

Alert

2/1/13

Where has the resistance gone?

The writer of this piece is reminded of a book read years ago titled Auschwitz, written by a Jewish doctor who, in order to save his own life, had collaborated with the Nazis at that infamous death camp in Poland. As a collaborator, the doctor was required to perform insidious surgical experiments on his fellow Jews. He also was in a position to watch prisoners by the thousands regularly march themselves to the gas chambers. His book, written after the war was over, gave a firsthand account of this, reporting that the Jews did indeed march to their deaths without resistance – even sometimes singing on the way – although they far outnumbered the guards.

Auschwitz is not an easy book to read, for it uncovers the claim of evil to use good people to commit the most horrible of crimes in the name of some cause and makes the reader search his own consciousness to see how he might be compromising with error in order to save his own mortal sense of life and career, instead of standing up for Principle, no matter what the cost to his personal life. The book searches for the reason for the lack of resistance among the prisoners. Why was there such passivity? The student of history reading the book Auschwitz has to question the motivation of those who, like the doctor, participated, either willingly or unwittingly, in the horrendous evil involved in the attempt to exterminate a race of people.

The Question

This mailing addresses the question: Why is the Christian Science Field, and particularly those who teach and practice this Science on a professional basis, not responding with strong and open resistance to the incessant (sometimes subtle, sometimes glaringly obvious) changes being made to the pure design for the Christian Science Church established by its Founder, Mary Baker Eddy? These changes amount to adulterating both the religion and its activities.

The Discoverer of this Science, who is also the Founder of the Church and the forever Leader, says that “adulterating Christian Science, makes it void” (S&H 464:25). The dictionary defines “void” as: “containing nothing,” “having no members or examples,” “vacant,” “useless,” “of no legal force or effect,” “lack,” “a feeling of want or hollowness.” That definition, when applied to adulterated Christian Science as in our Leader’s statement above, would mean literally no healing. That unequivocal admonition – “adulterating Christian Science, makes it [useless; of no effect, etc.]” – if acknowledged and heeded, compels loyal followers to rise in vigorous resistance against the adulteration. This applies particularly to Christian Science teachers and practitioners whose integrity gives them the courage to stand for that which is right – no adulteration – and set an example for the Field. There is no choice when the alternative – losing the ability to heal – is made clear.

If Christian Science is the final revelation, as Mrs. Eddy says (S&H 107:5), then the Church which represents it is designed to set a collective example for the whole world of demonstrating divine Principle (law) and the pure healing which results from obedience to that law. If that Church is allowed

by its followers to become adulterated (as has now occurred), this has a massive adverse effect on the world – seen in confusion, conflict, loss of freedom, and increased suffering – and her followers have to bear the responsibility for that. Mrs. Eddy says:

“Posterity will have the right to demand that Christian Science be stated and demonstrated in its godliness and grandeur, – that however little be taught or learned, that little shall be right. Let there be milk for babes, but let not the milk be adulterated. Unless this method be pursued, the Science of Christian healing will again be lost, and human suffering will increase” (*Ret.* 61:26).

It is assumed from those words that every student (but especially those entrusted with the sacred duty of teaching and practicing Christian Science professionally) has the obligation to preserve its purity for the salvation of the whole world. And yet, Christian Scientists today, in general, seem to have come to accept the adulteration – some with resignation and some with enthusiasm. How can this be? Are they no longer able to see the changes as adulteration? Mrs. Eddy terms that inability to discern right from wrong “moral idiocy” (see *Mis.* 107:25). To the degree that Mrs. Eddy’s followers accept the adulteration of the movement, without vigorous, persistent, and effective protest, to that degree they are not only marching to their own destruction, but setting the example for the world to do the same.

The Christian Science religion, as well as its worldwide activities, as presented by the current administrators of the Church, is no longer recognizable to those who knew it fifty or even thirty years ago. When there is no one left who has a memory of experiencing the real thing, there will only be those who have been educated in the adulteration. To them, the wrong will look right, and “the Science of Christian healing will again be lost, and human suffering will increase.”

The latest adulteration

An illustration of a current adulteration is the attempt to accommodate Christian Science to the medical health-care system (touched upon in the October 2012 *Journal*), an accommodation that, in reality, is not even possible. What has come to light in recent weeks is that *Journal*-listed teachers, practitioners, nurses, and nursing facilities may now apply to become members of a provider network which provides spiritual care services to members of contracted health plans, whereby any patient of theirs who is a member of such a plan may request that his or her practitioner bills be paid by that plan. From all available documentation, it appears that such an arrangement will involve a violation of the teachings of Mary Baker Eddy in regard to diagnosis, as well as a violation of the specific *Manual* By-Law regarding practitioner/patient confidentiality.

This provider network, Christian Science Spiritual Care IPA, Inc., is designated by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a corporation under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code on 8/15/12 (see <http://corp.sec.state.ma.us/corp/corptest/CorpSearchSummary.asp?ReadFromDB=True&UpdateAllowed=&FEIN=001085794>). This non-profit corporation is governed by five officers: a Christian Science teacher, a practitioner, a state Committee on Publication, a medical doctor, and a Ph.D.

The requirements for membership in Christian Science Spiritual Care IPA (Independent Provider Association), as stated on its website, include agreeing to: (1) becoming “credentialed” for health

insurance plans (which, among other stipulations, requires carrying \$1,000,000/\$3,000,000 malpractice insurance); (2) consistent billing for services by using fee schedules negotiated by the IPA network with health plans; (3) electronic submission of patients' claims by the IPA network to the insurance companies (see <http://csscipa.wordpress.com> [accessed 1-28-13]). Participating providers for contracted health plans are typically trained in preparing medical-type invoices requiring medical diagnoses. A practitioner, then, as a participating provider, would be in the position of having to report a medical diagnosis for any problem (see, for example, Aetna Health Insurance requirements for "Eligible Health Care Expenses," stipulating that evidence of medical necessity must be submitted in order for amounts paid to Christian Science practitioners to be eligible for reimbursement, http://www.aetna.com/members/fsa/eligibleExpenses/healthcareFSA/healthexpenses_C.html). If so, this would go against Mrs. Eddy's warning: "A physical diagnosis of disease...tends to induce disease" (*S&H* 370:20). In addition, the name and personal data of the patient would have to be provided with the submission of the claim.

Christian Science practitioners who join the IPA network are known to health plan members seeking spiritual care as "Preferred Providers" – a designation that adds a possible second level of requirements for those who desire to be in the public practice. This clearly introduces an element to the public practice of Christian Science not in Mary Baker Eddy's God-dictated design. Will the public view some practitioners as more competent than others? As of this writing, according to the network's website, 13 teachers, 13 practitioners, one nurse, and four nursing facilities (all of whose names are listed, and many well known and longtime) have already become members of Christian Science Spiritual Care IPA. It has to be assumed that this plan has the approval of the Christian Science Board of Directors, which would amount to authorization for *Journal*-listed practitioners, teachers, nurses, and nursing facilities to violate the *Manual*'s confidentiality provision for a practitioner/patient relationship in the *Manual* (Art. VIII, Sect. 22) – an offense which, according to that By-Law, subjects the offender to Church discipline. This could set a precedent for the Directors to override *Manual* By-Laws. How could this be happening?

Two Conclusions

Logic offers the thinker one of two conclusions as to the reason for this attempt to accommodate Christian Science to the medical health-care system: (1) the decision-makers are Christian Scientists who, though sincere and dedicated, have forgotten that Christian Science is the final revelation and have allowed themselves to be mesmerized by whoever (for whatever reason) would want to take control of or wipe out Christian Science, and are being used to make decisions they would not otherwise make if in their right mind; or (2) they are individuals who in the name of Christian Science (but for whatever ulterior reason) are consciously attempting to wipe it out by adulterating it and turning it into something it is not. In either case, "the cause of the mischief" should be "found out and destroyed" (see *My*. 211:27) so that healing will not be lost, and the world will not sink into the blackest of night for another 1900 years, as Mrs. Eddy said to Adam Dickey (see *Memoirs of Mary Baker Eddy*).

Therefore, time is of the essence here. For those who are still able to recognize the adulteration as a corruption, there is a small window of opportunity to come forth and make a difference. At this point, it may take substantial sacrifice for teachers and practitioners to take a public stand. But what are popularity, career, and income when weighed in the balance with salvation? To allow such a compromise as is involved in the latest attempt to accommodate Christian Science to the medical health care system is to sell one's soul.

As difficult as it is to conceive that the adulteration of our movement is caused by mesmerized members or intentional intruders at the head of our Church, the thorough student of Mary Baker Eddy's writings eventually has to come to one of those two conclusions mentioned above. There is no other choice, for changes would never be made by loyal, clear-thinking Christian Scientists who understand that Christian Science is the final revelation, the revealing of which God had been preparing Mrs. Eddy through many years to receive (see *S&H* 107:3). They would know that changing anything established by the Discoverer, Founder, and Leader would be to their Church what treason would be to their country.

Jesus' response to and Mrs. Eddy's warning regarding hierarchical corruption

Both logic and the example of the master Christian show the fallacy of considering a church as hierarchical – demanding unthinking subservience from its members. By his example, Christ Jesus illustrated how a church hierarchy (whether an actual one, as in the Jewish faith of his time, or an assumptive one, as misconceived by the Christian Science Church today) that is obviously corrupted should be responded to by the people. Jesus often rebuked the Pharisees, and once referred to them as a “generation of vipers” and hypocrites (see, for example, Matt. 3:7; 23:13-29, 33) and to King Herod as a “fox” (see Luke 13:32).

Mary Baker Eddy followed the Master's pattern of resisting the false concept of a hierarchy by making provision in the *Manual* for the members of her Church to protest the Board's actions and require resignations if those actions are not in accordance with her design (see Article I, Section 9). Her provision for this protest is not a casual one, suggesting that a member may speak out against a violation if he wants to or feels like it. That portion of the By-Law begins, “It is the duty of any member...to inform the Board of Directors of the failure of...any...officer in this Church to perform his official duties.” Further language in that same By-Law reads: “...the Directors shall resign their office or perform their functions faithfully.” Recognizing the Directors' failure is a duty of every single individual member. But only those who know Mrs. Eddy's writings and life well enough to see that the current trend in the movement is off track will fulfill that duty. It should be the Christian Science teachers who most of all fulfill that duty, for it is they who have the responsibility to teach their pupils to discern between right and wrong and to courageously stand for the right.

In another By-Law, Article XXIV, Section 6 (“Provision for the Future”), Mrs. Eddy makes another provision for disciplining the Board, this time by a Committee – the Finance Committee. The very title of the By-Law indicates that our Leader anticipated the time when it might be necessary for members of the Church to compel discipline of the Directors. Her words instruct the Committee to watch for any deviation from duty by the Board and to be prepared to dismiss them from office, if necessary. The By-Law reads: “In case of any possible future deviation from duty, the Committee on Finance shall visit the Board of Directors, and, in a Christian spirit and manner, demand that each member thereof comply with the By-Laws of the Church. If any Director fails to heed this admonition, he may be dismissed from office and the vacancy supplied by the Board.”

These two By-Laws, coupled with Mrs. Eddy's reference to the Church as “essentially democratic” (see *My*. 247:2), correct any misconception that the Christian Science Church, as established by Mary Baker Eddy, could ever be considered a hierarchical church. The ramifications of this correction in the consciousness of members worldwide are great. If this truth in Mrs. Eddy's writings is acknowledged

and acted upon, it will cleanse the Church and the movement of the errors imposed upon it by the misguided officials and will establish the Christian Science Church on a permanently strong basis.

A bit of history that gives a perspective

During Mrs. Eddy's lifetime and after, there have been attacks on her character and mission and on her book *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, as well as challenges to the Christian Science way of life and to its church organization. But in the 1980s, beginning with the first worldwide video conference in 1984, the decisions made by church officers became so divisive and destructive that it was evident to many longtime faithful workers that the attack was coming as much from within the movement as from outside of it. As bizarre as it sounded then, many questioned whether some foreign element had taken over the Christian Science church headquarters.

The changes announced by the Directors at the 1984 worldwide video conference (constituting a major shift in focus from God to mankind) and then at the one in 1987 (wherein the same shift was mandated for Christian Science lectures) should have been a warning to the Field of the massive alterations planned for the design Mrs. Eddy left for her followers. In retrospect, it also is apparent that those video conferences were the beginning of the current thrust towards ecumenism.

Some major instances of resistance

The next year (1988), a major upheaval occurred at the headquarters of the Church in Boston, news of which spread quickly throughout the Field, causing a great commotion. It had to do with alarming decisions the Directors were making regarding *The Christian Science Monitor*. The decisions involved a massive move into television with the threat of putting down the print *Monitor* entirely. The long-experienced, accomplished editor of the *Monitor*, Katherine Fanning, resigned, citing ethical problems that made it impossible for her to remain. At least ten journalists, some of them award-winning, including the highly respected managing editor and assistant managing editor, resigned at the same time.

The resistance expressed by the resigners was felt throughout the Christian Science Field because copies of the well-written, well-documented resignation letters, vigorously and pointedly protesting the decisions made by the Christian Science Board of Directors, were broadly circulated, causing such a stir that teachers worldwide were officially called on a Friday evening to an emergency meeting at the Church headquarters the following Monday (three days before Thanksgiving) to elicit their support.

One might think that such a radical stand as resigning, taken by respected journalists, would have had the effect of stopping the corruption – if not overnight, surely eventually. This was the hope expressed by many of the teachers attending that meeting. But that was not to be. The Monitor Channel came and went, as did the newly conceived *World Monitor Magazine*, leaving the Church \$450,000,000 poorer, to say nothing of the draining of talent and integrity, as well as the emasculation of Mrs. Eddy's award-winning, world-renowned, *daily* newspaper.

The mental atmosphere of resistance in the movement was intensifying. Across the Field, there was a keen alertness, an attitude of watching, a willingness to openly discuss the problems, and a readiness to demand obedience to Principle – to Mrs. Eddy and her *Manual*. The opportunity for a major expression

of resistance came quickly. In 1992, there was another enormous stir of protest within the Christian Science movement. The event which triggered it was the Church's publication of a controversial book, whose thesis was at odds with the Directors' concept of Mrs. Eddy. Many believed that the publication was unethical because the motivation was to receive a substantial bequest – funds desperately needed because the extravagant expenditure for the Monitor Channel had put the Church in financial jeopardy. The decision by the Board to publish that book severely divided the Field (a division that affected virtually every branch church in the world) and opened the floodgates of strong and persistent protest.

Of all the earlier upheavals in the years after Mrs. Eddy's passing, what made 1992 and the years following particularly significant was that 46 *Journal*-listed Christian Science teachers and 60 *Journal*-listed practitioners had the conviction, dedication, and courage to risk their careers by signing their names (some several times) to strong letters of protest addressed openly to the Christian Science Board of Directors and circulated throughout the Field. This organized effort at resistance known as The Mailing Fund was highly charged and intense at first, with substantial support from the Field in addition to the 106 teachers and practitioners who originally signed on to it, but its momentum slowed toward the last few years of its ten-year duration.

In December 1993, a lawsuit citing financial malfeasance (involved in the exorbitant broadcasting expenditures) was filed against the Directors by two church members, one of whom, soon after the filing, became a state Supreme Court justice. Legal counsel for the Church argued the case in the court on the false basis that this Church is a hierarchy, and the court unfortunately accepted that argument.

Just as The Mailing Fund formally announced in writing its stopping of operations (July 12, 2003) as an information/protest mailing campaign, another organized protest presented to the Board of Directors and to the Field in a thoughtful and meticulously disciplined way came forth officially in 2004 – called Matters of Conscience. Besides the two teachers who authored that voluminously referenced document, 107 *Journal*-listed teachers, practitioners, and nurses signed their names to the document in open protest against a long list of questionable decisions that had been made since 1984 by the Christian Science Board of Directors. That highly organized, well-documented protest in the way of papers circulating in the Field awakened many students worldwide and lasted about five years.

Through those years of collective efforts at protest, there were also significant, well-written individual protest papers circulated throughout the Field. And yet the changes – the persistent adulteration – continued, and with no results showing from the protests, the Field was left demoralized and in disarray. Since then, the Directors' relentless proposing and implementing of changes to Mrs. Eddy's divinely inspired design for the Church has continued and elicited very little open protest but has caused ever-increasing division in the branch churches, and the division is accelerating the demise of those branches. Is this what Jesus was warning about when he said that "Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation..." (Matt. 12:25)? The Directors, who either mandate or insidiously suggest the changes, cause the division, and then blame that division on those who insist on strict obedience to Mrs. Eddy's design. Those making the changes – the Directors – then demand unity in the Field. But unity under those terms means simply yielding with no resistance to the adulteration.

Rereading the letters written by the dedicated, protesting workers of 1988 and 1992-2009 and evaluating their reason for speaking out constitutes an important history lesson. Those protestors had the potential

for ultimately making a significant difference had they persevered in their efforts. But sad to say, they seemed to have given up before the hoped-for correction was achieved. (Anyone who wants to benefit from reading those individuals' stated reasons for resisting can order copies of those letters from the Sheep Mailings Committee.)

Why the cessation of protests

It may be important at this time in the history of the Christian Science movement to understand the impact, not only of the protests, but even more, the reasons for the cessation of the protests, because when those individual and collective efforts at resistance went silent, that is, when those highly respected teachers and practitioners ceased setting an example of resistance, there seems to have set in a passive acceptance – an appearance of general endorsement – of the massive changes. How can a state of mental passivity to error be in the Christian Science movement – a movement predicated on alertness, thinking, and the courage to take a stand for Truth and against error? It seems inconceivable that real Christian Scientists, loyal to their Leader, would come to the point where they can accommodate the adulteration of Mrs. Eddy's teaching or the corruption of her design for her Church and the movement, and not only accommodate it, but actively support it by participating in its activities and commending them.

The keen realization of something being very wrong that compelled dedicated teachers, practitioners, and nurses to take a public stand, putting their careers at risk by expressing their disapproval of Directors' decisions affecting the Christian Science movement, seems to have disappeared. That which those 200-plus highly respected church notables were so vehemently criticizing still exists and has grown exponentially worse. Yet the protestors are no longer protesting. Today, open resistance to the corrupting of the movement is virtually nonexistent, especially among the teachers and practitioners. Many have capitulated and are now serving that which they had resisted so vehemently. Why?

In an analysis of this kind, great effort should be made to avoid speculation. In this case, reason, coupled with years of observation, as well as confidential reports, substantiate the offering of at least three possible reasons why protests have almost completely stopped:

- One reason, of course, could be the same conclusion reached by the Jewish doctor relative to the death camp at Auschwitz – that the prisoners marched themselves to their own extinction without resistance simply because they refused to believe that man could be that evil.
- Another possible reason has to do with threat of punishment. By the time of the third major protest – that is, the “Matters of Conscience” – the Directors were regrouping from the irresponsible financial loss (a half-billion dollars), as well as the loss of respect by the Field, incurred by the failure of the Monitor Channel. They were beginning to gain back some of the control over the Field they had lost through that foolhardy venture. By making an example of a few teachers whom they unjustly and severely disciplined and then paying personal visits to many of the 107 that signed their names in support of the “Matters of Conscience” document, the Board was increasingly able to intimidate teachers and practitioners by threatening them with de-listing from the *Journal*.
- The third possible reason and the one most often asserted today by teachers and practitioners, is that they can serve the Cause more effectively from within than from without.

As for the first reason, there is a natural and deep-seated desire on the part of Christian Scientists to believe in the integrity of the Christian Science Board of Directors, and so church members have been unwilling to believe that the administrators of their Church could act in any wrong way. Christian Scientists are so intent in their efforts to see only good as real that they seem sometimes unable or unwilling to face the *claim* of evil. Mrs. Eddy addresses that kind of false metaphysics in many places in her writings. One example is in *Miscellany*, where she says:

“Certain individuals entertain the notion that Christian Science Mind-healing should be two-sided, and only denounce error in general, – saying nothing, in particular, of error that is damning men. They are sticklers for a false, convenient peace, straining at gnats and swallowing camels. The unseen wrong to individuals and society they are too cowardly, too ignorant, or too wicked to uncover, and excuse themselves by denying that this evil exists. This mistaken way, of hiding sin in order to maintain harmony, has licensed evil, allowing it first to smoulder, and then break out in devouring flames. All that error asks is to be let alone; even as in Jesus’ time the unclean spirits cried out, ‘Let us alone; what have we to do with thee?’” (210:19).

When we consider the second reason – intimidation and fear of punishment – teachers and practitioners would not want to admit to that, as it would repudiate everything Christian Science teaches about fearlessness and the all-power of God, so they would be more likely to claim the third alternative – that of believing that they can do more good inside than out. But has that been proved to be true? Are we closer today to reestablishing the recognition of Christian Science as the salvation of mankind because of the teachers and practitioners who have agreed to collaborate with those doing the corrupting and have stopped protesting?

A confrontation with conscience

Attempting to serve the Cause without resisting the error, using any of the three excuses above, forces a confrontation with conscience, and brings integrity into question. The fact that Christian Science is the final revelation of Truth and that Mary Baker Eddy is the forever Leader of the Church God inspired her to establish constitutes the consciousness of every true Christian Scientist. When confronted with a change to her design – an adulteration or corruption of her intent – the true Christian Scientist cannot in good conscience just look the other way and proceed as though everything is all right. That would compromise his consciousness, and eventually his very soul.

What is more compelling than a strong living example of courage to stand for that which is right no matter what it costs in the way of career and popularity? Isn’t that what Christian Science is all about – demonstrating that which is right, real, and true? Without that demonstration by those who are assigned the task of teaching and healing, what are the words worth?

This mailing has been an attempt to analyze, from a historical perspective, both the significant organized instances of resistance through the last thirty years, as well as the present passivity in the Christian Science movement. The purpose – the hope – is to awaken a strong and relentless resistance that can stop the destruction – the adulteration of true Christian Science on this planet – before there is no one left who has a memory of experiencing the real thing.

Afterthought

As much as we would all like to forget the horrors of the Nazi death camps, Auschwitz will remain forever a reminder of how the belief in evil, while completely unreal, can seem to be a cruel reality. Aren't Mrs. Eddy's words descriptive: "...I beheld, as never before, the awful unreality called evil" (*S&H* 110:8)? Germany is endeavoring to keep the memory alive as a warning to its people, and indeed to the world, of the state of thought that led up to the atrocities of the Holocaust.

It is of perhaps more than casual interest that January 30, 2013, marked the 80th anniversary of Hitler's rise to power as Chancellor of Germany. At the opening of a special exhibit at the "Topography of Terror" memorial in Berlin, the director of the memorial clearly described the "path" that "ended in Auschwitz." The current Chancellor, Angela Merkel, "urged Germans to always fight for their principles and not fall into the complacency that enabled the Nazi dictator to seize control." She said that "the rise of the Nazis was made possible because the elite of German society worked with them, but also, above all else, because most in Germany at least tolerated this rise...." She also pointed out that "German academics and students at the time happily joined the Nazis...in burning books deemed subversive" (see "Germany Marks 80th Anniversary of Hitler's Rise," David Rising, Associated Press, January 30, 2013).

Of all the horrors imaginable on earth, there is none worse than the loss of the pure Science of Christ, reinstated for this age by Mary Baker Eddy, for that would mean the loss of the only real solution to all problems. Her words in the first edition of *Retrospection and Introspection* serve as a warning: "The methods of Animal Magnetism, especially its secret work, should be exposed. This alone can protect the people from a future Reign of Terror, far surpassing the error and terrorism of the Dark Ages" (p. 71).

'Twas a sheep, not a lamb, that strayed away
In the parable Jesus told;
A grown up sheep, that had gone astray,
From the ninety and nine in the fold.

Out on the hillside, out in the cold,
'Twas a sheep the Good Shepherd sought,
And back to the flock, safe to the fold
'Twas a sheep the Good Shepherd brought.

And why for a sheep should we earnestly long,
And as earnestly hope and pray?
Because there is danger. If they go wrong,
They will lead the lambs astray.

For the lambs will follow the sheep, you know,
Wherever the sheep may stray,
When the sheep go wrong, it will not be long
Till the lambs are as wrong as they.

And so with the sheep we earnestly plead,
For the sake of the lambs today;
If the sheep are lost, what a terrible cost
Some lambs will have to pay!

Adapted from a poem entitled "Example" by C.D. Meigs

Doesn't this poem compel the Christian Scientist to consider what the consequences are for the children or newcomers of today (the lambs) if the sheep ("those who follow their leader") go astray? If the sheep experienced in following their Leader (Mary Baker Eddy) forget who their Leader is, neglect her instruction, and instead go wandering on a dangerous path, following a counterfeit leader who calls them away from the fold, what will the lambs have to pay? If there is no Church of Christ, Scientist, hence no Sunday School, where will the lambs go to be fed?