the stoves are already installed – we are in the process right now of painting the kitchen, working nights on it – we have already bought some new utensils when we got the stoves and other new equipment will be purchased as we go along.

As far as the inconvenient layout is concerned we can all agree heartily but it does not detract from the service we are able to render, it only makes more work for the employees. It is sufficient to say that it is one of the things that we will eventually correct as we go along.²

Even at this early point in his experience at Tenacre, it is clear that Mr. Harrison expected that the organization would continue, and not only continue, but prosper. His memo reflects his conviction that “as we go along” everything that is needed would be supplied.

Besides bringing a wealth of business experience in reversing the downward fortunes of hotel enterprises, Burwell Harrison came to the floundering Foundation fresh from taking practice calls in his own teacher’s office. After Class Instruction in Christian Science in 1934, he split his days between running the Hotel Martine in East Orange, New Jersey and his own public practice of Christian Science. Burwell commented on what turned out to be his preparation for the position of manager:

At the time I was ‘growing into my teacher’s office’ – I was running a hotel but had my father [Franklin] and my wife [Martha] in the front of the house, and I was in the back of the house. I could straighten out things and leave by 10 or 11 o’clock. So, I went down to his office whenever [Mr. Bleakly] wasn’t there, which was two or three days a week; and I took it all summer for several years. So, I was really going into the practice.³

His practice⁴ soon assumed an entirely unexpected form, one that perfectly blended his hotel experience with his love for the public practice of Christian Science.⁵ It was a blend that would serve Tenacre and the Christian Science movement for over fifty years.

The peculiar stricture informally placed on the nursing home’s operation by The Christian Science Board of Directors, along with the determination of the Board of Trustees of Tenacre to pay back local creditors 100 cents on the dollar, accomplished two things. First, it completely shut off the

"broad way" of utilizing all the contemporary methods of fundraising. Second, it forced Tenacre into the "narrow way" (Matt 7:13, 14) or the need for the sort of importunate prayer urged on all Christian Scientists by Mary Baker Eddy. In her *Message to The Mother Church* (1896) [Mis. 127:7], she counseled:

One thing have I greatly desired, and again earnestly request, namely, that Christian Scientists, here and elsewhere, pray daily for themselves; not verbally, nor on bended knee, but mentally, meekly, and importunately. When a hungry heart petitions the divine Father-Mother God for bread, it is not given a stone, - but more grace, obedience, and love. If this heart, humble and trustful, faithfully asks divine Love to feed it with the bread of heaven, health, holiness, it will be conformed to a fitness to receive the answer to its desire; then will flow into it the "river of His pleasure," the tributary of divine Love, and great growth in Christian Science will follow, - even that joy which finds one's own in another's good.

In this case, however, the prayer would be for the benefit of an organization run by and for Christian Scientists, rather than for an individual Christian Scientist. This urgent prayer was in fact the only channel of correction available to the Christian Scientists in charge of the resuscitative efforts.

When we reorganized Tenacre at the request of the Christian Science Board of Directors - we could never say it was anything but unofficial - they also told us they didn't want us soliciting the Field for money. This didn't cause us any trouble because we just didn't know any better. We didn't know how to solicit money if we could have. We could have learned fast, but, at the moment, it didn't bother us. And so we just made both ends meet.⁶

Burwell commented in a 1967 letter:

We take no credit for a more righteous approach to financing; there was nothing to do but pray.⁷

And pray they did. The metaphysical maturity of the new Board was very much appreciated by the new manager, who later would comment that they all were "powerful pray-ers."⁸ All its members were *Journal*-listed practitioners. Along with Howard Graham Bleakly, C.S.B., of Newark, NJ (the former lawyer and the Harrisons' teacher in Christian Science⁹), the Board included Cornelius Jackson, C.S., also of Newark, NJ; Mrs. Minna Voskuyl, C.S., and Admer D. Miller, C.S., both of New York City; Luther Hudgins, C.S. of Trenton, NJ; and Samuel H. and Mrs. Margaret H. Rogers, husband and wife, Christian Science practitioners from Chatham, NJ. In these beginning months, their metaphysical work was to be as much tested as it was appreciated.

While the corrections to the physical plant were being made, the question of groceries arose. Where would they come from and who would pay for them? Tenacre's credit had dried up. On his own initiative, Burwell freely used the credit he had built up at the Hotel Martine to guarantee the supply of victuals to Tenacre. While a generous gesture, it did not please everyone. Cornelius Jackson, the Secretary of the Board, took issue and informed Mr. Harrison that he questioned his authority to take such an action without first having consulted with the Board. The response, typical of the very direct manner with which Mr. Harrison approached issues, was:

I had to tell him I didn't have any authority to do it, and I remember clearly saying, "Mr. Jackson, this isn't a church, and I'm not the Clerk. I'm running this business and you have to have [these groceries], and you're using my credit. If you want to run it like a church and if you think I can operate as a Clerk, then I'll go back home."

[Mr. Jackson] was accustomed to having everything pass through the Board first. That's where the autonomy of the manager started. Never again did anybody question me, and never has a member of our Board ever been asked to raise money.¹⁰

Mr. Jackson's response is not recorded, and Mr. Harrison did not go back home. It was indeed the beginning of the manager's autonomy. As well, it simultaneously freed the Board of Trustees from the daily cares of running the place. Their efforts could be exclusively focused on the metaphysical work. The Board's willingness to prayerfully consider all the issues Tenacre needed to face, along with Burwell's flair for getting things done, demonstrated Mrs. Eddy's statement, quoted earlier, regarding the coupling of prayer and action – *"the fervent habitual desire to know and do the will of God"* (S&H 11:29)[emphasis added]. This new arrangement, which proved as enduring as it was practical, drew Tenacre away from the shallower dictionary definition of stewardship towards its fuller, Biblical expression.

As necessary as it was to have extended his credit to provide Tenacre with groceries, it was only a temporary measure. A permanent solution was in order. The new Board and manager found themselves in much the same position as the widow woman who was in danger of losing her two sons to her creditor. Elisha asked her, *"What hast thou in the house"* (II Kings 4:1-7)? They, too, would have to answer this very question. After all, it was also the only place to look. They could not raise funds from the Christian Science field, and the Trustees were asked only for their metaphysical oil.

One of the first "vessels" that they worked together to fill with the oil of inspiration was the idea of a brochure. During the Barmores' tenure, Tenacre produced handsome brochures and regularly sent mailings to the Field. The purpose of a new brochure was to signal the Field that Tenacre was under new management and its doors were still open. Commented Burwell:

When I was asked to come here, my teacher told me the place was needed. I had been operating a hotel, and that summer before, I had operated a resort at the shore, and I had published a brochure in which I presented the hotel accommodation in a selling context. We had on this new Board for Tenacre, a lady who was in the advertising business. So naturally when we talked about printing something, she was the one we turned to. She had the assignment to come up with a brochure.

So, at the next meeting they showed me the brochure she had drawn up. I read it and was shocked, because I knew what kind of accommodation we had here, and I was reading about some lovely accommodation. In the end, I said, "You know, this is the kind of brochure I printed for the hotel I operated last summer, when I was trying to sell accommodation. This is selling Tenacre. If we have to sell Tenacre, then the Field doesn't need it. I understood that we only had to tell the Field we were here, it was under new management, and we were here and ready to serve them, and that was all that was necessary. From there on it would go." I undertook to write an announcement, and all I said was, "We're here," and I mailed it out. Because we didn't have any accommodation to sell.¹¹

The announcement, sent out with the approval of the Department of Institutions and Agencies, was very simple. It was printed on a French-folded, 8 1/2" by 11" sheet of paper. One quarter-panel contained the names and addresses of the new Board of Trustees. The other three panels bore messages faithful to the simplicity urged by the manager. It offered facilities and a staff fully supportive of Christian Science healing; it was reorganized; no member of the new Board would act as Christian Science practitioner for any guest staying at the sanatorium; it was not just for mental cases. It ended by soliciting "the prayerful and loving support of all Christian Scientists, that this new endeavor may truly heal and bless." A total of forty-five hundred announcements were mailed to the field on August 8, 1939.¹² Burwell noted in his July 16, 1939 memo to the Board of Trustees that most of the mailing was posted from Trenton, at three cents per piece. The rest of the mailing, destined for New York City and the surrounding area, was mailed in New York, rather than from Trenton, at two cents per piece. Thus he was able to save a grand total of five dollars on postage. This practice of stretching Tenacre's resources as far as possible and using, when possible, the most economic means available, was one he continued throughout his entire tenure.

“as we go along”

The response to this mailing seems to have been fairly substantial. Inquiries came through the mail and over the telephone. However, most were not cases Tenacre could serve. Burwell noted:

We are receiving inquiries in almost every mail – seldom do we receive one that seems to come within the sphere we wish to serve. I feel that this is due to the fact that we are not receiving the support as yet of the Christian Science practitioners in the Field who are really in touch with all cases that are legitimate Christian Science [cases].¹³

Nonetheless, the announcement accomplished its task. Soon after it was mailed, Tenacre placed a similar notice in *The Christian Science Monitor* and had it run for a number of weeks. It was now widely known that Tenacre was back in operation, ready to serve the needs of “those seeking healing through Christian Science treatment.”¹⁴

The value of what the manager’s understanding of the difference between “selling accommodations” as a fancy hotel might and offering a service in support of spiritual healing to Christian Scientists, was soon proved. In response to the *Monitor* ad, Tenacre received a call from a Michigan family asking for help for a family member. Burwell remembered the visit this way:

He was the owner of a big department store. They sent him down here with a couple of bodyguards and his wife and the manager of his store. They came in on a sleeper train, and I met them over at Princeton Junction. The manager got off first and took hold of me and took me off to one side and said, “I hope you got a nice accommodation.” I said, “Have you had breakfast? We better stop downtown and have breakfast.”

I had to talk to them. I said, “We don’t have anything but an atmosphere at Tenacre – no corner rooms, no private baths. This is all there is, but we’ve got Christian Scientists, and that’s what this fellow’s come for.” In the end, his wife stayed downtown at the hotel, and he stayed out here, and the manager went back to Michigan. It took a little bit of diplomacy at the moment to handle that one.¹⁵

Diplomacy, ingenuity, inspiration, resourcefulness – active expression of the qualities of stewardship – in combination with the manager’s on-the-spot decision-making power, showed Tenacre to be an organization willing to and capable of praying-on-the-run. Tenacre was demonstrating its ability to instantly respond to the legitimate needs of those needing Christian Science nursing, as well as to the ongoing inquiries of the public licensing authority. That it continued to positively respond to the demands of Department of Institutions and Agencies, that it no longer perceived their queries to be either punitive or meddlesome (as sometimes had been the case in Barmore years) indicated that Tenacre, as an organization, was, like its manager, “earning its spurs” even as it sought to reflect the teachings of Christian Science in the daily practice of its nursing ministry.

Such unfoldment blessed not only Tenacre, but also those with whom the organization was in contact. This was certainly the case with a young executive who had been in touch with Burwell on several occasions in the latter part of 1939 in regard to the care of a bedridden relative who desired the atmosphere at Tenacre. Recalled Burwell:

He wanted to know if I could take care of a relative of his. I said, “No, I’m not in a position to take physical care of a case of that kind.” But he kept at me, so I said, “Well, we have a cottage here that we’re not using. It has been vacant since I came here, and it has five rooms in it. It has no heating system. It would cost me \$1,500 or \$2,000 to fix up a room there. If you can pay for special [Christian Science] nursing, around-the-clock [Christian Science] nurses, then I’ll fix it up, if you give me the \$2,000 to fix the room up.” So, he did!

That building had five bedrooms, and they all worked toward a kitchen. You could go outside from all five rooms. It wasn’t very long before someone else came to me, and I made the same

“as we go along”

proposition to them. Finally, we had five patients in that building, physical care patients, not mental, and all of them had two Christian Science nurses.

We found out that the admissions and departures from that building of five were five times as much as any place else.¹⁶

While the renovation enlarged Tenacre’s service, it made an impact in other ways. First, it provided the blessing of learning something about privacy. The Cottage design fostered privacy and the first guests to use it needed the round-the-clock care provided by private Christian Science nurses. Thus it was that the guests themselves were totally free of anyone else’s presence, with the exception of those working directly in support of the healing. And Burwell records that there was a succession of quick healings.

Second, the guests in these Cottage rooms were there for physical healing rather than for mental care. When the Christian Science nurses from North Hall began to be rotated into the Cottage, turnover in the staff dropped and the Christian Science nursing staff further stabilized. The Cottage provided them with a welcome respite from the demands of mental care cases in North Hall.

Between 1939 and 1941, the new manager and Board of Trustees made great strides in extricating Tenacre from its tenuous state of impecuniousness and doubtful repute. They found that they were on a journey for which neither maps nor helpful guidebooks existed. Christian Science nursing was, for all intents and purposes, still very much in its infancy. Burwell put it this way:

I found out early that Christian Science nursing was not an accomplished art. Nobody could tell me what it was.¹⁷

It wasn’t for want of asking that he made this statement. He asked the Christian Science Benevolent Association in Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts, operated by The Mother Church, to recommend Tenacre to Christian Science nurses who had completed their three-year training course. He found, however, that they did little if anything to encourage their graduates to work at Tenacre. He concluded that there were two reasons for this. First and most obvious was that Tenacre’s continued existence, at least to those looking from the outside in, was very much in doubt. It was still to be seen as to whether or not its one-time reputation for good works could be resurrected. Second, graduates from the Benevolent Association were trained for private duty. Also, they had not been exposed to mental care Christian Science nursing and were possibly reluctant to consider it. Therefore, by dint of their training, they were much more inclined to establish their individual practices of Christian Science nursing in the Field instead of in an institution. Whatever the reason or reasons may have been, Benevolent Association-trained Christian Science nurses did not regard service at Tenacre as a viable alternative. Just where trained Christian Science nurses might come from was yet to be determined.

Before any progress could be made in that direction, Burwell found that he first had to earn his spurs with his own staff! When he arrived at Tenacre in 1939 as a callow volunteer manager, he was all of thirty-two years of age. He was younger than any of the Christian Science nurses on the staff. He confided in later years that they were fairly doubtful that a neophyte such as he was truly equal to the task before him. Burwell responded to this challenge by making sure that he was on solid metaphysical ground before he proposed anything either to the Board of Trustees or to the staff of Christian Science nurses. He poured over past and current volumes of the Christian Science periodicals to glean arguments he felt could be employed to bolster his own prayerful reasoning for doing what he felt needed doing. Then he would refer to an article he had read when making his point, and, more often than not, keep the article close at hand for ready distribution. This was a practice he continued throughout his entire fifty-year tenure. Step by step, he began to assuage the doubts of the Board and the staff, as well as his own.

The records indicate that Christian Science nurses were constantly coming and going. Christian Science nurses would move back and forth from private duty cases to Tenacre for a few months and then back to private duty again. An advertisement for Christian Science nurses, appearing in *The Christian Science Monitor* in the 1930s, is an indication that Kathryn Barmore was actively engaged in keeping Christian Science nurses on the staff. The new Board and manager inherited the situation with which she was likely all too familiar.

In addition, Tenacre still had to have at least one former medical nurse. In a 1996 interview, Burwell described the staff he inherited in 1939:

The license was granted on the basis of our having a registered medical nurse. The State authority could not set that aside. If we had a former medical nurse whose license was still valid, they would recognize that, [even while] knowing that she was not now following any medical procedures. Ruth Hulse [a former medical nurse], who was credited by the Philadelphia area as having delivered about 300 Christian Science babies, was head nurse when I took over. She had about eight or nine Christian Science nurses at that time.¹⁸

Fortunately, the employment files from that time were saved and indicate that, including Ruth Hulse, there were nine Christian Science nurses and two orderlies. Of this number, seven had been hired by Kathryn Barmore, and the remaining four by the Court-appointed Receiver, Harry Starr. One of this number, Lilian Nichols, had been with Tenacre and the Barmores since Tenacre's doors were first opened.¹⁹ Margaret Leighton, Madeline Elsaesser, Floyd Jones, and Estrid E. Bernsdorff, were hires of Mrs. Barmore. Mary B. Robinson and Ruth Hulse were both Registered Nurses and were also hired by Mrs. Barmore. Jennie W. Sergeant, Carroll M. Tucker, (a male nurse, a close friend of Burwell, and like Burwell, a pupil of Howard Graham Bleakly), Annie M. Rye, and Florence Bechler, were hired by Mr. Starr.

Here was the conundrum: how was it possible to augment the Christian Science nursing staff if the one place in the country preparing trained Christian Science nurses neither encouraged its graduates to go to Tenacre nor acknowledged that Tenacre might be a good place to work? Several steps were taken in an effort to unravel the puzzle. First, the standing employment files were rooted through and letters fired off to former staff members. Burwell hired five people between June 15, 1939 and the end of that year. Then, in an effort to further bolster the staff, Tenacre's Christian Science nurses themselves went to the new manager with a request. They asked:

"Would it be all right if we put Mrs. Swift on the [Christian Science] nursing staff and get someone else as a housekeeper?"

The request put Burwell back on his heels. Why not indeed! Mrs. Swift was a Christian Scientist but had had no training. At the time this suggestion arose, only three sources for *Journal*-listed Christian Science nurses existed. The first was the Benevolent Association training program that included a three- to five-year "apprenticeship" as a housekeeper prior to the 3-year Christian Science nurses' training program.²⁰ The second was engaging someone who had worked in the Field. For example, if one were engaged in nursing fellow Christian Scientists in the Field for five years, one could supply The Christian Science Publishing Society with three references of successfully concluded cases and thus be approved to list in *The Christian Science Journal* as a Christian Science nurse. Former medical nurses were the third source. If a medical Registered Nurse converted to Christian Science, they could apply for *Journal*-listing. In any case, it was a limited pool. He responded to the suggestion:

Up to that time, all I heard about were trained [Christian Science] nurses, experienced [Christian Science] nurses, and I said, "Well, this woman is not experienced – she's a mother, and she has raised four boys, and they're all in business today. She's a dynamic person, but what does she know about [Christian Science] nursing?"

There were some areas where Burwell was not ahead of his times. But he continues:

They said they had been using her every spare minute that she was not doing housekeeping, and they would like to put her on. So, I gave them permission to do that, but said, “Listen, if you can make a [Christian Science] nurse that fast, why are we beating the bushes around here to find [Christian Science] nurses? Why don’t we make our own Christian Science nurses?”²¹

The suggestion, “Why don’t we make our own Christian Science nurses?” though novel to Burwell, had its roots in Tenacre’s own past. Ever since Tenacre formally opened its doors in 1922, its Christian Science nursing staff had come primarily from either the second or third category of sources listed above, or from those who had received their experience as they lived and worked at Tenacre.²² In a 1981 interview, Burwell further recalled:

[Before 1939, Tenacre] trained their own Christian Science nurses from scratch. There was a tremendous esprit de corps among the ones that had been here and gone out and come back. There were maybe ten or twenty Christian Science nurses that were identified as “Tenacre nurses” in those days, and very few of them had had any formal training except what they got here. There was no formal training.²³

With a nod toward the Department of Institutions and Agencies, formal training at Tenacre by qualified instructors became an idea whose time had come. It received a great boost toward reality when the manager received an inquiry from a Benevolent Association-trained nurse in early February of 1941. The letter from Miss Emily Moulton read, in part:

I should very much like to come to Tenacre for two or three months to get some experience dealing with mental cases. I do not feel that I have mastered Christian Science but know that I have learned enough of its truth and beauty to love it. I am seeking always to make it more effective in my life and thoughts.

Miss Moulton (later Mrs. Valentine) was hired. Immediately it was seen that she was literally a Godsend. Said Burwell about Miss Moulton:

She was a born teacher, and it was she that started the Tenacre School for practical Christian Science nurses.²⁴

The far left bay of the garage, which is today’s Post Office building, was converted into the School’s first classroom. Two and three candidates were accepted for training every month or two, and Miss Moulton was the School’s instructor.²⁵ She provides a glimpse of the blessing that Tenacre had let itself in for when she was hired, in a 1973 article published in *The Christian Science Journal*:

As a graduate [Christian Science] nurse, I went to a Christian Science facility serving, particularly, people who were suffering from mental illness. I had come there to learn how to care for patients with mental problems.

It was a revelation to me to see, shortly, that what I had really come for was to learn to be a Christian Scientist when caring for the mentally ill. I, not they, had to be the Christian Scientist. And what discipline and growth that was! Whenever I really achieved that level, I was a true comfort to the patient, a true support to the healing work, and a real blessing to the facility. I was then part of the ministry of healing that is Christian Science in operation. I was at one with the functioning of divine Love.²⁶

This approach blessed those who came here for training as well. In fact, training positions were offered to those who were actually ineligible for training at the Christian Science Benevolent Association. The Benevolent Association required that candidates be between the ages of 24 and 42. Because Tenacre did not want in any way to appear as though it was competing with the Benevolent

Association for Christian Science nursing training candidates, it opened the doors to its school to those who were under 24 and over 42. For many years, most of the Christian Science nursing trainees were of the latter age grouping. Eventually, Tenacre had quite a pool of talented, dedicated, mature Christian Science nurses, all of whom had been trained on site. Commented Burwell:

*What we were doing was pioneering institutional nursing without knowing it!*²⁷

The School itself was yet another “vessel” filled by the outpouring of inspired activity. Such inspired activity was an important part of all the factors of stewardship that helped to define Tenacre in the crucial days following formal takeover, and continues to define it today. It was also an important milestone in the improved relationship between Tenacre’s staff of Christian Science nurses and its manager.

There was another aspect of staffing that was also quite different from staffing the Hotel Martine in East Orange. As difficult as it was to attract new Christian Science nurses to Tenacre’s staff, it was also impossible to lay any of them off – as he automatically would have done at the Hotel Martine – should there be a downturn in occupancy. This he faced sometime in the third quarter of 1940. Having worked so diligently to find the staff, he turned to the Board of Trustees for prayerful support. Burwell spoke of this predicament:

*We had twenty guests and twenty [Christian Science] nurses and could think in terms of a decent operation. Then ten people were healed and went home. I had twenty [Christian Science] nurses and didn’t want to lose any of them. I said to Henry Stenson that if I were in the hotel business, I could reduce my staff, but in this case I have to hold on to them. I don’t have money to pay them. But we worked it out day by day.*²⁸

After only a short while, new guests filled Tenacre to capacity, and the crisis was over. The Christian Science nursing staff likely began to see that they had a modicum of support from the new manager.

The great turnover in the physical care cases that he attributed to the Cottage’s design lent sufficient encouragement to try a similar sort of set-up in meeting the special needs of a patient in the mental care building, North Hall. He took steps to improve a private enclosure and the little shed it surrounded in the hopes that whomever would be cared for there would benefit from the enhanced privacy. What eventually became a secure outdoor pavilion never met with the full approval of the Department of Institutions and Agencies. He was asked to end that experiment. It appears to have been a case where enthusiasm for a new discovery outstripped the wisdom necessary to please the licensing agency. Yet the value of the patient’s privacy continued to have an effect on all future design considerations at Tenacre. Burwell related in an interview in 1987:

*I went to the State architect, who had a private practice, because I knew that whatever he did would get approval. I had him design the units. You will recognize them as #15, #17, and #19 in North Hall. Those three units had a living room, a bedroom, a bath, and an exercise yard. And we had an observation corridor alongside of them where, regardless of weather, we could put the patient in there and leave them totally free of someone else’s presence. But we could observe them from the other side of the wall. We used those units very successfully with private duty [Christian Science] nurses.*²⁹

The addition of these 8 rooms (five in the Cottage and three in North Hall) brought the total of rooms available for Tenacre’s guests to 26. With the increased capacity came an increase in the number of guests. And with more guests, there was greater income. Burwell commented on this development:

*We were running full, because the Field needed us. We never had to “sell” Tenacre after that. And we priced it at a figure that would break even at 75% occupancy. I could run the whole place if I had 75% of the rooms occupied at \$7.00 per day, and that included 2 hours of [Christian Science] nursing. Once I went past 75%, I was in the profit position.*³⁰

I can remember once I had a call from Chicago about somebody who needed to come here. This was Monday and they said, “Well, we got a driver, but I don’t think we can make plans to leave here before Thursday, so we’ll get there Saturday.” I said, “I’ll come and get her!” I left in the next hour and drove all night with somebody with me and we picked up the patient and drove back and I had two extra days’ revenue. So I was rendering a service to both, to Tenacre and the patient. We did things like that rather than keep a room vacant.

For a while I literally had a 25% profit. This profit was going to rehabilitate the place, to pay off the creditors from the bankruptcy, and to accumulate a little bit of savings.³¹

As prayer brought inspired ideas and progress, those involved with Tenacre began to see more and more, “the manifold grace of God.” Examples of grace – things freely given and gratefully received – abound. The manager himself worked for the first two years as an unpaid volunteer. He commuted several times a week from his home at the Hotel Martine in East Orange, New Jersey. The Garden State was not then blessed with the high-speed, express thoroughfares it enjoys today. He likely picked up Route 27 at its terminus just south of Newark and drove the 40-plus miles to Princeton and Tenacre. Burwell is quoted as saying, “I was running two food-serving operations and ate most of my meals at the Sunset Diner on Route 27 – in between!”³²

In summer 1941, after two years of commuting, he and Martha surprised themselves by agreeing to leave the Hotel Martine behind and move to Tenacre. They converted Terrace Cottage into a simple residence. It had been used to house dairy machinery and once featured a bank of stanchions used to hold the cows as they were being milked. It still had a dirt floor in the kitchen area when they moved in and for the first year. Martha recalled:

We had no place to live when we came here, so we made a place. We were in it for 20 years. It had a dirt floor. I can remember the day I sat in the middle of it and cried. I said, “Burwell, we’ll have to leave if you don’t get a kitchen floor.”³³

It is an understatement to say that their patience paid dividends – both for Tenacre and for themselves. But in this instance, Martha’s patience was at an end. Burwell finally took steps to install a suitable floor, and the conjugal crisis was finally healed. While they lived there it was known as Harrison Haven.

As an expression of the desire of the Board of Trustees to have Tenacre appear as though it was again worthy of the confidence of the Field it served, and, as well, to assuage whatever antagonistic feelings the Department of Institutions and Agencies may have been harboring against Tenacre, the Christian Science practitioners who were Board members agreed not to take as patients those who were guests at Tenacre. They did not want the perception that Tenacre could possibly be taking advantage of its guests. It was a gesture replete with grace. At first glance, this may not seem to be much of an addition to the examples of grace that eased Tenacre’s passage through the period of reorganization. To the contrary; several things were accomplished with this decision. First, it was a signal to the Department of Institutions and Agencies that personal profit was not the reason the new Board desired to have its license reinstated. Second, it was a clear indication that the not-for-profit Foundation truly had another motive – they were there solely for the benefit of those it would serve. The Department wanted to prevent a conflict of interest and the Board fully concurred.

Still another example of things freely given and freely received: George Van Horn, a local carpenter, worked without pay for a number of years. His is an unparalleled example of selfless service. Without the form of “grace” his unique contribution provided, the Cottage, the outdoor pavilion, and numerous other projects, all designed to maximize the amount of viable space, likely could not have been completed in such a timely fashion. Burwell described George’s value to Tenacre:

George Van Horn was a young contractor in the area who had no financial backing, going from hand to mouth. I began to want to do things, and he came in and before he or I knew it, I

owed him a couple thousand dollars and had no way of guaranteeing it out of Tenacre, so it was a gentleman's agreement. I got Van Horn building on trust. From that time on, Tenacre on his books as an Account Receivable grew and grew because I was keeping some of his men at Tenacre all the time. He was doing the work and supplying the lumber and nothing but my good looks to assure him that he would be paid. It got up to \$35,000 at one time that we owed him. Tenacre became a very profitable account for him. But at the beginning, he was a very important factor. His need and our need came together to benefit each one.³⁴

The Christian Science nursing staff made a contribution at least as valuable as George Van Horn's. It was nothing less than heroic. No other adjective can properly describe what they did to help with the resuscitative efforts. They worked for long hours over long periods of time with little compensation, other than knowing that their work was needed and valued. A Christian Science nurse worked for twelve hours each day (with two hours off in the middle of each shift), six and a half days a week, with a half-day off. The night duty staff worked twenty-eight days straight with two days off at the end of the twenty-eight-day cycle.³⁵ The demanding schedule those Christian Science nurses followed made it possible for Tenacre to realize the benefit of the peculiar design that the Cottage, refurbished by George Van Horn, provided in support of the effective practice of Christian Science nursing in an institutional setting.

But there was still another element in the pre-war period that had to find its proper expression, that of benevolence. The manager's autonomy, the carpenter's largesse, the Board's selfless motives, and the skills, generosity, consecration and ingenuity of the staff of Christian Science nurses, were all factors that prepared the way for the advent of what came to be called “The Tenacre Friendly Fund.” It began spontaneously and reflected the gracious generosity by which Tenacre itself had been blessed, by providing benevolence for those guests needing help with payment of the charges. Burwell traced the beginnings of The Friendly Fund:

In 1941 we took in a patient from New York, a young girl who was in Sunday School, who had become mentally off balance. When I talked to her father about the financial arrangements, I found out that he was a \$40 a week milkman. Our rate was \$49. I said, “How are you going to pay for this?” “Oh,” he said, “I'll just use up all my savings [\$300] if I have to.” I said, “I can't take it from you at \$49 a week, but I also can't take her for nothing, so you pay \$25 a week.”

That night [the father] went home with a Mrs. W__ who owned half of Brooklyn's tenement houses. In his gratitude and exuberance, he told her what we had done. So she came to see me the following week. “How come I pay \$49 a week for my daughter and he pays \$25 when they are in adjoining rooms?” I said, “Because you can afford to and he can't. If you need the same kind of help he needs, I'll do the same for you.”

The next week when I rendered him a bill, I rendered it for \$49 and just pulled the “Tenacre Friendly Fund” right out of the air and wrote in a credit from The Tenacre Friendly Fund for \$24 and left \$25 for him to pay. That's how The Tenacre Friendly Fund came into existence.³⁶

In another interview, Mr. Harrison explained,

It has never had contributions equal to what we give in benevolence.

We've always said that we feel that you can't run a place like this without the element of benevolence provided. You've got to make provision for it.³⁷

That it was able to include benevolence to its guests was a true indicator that they were indeed on the right path. The break-even point established by the manager (the point beyond which the organization began to turn a profit) along with the new Friendly Fund, enabled Tenacre to offer at least some form of benevolence to the point where one in four beds was a “free” bed.

“as we go along”

As time went on and expenses grew, before we ever raised our rates, we allowed that breakeven point to keep going up and up until it was 90%; it was only one bed out of ten that we could afford to be a free bed. Once it hit that, we had to decide just what to do about it. What was happening, the rich were paying for the poor – people who could pay full rate were paying for it. So when it reached 90%, I found I couldn't even sustain that. I said, “I think that one out of 10, or 10% benevolence is the minimum that this kind of place should ever operate at. You just cannot maintain a non-profit enterprise particularly in the Christian Science context and say, ‘Okay, we don't take anybody who can't pay the full rate.’ You've got to have this much elbow room to move around in, in the way of benevolence.”³⁸

By dint of his membership in the Princeton chapter of the Rotary Club, Burwell was acutely aware of the methods Princeton Hospital used to meet its financial obligations. Rates were kept artificially low so that individuals availing themselves of its services could afford to pay. Yet, as beneficial as that seemed to be in the short term, the hospital and its “auxiliaries” – groups concerned about the welfare of the community – were in the position of having continually to raise money in order to make up the deficit built into such a funding system. In order that Tenacre might never be put in the position of having to dun the Christian Science Field for contributions – which was not an option since the time of reorganization when The Christian Science Board of Directors informally requested that Tenacre not ask the Field for financial support – rates were set so that they met the actual Christian Science nursing and operating costs.

To be sure, a keen eye was continually cast toward the daily costs of Tenacre's operation. Just as every inch of space was utilized to maximum efficiency³⁹, and every room possible was used for a paying guest, so too, every dollar was stretched as far as it would go. It was thus that Tenacre became self-sufficient.

The discovery that benevolence could be offered through The Friendly Fund, and that it could be offered regularly, points to the fact that Tenacre had indeed been resuscitated, and that it was a thriving and vital institution. Benevolence is an issue, which will surface in a number of different, significant forms throughout Tenacre's history.

Despite this renewed health, the record still holds plenty of evidence that, at times, it was a very rough go. Burwell recalled:

Taking care of mental patients is no picnic. We had escapes and we were beaten up. Martha wondered what right we had to be attempting this with no education, no professional experience of this kind, and she was constantly bothered by that particular aspect of the whole thing. What right did we have to think we could do it?

Our Board recognized that we were walking on water, so they were acting like Christian Scientists in their approach to us. They weren't asking too many details. We were calling on them all the time.

We had enough results to be encouraged all the time, but we had our down times.⁴⁰

By assiduously taking up the work in each case – by pouring out the “oil” that the work of the dedicated Board members provided – many wonderful results were seen despite the sometimes severe challenges that arose. The manager spoke of one such case in the 1987 interview:

In one of those units we had a woman who was attempting to starve herself to death – and she finally appeared to be in a coma. I was spending some time in there, and at some point I discovered a little flutter to her eyelids as though she was alert to what was going on and really knowing what we were doing.

So, I asked them to get me a record changer with Mr. Brown's reading of Science and Health, and I put it in the clothes closet and put a stack of records on it.⁴¹ I set them going, and we

“as we go along”

were timing it and would go in and change them. She got Science and Health in that closet 24 hours a day, and she finally came out of it.

She finally waited on tables here for a long time. At some point she told me that’s what did it. She said, “I couldn’t shut the stuff out.” She was a good Christian Scientist to start with. So she could doze off or go to sleep and when she woke up it was still there. Finally, it penetrated and she began to work positively with it. So, our PA system came out of our desire to furnish a 24-hour service of that kind.⁴²

The Public Address system is an integral and valued part of features available to both guests and residents at Tenacre even today. Thus it illustrates the spiritual worth of inspiration poured out selflessly – it is of enduring and constant value.

Again and again, it was proved that adversity, the toad ugly and venomous of Shakespeare’s invention, had its sweet uses.⁴³ Their patience in facing the adversities encouraged them in the work and granted an increasing sense of confidence. It would be needed.

In 1943, when the wartime draft started including married men, Burwell Harrison was drafted into the U.S. Army. Under the terms of the Draft law, he could have qualified for a deferment from service as an individual indispensable to his company’s operation. In fact, he actually had a petition in hand that had been drafted by Tenacre’s attorney. But this option was not exercised.

Martha and I read this affidavit of indispensability the lawyer had prepared. I said, “If I die today, Tenacre will go on.” We were down at the door of the Draft Board that June evening to present it. We turned around and came home, never having presented it.

Tenacre was on its feet by that time – no, we still hadn’t paid off all the creditors, but we were on the way.⁴⁴

His induction was postponed for 60 days while construction on the new sewage treatment plant was completed. As well, the Harrisons traveled to Boston in order to introduce Mrs. Harrison to the Christian Science Board of Directors as the interim manager. Shortly after their return to Princeton, he was inducted. It was a memorable scene:

Henry Stenson was a New York [Christian Science] practitioner who never had an office. He became one of the most dedicated Board members we ever had. He was the one I called the most for metaphysical support for Tenacre. He came down to Tenacre the day I left for the Army. We were assembled on Nassau Street and marched all the way down to the railroad station. I was in charge of the 90 men since I was the oldest one of the bunch, and so they had given me the papers to carry. Mr. Stenson walked right at my elbow on that march down the block to the station.⁴⁵

Had Norman Rockwell, the popular painter and illustrator of the American spirit in the 1940s and 1950s, been a witness to all of this, the scene he might have painted, – a 91-man parade of inductees, headed by a man twice the age of the men he was leading, himself accompanied by his Christian Science practitioner – would certainly have been a worthy cover for *The Saturday Evening Post*. The Tenacre Burwell Harrison left behind in the capable hands of the Board and Martha Harrison was a fully revitalized organization operating at full capacity. The major work of reorganization, save full repayment to the creditors and bondholders, was accomplished.

¹ Interview, Chris Irby/JBH, February 1996, p. 1.

² Memo, JBH to H. G. Bleakly, July 19, 1939, p. 2.

³ Interview, Honicky/JBH, 1987, p. 4

⁴ One example of the results of Burwell's prayerful work for himself: When the 1939 World's Fair opened in late 1938 or early 1939, he took it upon himself to take some permanent residents of his hotel in East Orange, NJ to visit the marvel. On p. 20 of the Harrison/Honicky interview, he shared, "That was a very conscious, deliberate prayer, and within two or three months after I had taken over, I had fixed myself a bed where Mr. and Mrs. Travis live back of the Post Office and would take a nap after I had gotten myself up early and come down here. That afternoon I was very disturbed about the whole thing, and I was saying to myself - I couldn't go to sleep - 'How in the hell did I get myself mixed up in this business?' The answer came back, 'You asked for it.' I've always said the voice came out of the corner of the room. 'You said you'd go anywhere and take Christian Science where you went. And just because this is only between 40-50 miles out of New York or Philadelphia, it's just as pioneering as if you'd gone to Iceland.' I was thinking of one of those foreign countries that I was seeing in those buildings. So, I realized that day that I was 'stuck' with it."

⁵ Interview, H. O. Rivas/JBH, 1987, p. 4.

Upon his return from WW II, Burwell resumed taking Christian Science practice, apart from his work at Tenacre, and accepted calls from patients in his Trenton, New Jersey office. The Board of Trustees asked him to curtail this activity so that his entire effort could be given to Tenacre. He complied.

⁶ Interview, Nancy Young/JBH, 1975, p. 1.

⁷ Letter, JBH to S.S., September 8, 1967.

⁸ Jaffe, Dorothy, "The History of Tenacre: The Tenacre Idea", 1965, p. 3.

⁹ Burwell and Martha Harrison were married in January 1934.

¹⁰ Honicky/JBH, 1987, p. 7.

¹¹ Young/JBH, 1975, p. 1, 2.

¹² Letter, JBH to Commissioner William J. Ellis, July 29, 1939.

¹³ Board Memo, July 19, 1939.

¹⁴ Brochure, July 1939

¹⁵ Young/JBH, p. 2.

¹⁶ Honicky/JBH, p.14.

¹⁷ Ibid, p. 13.

¹⁸ C. Irby/JBH, 1996, pp. 3, 4.

¹⁹ Lilian Nichols worked at Tenacre from 1922 until the 1960's. Memo to the Board, March 28, 1966.

²⁰ Interview, Van Horn/JBH, 1981, p. 4.

²¹ Honicky/JBH, pp. 82, 83.

In point of fact, the Benevolent Association trained Christian Science nurses for private duty. JBH in the Van Horn Interview, p. 2: "When we came to Tenacre and tried to get some BA Christian Science nurses down here so we could have at least the highest standard that we could find for Christian Science nursing, Miss Wassman was very outspoken. She did not want any of her nurses coming here – not because she didn't like us, but they were trained for private duty [Christian Science] nursing, and as for institutional [Christian Science] nursing they never thought of that."

²² Interview, Wesman/Fielder, p. 16.

Alberta recalled, "There was a Miss Adele Gutmann that advertised an employment agency in The

[Christian Science] Monitor. When I would need extra help, I would contact her and she would send me down help. One of the times, we had a situation in which I had my uniform on for three days and nights without taking it off. So I called her, but she said that everyone had been called out. She had three people. She said, ‘They won’t be much help, because they don’t know very much. One of them is a refugee from the First World War. Another one is a young person that I don’t have much confidence in.’ I said, ‘At this minute, anything would be useful even if all they can do is carry trays.’ ”

²³ Van Horn/JBH, p. 3.

²⁴ C. Irby/JBH, p. 4.

²⁵ Memo, JBH to Staff, November 8, 1973.

“Mrs. Valentine or Emily Moulton was the first Chestnut Hill graduate who consented to come to Tenacre after Mrs. Harrison and I came here in 1939. She went on to the practice, moved to California, married. And, through opening her own home to a couple of elderly [Christian Science] practitioners to prevent their going to a county home, she became in the eyes of California law an operator of ‘a home for the elderly.’ She withdrew from the *Journal* as a [Christian Science] practitioner and became the founder of Valentine Home in San Mateo.”

²⁶ Emily Moulton Valentine, “The Professional Nurse.” *The Christian Science Journal*, 1973, Vol.91, No. 10, pp. 600-603.

²⁷ Honicky/JBH, p. 13.

²⁸ C. Irby/JBH, p. 5.

²⁹ Ibid, p. 15.

³⁰ This was a formula gleaned from his experience at the Hotel Martine. Van Horn Interview of JBH, p. 30, Burwell states, “When I was charged with finding out how to make this thing go, I figured out what it would cost to operate. Then I figured out what rate I would have to have to cover that cost of operation if I was operating at 75% occupancy – which is just exactly what I did when I picked up a bankrupt hotel in East Orange.”

³¹ Young/JBH, p. 2.

³² Honicky/JBH, p. 5.

³³ Interview, Board/JBH & MCH, transcribed in Board Minutes, Sept. 25, 1991, p. 1. This story was recalled at a special farewell meeting with the Board just before the Harrisons retired to California. After living with the dirt floor for a year, a proper floor was installed.

³⁴ C. Irby, p. 3.

³⁵ Honicky/JBH, p. 14. The full quote: “In those days [Christian Science] nurses were getting \$2.00/day. They worked 27 days without a day off and then they got two days. For \$60/month and room and board, they worked 28 days straight and two days off. And our rates I imagine were still \$7.00 - \$9.00/day for room, board and full nursing— 24 hour nursing. We were \$7.00/day when I came here. So, we went to \$9.00 to \$12.00 to \$14.00, etc. ... We could get private duty [Christian Science] nurses in here for some better than \$2.00/day but not much more.”

By comparison, in researching the Monthly Reports of the Department of Institutions and Agencies, it was found that an RN hired in 1927 to work as a mental nurse in one of the State’s institutions worked at the rate of \$100 per month. Though the salary level was \$40 per month less for a Christian Science nurse working at Tenacre some 11 years later, the effect of the National Depression is not to be overlooked. People were oftentimes grateful for steady work and agreed to accept whatever wage was offered. Thus a low wage and a job that included room and board did not always appear to be a great hardship. In a letter of October 30, 1944 from Tenacre to Agnes Louks, a Christian Science nurse, suggests that the work hours had been reduced: “The salary given to nurses who are listed in *The Christian Science Journal* is

\$64.00 per month, plus room, board and the laundering of uniforms. Our [Christian Science] nurses work 8 ½ hours each day and have a day off during the week. There is also a day's vacation earned each month which may be had at the end of six months of service." There is considerable doubt that Christian Science nurses actually were working the hours Miss Louks was led to believe. Betty Jo Hunt, remembered in a January 2000 interview that night duty Christian Science nurses in 1959 worked for 28 days straight and then had 6 days off. It was not until September 1965 that the 40-hour work week became general policy. To be sure, the hours were always adjusted in order to balance the demand with the number of Christian Science nurses available.

³⁶ Young/JBH, p. 3. To be sure, the Barmores offered benevolence, but without the entrepreneurial wisdom that Burwell brought to bear.

³⁷ Van Horn/JBH, p. 32.

In this interview, Burwell quotes a former bookkeeper, Minna Travis, who said, "This place, they're not interested in what comes in; they're interested in giving. I think the giving is the thing that brings it in." About this quote, Burwell says, "She says it very nicely. It's so off-hand that it's genuine."

³⁸ Young/JBH, p.4

³⁹ Interview, Archives/Gehret, 1999.

Retired Christian Science nurse and instructor, Maurine Mallard Gehret began her service to Tenacre in 1942. The classroom where she taught Christian Science nursing to Tenacre students, in the first bay of today's Post Office, was actually her own room! Lanning-MacQueen Interview of Muriel Hustedt, who has been continuously a staff member 1963-present (2002), shared that if a staff member went on vacation, her room must be spotless so that Tenacre might use it for visiting family or guests.

⁴⁰ Honicky/JBH, p. 20.

Mr. Harrison adds, "By this time--this was quite late, in the late 50s, I guess--Martha and I went to Chicago to interview [a couple who had applied]. I learned from this magazine that the American Psychiatric Association was having an annual convention in Cleveland, and it was on the subject of The Open Hospital. They were going to hear from a committee that they had set up the previous year that had gone to England for three months and studied the concept of an open hospital over there. This was getting away from the snake pits. The theme at the convention was this report from this committee. So I felt it would wise for Martha and me to go. We were there for three days. Lo and behold, after three years of studying the question before they appointed the committee and they sent the committee to England, and this big deal of reporting on an open hospital! They were just learning what we had already attempted and put into pretty good effect. Martha never questioned our ability after that. We just know that you can do anything that you have to do and are given the information that you need."

⁴¹ North Hall rooms were small with few furnishings. There was a built-in dresser in the closet on which the record player could be set. The closets were lockable so the contents would not be disturbed.

⁴² Honicky/JBH, p. 17.

⁴³ Eddy, Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures, p. 66:1

⁴⁴ Honicky/JBH, p. 12

⁴⁵ C. Irby/JBH, p. 2.25

“during the War”

Chapter 3

“ ...during the War”

*“They which builded on the wall, and they that bare burdens,
with those that laded, every one with one of his hands wrought in the work,
and with the other hand held a weapon.”*

Nehemiah 4:17

America entered the Second World War as a result of Pearl Harbor. The severe national depression was forever put out of sight and out of mind through the tremendous concentration of thought, energy, and desire that was collectively expressed by the American people in our nation's response to the gravity of the global situation.

With G.I. Joe at the Front, Rosie the Riveter took up the work at home (*“every one with one of his hands wrought in the work, and with the other hand held a weapon”*). Women worked in jobs not normally available to them in peacetime. They not only manned the factories and produced the food, munitions, armaments, and all other war equipment needed on the land and seas and in the skies, they also enlisted in the military, ran the newspapers, and filled executive and management positions.

As one who stepped up to fill the vacuum left by her husband's induction to the U.S. Army, Martha Harrison took over the reins of Tenacre as its interim manager. There were twenty-five guests and twenty-five Christian Science nurses at Tenacre when she began.

Steps had been taken, before Burwell's departure, to bring the physical plant up to snuff as much as possible¹ and to insure that Tenacre would not be left completely at the mercy of the local food rationing board. Board member Henry Stenson purchased some large copper kettles so that fresh vegetables might be canned and served throughout the winter. A new Board member, Joseph Sykes, the owner of a Philadelphia lumberyard, generously donated more than enough lumber so a large, first class chicken house could be built. Burwell recalled:

During the war, when meat was so scarce, I put in one of these tiered chicken raiser things with 50 chicks up on top and moved them down. We had chicks coming in on a regular schedule from some place in New Hampshire until we had quite a thing. Finally, I bought the guts of a barn, and we had layers of cages where they laid eggs that rolled down the trough. We used this 11-foot-square building for that first thing. At some point Mr. Sykes said, “If Burwell is going to keep chickens, then we ought to give him a chicken house.”

He sent the lumber up every week, all we needed, and he would pay the payroll for the carpenters. He contracted for a 20' by 40' house, a one-story chicken house. When we decided to add an upstairs, we added an outside staircase, as I didn't want to give up any of that 40' interior space. I kept enlarging and enlarging the building all the time. When I went in the Army, it was finished and stocked with chickens.²

It was stocked with over 400 chickens at the time of his induction-day march to the Princeton train station. However, it was soon seen that even the best-laid plans, however carefully incubated, do not always hatch as hoped. The man hired to tend the chickens left Tenacre about a week after Burwell was inducted. He had chickened out and flown the coop. “So, Martha was here without a man on

“during the War”

the place and those chickens to take care of, plus all the guests and everything else,” recalled Burwell.³ Martha’s own recollection of the chicken house was slightly more vivid:

We didn’t have a man on the place, and I would get 100 pound bags of feed, back the little old station wagon up to the steps and tumble those bags up.⁴

It might have been a backbreaking task had it not been for the extraordinarily light touch with which she customarily handled weighty matters. In the interview she and Burwell gave in September 1991, Martha remembered something that had stayed with her through the years:

I got a call one night from Miss Griffin, one of our [Christian Science] nurses who was a paragon of virtue. She had charge of that little Cottage. We had a young woman come in that afternoon. Miss Griffin called me and said, “Mrs. Harrison, this new guest will not go to bed.” It was a lovely summer night, and I went over to see the new guest. She was sitting out on the porch enjoying the summer evening. She was perfectly capable of putting herself to bed, and she didn’t want to go to bed. Personally, I didn’t see why she had to go to bed, but I was upholding the [Christian Science] nurse, and we had a nice conversation. I went out and said to Miss Griffin, “Miss Griffin, she can put herself to bed – why does she have to go? You need a light touch with the guest.” And she said, “Mrs. Harrison, I never feel light on night duty.”⁵

This manifestation of Martha’s own light touch precisely illustrates the distinctive approach that carried her through the war years and continued to bless Tenacre throughout the ensuing years – a lightness, blended with a most kindly love that brought a sense of grace to her quotidian routines. Maurine Mallard Gehret, a Benevolent Association-trained Christian Science nurse who was on staff at that time, recalled:

Martha was very capable and managed Tenacre during the War. She knew all the vendors that Tenacre used, and they all knew her. When Ken Gehret became Monitor ad rep in Princeton, he had an easy time of it because everyone who advertised knew Martha. He later went to the Annual Meeting in Boston to give a report as to why he was so successful in selling ads. It was all due to Martha.⁶

Her kindly touch reached the hearts of everyone who met her, save perhaps of one man, the head of the food rationing board. In reminiscing about that time, she recalled:

There is something about having been in a war; life’s never the same afterwards. I oftentimes think of that when I go into the Superfresh and see all the produce available. We used to have ration cards here. I would go to the Ration Board to pick up sugar and gasoline and meat coupons. There was a Colonel B. who said to me, “Mrs. Harrison, you’re here for sugar for your booby hatch!” I used to have to steel myself to go in.⁷

Another of Martha’s stories reveals some of the unique challenges Tenacre faced in caring for mental cases. It shows evidence of Martha’s own metaphysical maturity, having come into Christian Science gradually after her marriage to Burwell.

We had a man patient here in North Hall. He had been a baseball player. He also had wheat fields way out in the West, and he loved to walk. He had become a recluse and didn’t communicate, but he had this wide, toothless smile that went from ear to ear. We had to watch him because when he got out, he walked.

So, one day, he went for a walk, and we couldn’t find him. I had notified the police, had notified the family; the [Christian Science] practitioner, of course, was working. I was just beside myself and thought, “Burwell’s coming home from the Army, and this fellow should

“during the War”

walk!” I had him every place but where he should be, and I couldn’t get my peace. This went on until the third day.

I was up at 4 o’clock one morning reading the Lesson. It was on “Man,” and out jumped from the page, man is not “an isolated, solitary idea,”⁸ and I thought, “Of course, he isn’t! He’s coexistent with the Father; the Father knows where he is; the Father’s taking care of him.” And I just made every affirmation I could of his unity and his oneness with his God.

About half an hour later, the Princeton police called and said, “Mrs. Harrison, your man is up at the Franklin Park Police Station.”⁹ We had a little station wagon that had gone about 90,000 miles. I drove up to the police station and went in and told the Captain who I was. He said, “Are you going to take that nut back to Princeton by yourself!” They brought him out. They had taken his belt off. He looked at me with this grin from ear to ear. I turned around and said to the officer, “Officer, he’s the prettiest thing that I’ve ever seen!” We got home, and he was as happy as a lark.¹⁰

Martha included another metaphysical landmark in her reminiscence:

We had a very disturbed patient. He was in a room with just a mattress on the floor. We had told the family that we weren’t equipped to keep him. The [Christian Science] nurse called me and said, “I don’t know what we’re going to do until the family comes.”

I called the [Christian Science] practitioner. I also called Mr. Stenson. He was the dearest, most wonderful man, and I could talk to him like a Dutch uncle. I told him what we were up against, and I went over to South Hall [torn down in 1956] and said to the girls, “Let me see him.”

I went in. He was calm. I sat on the mattress on the floor with him, and I said, “You know, this is Sacrament Sunday, and a Christian Scientist goes to church, and you’re going to church.” I came back and called the [Christian Science] practitioner, and the [Christian Science] nurse said to me, “You must be out of your mind. Do you know what you’re doing?” And I said, “I think so.”

We had the little church down on Olden Avenue then. He got dressed, and I was just praying, praying, praying. We got in that car, and we went to the church and sat on the back pew. When we said the Lord’s Prayer at the end of the service, the tears rolled down both of our faces. That thing just absolutely broke! And you know, when you’ve had an experience like that, you can’t settle for less. Those things have just fortified me over the years. When the family came, it was like the man who was “clothed, and in his right mind.”¹¹

...praying, praying, praying. One issue surfaced during this time that even the interim manager’s “lightness” and “steel” could not immediately resolve. A few of the staff Christian Science nurses had obviously been watching the innovations taking place in the wider labor market. By the beginning of the Second World War, the eight hours per day, five days per week reform had become the accepted workplace standard. It was an idea championed by the talented instructor of Tenacre’s School, Emily Moulton. But it was an idea whose time could not yet come to Tenacre.¹²

It would have required enlarging the size of the nursing staff by a third, proportionately increasing the Christian Science nursing payroll, and so on. For an organization that had just regained its financial equilibrium, it was a wholly unwieldy suggestion. Miss Moulton, bolstered in her reform efforts by her sister and aunt who were also members of the staff, did not relent. Burwell recalls,

Miss Moulton was a very difficult person for Martha to work with. In the middle of the war when labor was so scarce, she decided that [Christian Science] nurses had to go on an eight-hour day, five-day week, and she defied everybody. Martha was just at her wits’ end.

“during the War”

The Board was not going to innovate in this manner, under those circumstances. Even though the [Christian Science] nursing supervisors attended a Board meeting and were told that it was foolhardy, they were the Christian Science nursing authorities, and we couldn't do without them. And so while I was in the army, they went roughshod over Martha. But she survived it.¹³

In November 1945, Burwell Harrison returned from his military duty.¹⁴ He was impressed and surprised by Martha's accomplishments.

I really never expected Martha to be here when I got back. I thought she would ease herself out of here and go back to Washington, D.C., and when I got back, I'd go back to Washington, and we'd start all over again. That's what I fully expected. By the time I got back, – she couldn't buy things; she couldn't even repair the place – she had enough money in the bank to pay off almost all the rest of the debts, the [local] creditors, but not the bond issue.¹⁵

He discovered that a number of significant developments had taken place in his absence. He found that not only had Martha kept the place going, she had faithfully adhered to the debt payment schedule. She managed to save enough money so that all of the Princeton area suppliers could finally be repaid, 100 cents on the dollar, as per the Board of Trustees's original wishes and the reorganization agreement. This marked the full reemergence of Tenacre's good standing in the Princeton business community and opened the door to a reevaluation of the retirement of the indebtedness to the bondholders.

He also encountered the issue of the 40-hour week that had been proposed by Emily Moulton. The question was brought up and discussed again, yet it remained impossible to implement. A strenuous effort to both resolve the situation and retain the valuable Miss Moulton was made, but to no avail. Nine months after Burwell's return, Emily Moulton resigned. In a letter to the Board of Trustees, Miss Moulton explained her action:

I am not in sympathy with Mr. Harrison's attitude toward the proper value of his women [Christian Science] nurses and his graduates, nor to that which I call common business policy and not absolute honesty, nor to his demand that I simply teach and quit thinking about the progress of Christian Scientists and present day human conditions.

To him I seem too radical, unorthodox, and concerned with other people's business, too much concerned with present day conditions in relation to Christian Scientists, too impracticable.

Only Truth and Love are indispensable and that we all have with us all of the time. I therefore go forward to find that place where just as I am at the present stage of my growth I am of value, and of a value that shall increase and not diminish.

This five and a half year period has been full of joys as well as of sorrows, full of gropings and reachings toward Truth, toward the greater understanding and application of Christian Science. I believe and have faith that I have made consistent progress.

I am sincerely grateful for the friendliness and helpfulness the Management and Trustees have consistently shown me.¹⁶

It was a classic case of a moral dilemma: both sides were right. Management went forward with what they saw to be nearest right under the circumstances. Her resignation letter, dated August 15, 1946, was accepted with reluctance. Miss Moulton eventually entered into the public healing practice of Christian Science and moved to California where she married. She opened her own home to Christian Scientists, which eventually became Valentine Haven. Despite their differences, the Harrisons and Mrs. Valentine remained friends and kept in touch through the years.

“during the War”

The chicken house proved a more easily remedied question. Burwell saw that Martha had had her fill of chicken husbandry. The situation met with immediate resolve.

I hadn't been here very long before I cleared out all the chickens and let the place air for a year or two. Then we remodeled it into a dormitory and a recreation room. At one point, that was the largest single room we had at Tenacre – we held our Chapel services in it.¹⁷

Halfway House, as the former first-class chicken house came to be known, was yet another example of making the best possible use of what was available to them, another example of Tenacre's imaginative ministry of stewardship.

Burwell discovered another important accomplishment upon his return. During Martha's interim management of Tenacre, the Board of Trustees had entered into a purchase agreement for the adjacent Benson property. This was a major purchase that included not only the approximately 5 acres of ground, but also several sturdy, serviceable buildings. Burwell remarked at length on this expansion:

It had been for sale ever since I came to Tenacre for \$17,000. It had five acres of ground and the main house, which we call New Tenacre and was originally the homestead of a private family.

Two of our Trustees, while I was in the Army, Mr. Sykes and Mr. Grossman –the Philadelphia trustees – decided Tenacre should get the piece of property that had been up for sale all these years. By this time, we were housing twenty [Christian Science] nurses downtown and transporting them back and forth about four times a day. They would go downtown for their two-hour break, and we'd have to bring them back up. They worked twelve hours a day but took two hours off in the middle of that twelve hours, night and day.

The trustees bought it for \$14,500– the whole property – the house with this apartment attached, the barn which was then just a horse barn with all the stalls vacant, and a loft – all of that property and all those buildings and five acres of ground for \$14,500. The trustees furnished the \$3,000 down payment, and then we paid off the \$11,500 at the rate of \$1,000 per year and some interest. Part of the demonstration as I see it was that no one saw that place in all those years, and without it, we would be nowhere.¹⁸

As it was, a fellow Rotarian, who was a local real estate magnate, had plans for the buildings and property that were preempted by the decision of the Board of Trustees to purchase it all for Tenacre. The action, both for its timing and for what it brought to Tenacre, deepened the Manager's appreciation for Martha's managerial contribution during his absence and for the metaphysical concept of Tenacre that the Trustees brought to the Boardroom. He noted:

Metaphysically, I'm sure they translated Tenacre into a spiritual idea that had energy and impetus and power and everything within itself and that there wasn't anything they could do to it. Nobody could add to it nor take away from it. It was there.

It doesn't depend on us. The idea of Tenacre, the idea of service, the idea of being an opportunity to demonstrate Christian Science is evidence of God – that's what it is.¹⁹

Thinking of Tenacre as a spiritual idea was for Burwell a constant. He looked for and found God's hand in the faithful contributions of the Board and the staff and began to appreciate more their willingness to face challenges.

At the October 26, 1946 Board Meeting, Burwell distributed a memorandum to the Trustees present. It outlined the events leading to the demonstration of Tenacre's regained status. It pointed to the absolutely unique management style that had evolved since 1939 and to the unorthodox, ad hoc, yet wholly successful functioning of the economic aspect of the Foundation. And it

acknowledged that the stabilization and renewal of the organization would not have been possible without the consecration and sacrifices made by the early staff members.²⁰ The conclusion of the memo bore the reason for its writing:

*We have been willing to retire gracefully many times. Indeed, it was not until sometime after my return from the Army in 1945 that we permitted ourselves to even think in terms of permanency at Tenacre. We now have what amounts to a large financial investment in Tenacre. But, even so, as long as we are not dismissed summarily without some consideration being given to a financial settlement of some kind – possibly a year’s salary – we will both gladly retire gracefully at any time the Board feels we should do so.*²¹

This was a curious, even cautious way by which to indicate their willingness to continue at Tenacre. They were asking for the Board’s recognition of the extraordinary efforts, intelligent ideas, and novel methods by which Tenacre had gotten to this point; the Harrisons also needed the Board’s support for their management style during current challenges. Or they could leave and follow through with their pre-Tenacre plans to continue in the hotel business. The minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Trustees for December 1946 included the following resolution:

*Mr. Harrison brought up the advisability of his continuing at Tenacre for more than another six months, and it was moved, seconded, and passed that the matter be referred to the Executive Committee for discussion with Mr. Harrison and a report be made to the Board at its next meeting.*²²

By the January 1947 meeting, it is seen that the “ ‘conflicts’ which had given [Mr. Harrison] concern had been settled so that he could continue in the work indefinitely, but both [Harrisons] were most grateful for the understanding and generous thought of the members of the Board.”²³

While this was being worked out, the Board minutes show that the tough questions were being addressed. Certainly, Emily Moulton’s provocative letter to the Board in August was fresh in thought. There was the need to provide the Christian Science nursing staff with an employee benefits package. The Bond repayment plan was on the docket, right alongside the troubling erosion of Tenacre’s bottom line by the exhausted physical plant. The constantly increasing requests for benevolence brought the question how to augment or replace entirely Tenacre’s Friendly Fund.

They gave prayerful attention to the indebtedness to the Bondholders. In November 1946, each bondholder was asked to extend the term of his bond for ten years at 3% (down from a previously rearranged 4%). The January 1947 minutes show that fourteen bondholders had assented to the new agreement. By April 1947, a Board member, Joseph Sykes of Philadelphia, began to buy the bonds of those individuals desiring to redeem their bonds at less than face value rather than wait for the bonds to mature at the later date. By May 1947, 75% of the bondholders had agreed to the new arrangement, and the Board appointed one of their own to act as an agent to see if those not agreeing would sell their bonds at a discount. By May 1948, 100% of the remaining bondholders agreed to the new structuring of their agreement. The Board continued to pay bondholders their quarterly payments on time.

The Moulton influence was persuasive beyond her departure. The October memo to the Board gave a qualified nod to some of the Moulton objections:

*From the outset, salaries at Tenacre were based upon ability to pay net on accepted standards for the job done. The success of Tenacre’s reorganization was accomplished literally upon the backs of the early staff members – who, at great personal sacrifice, contributed services we could not otherwise have purchased. Because they were enlisted and not employed, neither the management nor the Board was in the position of employers. This called for a more personal and intimate understanding between management and workers than could have been possible had the Manager maintained strictly an “agent of the Board” position.*²⁴

“during the War”

An entry in the November 26, 1946 minutes bears a more sober and realistic tone that indicates something of a turnabout in the managerial approach:

Due to unrest, and in order to retain our graduates and other experienced [Christian Science] nurses on the staff, Mr. Harrison had, on November 1st, increased the salaries of six persons from \$64 to \$75 per month.²⁵ He asked that the Board ratify his action, and this was done. It was further decided that the position of head [Christian Science] nurse and that of the teacher of the training course should receive up to \$125 per month, and that the salaries of the supervisors should be \$100 per month for the first year, and \$110 per month thereafter.

Salaries along with the daily rate charged by Tenacre for Christian Science nursing services had changed only once since the 1939 reorganization. After the war's end, labor was even more scarce than it had been during the war, as numerous new employment opportunities in the postwar period were attracting skilled, qualified workers to other, more lucrative fields at an unprecedented rate. This further exacerbated the need to reform the way Christian Science nurses were regarded by Tenacre's management. After those selected salaries were raised, the rudiments of an Employees' Welfare Fund²⁶ were introduced to the Board for their consideration in January 1947. The minutes of that meeting show that, “the manager was instructed to have further information regarding pensions and bonus plans at the next meeting.”

In September 1948, the daily nursing rate for guests was raised from nine dollars to ten dollars daily, only the second rate increase since reorganization.²⁷ The hike in the rate was sufficient to keep Tenacre in the black. This was supplemented by a steady flow of cash gifts and contributions. Each contribution was noted in the monthly Board minutes, and each one received a personal note of thanks from Martha Harrison. Those modest but vital contributions, the rates charged the Christian Science nursing guests, the extraordinarily careful portioning out of the funds to various construction and maintenance projects, along with an eagle eye constantly turned toward the bottom line, produced a steady and profitable fiscal picture.

As tight as the reins on the financial process might have been, one line item – benevolence – defied resolution, much less control. The issue was especially heartrending when it came to supporting the early workers in Christian Science who now needed loving care. Some were eligible for support by The Mother Church. Christian Science Pupils Associations and Christian Science branch churches would contribute sums that were directed to the support of an individual from among their number who had dedicated his or her lifework to the Cause of Christian Science and now was a guest at Tenacre. As grateful as Tenacre was for those gifts, they represented only a small portion of the total cost of providing Christian Science nursing care for that individual. The gap was filled with contributions from The Friendly Fund. It was a gap, however, that at times threatened to become a breach.

Burwell explained the complexity of the situation in a letter he wrote to a group interested in starting a Christian Science facility in the Midwest. The planners of the new facility had written asking for Burwell's specific comments on the benevolent aspect of Tenacre – how it was established, how it was maintained, and to what extent Tenacre accommodated benevolent cases. The carefully worded answer takes five single-spaced typed pages in order to give the full magnitude of the benevolence question. Writing in 1947 from a vantage point that he underscored was blessed with 20-20 hindsight – using what he had learned since 1939 – Burwell wrote:

There are two services to be performed: (a) the maintenance of the [Christian Science] nursing home on an economically sound basis and (b) providing funds to make the services of the home available to persons who can pay only a portion or none of the cost of such service. But I feel it is more important that the services of the home be maintained properly with a limited benevolence than for it to assume a benevolent aspect beyond its means.²⁸

“during the War”

He then laid out the restrictions, assumptions, and presumptions that comprised the basis of Tenacre’s ongoing financial *modus operandi* and that forced the conclusion that benevolence, if the facility were to survive, must be limited. Implicit in his statement is that all such organizations would do well to base their own operations on these very same bases.

We presumed that such a service could be self-supporting from earned income but we were reckoning on all guests paying a fair established rate. We soon found, however, that individuals applied to us for reduced rates as expectantly as they would to the Christian Science Benevolent Association Sanatoriums.

Our first attempt to meet the situation was to reply to each inquiry and accompany each brochure with words indicating that “although Tenacre was self-supporting, entirely without revenue except from guests and although our charges were less than those of comparable institutions in the vicinity, no one was to be turned away for financial reasons.”

At first we merely granted reduced rates in “hardship” cases; [Christian Science] nursing services were the same without regard to the rate paid. Such information was confidential with the office force. This system was confusing and unsatisfactory for many reasons, but suffice it to say that it is the best method, which lends itself most readily to imposition by those who want the best at the lowest rate.

At this point, Burwell mentioned The Tenacre Friendly Fund and the hope the Friendly Fund would not only meet the temporary need for financial relief of the “deserving persons” it was designed to help, but also that it would, by dint of the generosity it demonstrated, naturally elicit a sense of gratitude – in the form of contributions to the Friendly Fund – that would more than offset whatever benevolence might be granted from that fund. He pointed out, however, that grants from the Friendly Fund always outstripped contributions to that fund and consistently did so by a large margin:

Because of tremendous demands being made upon us by the entire field, we are being forced lately toward the more narrow interpretation of “deserving persons.” Out of 40 guests, 15 to 20 are receiving grants in various amounts at all times. During the 12 months ending April 30, 1947 the Fund granted assistance totaling over \$22,000, of which only \$1,600 was contributed by the field.

When it was established, we presumed that the field would be interested in contributing to our work and some modest solicitations were made. The results, however, were so meager that we became more or less reconciled to providing the entire amount within operating figures.

Before veering away from the subject of what form benevolence can play in organizations such as Tenacre to wider musings on the issue of benevolence within the Christian Science movement, one last, cogent point was made:

During these same years, private nursing homes and non-profit enterprises, such as Tenacre, have been forced to make the entire provision for benevolence, as we have done through The Tenacre Friendly Fund, at the expense of operating at a loss or devoting to benevolence money desperately needed for other purposes.²⁹

The words – ‘desperately needed for other purposes’ – chosen by Burwell to describe the situation, did not exaggerate the case. Burwell recalled:

The thing that caused me some concern out of which this came was that we had a guest in that room [now called Clock Cottage], and she got splinters in her feet when getting out of the bed. So, I was saying in one form or another that we had used what we had as best we could

“during the War”

and to the length of its usefulness, and I felt that Tenacre was going to have to be rebuilt if it was going to stay.³⁰

This was the only possible conclusion that could have been drawn. The calls for repairs in each building increased to the point where constant repair was no longer acceptable. Even a “good steward” could not continue to put “a piece of new cloth unto an old garment, for that which is put in to fill it up taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse.” Neither could they “put new wine into old bottles: else the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish.” (Matt 9:16,17)

The only alternative, the only possible way to bring the costs of building maintenance back under predictable control, the only way to continue to offer an atmosphere conducive to healing to its guests, the only way to guarantee that the administration be free of unnecessary concern for the guests, was to put “new wine into new bottles.” (Matt 9:16, 17) The entire physical plant needed radical refurbishment.

The idea of a letter to the field was considered. Tenacre had periodically published brochures ever since its founding. Since 1939, the brochures were modest productions, not much more than leaflets. Just as Tenacre had become threadbare, so too had the mailings. A new approach was in order, one that was equal to the task before them. The importance of the project and the impact it would have on Tenacre’s future would be seen only gradually.

The idea of a special brochure was first mentioned in Board Minutes for June 20, 1950:

The Board members were shown some photographs and recommended copy for the brochure which will be sent out in September.

September came and went. At the October 1950 meeting, the brochure was discussed again, as were other methods of publicity. The February 6, 1951, Board Minutes mention that it promised to be “more elaborate,” but still further delayed. One other item of note found in these Minutes was that three rather large gifts had been received around the end of the year: one, from a longtime friend of Tenacre, for \$3,300; a bequest from an estate in the amount of \$5,000; and large gift from a businessman for \$20,000. Immediate plans were made to put these funds to use in improving and renovating some of the buildings.

Later in February 1951, the Board authorized to spend \$200 in support of the project along with a \$300 gift that had been earmarked for the “brochure fund.” Some time later Burwell came upon some promotional pieces done for a New Jersey college that proved to be a major inspiration:

Into my hands came a set of fund-raising literature from Upsala College. As I remember, it was in two major pieces. One of them was the directions to those who would be raising funds, and the other was a brochure they could leave with people which told the history of Upsala.

It was very definitely a fund-raising firm that was undertaking to raise this money. What they were saying was that Upsala started in a residence in Montclair and took over the house next to it, and the house next to that, and finally the whole block, and now it had proven itself as a university, and if it was going to continue, it had to have a more formal campus.

I didn’t need that fund-raising stuff, but I did need that format of the history. So, we got hold of an outfit in New York, a man and his wife who were in the advertising business in New York, who were recommended to me that would do this thing gratis, or for a minimum amount of money. They came down and I told them the history, etc. They came back with a paste-up, but the copy! They never got the message at all!

In the end, Martha and I went up to Mount Desert Island in Maine and visited a [Christian Science practitioner] whose wife was here as a patient, an elderly gentleman to whom we had taken quite a fancy and he to us. We were there a few days, and I took that with me. While up

“during the War”

there I rewrote the whole thing, but at least I had some kind of a format. I followed the Upsala College format.³¹

The pictures, the text, the layout, and architectural renderings all blended to present the Foundation as it was right then and to show what it could be in the future. The August 28, 1951 Board Minutes give this account:

...it was presented to the Executive Committee on the 21st [of August]. They made some corrections, and Mr. Harrison telephoned Boston for an appointment to show it to the Board to Directors on Tuesday or Friday. The Secretary for The Board of Directors called back on the telephone the same day and said the whole Board would review it if the copy would be mailed to them – that it would be read and returned immediately. The copy was reviewed on Thursday and sent back with a four-page letter of recommendations, all of which were most helpful. The copy was then revised in accordance with their recommendations, the recommendations of the Executive Committee, and further reduction in the number of words, and given to Mr. Huntley on Monday, the 27th, for the final printing.

Methods of distribution of the brochure will be discussed at the next Board meeting.

The letter from The Christian Science Board of Directors, with its four pages of written recommendations, was welcomed and gratefully acknowledged in a letter to them dated September 15, 1951:

We are most grateful to you for the very kind consideration which was given the copy of our brochure. A great feeling of deep appreciation came over us all when we realized the time given to the matter which was so important to us, and yet only one of so many to you.³²

With the approval from church headquarters, the brochure was ready. It was just under 9 x 12 inches – a two-color glossy booklet full of pictures, blueprint drawings, and the whole background of the institution as well as a vision for the future. It was paid for by the “friends of Tenacre” mentioned at the beginning of its message:

AN OPEN LETTER FROM THE FRIENDS OF TENACRE WHO HAVE SPONSORED AND PAID FOR THIS BROCHURE

During the past twelve years we have come to know the work being carried on at Tenacre Foundation – making the most of the buildings and equipment with which it has worked.

Tenacre Foundation has demonstrated its enterprise, its capacity for service, its ability to make sound use of its modest resources. This institution is self-supporting and needs no funds for operating expenses or to maintain its present rate of benevolence. However, the time has arrived for the replacement of outmoded buildings and equipment, so that Tenacre may continue its economical method of operation and the institution may be truly representative of the great Cause it serves.

To the end that the new Tenacre may have its complete unfoldment, in the orderly method by which all things necessary to our Cause have always been supplied, we – the contributors to the publication of this brochure – feel that publishing the story of Tenacre in this brochure is the greatest initial contribution we can make.

The brochure goes on to lay out before the reader what the organizational thinking had been over the course of the previous twelve years:

In assuming this responsibility in 1939, the new trustees reasoned something as follows: “If allowed to be sold to satisfy creditors the experience of Tenacre will remain a blot on Christian

“during the War”

Science in this community and a valuable piece of property will have passed out of the hands of Christian Scientists. This is ample opportunity for service if Tenacre is properly managed. Operated in a Christianly scientific manner and the creditors paid, Christian Science will have been supported in Princeton and the state, and a valuable piece of property will remain in the service of Christian Scientists.” With no initial funds and unable to make appeals to Christian Scientists, they said further, “The home must prove itself. It must be self-supporting, on a pay-as-you-go basis. If Tenacre serves well, makes good use of what it has in the way of buildings and equipment, establishing itself on a sound financial basis, it will take its proper place in relation to other philanthropic enterprises serving Christian Scientists and receive their support. Then permanent, efficient buildings, properly equipped, will be provided.”

The next section titled, “Where from Here?” even more plainly puts the motive for the publication before the reader.

It was recognized at the time of reorganization in 1939 that the existing buildings and equipment would have to be replaced if the institution justified its continuance after the first few years. This it has done, and the remodeling and altering of existing structures – the “making good use of what it had” – has been carried as far as seems possible. The standards Christian Scientists expect of the institutions which serve them and the need to effect certain further economies of operation make the time propitious for Tenacre to think of a new plant. This new Tenacre must be built from gifts made in recognition of services already rendered and the great opportunities for further service which these portend. Contributors will have assurance that gifts will provide permanent, modern buildings and equipment and will not be expended for operating expenses. The experiences of fruitful operation since the reorganization have produced a maturity which will enable Tenacre to use to the very best advantage whatever is Love’s provision for the future.

The booklet then went on to describe the addition to North Hall that had been completed just three years earlier in 1948. The design for the future plans was called a “Blueprint for an Ideal,” and included the construction of more of those apartment style units as well as “a new Physical Care building.” Space was also given to a short description of Tenacre’s “School of [Christian Science] Nursing” and emphasized the fact that its course of study was a “splendid provision for those who could not take the Christian Science nurses’ training course offered at the Sanatoriums of the Christian Science Benevolent Association.”

The brochure also mentioned the importance of the Friendly Fund. Without the Friendly Fund, the entire written appeal would have lacked its most striking and salient element:

In the last twelve years grants through the Tenacre Friendly Fund have exceeded \$200,000. Contributions during this time have been about \$20,000. Tenacre has, in this way, extended more than \$180,000 of its income to benevolence for deserving Christian Scientists.

Such a sum would have paid the mortgage and built the modern, efficient, physical institution that all would like to see. But to have done so would have left the heart out of Tenacre. The work of the Friendly Fund is part and parcel of the basic idea of service to Christian Scientists on which the home is founded and being carried on.³³

It is safe to say that *Blueprint for an Ideal* was, for all intents and purposes, Tenacre’s masterpiece. It thoroughly put before the interested reader a detailed, intimate portrait of a humble but determined venture in living and demonstrating Christian Science in a communal setting. It was a community apart from the world that had its heart in the right place.

Interestingly, Burwell’s plan for the brochure was to send out two mailings of 5,000 copies each. His plan did not receive the hoped-for endorsement from the Board of Trustees. He recounted:

“during the War”

My teacher, Mr. Bleakly, who was President of the Board, said, “What do you want to print 10,000 copies for?” I said, “Well, we have a mailing list of 5,000 [Christian Science] practitioners and teachers east of the Mississippi River. I found out that they don’t read what you send them, so I want at least two shots at them.”

This Board, they were not businessmen – they were men of small means financially, anyway, and they didn’t have any idea of things like this – so they just said, “No!” I finally said, “If I raise the money for it, which I was against doing, but I knew several that we had served that I felt would go along with it. They finally, grudgingly said, “OK, if it doesn’t cost Tenacre anything of its cash flow right now.” So, I raised the \$4,200, and we printed it. I remember at the time, and this has always been important to me: when he asked me why I wanted to print 10,000, I said, “Mr. Bleakly, I don’t know. Maybe I’m printing it for one person.”³⁴

The brochure, later referred to as the “*Blueprint for an Ideal*,” because of the great hopes it expressed for a “New Tenacre,” was finally mailed in November 1951. It would soon be that all the things Tenacre had forgone would be added to it, and this due in no small part to this carefully written mailing. Burwell commented:

The striking thing to me about it was that it never occurred to me to say we want \$20,000 or \$2,000,000 or whatever. It didn’t say that it had to be done in any length of time. It merely stated the story and let lay.³⁵

Contributions from the field began to pour in. At Christmas 1951, Burwell received a telephone call from the donor of the \$20,000 gift Tenacre had received in December 1950. It was Mr. B____ of Reading, Pennsylvania. He told Burwell that his financial advisors had said that, due to certain tax considerations, he could make a contribution at that moment that “I won’t be able to make again in my lifetime.”³⁶ The manager immediately made a trip to Mr. B____’s office where he saw a copy of the brochure on the desk. In their hour-long conversation, Mr. B____ made it plain that the brochure’s highlighting of Tenacre’s self-sufficient, economical method of operation is what attracted his interest. It had found its “one person.”

Burwell then received a check in the mail for \$250,000. It was an amount more than equal to the income Tenacre had forgone over the past 12 years by granting benevolence through the Friendly Fund. Plans to refurbish, replace, and build anew could now emerge – from hopes and dreams, prayers and plans, to demonstration. From the *Blueprint for an Ideal*, the new Tenacre would begin to emerge.

¹ Interview, Honicky/JBH, 1987, p. 64.

The construction of the sewage treatment plant was not without its challenges. Because the construction had been drawn out and more costly than foreseen by the original estimates, Burwell received a temporary, 60-day reprieve from the military draft. George Van Horn, the same contractor who worked on the Cottage, ran into bedrock that took quite some time, effort, and money to remove. His bill for the work, however, was no higher than the original estimate that he had submitted. Once Burwell discovered that Van Horn was absorbing the cost overrun, he went to the Board and asked that the difference between the estimate and actual cost be paid to Van Horn. Recalled Burwell, “*When I told our Board about it (and this wasn’t in the days when we could afford it) we said that this place should not be built on anybody’s back – so we paid George Van Horn his full price.*”

² Ibid., p. 62.

³ Interview, Board/JBH & MCH, Board Minutes, Sept. 25, 1991, p. 5.

⁴ Ibid., p. 5.

⁵ Board, JBH/MCH, p. 4.

⁶ Interview, Archives/Gehret, 1999, p. 4.

Maurine Mallard came to Tenacre as a young woman, newly graduated from the Benevolent Association in Boston. While taking private cases in the Boston area, she met a Tenacre Christian Science nurse who was in Boston for her Association meeting. She urged Maurine to come to Tenacre, because she was so needed. She arrived in the summer of 1942. The Harrisons were like parents to her. Mr. Harrison introduced her to Ken Gehret, a research analyst, and ‘gave her away’ at her wedding to Ken in 1950.

⁷ Board, JBH/MCH, p. 2.

⁸ The full quote from *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, p. 259:1, by Mary Baker Eddy is, “Man is not absorbed in Deity, and man cannot lose his individuality, for he reflects eternal Life; nor is he an isolated, solitary idea, for he represents infinite Mind, the sum of all substance.”

⁹ Franklin Park is some 15 miles northeast of Princeton.

¹⁰ Board, JBH/MCH, p. 6.

¹¹ Board, JBH/MCH, 1991, pp. 5, 6.

¹² The five-day week of 40 hours was not formally instituted until it was voted on at the September 21, 1965 meeting of the Board of Trustees.

¹³ Interview, Chris Irby/JBH, 1996, p. 4.

¹⁴ Burwell Harrison spent his entire time in the Army as a Sergeant in Co. K, 253rd Infantry. He noted that he was simply too old (he was twice the age of most inductees) to go to Officer Candidate School. His unit saw 27 weeks of action in the Battle of the Bulge, where he was awarded the Bronze Star with two Oak Leaf clusters for his valor. He attributed his ability to help others to prayer. A story he told to his second wife, Helene Harrison, illustrates his prayers for his own protection. “While contemplating how to cross a road during heavy shelling, he stopped and pulled a poem from his pocket. At that point there was an explosion on the other side. He then proceeded to cross the road in safety. The poem was, “*I am the place where God shines through, For He and I are one, not two. He wants me here and as I am; I need not fret nor will nor plan. If I’ll but be relaxed and free, He’ll work His great plan out through me.*” He was authorized by The Mother Church to serve as a Volunteer Christian Science Wartime Worker.

¹⁵ Honicky/JBH, p. 12.

¹⁶ Letter, Moulton to Board of Trustees, August 15, 1946.

¹⁷ Honicky/JBH, p. 62.

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 58, 59. The figures quoted are from the deed itself which are slightly different from the figures Burwell remembered.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 60.

²⁰ The Harrisons themselves took pay cuts from time to time to “free up” enough money so that needed staff might either be retained or hired.

²¹ Board Meeting minutes, October 28, 1946, p. 3

²² Board Meeting minutes, December 17, 1946, p. 1.

²³ Board Meeting minutes, January 21, 1947, p. 2.

²⁴ Board Meeting minutes, October 28, 1946, p. 3.

²⁵ Here are the equivalents in year 2000 dollars: The raise from \$64 to \$75 is like going from \$477 to \$560 per month. The raise to \$100 per month translates to \$745. The raise to \$125 per month given the head Christian Science nurse and instructors was the equivalent of \$930. For supervisors, \$110 per month equates to \$820.

²⁶ Due to some vagueness in the law, Tenacre was not part of the Social Security System at this point in time. The Employee Welfare Fund was talked about so that employees would have some sort of guarantee that they would not be bereft of retirement benefits entirely.

²⁷ Letter, JBH to M. Kempthorne, November 29, 1947. The \$9 daily rate was established in April 1946.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Honicky/JBH, p. 50.

³¹ Ibid., p. 50.

³² Letter, J. Burwell Harrison to The Christian Science Board of Directors, September 15, 1951. It is rather an extraordinary thing for the Board of Directors to take notice of the advertising copy of a Christian Science home. To be sure, Tenacre had included the Board of Directors in previous plans for their mailings, primarily because it wanted to include some form of endorsement from them for Tenacre's peculiar form of institutional Christian Science nursing. And an active correspondence flowed back and forth between the Princeton Christian Science home and the Church's Boston headquarters. Not only was their four-page recommendation unexpected, and welcomed, it also meant that there was now full official approval for the appeal that Tenacre was about to broadcast. It was, after all, The Board of Directors that, in 1939, informally prevented Tenacre from direct appeals for funds from the Christian Science field. It would appear that this injunction was now set aside. The language of the brochure, however, hedges just a little, and never actually asks that any amount of money be sent. But it does clearly use specific amounts of money to paint a picture so hopeful that one could not refrain from making a contribution.

³³ Ibid., p. 16.

³⁴ Honicky/JBH, p. 51.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 51.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 51.

Chapter 4

"... two prayers coming together"

*"...we know that all things work together for good
to them that love God, to them who are
the called according to his purpose."*

Romans 8:28

The modest bequest given Tenacre in 1939 was an answer to prayer. It was an indispensable help in the process of securing Tenacre's license to operate.

The Tenacre of 1951 was a more stable operation than the Tenacre of reorganization days, and the projects it needed to inaugurate were much more complex in nature than were the purchase of two stoves, some roofing material, and a few buckets of paint.¹ The whole facility needed replacing. Much had been demonstrated, but to go forward, it had to have a new physical plant. The concept for what was needed had been discussed, prayed about, and put into writing for mailing to the Field. They had been good stewards, "been faithful over a few things;" they prayed to be ready to be "made ruler over many things" (Matt 25:21). The plan was laid and cherished; they didn't have to wait long. Tenacre was on the verge of receiving the largest donation in its history. It would come from a gentleman whose family business was going public on the New York Stock Exchange.

The capital gains on the transaction provided the [friend of Tenacre] with a choice: he could either pay a large amount in taxes on his windfall, or he could make a onetime gift of that money to a charitable organization in lieu of paying taxes on the gain. He had received the brochure [Blueprint for an Ideal] we had sent to him, and he lifted it up.

Tenacre would have to guarantee that his donation would specifically be used for the purposes set forth in Blueprint for an Ideal.

They wanted to make sure we weren't going to use any of the money to pay off the debts. I said, "The first thing we can do is sit here and call [an attorney] and tell him what we want. I think that between now and December 31st, he could straighten it out for us."²

The debt to which Burwell referred was the ongoing heavy obligation Tenacre retained to those individuals who had subscribed to the 1928 bond issue. Immediately after the Wednesday, December 26 meeting with the benefactor, Burwell drove to Philadelphia to confer with Board member Joseph Sykes. Since Burwell's return from the Army in 1945, Joseph Sykes, the lumberyard owner from Philadelphia, had been buying the outstanding bonds from some of the bondholders, who because of varying circumstances, preferred not to wait until the bonds matured according to the bankruptcy court settlement. As a result, Sykes was able to purchase many of the bonds at 10 cents on the dollar.

After attending church together, Burwell explained to Mr. Sykes what had to be accomplished before the benefactor would feel fully confident in distributing his money. Mr. Sykes could have made a tidy sum had he held the bonds, but chose instead to turn all the bonds over to

“two prayers coming together”

Tenacre as a gift. It was yet another example of selflessness of an individual from which Tenacre greatly and gratefully benefited. Recalled Burwell:

I went to Philadelphia that afternoon [December 26], and told him what I had been doing all day. He gave me all the 36 bonds he had. He donated them to Tenacre, and took a tax deduction for them.

By going down to see Mr. Sykes that day in 1951, and his giving me the \$36,000 [in the form of the Tenacre bonds], he had put us in the position to comply with their request³ [to be debt-free].

As Tenacre owned most of the remaining bonds, and could redeem the few still outstanding bonds with money that had been set-aside for that purpose, it was now virtually free of the obligations that had caused it to file for bankruptcy in 1938. Burwell was able to report to the donor that the conditions had been met.

He mailed me the check, just a little piece of paper with \$250,000 on it. I've always joked and said that I carried that check around in my pocket over the weekend and kept looking at it to make sure those zeros didn't rub off!⁴

The check can be seen as an acknowledgement of the Christian stewardship found in the efforts of its Board, management, and staff to successfully sustain and maintain the Christian Science home. Further still, the gift was made because both donor and recipient had been praying in their own way to be able to serve the Cause in some meaningful way. Burwell explained:

This check is to perpetuate, to any extent that the donor can, the economic facet of the operation. That's what he was interested in. That's what I was interested in. I could talk to him about using his money to extend our self-supporting characteristic.

He said that he had contributed all his life to enterprises and never had one come to him with this kind of story. They always can absorb more and more and more without attempting to do it themselves.⁵

One other thing – when I was thanking him as profusely as I could – he said, “Well, don't thank me, because when I began to run a profitable business and became aware that there was an opportunity to be philanthropic with some of the profits, in my own way, I prayed that whenever it was that I would be able to make substantial contributions of this kind, I would know just where to put them. All these years that you've been at Tenacre, in the final analysis, you have been praying for a guy like me to come along.”

So he saw it as his demonstration to find the place, and our demonstration to find him. So it was the result of two prayers coming together.⁶

But the benefactor's largesse did not just appear out of the blue. He had been, in the three years previous, actively searching for an organization that might be deemed worthy of the funding he was hoping to bestow. His search coincided with the desire to find help for a relative, who had been mentally troubled for some years. Burwell recollected:

He came here in 1948. This yellow Cadillac convertible with the top down drove up with these people dressed in New York or Madison Avenue, or Hotel Pierre-type of clothing. He got out and introduced himself and [the woman with him] who was an employee of his. He had a [relative] who had been under medical attention for a long time from mental illness. And [his secretary] was a student of Julia Johnston's. Finally she had said to him, “Mr. B____, would you now try Christian Science for [your relative]?” And he said, “I'll try anything.”⁷

“two prayers coming together”

His personal secretary was a Christian Scientist and a pupil of the well-known Christian Science teacher, Julia Michael Johnston. She had been quietly witnessing his vain attempts to bring comfort and succor to his relative, and having done so for many years, finally suggested to him that he try Christian Science. He did. Apparently just after an interview with Julia Johnston in New York City, they drove to Tenacre. Burwell recalled:

He came in to see us because he was told by Julia Johnston that we would take care of her as a mental patient and give her Christian Science nursing.⁸

He talked to me; he was here for an hour and a half to two hours. I spent the entire time convincing him that we were no place to bring a neophyte in Christian Science. I said, “You bring her here, and we’ve got to give her 24 hours of Christian Science every day. I cannot tell the staff to give it to her in spoonfuls the way she can take it, because they are full-fledged Christian Scientists. I’ve tried it, but it just doesn’t work.”

So he went away. I didn’t even remember his name. I got a letter from him three or four days later, on this highfalutin stationery, thanking me for my time and saying that he benefited greatly from his visit, that he grew in his understanding of Christian Science more than he ever had up to that point.

[His relative] had been in a private hospital and obviously the doctor’s making a profit on the care. But when he switched to Christian Science care, he made a deal with the doctor to give them a private suite in the hospital. [He] put in Christian Science nurses and just paid the doctor for the accommodation.

[She] improved to such a point that they finally took her back home.⁹

He was persistent; he was thoroughly convinced that Tenacre was the right place for his relative and regularly called Mr. Harrison in the attempt to have him admit her. Each call met with a kind, but equally persistent, “No.” It likely was quite an unusual experience for this gentleman to have someone refuse his requests. Finally, in 1950, Mr. Harrison received an invitation he couldn’t refuse:

Once he called me and said, “Mr. Harrison, I think that maybe you and Mrs. Harrison should come to [my home] at my expense. I’d like you to meet [my relative] so you would know what we are talking about.”

We were going to Williamsport, Pennsylvania, to take a patient home, so we said, “Okay, we’ll come by and see you.” So we did. She served us tea at the home and was just a perfect hostess and everything was all right.¹⁰

Since the time of his first visit in 1948, Tenacre had been adding on several apartment-type rooms for mental care cases, utilizing the privacy-enhancing design of the 5-room Cottage. Then came yet another call, this one more urgent than all previous calls:

“Mr. Harrison, the family has put up with this for several years now, and they’ve reached the end of their limit, and I have to put her someplace. Frankly, I won’t be at any peace of mind if she’s not at Tenacre!”

I answered, “In the time since, we have built some new accommodations, and we have room now for special cases. You can afford to pay for special [Christian Science] nurses, and I’m in a position to do it today. One of these new rooms is open, and I would have to withdraw my objection to taking her.”¹¹

“two prayers coming together”

So they brought her that afternoon. That was in the fall of 1950. The family, not entirely sure that they would be able to convince her to stay at Tenacre, had simply invited her to go out with them for a ride in the car. Burwell remembered her arrival:

They drove up opposite the office. She got out. She remembered me. She greeted me like a long lost brother, put her arm in my arm and walked all over the place. I took her in and showed her the room I had prepared for her – just showed her the room. She came out and said, “You people can go home; I am going to stay here.”¹²

This new guest needed the shelter of Tenacre and stayed for several years. She and Martha Harrison became good friends and took trips together to Florida.

It appears that the donor benefited greatly from his regular conversations with Burwell. With each telephone call, aside from being an opportunity to continue his pleadings on behalf of his wife, he also made room for questions he had about Christian Science. For every question he had, he got a response. In proportion as his understanding of Christian Science grew did his friendship with Burwell Harrison also grow. Recalling the beginnings of their friendship, Burwell said:

He used to call me in that two-year period [1948-1950]. He’d call me, and he’d say, “I’m going to drive to Philadelphia and catch the train for New York. I have two Pullman cars, and I wish you would get on at Trenton and ride to New York with me.” Before very long I was going up to the office with him, and I sat in on meetings. We were developing a great friendship. I was talking to him about Christian Science, of course; that’s what he wanted. I would go to lunch with him and the officers of his company.

I guess I must have ridden with him a half a dozen or more times..¹³

It took quite a while before it dawned on me that what he wanted was a Christian Science thought – because we were always talking about Christian Science. He was asking me questions – he was trying to learn Christian Science, and I was doing my best to educate him. He was using me as a practitioner without telling me about it. He just wanted me there and to hear what was going on, thinking there was some help I could give it. That went on for a number of years.¹⁴

This executive felt his business was blessed by his association and friendship with Burwell Harrison. His gift was a tangible expression of his gratitude.

Soon after the receipt of the \$250,000 check, another special Board meeting was held. The schedule was established to reflect all the projects that the donor and Burwell had discussed together and which were in the letter that came with the check. The approval of the immediate hiring of an architect to design and supervise the construction of the new ‘physical care’ building and the renovation plans for the Barn filled out the agenda.

With the large gift, a number of capital projects could now be carried simultaneously. The Board, acting on the counsel of the donor himself, established a Building Account, which would be the single account from which all funds for each project would be drawn and kept separate from the general operating account.

The first project underway was adding a second floor of ten staff rooms to the Barn. Work had also begun on the new ‘physical care’ building.¹⁵ Architect, Ken Kassler, a specialist in residential design whose work showed the influence of Frank Lloyd Wright, had been approached prior to the design and mailing of Blueprint for an Ideal and asked if he would take on the work of designing the proposed physical care building.¹⁶ He at first declined the offer, as he said he had no experience in “institutional” design. It was precisely why Tenacre wanted him to design the new structure. They did not want either the look or the “feel” of an institutional building. Rather, they hoped to retain the “homey” quality that marked most of Tenacre’s modest edifices. Ken Kassler agreed, and worked for a fee that was considerably less than industry standard.¹⁷

“two prayers coming together”

The preliminary step of the project was to raze the old Cottage which was on the site chosen for the new building. The Cottage would be remembered in the design elements that would be incorporated in the new building. Thus the advantages of the smaller building would be blended with the economies of scale of the larger building. The new building would serve sixteen guests and would be ready for occupancy by fall. Burwell Harrison outlined what hopes there were for the innovative design:

The idea was that people entering the building would be admitted from the [exterior] front door of the guest's room. What [the visitor] would do is stop at the main office and be announced. The [Christian Science] nurse would leave her administrative position and go to the door and welcome the [visitor] for the patient, the practitioner, or whomever. They would be exposed only to that one room. The patients in the building would not be exposed to visitors. The corridor was built, an 8' wide corridor I think it is, and a solarium type of thing only loaded on one side.

We were going to have two different staffs. We were going to have an administrator in the building, but have a supervisor for the north corridor and the south corridor. The [Christian Science] nurses would not be interchangeable between corridors.

There were a lot of good ideas. Very interesting: within a short few months after this was built, Kaiser Hospitals in California built a multi-story building with that same idea – but the point that was clear to us then was that this was the end of a long architectural study and consulting with all the working people, etc. to come up with this idea. Here we arrive at it in our own little fashion here and tell the architect what we wanted.¹⁸

Sharing the news of the gift and of the progress in the building of West Hall, as the new building was now known, with The Christian Science Board of Directors – by dint of the correspondence centering on the Blueprint for an Ideal – resulted in a rather unusual outcome. The Christian Science Monitor published staff writer Harry Kenney's 500-word article about Tenacre's building program and its most innovative aspect, West Hall. The article, titled “Tenacre Building Design Stresses Home Comforts,” appeared in the October 17, 1952 issue of the Church's daily newspaper. It read, in part:

Tenacre Foundation is erecting a new set of buildings specifically designed to better care for students of Christian Science who are in need of healing.

The plans include a single story, rambling structure, enhancing the features of privacy, accessibility, and many uninstitutionalized arrangements. It consists of 16 rooms with eight baths - one between each two rooms.

West Hall's completion was announced in a display ad in the January 20, 1953 issue of The Monitor. It included a photo of the entrance drive with this text:

We Gratefully Announce The Opening of WEST HALL

Sixteen Rooms for Patients Needing Physical Care [Christian Science] Nursing. All rooms at ground level, individually entered from sitting porch – wide view of sky and lawn from bed – patient can be wheeled to sunning deck while in bed – many other features desirable to Christian Science Nursing, including an individually controlled speaker in each room carrying appropriate music, talking books, special tape recordings and selected radio programs.

Tenacre Foundation, Princeton, New Jersey

A Unique Non-Profit Institution Serving Christian Scientists

“two prayers coming together”

Martha Harrison called West Hall, Tenacre’s “prayer in stone.” The importance of West Hall to Tenacre’s sense of progress at that moment cannot be overstated.

As they started planning for the next projects, enlarging North Hall and building the mental units, it was necessary to continually reaffirm the principle of keeping the operating expenses separate from the Building Account. It must have been tempting to use the building funds to help with the operating expenses. With the expanded capacity in housing and guest accommodations, the insurance increased dramatically. It was necessary to expand the sewage treatment system and the facility’s fire-fighting capacity. And the requests for benevolence continued at a steady pace.

There was still enough in the Building Account to get started on North Hall. It was arranged to build only as much as that Building Account would cover. The architect was instructed to break down the North Hall project into steps so that construction could proceed with as little disruption to both the guests and the finances as possible.

More gifts came each year from the same donor and continued to support the projects. Two entries in the January 19, 1954 Board minutes record:

The Manager reported receipt of a gift ... of 5600 shares of stock.... The stock certificate, made out in the name of Tenacre Foundation, is held for safe keeping in the safe at Tenacre.

This gift was accompanied by the following letter:

December 31, 1953

*Board of Trustees
Tenacre Foundation*

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I hand you herewith, as an unrestricted gift for the purposes of Tenacre Foundation, certificates totaling five thousand six hundred (5600) shares of the \$5.00 par value common capital stock ... which has been transferred from my name into the name of Tenacre Foundation.

Sincerely yours,

The gift was valued at \$75,000. It was voted that the entire amount be placed in the Building Account and that it would be used for the purposes of that fund and for other capital improvement. One other note in the Board minutes reveals the mental resolve of that small group of stewards:

There ensued a discussion of the wisdom and methods of raising funds. It seemed the consensus of opinion among those present that Tenacre should continue to depend upon its works to bring about expressions of gratitude rather than organized fund raising methods and campaigns.¹⁹

Further, gifts over and above the amounts bestowed by this one donor began to flow more fully. The Bleaklys had no children and he willed a gift of \$17,000 to Tenacre as well as some property in New Hampshire. It seemed that Tenacre was the recipient of an overflow of blessings when another large gift from an estate, valued in excess of \$100,000, came to it. With it and hundreds of other donations of lesser value (but not lesser worth), Tenacre’s chief benefactor’s own desire to encourage others to see their way to support the economic aspect of the Christian Science nursing facility in Princeton was being realized. He made two more gifts to Tenacre, one in late 1954 and the other in the closing days of 1955. Each gift was valued at \$112,500.

In 1955, Burwell Harrison was formally elected to the Tenacre Board and became its chairman. Paving, land purchase²⁰, landscaping, combined with the means of implementing the plans each project carried with it, were all things that, prior to 1952, could only be imagined. And by

early 1956, it likely felt to Tenacre and its manager that the day when closing Tenacre because of the hopeless condition of its physical plant was long past. So it was.

But the record of progress and increasing stability received a jolt early on a Friday morning in late June.

A fire broke out in South Hall, quickly producing thick black smoke. As it happened, Burwell was already on the telephone speaking to the Princeton Police, reporting another untoward incident, when he happened to look out from his vantage point in Main House. When he saw the smoke, he exclaimed, “Forget everything – just get the fire engines out here!” Within 12 minutes, all three Princeton fire companies had responded. The report in the Princeton Packet tells of the bravery of Tenacre’s manager:

Harrison reached the building and entered a corridor that separates the destroyed wing from a new, masonry section of North Hall.

Smoke prevented him from reaching the rooms, so he ran to the side of the building and kicked in a bedroom window. As smoke and flame poured from the window, he fell to the ground, spraining his knee.

County Detective LaRossa credited Harrison with averting a greater loss of life when he quickly evacuated the survivors.²¹

The incident engendered at least ten regional newspaper articles and was picked up by at least one wire service. A member of The Christian Science Board of Directors saw the wire service coverage and immediately telephoned the Harrisons, letting them know of their Board’s support.²²

The fire itself was not the only conflagration. The Mercer County Prosecutor formally charged Mr. Harrison, as Tenacre’s Manager, with negligence. Burwell described that process:

I had to go down before the county court with a jury and the county prosecutor. They went through all our records for staffing and everything else, in a very cooperative, friendly way. But they had to get it on the record whether there had been any negligence here or not.

Once these people in the jury box discovered that we didn’t have any medical staff here, they couldn’t understand that. And they began to ask questions that went far beyond the thing at the moment. I just stood up and said, ‘We have the right, under the First Amendment, to practice our religion. This is our religion. We are a well-recognized church that relies on prayer for healing.’ I really had to get militant about it.

Finally the prosecutor said, ‘Mr. Harrison is not on trial. His religion is not on trial. The method is not on trial. What we are trying to find out is, was there any negligence that particular morning?’²³

It was formally and finally determined that there was none. Interestingly, one of the chief witnesses speaking for Tenacre was the State of New Jersey’s Department of Institutions and Agencies. Because Tenacre had continually worked with the Department on such issues as the condition of the physical plant, the sort of patient who should be accepted for care, and so forth, they were fully apprised of Tenacre’s worthiness to be licensed. In a very real way, they had become Tenacre’s best supporters.

The Township of Princeton convened a public hearing so that some of the Foundation’s neighbors might air their questions and grievances. It surfaced that their fears were based on the fact that Tenacre was not medical in nature. Again, the Department of Institutions and Agencies supported Tenacre by pointing specifically to the Foundation’s great expense in upgrading their on-site fire-fighting capacity long before the date of the fire. Mr. Harrison testified of Tenacre’s commitment to the community of Princeton and of its exemplary track record with the licensing agency during his management. However, not all were satisfied with the proceedings and took their

“two prayers coming together”

complaints to the Press. The popular Princeton paper, *Town Topics*, printed several letters. One of them was wholly sufficient to assuage the heat of misunderstanding without itself endorsing Christian Science:

I am not a Christian Scientist, nor have I any sympathy with their beliefs, but I believe they have every right to exist and expand here in Princeton, if they so desire. I have lived near them in two different houses, and I have never found them to be undesirable neighbors. After all, they have been a member of the Princeton community since about 1921. It seems a bit unfair to question their right to exist at this late time.²⁴

Though no convert, this writer's letter met the need. No further letters were published. At the Board meeting of July 3, 1956, Tenacre formally began to plan the full recovery.

The benefactor passed on in 1956 and the era of his personal involvement in Tenacre's development came to an end. But did it? A trust for Tenacre's benefit had been put in place and was beyond anyone's imagination.

The will stated: that “first priority be given to the building and equipping of a larger and more adequate manager's home.” What a gesture of the love and respect for the Harrisons and Tenacre, both of whom had been in many ways, the answer to his prayers. After twenty years' residence in the converted milking shed now known as Terrace Cottage, the Harrisons would have a new home.

On October 26, 1956, after having received a telephone call of condolence and comfort from one of the Trustees under the will, Burwell put pen to paper to express his gratitude for his relationship with this gentleman:

The confidence shown in Tenacre and its mission by Mr. B _____ has placed upon us all, for a number of years now, the responsibility of being worthy of it. This new evidence of his confidence and provision for its continuance can only call forth greater devotion – to the end that Tenacre be the institution he wanted it to be and that it stand high in its healing mission of service to mankind.

It has never before been my privilege to know such a man so intimately, and while it was my sincere desire to be of service to him, I grew more and matured more during those years of association with him than at any other time in my experience. I could only wish I might have benefited him more.²⁵

This wish was a statement typical of Tenacre's self-effacing manager. They had been praying, in their own ways, to be involved in the unfoldment and sustenance of an idea larger than themselves. They succeeded beyond anything either of them might have hoped for. The Tenacre of today stands in no small part as testimony to two prayers coming together.

¹ Another indication that it was a more complex organization is seen in the explosion in the number of pages in the Board Minutes. The earliest extant minutes, dating from 1946, rarely exceed one or two pages in length. Once the donated money began to show in the financial reports, the number of pages needed for each Board meeting minutes increases to 5 and 6 pages.

² Rivas op.cit., p. 15.

³ Rivas op.cit., p. 14:30.

⁴ Young/JBH Interview, 1975, p. 15:19.

The joy Burwell felt must have been particularly sweet. Prior to the gift from Mr. B____, in 1948, Burwell had worked with a group of Christian Scientists who were determined to start a Christian Science facility in Philadelphia. On pp. 5, 6 in this interview, he shared: “In 1948, this group in NY got turned down by Boston for a BA [in New York]. So they said, ‘OK, we’re going to start our own.’ So they did and they got Manhattan Sanatorium started. Then I got [Isaac] Grossman on our Board from Philadelphia. It was decided that Philadelphia had to keep up with NY, and they ought to have a sanatorium. So [Grossman] got four other fellows, and they formed a corporation to build the Philadelphia Sanatorium.... They got me to go down to Philadelphia 13 Sundays in a row and I addressed 13 different groups of people. Each time, after the first few times, my part would get smaller, and these other 5 men would come in—one was the treasurer, one was the president, and they would take over different aspects of the talk. Finally they relieved me of the whole thing—they got professional enough at it, but it was all a dream.

One board meeting, Isaac Grossman came and he said, ‘Did you hear what happened to Philadelphia?’ and I said, ‘No.’ He said, ‘Somebody died and left them a quarter of a million dollars.’ And the day they told me, I burst out crying. And I said, ‘How in the hell can that happen? Here we are working our fingers to the bone and nobody ever hears about us. This thing is a gleam in your eye and you get a quarter of a million dollars?’ He said, ‘They came to one of our meetings.’ I said, ‘Which meeting?’ He said, ‘The one in Ocean City, New Jersey.’ I said, ‘I addressed that meeting for an hour and a half. I am raising money for you people.’

I just couldn’t understand it. But that happened. Then things did begin to happen for us. I don’t know when—I’d have to look to see when the contributions began to come in.” And with the contribution in support of Tenacre’s work, Burwell had been made “glad for every scalding tear.” Hymn 208 by Mary Baker Eddy.

⁵ Honicky/JBH Interview, 1987, p. 52:1.

⁶ Ibid., p. 105:6.

⁷ Young/JBH, 1975, p.7

⁸ Rivas/JBH, 1987, p. 9

⁹ Young/JBH, p. 7.

Interestingly, the doctor was impressed with her progress, and he knew that it was due entirely to Christian Science treatment. According to Burwell Harrison, some years later, the doctor’s own daughter was admitted as a patient to Tenacre.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 8.

¹¹ Rivas/JBH, p. 9:34.

¹² Young/JBH, p.14:29-33.

¹³ Ibid., p. 9:4-18.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 11:13.

¹⁵ The Board Minutes for Jan 22, 1952 (p. 3) show that groundbreaking for the new building would be in April 1952 for the first half of the building, and that the other half of the building would start in the fall of the year. It was a groundbreaking for a building with a groundbreaking design. Said interviewer and Board member Don Honicky to Burwell during their 1987 interview, “You design around healings rather than hope that healings come based on the design you’ve got.” (Honicky/JBH, op. cit., p. 19:17)

¹⁶ Burwell sometimes stated that Ken Kassler was a pupil of Frank Lloyd Wright. Archives Department checked with Princeton-based architect Jeremiah Ford III in March 2000 and asked about Mr. Kassler's training. Mr. Ford responded: “As for Ken's beginnings, he never worked for Wright. Ken started his career as an independent practitioner in the early thirties shortly after graduating from Princeton Architectural School. Perhaps Burwell was persuaded by the fact that there were many similarities in Ken's work to Wright.” (e-mail, Jeremiah Ford III to Ewan MacQueen, March 21, 2000.)

¹⁷ *Blueprint for an Ideal* included several of Ken Kassler's sketches for what came to be known as West Hall.

¹⁸ Honicky/JBH, p. 19, 20.

¹⁹ To that end, the Board voted at its May 18, 1954 meeting to design, print, and mail another brochure to the field, convinced as they were that a report of the ongoing unfoldment of good, both in the Christian Science nursing care offered at Tenacre and in the progress demonstrated in the Building Program, would elicit yet another generous response of support. The brochure, minus any explicit fundraising effort, was completed and mailed by the September 1954 Board meeting.

²⁰ In 1956, Tenacre purchased seventeen acres of woodlands from Mary Pardoe, who owned large tracts of land bordering Tenacre. In order to enlarge North Hall, Tenacre needed the increased acreage to satisfy the Township zoning requirements that in a residential zone no more than 10% of the lot can be developed.

²¹ *Princeton Packet*, June 28, 1956.

Four guests passed on as a result of the fire.

²² Betty Jo Hunt, head of North Hall for many years and who also served as School Director and Director of Christian Science Nursing, shared in a January 2000 interview what Burwell had told her about the fire, especially how he had been in touch with a member of The Christian Science Board of Directors, W. Stewart Booth. He said that he told Mr. Booth that mortal mind was doing this, and saying that, and trying this, and so on. Mr. Booth responded emphatically, “Burwell, THERE IS NO MORTAL MIND!” Miss Hunt was a pupil of Mr. Booth.

²³ Van Horn/JBH, 1980, p.53.

²⁴ Margaret Grace of Pretty Brook Road to the *Town Topics*, July 15, 1956.

²⁵ J. Burwell Harrison letter to Harold Miller, October 26, 1956 (Archives #JB002)

Chapter 5

Conflict and Resolution

“All that worketh good is some manifestation of God asserting and developing good. Evil is illusion, that after a fight vanisheth with the new birth of the greatest and best. Conflict and persecution are the truest signs that can be given of the greatness of a cause or of an individual, provided this warfare is honest and a world-imposed struggle. Such conflict never ends till unconquerable right is begun anew, and hath gained fresh energy and final victory.”

Message for 1900
Mary Baker Eddy, p. 10:2

The Department of Institutions and Agencies’ welcome show of support for Tenacre made for a fairly easy passage over the shoals of the Mercer County prosecutor’s negligence inquiry that followed the June 22, 1956 fire. Incredibly, at least to the contemporary observer, there appeared to be another side to their generous support. Fewer than two weeks after the Department had testified that Tenacre Foundation was a model agency to which they pointed other licensees, Burwell received a letter in which the Department reported the results of an in-house meeting designed to address the “circumstances relating to the fire at the institution and to other recent occurrences.” The July 5, 1956 letter continues:

Careful review of these reports led to the conclusion that Tenacre should seriously consider revision of its general operating plan and probably the advisability of eliminating that part of the program which calls for care of psychotic patients. It was our belief that conversion of all existing facilities for [Christian Science] nursing care of patients who are primarily physically ill would permit the institution to do effective work while eliminating the special hazards of caring for the mentally ill. It is understood, of course, that if such a change were to take place, a reasonable time would be required before it could be placed into full effect.

For this reason, we would expect that the program would be entirely converted by December 10, 1956¹

What could have precipitated such a drastic about-face in the Department’s attitude? Several factors seem to figure into the change that brought about this policy setback. The Department had undergone a gradual transformation since Tenacre was first licensed in 1927. In those early days the Department’s responsibilities included the oversight of all the state-run institutions, including orphanages, asylums, and prisons. They also included the extensive farm system that was designed to provide fresh food and worthwhile employment for the inmates of the institutions. Also in this mix were the independent, privately-run, medically-oriented nursing home operations. Essentially these were almost of negligible importance to the Commissioner in comparison with the much larger state institutional facilities. Of all of these institutions licensed by the state, one defied neat categorization. Tenacre Foundation was the lone institution operated by and for the adherents of Christian Science. It provided the Christian Science nursing facility with not only a unique identity, but also a modicum of notoriety other state licensees lacked.

Aside from regularly-scheduled licensing inspection visits the Department was required to make of its facilities, there were, theoretically, only two times in the life of a facility they might draw

the attention of the head of the licensing agency. The first notice came at the point of startup when the initial license to operate was required. The second would be if, aside from the results of the normally scheduled inspections of the Department, through negligence or some unusual circumstance, they found themselves in violation of the well-meaning but nevertheless firm regulations of the Department. In both instances, the operator, the individual in whose name the license was issued, could expect to meet the Commissioner of the Department in person, along with the actual inspectors, and would be able to deal with them face-to-face.

Tenacre early discovered that negotiation with the Commissioner and his staff, as is seen in the volume of letters that flowed back-and-forth between Commissioner Ellis and Burwell Harrison during the initial days of the Reorganization, required honesty, forthrightness, a sense of resolve, a willingness to listen, and the ability to rub elbows. Mom-and-pop operations, such as Tenacre's once was, could expect to have a friendly, familiar, hands-on relationship with that agency.

However, after the close of World War II, this began to change. The number of privately-run institutions grew. The demands placed on state institutions also increased as the veterans returned and as New Jersey drew even more closely to total urbanization. The medicalization of society increased. So, too, did the welfare state. The state's rules and regulations were more regularly reviewed and augmented and, given the post-war increase of federal programs and the invasive nature of the rules and requirements those programs engendered, gradually became more rigid and restrictive.

The Department and its responsibilities had grown to the point where it was necessary to form a Bureau of Inspection so that it could keep abreast of its duty to examine and certify each and every facility it now licensed. And those who may have been familiar with Tenacre and its totally unique, religious approach to Christian Science nursing mental and physical care cases, were retired and no longer there.

Commissioner Ellis, who had been so taken with the sincerity of Alberta Fielder and the completeness of her healing as he granted Tenacre its very first state license in 1927, and who had served the people of New Jersey so long and so well, retired shortly after the end of World War II. Working with Commissioner William Ellis was not a burdensome task. Rather, it meant working with an individual who brought civility, reason, and tolerance to each meeting. A gentleman named Sanford Bates, who seems to have been cut from cloth similar to Mr. Ellis', replaced him. Mr. Bates was the Department's Commissioner for a little more than 10 years. John W. Tramburg, who took office just a few days after the fire on June 22, 1956, in turn succeeded him.

It was Commissioner Tramburg's three-page letter of July 31 that signaled the beginning of a new, more intransigent era in the Department. Naturally, a new commissioner would want all those institutions in his charge to be fully compliant with the spirit and letter of the law. It must have been something of a surprise to discover that this one institution, located in the township of Princeton, had a history of requesting to be excused from medical oversight of its religious mental care program and, further, that it had just survived a catastrophic fire and subsequent negligence inquiry.²

To be sure, Tenacre viewed medical oversight of its operation as a necessary, suffer-it-to-be-so-for-now situation: necessary, because it was still the only way they could operate in New Jersey, and because the net effect of such oversight was nominal. But, it was as though the oranges were making sure the apples were doing things right. Even though it seemed a mix totally antithetical to the Christian Science that undergirded each case needing Christian Science nursing at Tenacre, in practice, the required presence of the physician proved to be not very intrusive at all.

Dr. James, like his predecessor, Dr. McCorkle, was content to visit Tenacre as required. He would sign off on the admissions he was formally charged with reviewing, and then would check in with Burwell in his office. Their visits were collegial in nature and because of their respect for Burwell and for Tenacre, both Dr. McCorkle and Dr. James kept as low a profile as possible.³

“Conflict and Resolution”

Further, the good doctors and Tenacre’s manager were acquainted with each other because of their membership in the Princeton chapter of Rotary International.

As early as 1942, Tenacre had tried to eliminate the requirement that Tenacre have a salaried physician. In March of that year, Tenacre’s manager wrote the Department of Institutions and Agencies requesting that the number of hours of their “supervising” physician, Dr. McCorkle, be reduced, given the sort of payroll pressure they were experiencing. During those years, most of the talented work force was engaged in supporting the effort to win the war. One consequence was that most institutions were forced to raise their wages in order to retain qualified, competent staffing. This is precisely what Tenacre encountered, and thus their request was to have Dr. McCorkle’s supervisory duties performed on Monday, Wednesday and Friday, rather than Monday through Friday, for a correspondingly reduced salary. The April 1942 query received a polite, even sympathetic, but nevertheless unyielding reply:

We should be very sorry to see you lower the good standard of service you now maintain.

It would be impossible for the Department to accept a lower standard of medical supervision than the one now in force. The State is made responsible for the care of mental patients in both public and private institutions. It is on the basis of a daily visit of a regularly licensed physician acceptable to this Department that Tenacre is licensed to accept nervous and mild mental patients for care.⁴

Five days later, Burwell wrote each member of the Board of Trustees, giving them the benefit of his perspective on the question. It is still flavored by his confidence that a flexible negotiation process with the decision makers in the Department still existed:

It seems to me that the professional element in the Department is hanging on to a professional technicality that would not stand up in a discussion involving the practical aspects of the present situation.

I can see now that the approach I made in the case of the requirement of an R.N. as Head Nurse was better suited for a favorable decision. In that case Commissioner Ellis sat between us and the professional element in his department. He acted as an arbitrator considering the aims of both parties. In the face of such consideration arbitrary stands on either side got nowhere and in the end the practical needs of both parties were served and protected.⁵

He continued the circular to the Board by imparting his own view of the law involved and by asserting that the law as written actually had no jurisdiction over Tenacre. Further, he wondered if Tenacre would be served by pursuing the idea of jettisoning Dr. McCorkle in favor of someone who might require less money. He concluded this line of thought by wondering finally if he wasn’t just being ‘penny wise and pound foolish.’ As Tenacre would have been hard pressed to find another physician with Dr. McCorkle’s appreciation of Tenacre and its operation, this was the conclusion Tenacre stayed with. The April 1942 circular nevertheless shows the dynamics of working with the licensing Department in that era – dynamics that in the next few years would entirely disappear.

Medical oversight would indeed be brought up informally with the Department over the next few years. Tenacre’s hopes received a significant boost in 1947 when the state statute governing licensing of nursing homes was rewritten and became law. Charles M. Carr, the Christian Science Committee on Publication for New Jersey, successfully lobbied the legislation and was able to have a lengthy exception written into the bill. This exception eliminated the need for there to be any medical supervision of the physical care program that included the guests housed in the Cottage and Main House, and later, in the new West Hall. The accommodation read:

“Conflict and Resolution”

New Jersey Statutes Annotated, Ch. 30: 11-9 Nothing in this act or in Chapter eleven of Title 30 of the Revised Statutes shall be so construed as to give authority to supervise or regulate or control the remedial care or treatment of individual patients who are adherents of any well recognized church or religious denomination which subscribes to the act of healing by prayer and the principles of which are opposed to medical treatment and who are resident in any home or institution operated by a member or members, or by an association or corporation composed of members of such well recognized church or religious denomination; provided, that such home or institution admits only adherents of such church or denomination and is so designated; nor shall the existence of any of the above conditions alone militate against the licensing of such a home or institution; and provided further, that such home or institution shall comply with all rules and regulations relating to sanitation and safety of the premises and be subject to inspection therefore. Nothing herein contained shall modify or repeal any laws, rules, and regulations governing the control of communicable diseases.

It was hoped that this provision, included under the section of the law pertaining to physical care given in nursing homes, could also be applied to the section governing care provided in mental hospitals, under which North Hall was licensed and operating. Several discreet inquiries were made, yet none produced results until early in 1951. An in-house memo of the Department of Institutions and Agencies reveals the results of what likely was a very active meeting⁶:

*Mr. J. B. Harrison, manager of Tenacre Foundation (a Christian Science Institution in Princeton) stopped in to discuss Departmental regulations as they affect his institution. His attitude was congenial. He stated it has never been, and is not now, the intent of his organization to avoid inspection and he wishes to continue with the status of a licensed institution.*⁷

The memo goes on to indicate that Burwell was successful in persuading the Department to issue two separate licenses to Tenacre, one under Chapter 10 for the “Mental Unit” (North Hall) and the other under Chapter 11 (for so-called Nursing Home Cases). The latter included the proviso that those accepted for care under the Chapter 11 license would be examined by a physician to affirm that the guest was free from any communicable disease. But this was the lone meaningful agreement arrived at as a result of that meeting. Burwell had also tried to persuade the Department to relinquish the control they had exercised over admissions to North Hall on the grounds that it caused Christian Scientists to “accept medical treatment contrary to their beliefs.”⁸ He asked for permission to accept guests with alcohol problems, so-called feeble-minded guests, and children. His efforts were rebuffed on all fronts, with the exception that alcoholic patients could be accepted on a trial basis.⁹ Within this memo is found a statement that signals the end to the liberal ability of the Department to negotiate “understandings” with individual licensees. That sentence reads:

*Mr. Urbaniak¹⁰ points out that the Revised Statutes (3:10-7) require medical supervision of mental patients and he states it is not within the province of the Department to waive such supervision.*¹¹

Despite the stolid resolve of the Department, Tenacre Foundation continued to hold dear the idea that there should be no medical oversight, even for its mental care program. In August of 1951, Burwell reported to the Board of Trustees, such progress as he could. He reviewed the short history of the idea, and brought them up to date. The Board minutes for the meeting of August 28 record its latest status:

After having the memorandum read to him and noting that, in Mr. Urbaniak’s opinion, continued [medical] supervision rested on the fact that it was so stated in the law, and that it was not within the province of the Department to waive such supervision, Mr. Harrison

“Conflict and Resolution”

asked if there would be any objection to having the law changed. The group was most congenial and said that they were an administering agency and whatever the law said they would be glad to abide by – that they were not in the business of opposing legislation.

Having the law changed was the only possible alternative. The Board of Trustees approved this idea, and agreed that the memorandum should be forwarded to the Christian Science Committee on Publication for New Jersey, Mr. Carr, for his action.

Just four months later, in December 1951, Mr. Carr let Tenacre know that a Uniform Act bearing on the hospitalization of the mentally ill was about to be presented to every state legislature.¹² After reviewing the draft of the Uniform Act, the Tenacre Board saw that it should be amended so that it directly met the needs of those relying solely on spiritual means for healing. They then requested Mr. Carr to be in touch with the legal office of the Committee on Publication at The Mother Church in Boston, so that the Act be amended at its source, rather than in each state jurisdiction, a task that would have been much more difficult to accomplish.

Not knowing how long it might be before the Uniform Act became the law of the land, Tenacre continued to try to arrive at an amicable understanding with the Department. Frederick B. Lacey of McCarter & English spoke on Tenacre’s behalf at a meeting in 1952. At this meeting, the Department merely reconfirmed its position. Commissioner Bates chimed in a day later, on April 22, 1952, with a letter set in stone how Tenacre’s operation would be deemed acceptable to the Department.

The movement to resolve this issue then came to a standstill. Tenacre operated as usual, and the Department seemed satisfied that its demand for medical supervision was being observed. Tenacre’s focus now shifted to the construction and renovation projects made possible by Mr. B___’s gifts. The new West Hall was for physical care and so medical oversight was not an issue, that having been resolved in 1947.

The Uniform Act on Mental Care took a little more than five years to become law in New Jersey when it was passed by the legislature and signed into law by Governor Meyner on November 28, 1956. It included the changes that The Mother Church had introduced. These changes provided Tenacre with precisely what it had hoped for – complete freedom from all medical supervision.

However, the Department of Institutions and Agencies, which had chosen not to use its discretionary power to interpret a regulation in a way that recognized Tenacre’s unique operation, then opted to construe the clearly written accommodation differently by disregarding it entirely! The Department chose to hold Tenacre to a letter Burwell had written in August 1956, immediately after the June fire, and continued to press for even more thorough medical oversight. On December 4, 1956, five months after the fire, and six days after the Mental Care Act became law, the Department wrote to Burwell:

You have already agreed to provide medical certification of persons admitted to your mental care unit, and under law, this is also required for persons receiving sheltered care.

It seems to us that it would be advisable to extend this service to your physical care program. You would then have the benefit of your physician’s assurance that only patients requiring this type of care would be admitted to the physical care building [West Hall]. Furthermore, your physician could assist in making suitable transfers from one unit to another if such transfers became necessary or advisable. We believe that in this way there would be an added safeguard to both the patient and the institution.

We trust you will give this matter your serious consideration and we would appreciate your advising us of your decision in this regard.¹³

“Conflict and Resolution”

No doubt the Department felt their request was perfectly rational and humane, and that any institution under their purview would want to have all bases covered in the manner that they championed. They soon received Tenacre Foundation's decision.

The December 26, 1956 response is a model of corrective letter writing. It is direct, forceful, logical, specific, and persuasive. The two-and-a-half page reply pulled no punches. Calling upon his past experience with Commissioner Ellis and the Department, as well as upon the spiritual resources of the Bible and the writings of Mary Baker Eddy, Burwell sent off a letter to the Department's F. Spencer Smith, the head of the Bureau of Inspections. It was clearly not what the Department had hoped to receive. In the letter, Burwell immediately drew attention to the bill Governor Meyner had just signed on November 28. He underscored the fact that no longer was any medical supervision of a mental care program run by and for “adherents of any well-recognized church or religious denomination which subscribes to the act of healing by prayer” a legal requirement. As an ameliorative gesture, he let the Department know that Dr. James would continue to be retained, but only in the role of advisor. He continued:

Christian Scientists do not oppose any system of medicine or surgery or health regimen. We do not desire to impose our way of thought or healing upon anybody. We simply ask that we be permitted to enjoy the same freedom, which as American citizens supporting the American way of life, we are trying to sustain for others.

Healing the sick through prayer as Jesus did and directed his followers to do is a fundamental practice of this religion. Christian Scientists have proved that reliance upon material methods of healing is incompatible with reliance upon divine aid through prayer and that it is not only incorrect but impossible to mix both. We cannot and do not accept the common belief that God made both and therefore we should use “the best of both.”

The letter then shamelessly sets forth the Christian reasoning why there should be no medical supervision:

An institution such as Tenacre is maintained to support the Christian Scientist's ability to rely radically, by having his human need cared for by those who thoroughly understand what is being attempted and who can give him spiritual as well as physical support. Dilution of the atmosphere thus achieved – by the injection of persons other than Christian Scientists or the imposition to whatever degree, of materia medica personnel, opinions, observations or control – constitutes a serious hazard and places the success of the work being done in jeopardy.

Then, to bolster the crystalline clarity of that statement, a story from the Bible is brought to bear:

Allow me here to quote from an article, not written by a Christian Scientist: "A careful reading of the accounts of [Jesus'] healings, in the light of modern science, shows that he observed, in his practice of mental therapeutics, the conditions of environment and harmonious influence that are essential to success. In the case of Jairus' daughter [Luke 8: 49-56] they are fully set forth. He kept all unbelievers away "put them all out" and permitting only the father and mother, with his closest followers and friends, Peter, James and John, in the chamber with him, and having thus the most perfect obtainable environment, he raised the daughter to life."¹⁴

Burwell then quoted a passage from *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, by Mary Baker Eddy, p. 424:12:

In medical practice objections would be raised if one doctor should administer a drug to counteract the working of a remedy prescribed by another doctor. It is equally important in metaphysical practice that the minds which surround your patient should not act against your influence by continually expressing such opinions as may alarm or discourage – either

“Conflict and Resolution”

by giving antagonistic advice or through unspoken thoughts resting on your patient. While it is certain that the divine Mind can remove any obstacle, still you need the ear of your auditor. It is not more difficult to make yourself heard mentally while others are thinking about your patients or conversing with them, if you understand Christian Science - the oneness and the allness of divine Love; but it is well to be alone with God and the sick when treating disease.

This metaphysical broadside was designed to destroy the intractable resistance the Department harbored on the now moot question of medical oversight. Incredibly, the much-desired effect was not to be – at least in the short term. In response to the letter above, Burwell received what could be termed a gem of bureaucratic blandishment that was neither here nor there, but put forward the Department’s stupefaction in the face of Tenacre’s solid reasoning. Wrote the Chief of the Bureau of Inspection of the Department, no doubt as honestly as he could, to Burwell:

Frankly, I am a bit confused by the contentions of your letter since it was my understanding that the agreements we reached with Dr. Davis some time ago were apparently for the protection of Tenacre and yourself as manager, and I do not quite see how the passage of the new legislation would change the points upon which we had mutually agreed.¹⁵

His letter conveniently overlooks the fact that the letter to which he refers was written before the passage of the new law, and that the new law effectively superseded it and therefore totally eradicated the basis for whatever “final agreement” had been arrived at.

The record shows that Burwell retreated from his righteous epistolary assault, and left this work to Tenacre’s longtime legal trust, the Newark, N.J., firm of McCarter and English. By so doing, the process reverted into the amicable yet adversarial standoff with which the Department seemed perfectly content. But Tenacre, knowing that acquiescence might signal agreement, knew that the Department’s stance had no legs. It had become imperative that the matter be resolved. Tenacre had begun to suffer from the Department’s intransigence. For example, potential donors, when learning of the state’s medical oversight requirements, bestowed their gifts elsewhere, perhaps feeling that the care Tenacre provided was somewhat short of the Christian Science standard.

Burwell presented the case to Ward Herbert, of McCarter and English, in a letter written fully a year after the passage of the Uniform Mental Care Act:

The present arrangement affects us, however, in very serious ways: 1) So long as a doctor’s supervision is either actual or implied the Christian Science Movement cannot officially take Tenacre to its bosom. So long as it exists we have no defense against the gossip which circulates about this institution as to it not being a truly bona fide Christian Science institution.

2) Tenacre deserves a share of the financial support available to Christian Science in New Jersey, the Philadelphia area, and the New York City area. To date this has been relatively meager in so far as Tenacre is concerned and the meagerness has been contributed to largely by the ability on the part of fund raisers for the New York and Philadelphia institutions to imply that there is a slight cloud concerning the degree that we are actually and totally a Christian Science institution.

3) No one will ever know and we have no way of accurately measuring the effect of the doctor’s thought being present in our work. That the presence of the medical thought penalizes the work being done in Christian Science has been proved in many individual cases and is accepted as basic by a Christian Scientist.¹⁶

The letter closed by reiterating that Tenacre Foundation would be willing to retain Dr. James as a paid consultant, one who would be available to certify a passing, and mental incompetence, but

“Conflict and Resolution”

nothing more. And he urges Mr. Herbert to press the Department, at the very least, to relinquish its position, if it could not bring itself to acknowledge the fact of the legal provision.

Little progress, if any, was made between 1958 and 1962.¹⁷ Tenacre subsequently hired a local Princeton attorney, Mr. Ralph Mason, to champion their interests in this particular matter. A March 22, 1962 letter from Burwell to Mr. Mason gave a concise history of the legal conundrum. Work was taken up, and even then, no progress seemed to follow, that is, until World War II Veteran Harrison, in January of 1963, fired off a cannonball of a wake-up call letter to Mr. Mason:

If the reason you have not gone to Urbaniak or the Department is that your heart is not in our Cause, I think I should have the benefit of your thinking on the matter – if that is not the case, then it would seem that we are being neglected.¹⁸

This got results. Two months later, by letter, Mr. Mason sent Burwell a proposal for a new regulation that he hoped would persuade the Department to adopt the necessary course. It essentially clarified the law that had been passed in 1956 and made it palatable to and compatible with the regulations that the Department regularly promulgated. Four days later, Burwell responded with a modifying wrinkle which added language specifying that the proposed regulation applied only to those institutions operated by “a member or members or by an association or corporation composed of members of such well-recognized church or religious denominations.” This was accompanied by a proposed cover letter for which he asked Mr. Mason’s review. Ralph Mason, by now fully converted to Tenacre’s cause, shot back his modifications on March 18. A week later Mr. Mason received a letter from Dr. Urbaniak that, once again asserted that Tenacre had agreed to medical supervision of its operation.

Responsive to your recent inquiry regarding the above facility, may I hand you herewith a copy of a letter to Mr. Harrison, Manager thereof, on July 31, 1956, outlining our understanding after a lengthy conference on the same subject matter.

This communication was acknowledged to our Commissioner on August 17, 1956 by Mr. Harrison indicating that he agreed fully with the contents thereof and would comply.

Will you kindly indicate what changed circumstances are now present which suggests that this previous understanding should be abandoned or modified?¹⁹

On April 25, Mr. Mason sent Tenacre a copy of this correspondence along with a copy of his response. If the Department was capable of intransigence, Mr. Mason showed, in what he termed his “lawyer to lawyer approach”,²⁰ that he was capable of sticking to the subject. His letter precisely reiterated what Burwell’s understanding had been since the end of 1956. It authoritatively pared away all the baggage that had built up between the Department and Tenacre, and focused wholly on the course of the changes in the law pertinent to Tenacre and the Department since 1956.

There has been a change in the law, which occurred after the communications of July and August 1956, which removed the basis for the letter understandings. The statute was changed by the Governor signing into law Chapter 161 of the Laws of 1956 on November 28, 1956. This repealed Chapter 10 of Title 30 of the Revised Statutes, Institutions for Care and Treatment of Insane, and provided for all licensing and regulation under Chapter 11, Nursing Homes or Hospitals.

We believe that the provisions of RS 30:11-9 after November 28, 1956 established the standards of regulations and supervision of all the activities of institutions such as the Tenacre Foundation in Princeton.

When his letter, dated April 25, 1963 and addressed to Eugene T. Urbaniak, M.D., and Deputy Attorney General of the State of New Jersey, drew no response, another letter was sent on

“Conflict and Resolution”

May 1. It was worded exactly as the letter of April 25. A day later, he received a letter that showed, through a question it brought, that resolution was close. The doctor, Deputy Attorney General Urbaniak, queried:

*I think you will agree that the institution would be limited to receiving in the private mental hospital, the nursing home and the boarding home for sheltered care, only those persons who are adherents of the Christian Science Faith. Will you kindly advise me at this time whether this is a rigid and inflexible policy of Tenacre?*²¹

On May 6, Mr. Mason responded that such was indeed the case, and included a sample application card that Tenacre used for those desiring to be patients. During all of the period when correspondence flew between the Deputy Attorney General and Mr. Mason, the Board of Trustees kept constant in their prayer. Finally, a solid promise arrived. On May 10, Mr. Urbaniak pledged a “final disposition of this matter.”²²

The Board meeting minutes for August 27, 1963 show that, almost *seven* years after the law had been favorably changed, Burwell was finally able to announce to the Board, that the Department’s inspectors would “concern themselves only with matters of sanitation, fire, and safety.” The notation continues, “This has the effect we have been seeking – the official recognition of the licensing statute which became effective as it pertains to the remedial care and treatment of patients in institutions operated by and for those relying on prayer for healing.” Finally, the matter was concluded.

An interesting footnote to this chapter is found in a letter Burwell composed, but finally did not send to the Department of Institutions and Agencies. He wrote, in part:

Years ago – about 1939 – I said to Dr. Potter that it seemed to me any difficulty the Department had with Tenacre stemmed from endeavoring to make a non-materia medica institution conform to rules and regulations promulgated for materia medica institutions. I asked if we could not have a separate set of regulations fulfilling the Department’s responsibility as a licensing authority while at the same time recognizing that, as adherents of a responsible religious group, our attitude toward illness in general, and our methods of care and treatment, in particular were in extreme disagreement with the attitudes of those who relied upon materia medica.

*I do believe, however, that the situation as it now stands makes it possible for the Department to do in 1956, what I asked it to do in 1939, promulgate a set of regulations which will fulfill in every way its responsibility as the licensing and regulating agency while, at the same time, showing respect and consideration for the religious beliefs and commitments of a completely responsible and law abiding, though minority, group of citizens of New Jersey.*²³

What Burwell had easily seen in 1939 had finally come to pass in 1963. To be sure, the “professionals” had found their place in the Department. The door to the sort of regulation process once typical of the Department was, for all intents and purposes, finally closed, having been replaced by a more cautious and less flexible “chapter and verse” *modus operandi* that characterizes how the various departments of the state government conduct business. In a very real way, government had become another “lump” for the leaven of Christian Science.

¹ Letter, Department of Institutions and Agencies to Burwell Harrison, dated July 5, 1956, p.1.

² Letter, John W. Tramburg to JBH, dated July 31, 1956, summarized a meeting between the Department and Tenacre just following the fire. It indicated nine points of agreement and included three points of suggestions as solutions to certain questions that arose concerning the care of the mentally ill. Point six

under the agreements read, "It was agreed that Dr. James would make daily rounds, would see and talk with patients, and at that such time, he would record, for the administration, his opinion on unusual circumstances..."

The letter contained other suggestions that Burwell likely saw as helpful, and, as he was likely aware that the law regulating institutions such as Tenacre was ready to be passed. It would repeal the need for any medical oversight. Thus he could respond on August 17: "Your letter of July 31 has had our careful consideration. We find that it outlines as you indicate the basic understandings arrived at in my conference with Dr. Davis and Mr. Smith. We are now operating substantially in accordance with these agreements...."

³ The physician's role was explained in various communications. The following letter, dated July 18, 1939, from Commissioner Ellis to Howard G. Bleakly, CSB, President of Board of Managers of Tenacre: "The employment of a graduate registered nurse who can assume responsibility for professional questions which may arise in the absence of the doctor meets with our approval. Patients suffering from mental disorders must be limited to the nervous and mild mental type. Aged and chronically ill may also be accepted. All should be examined by Dr. McCorkle, preferably before admitted to the institution. Beginning July 19, 1939 we are prepared to permit you to accept patients approved for admission by Dr. McCorkle." Burwell Harrison's response to Commissioner Ellis of July 29, 1939: "I want, first of all, to express our sincere gratitude for the permission granted to us to continue the operation of Tenacre....Our conception of Tenacre is that it is to be a service to those turning to Christian Science for healing... . You probably have been informed that our present [Christian Science] head nurse left Tenacre previously because she did not feel that it was representing Christian Science properly. She is most enthusiastic about our attitude toward the work and has put her whole heart into it since her return. She is in full charge in so far as matters of a professional nature are concerned and Doctor McCorkle sees her in her office every morning."

It's unclear how long this procedure was continued. In late 1939, Ruth Hulse, a Christian Science nurse who also was an RN, continued to fulfill the state requirement on into the 1960's, but by 1962 she had retired and was in Tenacre's care for her latter years. She passed away in 1964.

⁴ Letter, Ellen C. Potter, M.D. to JBH, dated April 9, 1942.

⁵ Letter, JBH to Cornelius Jackson, dated April 14, 1942.

Burwell wrote of the state license and the "medical...influence" in his correspondence with The Christian Science Board of Directors on July 25, 1942: "Although we have been favored by the protection and privilege of a statutory license by the State of New Jersey, it is felt that a recognition of our institution as one operated by or for a recognized religious group may and probably will relieve the institution permanently from the levy of certain if not all government tax assessments and will further relax certain State supervisory privileges which have in them a certain medical element and influence."

In another letter from Howard Graham Bleakly to The Christian Science Board of Directors, dated February 2, 1945, when Burwell was serving in the U.S. Army in Belgium, the arrangement with the State was explained: "...we are required by law to have an inspecting physician on our staff who sees each new guest, and it is his responsibility to fill in an admission report for the State, giving a diagnosis, and saying whether or not the person is suitable for our care at Tenacre. He then signs what is called an "Order Book" giving permission for the guest to leave the grounds, accompanied or unaccompanied, as the case may be."

Mr. Harrison always identified Tenacre's work as religious and repeated this fact throughout his tenure. When the Township of Princeton finally granted tax-exempt status to Tenacre on the basis that it was a

wholly religious facility and no longer regarded as a hospital, in March 1999, the news was heartwarming to him. Mr. Harrison passed away in July 1999.

⁶ According to the Board minutes for December 12, 1950, Burwell reported this meeting to the Board and further related that he and Mr. Bleakly had also visited the Governor in his office, apparently to further bolster Tenacre’s case. The Board minutes for February 27, 1951 then record that “the manager read recent correspondence between the Department of Institutions and Agencies in Trenton, and Tenacre, with reference to lifting restrictions which seemed to interfere with our work.”

⁷ Memo, F. Spencer Smith to Sanford Bates, February 23, 1951.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Section 2.

⁹ The state tried to find a way to refuse this request as well, but because the state itself did not have separate facilities for alcoholics, they could find no basis for a refusal. Tenacre did begin to accept such patients, but found they had little success, and so declined subsequent requests.

¹⁰ Eugene T. Urbaniak was a physician and lawyer who worked as Deputy Attorney General for the State of New Jersey, whose duties included working as legal counsel for the Department of Institutions and Agencies. This statement is his considered legal opinion.

¹¹ In actuality, it was “within the province of the Department to waive such supervision.” It was the legislated function of each governmental department to give teeth to the statutes governing its department. They did so through the published regulations of the New Jersey Administrative Code that spelled out exactly how the law was to be applied. By design, it was the very nature of each Department within the state bureaucratic structure to be formally responsive and amenable to change. This was the Department’s way of saying, 1) that they had chosen to stiffen the bureaucratic process, and thus delay the process of change in the regulations as long as possible, and 2) that they wanted minority entities such as Tenacre to have the changes they desired to be handled first by the legislature. Perhaps the Department had seen that providing separate but equal treatment to Tenacre was, in essence, a First Amendment issue quite beyond the purview of their interpretive powers. In any event, it was clear that the Department did not want to be the final arbiter of the issue, and thus felt they had no choice other than to insist that Tenacre accede, once and for all, to medical supervision.

¹² A Uniform Act occurs when it is noted that a majority of states are considering similar legislation. A Uniform Act is introduced so that each state will have legislation on the topic that is “uniform,” and thus easily recognized from state to state.

¹³ Letter, F. Spencer Smith to JBH, dated December 4, 1956.

¹⁴ *Jackson Patriot*, Jackson, Michigan, January 20, 1895, as quoted in *Pulpit and Press*, by Mary Baker Eddy, p. 54:18.

¹⁵ Letter, F. Spencer Smith to JBH, January 3, 1957.

¹⁶ Letter, JBH to Ward Herbert (McCarter and English), dated January 4, 1958.

¹⁷ During this gap, Tenacre was thoroughly engaged on yet another legal front. Work had begun on what are today known as the “Cottages” and the question of tax exemption for this project, as well as for the new Trustee’s Home (built in accord with Mr. B. ____’s explicit wish that some of his gift be used for such purposes, occupied center stage during this time. The case involving the Trustee’s House was settled on appeal in a landmark case decided in Tenacre’s favor. Exemption was not granted to the Cottages. Mr. Herbert worked to lighten his caseload in preparation for leaving McCarter & English in 1960, when he assumed a judgeship in the Superior Court in northern New Jersey. Tenacre’s legal matters were left in the capable hands of Mr. Francis F.P. McCarter, but his focus did not include the medical oversight question.

¹⁸ Letter, JBH to Ralph Mason, dated January 12, 1963.

¹⁹ Letter, Eugene T. Urbaniak to Ralph S. Mason, April 23, 1963.

²⁰ Letter, Ralph Mason to JBH, March 11, 1963.

²¹ Letter, Eugene T. Urbaniak to Ralph S. Mason, dated May 2, 1963.

²² Letter, Eugene T. Urbaniak to Ralph S. Mason, dated May 10, 1963.

²³ Unsent letter, JBH to F. Spencer Smith, dated December 18, 1956.

Chapter 6

“unity... liberty... charity”

*“In essentials – unity
In non-essentials – liberty
In all things – charity”*

Melanchthon

ENDORSEMENT OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE NURSING HOMES

A photograph of a Tenacre School instructor in the 1940s shows a blackboard with the above quote. For Christian Science nursing, as in any endeavor where individuals must work together, the message is simple but conveys a profound principle. As more Christian Science facilities were established, the issue arose of how to work together on subjects of mutual importance. Unity, liberty and charity would be needed.

When asked, what was the first Christian Science facility, Alberta Fielder would say that it was House of the Pines in Catonsville, Maryland. Apparently, it was already well established when she nursed there beginning in around 1918.¹ Tenacre opened its doors as a 3-guest Rest Home in 1922, following the 1919 opening of the 30-room Benevolent Association in Chestnut Hill operated by The Mother Church. Requests to come to Tenacre from individuals, who, for a variety of circumstances, could not be cared for at the Boston facility, modestly grew until, in 1946, Tenacre was comprised of 33 beds and a staff of 26 Christian Science nurses. Located in the woods of New Jersey and being the only Christian Science facility with a significant number of mental cases, Tenacre improvised and developed Christian Science nursing of mental cases on its own. With a graduate from the Benevolent Association, the Tenacre School was formed in 1941 to train its own Christian Science nurses.

After the Second World War, in late 1946, The Christian Science Board of Directors formed the ‘Committee on Christian Science Nursing Homes in the United States’ through which to establish standards and provide accreditation for the small but growing number of Christian Science nursing homes. So with nearly 25 years of pioneering in Christian Science nursing in an institutional setting, Tenacre was eager to be part of the new program.

Mr. Harrison and Tenacre Board member Henry Stenson made a special trip to Boston to request that Tenacre be recognized by the new Committee. However, endorsement was not forthcoming. On February 10, 1947 a letter from the new Committee contained the reasons why Tenacre would not be accepted for accreditation.

The fact that you and Mr. Stenson called on the Chairman of our Committee at the end of last month was brought to the attention of The Christian Science Board of Directors. At the time the Directors expressed the opinion that in view of the fact that Tenacre Foundation is carrying on some activities which do not come within the scope of the Committee on Christian Science Nursing Homes in the United States, it might be better for Tenacre Foundation to go on functioning as it is now, rather than have it consider eliminating some of these activities. Since Tenacre Foundation advertises its facilities in The Christian Science

Monitor, this would furnish an opportunity for us to say to inquirers that the organization is functioning in a manner to meet the requirements for advertising in The Christian Science Monitor.²

Burwell Harrison wrote about the events of his and Mr. Stenson's trip to Boston when they were still fresh in thought. He described a meeting with two members of The Christian Science Board of Directors:

During the interview both gentlemen assured us Tenacre was "tops" in its field, and would be readily approved. They seem prepared to make whatever exceptions were necessary in Tenacre's case to approve it. That is, in such cases as size (they want homes of about 20 beds), name (they do not want the word "Foundation" used as a name), etc. These men felt The Mother Church could make these exceptions without establishing precedents because Tenacre is already established, whereas they would require new homes to meet their specifications.³

It seemed to him that The Board of Directors was ready to "grandfather" Tenacre and its operation into the unfolding scheme of Christian Science nursing homes. Their meeting with the Chairman of the Committee showed otherwise. Burwell asked the Chairman of the Committee about the criteria used to determine whether or not a home was in compliance, and noted, "She ...seemed stopped by our [Christian Science] Nursing School."⁴

While Tenacre remained unaccredited throughout the 1950s and into the 1960s, there was much Mr. Harrison shared with new Christian Science nursing homes that continued to seek out Tenacre's advice so that they might not have to reinvent the institutional wheel.

In March 1961, Tenacre received a letter from Boston, which directed that Tenacre should send no further mailings to Christian Science Reading Rooms. This was something of a surprise. For years, mailings describing its services had been freely sent to Reading Room librarians. Yet the letter stated:

...that librarians in our Reading Rooms should not be asked to keep a file of activities not connected with The Mother Church nor to serve as outlets for information about them.

You will be interested to know that information about the [Christian Science] Nurses Training course given at the Sanatoriums of our Benevolent Association is to be supplied to the Reading Rooms so that librarians will be able to answer questions on this subject.

Tenacre's manager immediately wrote saying they would comply. But just how to address the feeling of being excluded was yet to be resolved.

This letter about Tenacre's mailings coincided with the inception of a new *Monitor* advertising format. The *Monitor* had begun to group together all Christian Science homes officially approved by The Mother Church while putting Tenacre's ad at the bottom of the advertising section.

The combined effect of the exclusion from the Reading Rooms and less prominent advertising giving the sense that Tenacre and the Christian Science nurses that graduated from its school were less desirable, if not substandard, while perhaps unintended, was immediate. Requests for information about Tenacre's Christian Science nursing training program, while never great, dramatically declined. Mr. Harrison wrote a second letter to The Mother Church on March 20, 1961:

To my knowledge most Reading Rooms maintain files of advertisers in The Christian Science Monitor. Some limit the file to local advertisers; others are more elaborate and include national advertisers of schools, soups, etc. Our experience has shown that for our purposes results from Monitor advertising are very meager unless supported by direct mail reproduction of the advertisements – widely distributed.

It has been as a long time regular advertiser in The Monitor, spending more than \$3000 – sometimes more than \$4000 – that we have felt this literature could enter the Reading Rooms – to be dealt with there in whatever way local policy permitted.

The letter closed with the request that the mailings continue so that Reading Room librarians might, in the end:

...refer to Tenacre anyone available for Christian Science nursing training, who may not for some reason, be eligible for the Sanatoriums – or who for some reason does not choose to go there. It seems inconceivable that this would divert any eligible or willing applicant from the Sanatoriums.⁵

This reasoning was accepted whereby Tenacre could continue its practice of sending mailings to the Reading Rooms.

Olive LaRoche, Director of the Tenacre School of Christian Science Nursing, wrote directly to a member of The Christian Science Board of Directors with a plea for unity. Hers was a 3-page appeal for the reestablishment of unity in the field of Christian Science nursing. It provided a perspective of a graduate of the Benevolent Association’s Christian Science nurses training program. It is quoted in its entirety since it gives such a broad summary of the training program at that time:

The kindly interest you have always shown our [Christian Science] nurses prompts me to lay before you a matter which is giving me considerable concern at this time. It is the argument that our beloved Mother Church is being handled by that which would divide rather than unite its workers.

You may recall that I first came to see you in 1952 to thank The Christian Science Board of Directors for their part in enabling me, as a Briton, to take [Christian Science] nurses’ training at Chestnut Hill. I shall always value those three years, not alone for the training but for other benefits incidentally received, and I shall always have a deep affection for the Benevolent Association and strive to uphold its teaching and standard of [Christian Science] nursing. But I am grateful too, for what I learned both by precept and example at Hawthorne House, London, England, prior to going to Chestnut Hill. I know from observation that excellence in Christian Science nursing practice is not confined to the walls of the Sanatoriums.

While working privately in the field, as well as in other [Christian Science] nursing homes, I became acutely aware that on the one hand are the Benevolent-trained [Christian Science] nurses, and on the other former medical nurses, Tenacre-trained [Christian Science] nurses and some who have had no formal training. In some instances, Benevolent-trained [Christian Science] nurses, regarding themselves as the elite, have been less than kind in their attitudes towards those who have not been privileged to have Benevolent Association training. Yet all individuals serving as [Christian Science] nurses have been helping to meet the needs of their fellow Christian Scientists.

When invited to join the teaching staff at Tenacre four years ago, I did so with joy, seeing the assignment as an opportunity to work for unity between the various categories of [Christian Science] nurses, and whenever possible I have stressed the following fact: All Journal-listed [Christian Science] nurses share the common experience of (1) being a member of The Mother Church (2) having the desire to serve their fellows as [Christian Science] nurses (3) being recognized by The Mother Church as fulfilling the requirements given by Mrs. Eddy in Article VIII, Section 31 of the Manual (otherwise they would not be listed in the Journal).

Now I have always understood that while Tenacre Foundation was not directly administered by The Mother Church, its special services have been endorsed for many years now by The

Christian Science Board of Directors. Tenacre accepts for training those Christian Scientists, who, in general, are ineligible for the courses at Chestnut Hill or San Francisco, but who yet are capable of serving the field as [Christian Science] nursing attendants or as [Christian Science] nurses equipped to care for mental cases as well as other acute illnesses: the number who might have gone to the Benevolent Association instead is very small indeed, certainly not more than two or three a year. Thus in no sense, can Tenacre be deemed as a competitor or rival of the Benevolent Associations.

By keeping in close touch with the Superintendent of [Christian Science] Nurses at Chestnut Hill, the [Christian Science] nursing instructresses at Tenacre have kept abreast of changes in techniques practiced there and have imparted these to students at Tenacre, in the interest of unity when these [Christian Science] nurses get out into the field. In short, we are devoted to the idea of unifying the standards and practices of Benevolent-trained and Tenacre [Christian Science] nurses so that when they work alongside each other in [Christian Science] nursing homes or in the field on private cases, there shall be less cause for division, with resultant blessing to the patients, who need an atmosphere truly conducive to healing and not to petty rivalry.

For some months now, we have been aware that in some quarters Tenacre and its [Christian Science] nurses' training program is being misunderstood, to say the least. The rather obvious relegation of Tenacre's daily advertisement in the classified column of The Monitor from the top to the bottom of the column since the personnel department of The Mother Church has been advertising the Sanatoriums' courses daily, is a minor indication of this and would be amusing were its implications not so sad. The recent addition in the Sanatoriums' advertisement under the words "Under direction of The Mother Church" while strictly true, might be thought to imply that the Tenacre course is not "officially" sanctioned.

In the field and in [Christian Science] nursing homes, Benevolent-trained [Christian Science] nurses and Tenacre [Christian Science] nurses, as well as others, are bound to work together. What is truly important is that they should express a sense of fellowship one with another regardless of where they received their training.

Incidentally, the differences in training and experience are indicated in the Journal, the Benevolent-trained [Christian Science] nurses being distinguished by asterisks, and others by "daggers" and "double-daggers" and so on. The mere fact that a [Christian Science] nurse can claim Benevolent Association training does not of itself, alas, guarantee that she is a superior person. (In theory, perhaps, it should, but in fact this is simply not true.) Any official move that would appear to enhance the prestige of the Benevolent-trained [Christian Science] nurses at the expense of others who have been properly recognized would seem to be unjust.

...I do feel it would be a most unhappy thing for the movement if the [Christian Science] nursing field were to suffer further division. One sees in several directions that more unity within the movement is a vital need.⁶

Miss LaRoche's lengthy, heartfelt letter covered the whole ground. It was received most cordially, as is indicated by the Director's response:

"I like what you say. I shall continue to do all that I can to promote a right appreciation of the work which Tenacre is doing in our movement, and to strengthen the ties of brotherly service which unite all our workers."⁷

Another question of unity among Christian Science nursing institutions gave Tenacre the opportunity for a meeting in Boston. In early 1963, a course for practical Christian Science nurses

training at Pleasant View had just been advertised. Tenacre felt that if these courses were to continue, it would be forced to abandon the Tenacre graduate Christian Science nurses training programs that had been developed and nurtured since 1941 and the one-year practical Christian Science nurses training begun in 1951. Burwell wrote to the Trustees of the Christian Science Pleasant View Home and asked for an interview. This request met with an immediate response and a meeting was arranged for May 13, 1963. The Christian Science Board of Directors would also be present.

It was a rare and unexpected opportunity. Burwell, accompanied by Martha in her official capacity as Clerk for Tenacre's Board of Trustees, brought with him a hand-written, ten-page manuscript. Mr. Harrison began his presentation with gratitude. He gave thanks for the easy access to members of The Christian Science Board of Directors that Tenacre had experienced ever since the beginning of his tenure at Tenacre in 1939, and continued by thanking the Board and Pleasant View for the meeting so quickly called. He described what he felt Tenacre's role within the Christian Science Movement had been and touched on its demonstrated financial independence, ensuring that it would never be a drain on the Movement or on the Benevolent Association. He outlined his concerns with the intensified recruitment program.

He then described what Tenacre's demonstration of training its own Christian Science nurses as well as Christian Science nurses for the Field had been, stressing the fact that each step Tenacre had taken was not done without first consulting with individual members of The Christian Science Board of Directors. Then he pointed to the fact that ever since Tenacre had begun its school, it had been especially careful not to detract from the pool of talent available for Christian Science nurses training at the Benevolent Sanatoriums. Tenacre primarily sought candidates who were over 42 years of age, the age at which they were ineligible for the BA program.

If, however, The Mother Church is to now advertise a school for practical [Christian Science] nurses at Pleasant View and release those who finish such a course for field nursing – regardless of the number trained, we see in this only an additional diversion of those still available for training at Tenacre.

And in the light of recent experience, it would seem that our only solution would be to abandon our advertised training – train only for our own staffing – increase salaries, and otherwise add to the advantages for coming to Tenacre.⁸

Careful not to appear as though he was unaware of their own concerns, he then put forward two feasible possibilities that would meet the needs of Pleasant View and The Mother Church and at the same time obviate the need for Tenacre to close its own training facility:

- 1. Institute only informal training at Pleasant View, or, Transfer [Christian Science] nurses from the Sanatoriums for a period during the Regular Course in which they may receive specific training in the care of the elderly (at one time a Director mentioned it might be helpful if each BA [Christian Science] Nurse had a period with the mentally ill at Tenacre).*
- 2. Interest in Christian Science Nursing as a career [might] be stimulated by immediately recruiting the best thought available for the task, particularly by appropriate messages from The Christian Science Board of Directors, editorials and articles on Christian Science nursing as a career in the periodicals.*

There was receptivity to the ideas presented and Tenacre received a letter from the Board of Trustees at Pleasant View that could not have been more courteous and supportive. After thanking Mr. Harrison for his contributions to the meeting of May 13, the letter continued:

It is certainly not our desire to do anything that would make it more difficult for you to carry on the good work being accomplished at Tenacre. We are, therefore, happy to assure you that

we are not planning to establish an advertised practical [Christian Science] nurses training course at the Pleasant View Home.

Mr. Harrison also received a letter from The Christian Science Board of Directors. He responded:

We are very, very grateful for your kind letter of September 11 concerning the status of Tenacre [Christian Science] nurses and [Christian Science] visiting nurse work.⁹

In 1964, one of the Directors visited Tenacre and followed up with a letter:

I can't tell you how impressed I was with the layout at Tenacre and the wonderful opportunity of discussing your work with you. You are doing a great job, believe me! And all who really understand and are familiar with it appreciate it deeply.¹⁰

While not recognition, the appreciation shared for the many years of devotion that the Tenacre management and staff had contributed to this work helped to smooth the waters and restore a feeling of unity.

BENEVOLENCE AND STATE WELFARE FUNDING

The name "The Tenacre Friendly Fund" was used starting in 1941 to identify the source of benevolence given to guests. Charity and benevolence were an important part of the outreach of love which Christian Science nursing represented. From the business side, lessons had been learned that the operations must be kept streamlined and efficient and that self-supporting rates must be set so that the facility could break even with 75% occupancy. Benevolence was to be given to guests not able to pay, not to support an inefficient operation.

By 1951, after many years of using operating income to provide the benevolence, this question was posed: Instead of each facility having a fund-raising effort, could it be a coordinated movement-wide effort? Burwell Harrison wrote a letter to The Christian Science Board of Directors in September of 1951 on the subject of "Welfare Funds in Branch Churches and Associations."¹¹ It stated, in part,

We have reason to believe that there are many in Branch Churches and Associations ready to sponsor and carry through to conclusion the establishment of funds of this kind at the local level, once the enterprise is given official backing and guidance from "Boston." Could it not be done in somewhat the manner that official approval and guidance was given the idea of establishing local [Christian Science] nursing homes?

Welfare funds maintained by and for members of a branch church, a group of churches, or an Association – as distinguished from a "fund to provide Benevolence" maintained by a specific [Christian Science] nursing service or home – would permit the needy one to receive the particular assistance he needs – a [Christian Science] nurse in the home, rent paid, food provided, a stay at a Benevolent Sanatorium, etc. Local enthusiasm for a service or a home tends to put all "eggs in one basket," and leaves nothing with which to help the member who needs assistance other than that offered by the service to which all contributions have been made.¹²

Attention was again brought to bear on this question in an April 1955 address Burwell Harrison gave to the Christian Science Nursing Service for Northern New Jersey:

I am sure that we all agree that the primary mission of The Mother Church and its branches is to "preach the gospel," to make Christian Science available throughout the world to all

mankind.... But without question, Welfare Services geared to meet the great variety of special needs of individual students of Christian Science must come next.

...Isn't the helping hand offered to our brother in time of seeming need closer to the essence of true scientific Christianity – from the mount of which our own vision of the Christ becomes clearer?

Our Leader, Mary Baker Eddy, has taught us that "Love" (capital L), is reflected in love, with a small "l" – Christianly scientific, yet warm, compassionate, patient, tender, love.

It has been my observation that nothing has contributed more to the misunderstanding of Christian Science among non-Scientists than our failure to provide for the welfare needs of our members in trouble.¹³

Because Mr. Harrison was so actively involved with the Princeton community through his membership in Rotary, his membership on the Board of the Princeton YMCA, and several other local concerns, he knew whereof he spoke. Every Princetonian who knew Burwell knew that he was a Christian Scientist and that they could speak freely to him about his religious convictions. Undoubtedly he was aware of their concerns, especially in regard to the question of how Christian Scientists cared for each other. The address was a statement that truly reflected his concerns and would prove to be a motivating force working within his lifelong ministry.

Since its inception, the Tenacre Friendly Fund was never able to meet the demands made upon it, and, much of the time, it was just a way to identify forgone income. When the amount of benevolence exceeded ten percent of operating income over a period of months, the rates charged the guests would be increased. Once they were increased, the Friendly Fund in turn was used even more heavily.¹⁴

Around 1957, state welfare was provided for one of Tenacre's guests. It is recorded:

Through a set of circumstances, a Welfare case was certified (by the State of New Jersey) to Tenacre and somehow it was approved for support here with only a [Christian Science] practitioner's signature certifying the disability and need for [Christian Science] nursing care. When re-certification came due we adjusted the regular form to provide for re-certification by a [Christian Science] practitioner instead of a doctor, and so far as I recall this occurred several times as this guest stayed on and on with us.¹⁵

This case likely kindled a bright hope. This was not an unreasonable aspiration, as the state funding provided room and board, a clothing allowance, and some spending money – the basic essentials any indigent New Jerseyan might expect. And since there was neither provision nor requirement for any sort of remedial care, it appeared that any and every New Jerseyan might benefit from this public provision without regard to their religion. However, this hope was dashed:

When a second case was presented to us, we expected the same procedure to be accepted. This time the case came from Mercer County and was handled by a caseworker out of the main office of Welfare. In this case, the [Christian Science] practitioner's signature was not acceptable, and in the end, rather than allow a doctor to be brought in, we gave full benevolence to both cases for the duration, foregoing by this act, or policy, several thousands of dollars we could have had from welfare on both of these cases.¹⁶

In April 1961, Burwell Harrison was invited by a group of church members in Dallas, Texas, to speak to them about beginning a Christian Science nursing home in their area. A Christian Science teacher who had been present at the talk and who, by June, had become a Director, wrote Mr. Harrison in gratitude for what he had shared about benevolence and funding. Sensing that the topic had a new receptivity, Mr. Harrison wrote a five-page memo to The Board of Directors on July

5, 1961. It contained his most current thinking on the direction he felt The Mother Church might take in helping to meet the needs of the Christian Science nursing homes in this rapidly developing field.

Mr. Harrison's memo urged guidance by The Mother Church, so that support and operation of Christian Science nursing homes did not detract from the primary mission of The Mother Church. Point 4 summarizes this:

4. In general, I would recommend policies designed to accomplish the following:

(a) Once founded, all services [at facilities] would be self-supporting from earned income.

(b) All resources of the Movement available for humanitarian services to fellow Christian Scientists and other such purposes should be channeled into special funds of The Mother Church, branch churches, Associations and/or funds serving a geographically defined area. Assistance to individuals in paying the established self-supporting services would be available from these funds.

Results: Dedicated, well-managed services, existing on merit – without fund raising activities.

Welfare resources of the Movement oriented toward individuals according to need – not dissipated through services whose costs are out of proportion to the number served or the value of the service performed.

Direct aid to individuals permits them to have available that which best serves their need, whatever it may be – a visiting or full-time [Christian Science] nurse, a visit to a local [Christian Science] nursing home or to a distant Benevolent Sanatorium, etc.¹⁷

In the meantime, continuing to look to possible state funding, Tenacre renewed a legal approach to find a way to have the state Welfare Department accept the validity of a Christian Science practitioner's signature. In a February 25, 1964 letter to Mr. Ralph Mason, Tenacre's local attorney, Mr. Harrison reasons:

All previous negotiations have foundered over the relationship of Dr. James to Tenacre. It would seem to me that the recent ruling you obtained for us in this connection [eliminating medical oversight] makes it possible for the Welfare Department to change its position and accept [Christian Science] practitioner certification of clients of the Welfare Department when they are being cared for by Tenacre.¹⁸

This effort was not successful. However, the state's determination not to equate a Christian Science practitioner's signature with a physician's proved a blessing in disguise. Having just extricated Tenacre from state medical oversight of its religious nursing facility in 1963, it was now clear that the state would not be willing to provide the welfare funds Tenacre desired without some sort of renewed involvement in the care of its patients. The gain of welfare funding simply was not worth the price. Further, when Tenacre abandoned the effort to have the signature of a Christian Science practitioner accepted, the decision prevented them from being put in the position of having to certify as real something that they were working to prove unreal through metaphysical healing.

Federal Medicare Program

President Lyndon B. Johnson signed Medicare into law on July 30, 1965. It was perceived as an insurance program designed to benefit those citizens 65 years of age and older who were faced with ever-increasing costs of medical care, nursing homes, and hospitalization. The Medicare law specified that duly licensed hospitals would be the first participants in the program.

Tenacre's first contact with officials regarding federal government funding was in early 1962, when representatives from the Social Security Administration visited Tenacre. That this

government-subsidized medical insurance program would be provided for everyone over 65, with no qualifying threshold other than age, made the question of welfare funding again appear to be feasible.

Tenacre hosted Walter Garner of the Benevolent Association, in April 1964. A summary of his stay is included in the record:

Mr. Harrison reported that Mr. Walter Garner, Manager of the Christian Science Benevolent Association in Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts, visited Tenacre as a result of Mr. Harrison's letter to him in which he said that Tenacre had been successful in training young people who had come to us last summer, and that we wanted to circularize the [Christian Science] practitioners asking for their help in interesting young people in serving as [Christian Science] nurses' aides for the summer, but that we did not want to do anything that might conflict with the program in Boston. Mr. Garner was most impressed with what is being done at Tenacre and said for us to go ahead and do anything we want to do along that line.¹⁹

Very shortly after his visit to Tenacre, the Medicare bill passed out of the Congress. It was clear that there was to be a national health care program. Since exemption was not permitted, the federal office of the Christian Science Committee on Publication worked with the sponsors of the bill to arrange how Christian Science care could be covered. It was determined that the services of the Christian Science practitioner could not and would not be covered. The Constitutional threshold of separation of Church and State prevented such coverage.

Because some of the bedside duties of the Christian Science nurse appeared to be the same as those of a Licensed Practical Nurse, the Congressional sponsors of the bill were willing to authorize that certain aspects of Christian Science nursing care rendered by a graduate Christian Science nurse would be covered. Christian Science sanatoriums were included "on a par with participating hospitals."²⁰

Mr. Garner became the first Chairman of the new Department of Care. Mr. Harrison quickly developed a very high regard for Mr. Garner. Burwell remembered:

Walter Garner came into the picture at exactly the right time. There couldn't have been anybody else in the Movement that I ever heard of as well qualified to carry on that negotiation and who was so familiar with hospital operations and finances and how the system was going to work in a hospital setting. And he had credibility with them because he had a degree. I don't know of anyone in the Christian Science group who had those qualifications. So he was the man of the hour and appeared in the Movement at exactly the right time.²¹

Burwell Harrison was asked by The Mother Church to work with Mr. Garner. Burwell briefly described the resulting collaboration:

For the years of 1964-66, I worked with Walter in trying to figure out how we were going to integrate ourselves into and use the Medicare system.

I [spent] two years traveling to all the hospital conventions and all of the government seminars on just how the hospital industry was going to operate under Medicare. We were making the rules and regulations for how Christian Science institutions would be involved. When he couldn't go to one of these seminars or meetings, I would go – at Tenacre's expense, always. I would take a tape recorder and learned to sit underneath the speakers and I'd make about three days of tapes and take them to Boston. So he had the equivalent of being at that meeting. Sometimes he might come to the meeting, but he wouldn't get there for the first day or something, but I was the more flexible and did it.²²

Because Tenacre was licensed by the State of New Jersey as a hospital, it preceded other participating Christian Science nursing homes into the government program by six months. However, on the eve of launching the participation in Medicare, Burwell Harrison wrote a memo to the staff, signaling some reticence:

It is now generally known that the expansion of the Social Security system through the benefits which have become known as "medicare" include provision for Christian Scientists to receive care – first, in sanatoria serving Christian Scientists and afterward, if necessary, by Christian Science nurses in their homes.

My personal comment about this, at this time, is that without doubt it is a major milestone in the public acceptance and recognition of Christian Science as a healing system. It attests to the great healing work done and precedents established, in the face of tremendous odds over the past 100 years by those who have pioneered – beginning with the first Christian Scientist, Mary Baker Eddy.

I would further say that whether recognition of Christian Science by insurance companies and such things as Medicare will advance, set back, or merely delay more and better healing by Christian Scientists has yet to be proven. Inasmuch as it has been offered, we must accept the challenges presented – but it will be wise to approach this period in the growth and acceptance of Christian Science with caution and a full realization that its blessings cannot be accepted without risk in areas basic to the Christian Science method of seeking healing.

...If we are not alert in this respect, history may show Medicare as other than helpful in the ultimate fulfillment of our daily duty to mankind as Christian Scientists.²³

The formal announcement to the Christian Science field of participation in Medicare appeared in the July 1966 *Christian Science Journal*. Appended to the *Journal's* announcement was a list of seventeen Christian Science facilities participating in the new government program. The list included Tenacre.²⁴

With Medicare came official recognition of Tenacre by The Department of Care as an accredited facility. The Committee on Christian Science Nursing Homes in the United States had been replaced with the Department of Care. The new Manager, Walter Garner, presented the formal notice of accreditation during Mr. Harrison's March 1966 visit to Boston.²⁵ He wrote to the Tenacre Board:

I am very, very grateful for this further unfoldment. I see it as precisely timed and, today, indispensable to Tenacre's maximum usefulness to the Cause. I am officially thanking Mr. Garner, with copies being sent to each member of The Christian Science Board of Directors.²⁶

Accreditation of Tenacre was indeed timely. The inclusion of Tenacre's 75 beds in the total count with all the other facilities enabled the Department of Care to demonstrate to the federal program planners that there was a denomination-wide system of hospital-type care available.²⁷

As of July 1, 1966, Tenacre was a full-fledged participant since Tenacre was state licensed as a hospital. Most of the other participating Christian Science facilities were licensed as nursing homes and began six months later. Therefore, Tenacre was the first to try it. Almost immediately Tenacre began to feel that, just as participation in New Jersey's state welfare programs would have required compromises it was not willing to make, the federal program was showing itself to be even more invasive. For Tenacre, the hope of beneficial participation quickly faded.

Nevertheless, hoping against hope that Medicare would eventually prove to be of benefit, Burwell worked with Mr. Garner to develop a standardized bookkeeping system to make it as easy as possible for participating Christian Science facilities to claim their due. Ever alert to take

advantage of technological innovation, Burwell saw early on that the use of computers would be a tremendous boon to the whole process.

As it turned out, bookkeeping would prove a minor problem. By September 1966, two months into the program, Burwell was increasingly uncomfortable with Tenacre's participation in Medicare. In an interview, Burwell stated:

We were finding that it was pushing us in directions we didn't want to go, and one of the two big things was that everybody that came here, everybody, we had to report to the Medicare people – [whether they were] 65 or not. I said what we were doing was building up statistics of a negative nature.²⁸

The major problem revolved around the required Admission and Utilization Review Committee (AURC). The function of the AURC—comprised of the Manager, Director of Christian Science Nurses, Hall Supervisors, and a secretary—was to determine if the case required intensive care and how long this level of care might be needed. To do this required setting aside a long-cherished ethical standard of patient privacy.

At the start, a local Christian Science practitioner was asked to sit in on the AURC meetings and to respond metaphysically to what she was led to handle. She was also to share her revelations with the members of the committee. The first of her notes reflect the newness of the task set before the committee. She reasoned that it was necessary to define what it was they were to do and that "true definition should help others to clarify their thought." She further reflected:

The dictionary says "to define" is to "mark the limits or boundaries of; to make distinct or fix in outline or character, to determine the precise signification of; to discover and set forth the meaning of; to set apart in a class by identifying marks." There is an implication here that once a definition is set, it stays that way. So we must be sure that we define "man" correctly.²⁹

Job, who was struggling so hard to understand God, began to see that man alone cannot make laws, but rather that God is the law-maker and He gives man the wisdom to understand and hence to articulate His ordinances, which appear to us at this stage as human laws. (Job 38:33, 36.)

Our Leader explains that error is not necessary "to define or to reveal Truth" (485:1-2). It is the Science of being that reveals man based on Spirit, though the physical senses define him as based on matter (191:24).

As Christian Scientists, administering a human law, we are constantly being tempted to define man as mortal and material. But our Leader says (118:26): "The definitions of material law, as given by natural science, represent a kingdom necessarily divided against itself, because these definitions portray law as physical, not spiritual. Therefore they contradict the divine decrees and violate the law of Love, in which nature and God are one and the natural order of heaven comes down to earth."

We are seeking the "natural order of heaven" by constantly reasoning in the absolute and letting that be manifest in wisdom in human affairs.³⁰

Her spiritual perspicacity precisely laid bare the conflict that lay at the base of what Burwell Harrison and the Christian Science nurses intuitively felt. Was it going to be possible for Tenacre's Christian Science nursing mission to be double-minded, on the one hand affirming the spiritual nature of man and on the other reporting to a government authority a description of material symptoms?

On July 8, 1966, the Christian Science practitioner included in a letter to Burwell:

Our God-given purpose (as an institution) is defined by our Leader in Christian Healing (3:3-5, 10-12) "The primitive privilege of Christianity was to make men better, to cast out error, and heal the sick.... In proportion as the personal and material elements stole into religion, it lost Christianity and the power to heal."

While we assemble in meetings and fill out forms, let us be alert to look beyond these personal and material elements to the Christ-purpose we serve.³¹

Her own participation on the AURC at Tenacre continued to be a great blessing. In August, she wrote:

Dear Committee: The minutes of the last meeting indicate that applications are now coming to Tenacre as a result of its listing as a participating institution with Medicare.

This raises the question of right attraction. We want to know that only those will be drawn to Tenacre who seek to benefit from spiritualization of thought – not to benefit from Medicare.

The second section [of the Christian Science Bible Lesson] this week says, "God controls man, and God is the only Spirit. Any other control or attraction of so-called spirit is a mortal belief" ...([S&H] 73:10)

In subsequent weeks, she dug into such subjects as true government; assistance in health care for those in advancing years; what Christian Science teaches about resources; and then, because of the tremendous increase in the number of applications coming to Tenacre, prayed with the AURC on the topic of the wisdom needed to make correct judgments. This was followed by a defense of Christian Science "absent treatment."³² Her work through September 1966 was invaluable.

By October, objections from the Tenacre staff and administration were numerous enough that Tenacre's Board considered communicating with the Department of Care. Burwell Harrison sent a letter and followed up with the request for a meeting to share Tenacre's experience and the shortcomings of participating in Medicare. The meeting was attended by several members of Tenacre's Board, Walter Garner, The Board of Directors, and other interested parties.

Accreditation with the Department of Care had begun the same time as Medicare. Tenacre had acted independently for so long that it was unaccustomed to the reporting required and oversight given accredited facilities. Even with the Department of Institutions and Agencies, Tenacre had found ways to keep reporting to a minimum. Burwell Harrison wrote to Mr. Garner:

For years our whole management effort has been to disassociate ourselves from an industry and/or a profession, to "come out from among them and be ...separate" (II Cor.6:17), thereby attempting to relieve ourselves of some of the limiting and inhibiting general beliefs of an industry or profession. From time to time we have been able to pinpoint specific releases and overcomings. Generally, however, we are convinced that we do not experience all of the problems associated with nursing organizations, and institutions, and those which insist on showing themselves are held to minimums. To me the importance to mankind of a single victory in this and similar areas of Christian Science work is of the magnitude of a single healing of cancer, as it relates to the world belief of cancer, and is our single reason for existence.

...it disturbs me as a Christian Scientist to see the institutions operated under the auspices of Christian Science gravitate toward being a mere counterpart of what has grown up to serve the medically-oriented group. If the day has come when it is right for Tenacre to make its contribution within this "counterpart," and if I continue to be uncomfortable in such a situation, then I will merely have to consider carefully whether or not my work in Christian Science does not lie elsewhere.³³

While issues regarding accreditation continued to be discussed with the Department of Care, Medicare seemed to be preeminently not for Tenacre, and it would be best to step aside. Perhaps adjustments would be worked out to make it more palatable, but Tenacre could not wait for this to happen; the gulf was too wide to breach. In an interview, Burwell remembered the issue that impelled the decision to withdraw from Medicare:

...in about May 1967, we had had a lady coming in who was living with her daughter. She had an open wound on the back of her neck. The daughter would dress it for her two or three weeks at a time until she couldn't do a whole job on it, so she'd bring her mother in and the [Christian Science] nurses would clean it all up and she'd go back. ...But this time, [the bleeding] didn't stop, so she was here for a week or ten days.

...what we had to have was an [Admission and] Utilization Review Committee, and you had to meet every week and you had to keep minutes. The minutes had to be prepared in a manner that you could show to the inspector if he ever came around, and every case was talked about; a prognosis was arrived at, every week – how long was this person going to be here? I was attending as the Administrator...In the middle of it – we were talking about this lady – I said, "You know if it weren't for Medicare, I wouldn't even know what this woman's problem was, other than what I had learned when she came in here, and what was covered in the admission papers." We didn't pass information up beyond the floor supervisor. The privacy was the element, keeping as many human minds out of the picture as we could keep.

I said, "...this woman comes to us for Christian Science nursing...If we're supposed to do Christian Science nursing, we're not giving it to the woman, and therefore, as of right now, we're out of Medicare."³⁴

It was becoming clear to Tenacre that the decision to participate in and take advantage of the benefits of the federal Medicare program was undermining the religious ministry of Christian Science nursing at Tenacre.

However, to withdraw from Medicare would seemingly put the recently-accredited facility at odds with the Department of Care and with the other Christian Science nursing facilities participating in Medicare – a position Tenacre did not want. In the conversations with the Department of Care, Mr. Harrison was reassured that Tenacre was under no pressure whatsoever to partake of Medicare, and that participation in Medicare was entirely a local decision.

The Board minutes include the reasoning going on at the time:

Mr. Harrison feels that the statement in Science and Health by Mary Baker Eddy has relevance: "The ancient Christians were healers. Why has this element of Christianity been lost? Because our systems of religion are governed more or less by our systems of medicine." [146:2-5] Mr. Harrison further stated, "The [federal] departments which are exercising the degree of control already evident are completely medically staffed and oriented and maybe it is a good thing for the Movement that we are able, without burning any bridges, to pause and stand aloof in this matter. If experience shows there is another way we should go, we are still open and free to follow it."³⁵

Tenacre considered the possibility of only a temporary suspension of its participation in Medicare in order to avoid outright withdrawal, but a strong directive came in a letter from the insurance carrier which was underwriting the Christian Science participation in Medicare, stating Tenacre was to immediately inform the Social Security Administration of its intent to withdraw, and further, ask for instruction regarding the procedures involved in withdrawal.³⁶ Tenacre would not be able to create its own separate status while remaining a "participating hospital."

Before taking this step, Tenacre hired a lawyer, a Christian Scientist, Nancy Young, who was asked to examine Tenacre's experience with Medicare up to that point and put in writing Tenacre's position so it could be shared with the Department of Care.³⁷

In addition, two law firms were asked to prepare exhaustive legal opinions on the matters bearing on the legality, under both the New Jersey licensing statute and the First Amendment of the Federal Constitution, of Tenacre's participation in programs involving acceptance of public funds. Then they commented on each other's responses. Burwell Harrison recalls:

*We ended up with five [legal] papers, but no decision. Nothing clear-cut.*³⁸

"Clear-cut" in this case, at least for Burwell Harrison, meant total agreement by all the lawyers Tenacre had hired to make legal sense of what it saw as essentially a religious conundrum. Short of complete agreement, still, the opinions were very compelling, and made it clear enough that Tenacre had an undeniably strong basis to sustain its decision and to inform the Field of the reasons why it had decided to withdraw.

The differences in the legal opinions are exactly the differences that continue to hold sway today. For example, it was one legal opinion that the "secular" activities performed by Christian Science nurses at our sanatoria could be separated from the religious facets of Christian Science healing, and therefore it was perfectly justifiable to seek payment for those secular aspects.

Their opinion also contained a caveat. They reasoned that if certain aspects of Christian Science nursing could be deemed secular, and thus, eligible for government payment, it was equally reasonable to expect that the state would be justified in regulating those very aspects of Christian Science nursing. In other words, Christian Science nurses could eventually be required to be licensed by the state. And, of course, to be licensed as such, they would have to have the sort of training that was recognized by the state, in other words, medical nurse's training.

On the other hand, the jointly held opinion of Nancy Young and the other law firm was that it was wholly impossible to make such a split, and therefore it was also untenable to accept government payment for religious work. They held that this was a classic case of Church/State separation. It was this view alone with which Tenacre agreed, for it was the only one highlighted by these opinions that was fully compatible with Tenacre's past dealings with the State of New Jersey. Tenacre had found in its dealings with New Jersey that as long it depended on the First Amendment freedoms, those freedoms always guaranteed that Tenacre could observe its reasonable religious practice of Christian Science nursing without hindrance.

All the prayer and wrestling eventually brought a sense of peace. The Department of Care had left the door open for Tenacre, and for every Christian Science sanatorium, to decide for itself whether or not it wanted Medicare funds.

In compliance with regulations from Social Security, Tenacre published a legal notice in June 13, 1968 editions of *The Evening Times* of Trenton, *Town Topics*, and *The Princeton Packet*³⁹ of its formal withdrawal from Medicare.

Ever since its founding in 1922, Tenacre considered its entire demonstration to be nothing if not wholly religious, wholly dependent on prayer. Its record – in its dealings with the State of New Jersey, with the Princeton community, and in its demonstration of Christian Science nursing within an institutional setting – was thoroughly punctuated with example after example of importunate, answered prayer – clear demonstrations that had been arrived at without others to turn to. This self-reliant independence no doubt contributed to Tenacre's attitude toward Medicare and its regulations.

Tenacre felt that it could not change its stripes now and divide its mission between the secular and the sectarian. It could not accept what it saw as the severe compromises necessary in order to benefit from a medical care program of the government. It could not separate itself from the

First Amendment freedoms and protections upon which it had so heavily depended throughout its experience.

It is underscored here that it was not Tenacre's intention that this decision be in any way critical of any Christian Science facility that chose to participate in the federal program. This decision was made solely because Tenacre could not turn its back on its own demonstration of free thought and institutional independence.

Nancy Young summarized in a letter to Mr. Harrison:

... Tenacre staff and Trustees honestly believe that their stand on this question is more nearly in line with the teachings of Christian Science.... What everyone is looking for then is the right answer on a difficult question for the Christian Science Movement – not vindication of a position. Tenacre has chosen one direction – other Sanatoria have chosen a different course. It is a good opportunity to allow each to progress along its chosen path – within the broad framework of the Church....⁴⁰

The Board of Trustees added to the record on August 27, 1968 these comments when the legal study was finished:

...they represent minority findings and viewpoints. It seems important to say that Tenacre has not yet realized any more effectively than others the ideals and potentials of Christian Science nursing....We feel that maximum freedom to work in this direction can be done best outside the government programs.

¹ Fielder Interview, 1980, p. 10

² Letter, Committee on Christian Science Nursing Homes in the United States to J. Burwell Harrison, February 10, 1947

³ Memo, Burwell Harrison to the Board of Trustees, undated (c. February 1947) , page 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p.1.

⁵ J.B. Harrison to Catherine G. Runner, Corresponding Secretary for The Christian Science Board of Directors, March 20, 1961.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Letter, Francis L. Jandron to Olive LaRoche, June 26, 1961.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Letter, J. Burwell Harrison to The Christian Science Board of Directors, September 18, 1963.

¹⁰ Letter, Inman Douglas to J. Burwell Harrison, dated May 6, 1964.

¹¹ Letter, J. Burwell Harrison to The Christian Science Board of Directors, September 16, 1951.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ Transcript of J. Burwell Harrison's talk to Essex County Visiting Nursing Service for Christian Scientists, April 4, 1955.

¹⁴ The Minutes for the Board meeting of December 8, 1953 mention how the Friendly Fund works. "Gifts designated for the Tenacre Friendly Fund, charitable purposes, or otherwise indicating that the donor

intended to make a contribution toward the Benevolence given by Tenacre are deposited in the General Account. This is done because the benevolence granted through the Tenacre Friendly Fund is extended on the basis of the worthiness of the instance and is accomplished by a bookkeeping entry actually reducing the rate to the individual and constitutes revenue foregone by the General Account. Consequently such modest sums as come in recognition of our work in this direction belong to the General Account." The note then indicates that ever since the Friendly Fund began, such gifts comprise only ten percent of the amount of benevolence given during the early years of the Friendly Fund. Also, Tenacre never dipped into the money that came to Tenacre from Mr. B____, and, after his passing in 1956, from his estate which was given for constructing efficient buildings to keep Tenacre self-supporting.

¹⁵ Minutes of the Meeting, Board of Trustees, June 20, 1967.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ July 5, 1961 Memo from J.B. Harrison to The Christian Science Board of Directors.

¹⁸ Letter, J. Burwell Harrison to Ralph Mason, February 25, 1964.

Burwell also signaled the Board in a memo dated March 2: "...I feel the time has come to establish the rights of Christian Scientists with respect to eligibility for Welfare funds. It is a matter that needs to be prayerfully carried through the orderly but persistent presentation to the Welfare Department of all the factors, and we have always found that our interests are best served by a respected lawyer who is not a Christian Scientist."

¹⁹ Minutes, April 21, 1964.

²⁰ Van Horn/Harrison interview, 1981, p. 7. In point of fact, the Mother Church initially sought to have Christian Scientists exempt from the program entirely. When this effort was not accepted, the Committee on Publication worked with the authors of the bill so that the Medicare program would cover Christian Science nursing care rendered by a graduate Christian Science nurse. Because it was deemed that the work of the Christian Science practitioner was wholly religious, practitioner's fees were not to be covered by the federal insurance program.

²¹ Ibid. p. 10. Mr. Garner had been a hospital administrator while serving in the U.S. Air Force. He had taken a Master's degree in Hospital Administration and was expert in his task. Also, he had learned of Christian Science during his military service. Because of his conversion, he asked for reassignment within the Air Force. But the service felt that too much money had been invested in his training and his request was refused. He subsequently resigned. Shortly thereafter Mr. Garner was hired to manage the Christian Science Benevolent Association in Chestnut Hill, just outside Boston. His capacity for financial management in an institutional setting served him well at the B.A. When he became Manager of the B.A. in 1963, the financial situation there was somewhat in disarray. Said Burwell, "*He did something about it.*" This demonstration of financial know-how, combined with his military background in hospital administration, found favor with Mr. Harrison, who, for so long had been insisting that Christian Science facilities should be demonstrating their dominion even in these areas. When the new Department of Care absorbed the Committee on Care, Mr. Garner became its first Chairman.

²² Ibid. p. 11.

²³ Memo, J. Burwell Harrison to Tenacre Staff, April 4, 1966.

²⁴ The following facilities were listed in the July 1966 issue of the Christian Science Journal.

Broadview Sanatorium, Los Angeles, CA
Sunland Home Foundation, San Diego, CA
Christian Science Benevolent Association, San Francisco, CA
Wide Horizon, Wheat Ridge, CO
Morningside, Inc., St. Petersburg, FL

Hill Top Farm, Lake Bluff, IL
Christian Science Benevolent Association, Chestnut Hill, MA
Concord House, Inc. Detroit, MI
Great Oaks, Inc., Kansas City, MO
Peace Haven Association, St. Louis, MO
Tenacre Foundation, Princeton, NJ
High Ridge House, Bedford Hills, NY
Overlook House, Cleveland, OH
High Oaks, Inc., Philadelphia, PA
Sunrise House, Seattle, WA
Newhaven, Inc., Puyallup, WA
Clearview Home, Delafield, WI

²⁵ Memo, J. Burwell Harrison to Board of Trustees, April 27, 1966: "On my last trip to Boston, Mr. Garner handed me a Certificate of Accreditation for Tenacre, similar to those being received by all institutions serving Christian Scientists under the Department of Care. The accreditation covers the nursing services at Tenacre and leaves its extracurricular activities in an unapproved, but not disapproved, category. Over the years, this has proven to have been nothing short of Divine protection. There is no way of estimating the inhibiting influence supervision by the Committee, as previously constituted and administered, might have exerted upon the natural unfoldment which otherwise has been allowed to occur at Tenacre."

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Van Horn/JBH Interview, 1981. p. 67

²⁸ Interview, JBH with Don Honicky, p. 31.

²⁹ Letter, D.H. Smith to J. Burwell Harrison, July 8, 1966.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Letter, D.H. Smith to J. Burwell Harrison, July 14, 1966.

³² One Medicare-imposed requirement that there be a local practitioner on every case was especially difficult to reconcile. It was an impractical requirement as Mr. Harrison explained, *"because of our well established and proven rule of limiting practitioners to three patients whenever possible, and because Tenacre is dedicated to accepting the patients of all listed practitioners regardless of location."* (Board Minutes, June 1967.)

³³ Letter, J. Burwell Harrison to Walter F. Garner, May 15, 1967.

³⁴ Honicky/JBH Interview, 1987, pp. 33, 34.

³⁵ Board Minutes, July 25, 1967, p. 3.

³⁶ Board Minutes, October 3, 1967, p. 2.

³⁷ Nancy Young wrote a legal Position Paper prepared for Tenacre Foundation for sharing with the Christian Science Board of Directors so they would understand why Tenacre had decided to withdraw. Each section combined the perceived imposition with a metaphysical statement. First, the imposition of the Medicare's requirement of an Admission and Utilization Review Committee was challenged as antithetical to Tenacre's established practice of Christian Science nursing. The Paper held that to comply with the demand for such a committee, "inevitably involved prognostications on the course of an illness," something that "seemed to be in direct conflict with everything that Tenacre has stood for since its inception." Then the Position Paper, quoting Article VIII, Section 22 of The Manual of The Mother Church, pointed out Medicare's obligation that the institution report the name of every guest over the age of 65, including those patients not using Medicare even if "this reporting is made in the face of the patient's expressed opposition." It drew a sharp bead on the accumulation of national statistics. This was

followed by a brief discussion of the widespread interest in the kinds of information that computers would make available to medical and actuarial researchers around the country. Then, the Paper warned about the skewed nature of the data that would actually be provided by Christian Science Medicare participants. Further, a predictable consequence of participation in government programs was pointed to – that once a government program is begun, it tended to increase both in size and in the expansive, intrusive nature of its regulations.

³⁸ Honicky/JBH Interview, 1987, pp. 100-102.

³⁹ The legal notice of withdrawal read, "The Tenacre Foundation, The Great Road, Princeton, New Jersey, will no longer participate in the Health Insurance for the Aged Program (Title XVIII of the Social Security Act) effective July 1, 1968, in accordance with the provisions of the Social Security Act. No payment will be made by the Medicare program for covered extended care services furnished to patients who are admitted on or after July 1, 1968."

⁴⁰ Letter, Nancy J. Young to J. Burwell Harrison, June 18, 1968.

Epilogue

There are still many facets of Tenacre's story to be told and more lessons to be learned. The desire for continued demonstrations of Christian Science, to "see deeper principles and themes at work here," has been consistently expressed at Tenacre. Almost twenty years after the period covered in this Chronicle, the reader gets a glimpse in the 1986 President's Report that John Irby wrote then for the Board of Trustees:

We desire to see ever more clearly a deeper, more spiritual sense of "nursing" in every aspect of Tenacre.

It has been a historical feature of Tenacre that the work here is not separated into categories. Tenacre is a discovery of "nursing" in its highest sense. It is interesting to note how the individuals in the various departments inevitably see their work in those terms – whether in Maintenance, the Activities Program, Business office, or Food Department. They begin to think of their work as "nursing" in some form. It has a unifying effect which is so evident. It helps to see beyond the day-to-day nitty-gritty and see deeper principles and themes at work here, directing our thought beyond the routine and the specific to the grander vision, implemented in all the minutiae of activity. It is a wonderful thing to behold. We have a long way to go; it is an infinite task, but we are encouraged by the signs in all areas.