

Commentary

ACIM CE Text, Chapter 2

Right Defense and Release from Fear

Section III

The Proper Use of Denial

Explanation of underlining, italics and footnote formats can be found at the end of the commentary. See also the note there on the effects of switching from the FIP edition to the Complete and Annotated Edition. Please note that the FIP and CE versions may differ in where paragraph breaks occur.

Note on Differences in CE vs. FIP

The material in this chapter in FIP was dramatically re-ordered from the original dictation. Side-by-side comparison of sections is nearly impossible in some cases. This section is one such section. For instance, the opening three lines of Paragraph 3 in the original starting with “When you are afraid” were moved to the start of the first paragraph in the FIP. Some material in the section in CE were relocated to Section VI in the FIP.

This sort of major differences due to relocation of sentences and paragraphs diminishes over the next few chapters, until the primary differences are comprised of material that was omitted entirely by FIP and variations in wording.

Overview of the Section

This section deals with how the Atonement can be used to defend our minds against fear. Normally, we defend ourselves by attacking the perceived external source of our fear. The Course sees the Atonement as our true defense against fear. We deny the power of anything not of God to hurt us (1:11). As we have seen, the principle of the Atonement is that our errors never really occurred. Such “true denial” (2:4) is our ultimate defense against fear, as the last section pointed out (T-2.II.16:1–4). Thus, the true denial talked about in this section is just another way of describing the acceptance of the Atonement.

I would like to quote something Unity author Hypatia Hasbrouck wrote about “denials,” which are very much the same thing as what the Course calls “true denial.”

...there is one denial that can be easily adapted to help you quickly deal positively with almost any negative appearance or challenge the moment it arises. I call it *the all-purpose denial*...Here is the basic form: (This) is powerless to take or keep my good from me. In place of the word *this*,

you can substitute a phrase describing the negative appearance or challenge. (*Handbook of Positive Prayer*, page 39)

As you can see, the Course's instruction to deny "the power of anything not of God to affect you" (2:5) is identical to what Hasbrouck has us say: "This is powerless to take or keep my good from me." Try it the next time some "negative appearance or challenge" comes up.

Paragraph 1

When you are afraid of anything, you are acknowledging its power to hurt you. ²Remember that where your heart is, there is your treasure also.¹ ³This means that you believe in what you value. ⁴If you are afraid, you are valuing wrongly. ⁵Human understanding will inevitably value wrongly, and by endowing all human thoughts with equal power will inevitably destroy peace. ⁶That is why the Bible speaks of the peace of God which passeth (human) understanding.² ⁷This peace is totally incapable of being shaken by human errors of any kind. ⁸It denies the ability of anything which is not of God to affect you in any way.

Fear acknowledges that I am vulnerable and that what I fear has the power to injure me in some way (1:1). The main subject of this section is how fear blocks the extension of miracles through us, and how the Atonement is our defense against such fears. The objects of fear this paragraph deals with are, I believe, the same three varieties of lack of love talked about in a previous section: from myself toward others, from others to me, and from myself *with* others (T-2.I.26:1–2 (CE), T-2.I.5:7–8 (FIP)) —in other words, my own ego, other people's egos, and our shared ego faults. Our fear around these lacks of love testify to our belief that they can hurt me in some way. As we will see, such beliefs are what we must deny.

All of these originate as thoughts in mind. They are fostered by our desire for, or value of, something not of God. This is the import of the biblical quote in 1:2. ³We mistakenly think our ego thoughts have as much power as the thoughts we think with God. We think that our mistaken valuing of the things of this world, or of specialness, is as powerful as our desire for the peace of God. All thoughts are not equal! The fact is that "anything not of God" has absolutely zero effect. Our ego thoughts are not fearful; they are nothing.

Let me put this into my own words: When you value (or treasure) the wrong things, you believe in their reality, which means they have power to hurt you. That naturally leads to fear, because fear *arises* from the belief that something has power to hurt you. Thus, the reason we give such power to our ego thoughts and fear them is because we

¹: Matthew 6:21, Luke 12:34 (KJV): "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also."

²: Philippians 4:7 (KJV): "And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus." In the above passage, this peace does not pass *all* understanding. It only passes *human* understanding, which values wrongly and thus destroys peace.

³: The way the Course puts it is the reverse of the way the Bible states it (see footnote 1 above), but it works both ways..

value them. That fear of the ego (in ourselves or in others) is what blocks the expression of the miracle through us. We believe in what we value, and it is our valuing things that gives them power. If we want to stop fearing their power, we have to stop valuing them.

So what keeps me from performing miracles? Mixed motivation. Perhaps I value doing miracles, but I mistakenly give equal value to the ego, and thus believe in its power to *prevent* miracles.

Sentence 5 basically means that being afraid limits our understanding. Our peace of mind is shattered when we think our mistaken thoughts are as powerful as our real thoughts. According to Jesus, when the Bible speaks of “the peace of God which passeth understanding” (Philippians 4:7), it means that God’s peace is incomprehensible to our crippled understanding, our understanding limited by fear. When our understanding tells us to be afraid, God’s peace passes or supercedes that limited understanding (1:6–7). It denies the power of anything not of God to affect us (1:8). The peace of God is not inherently incomprehensible to the human mind. You need not abandon your understanding in order to find peace. On the contrary, God’s peace brings understanding with it, and heightened understanding can bring peace. As Jesus explains in Chapter 14:

Peace and understanding go together and never can be found alone.
Each brings the other with it, for it is the law of God they be not separate.
They are cause and effect, each to the other, so where one is absent the other cannot be (T-14.XI.4–6 (FIP), T-14.XII.14:4–6 (CE)).

Notice that peace *denies* something. “It denies the ability of anything which is not of God to affect you in any way” (1:8). The title of this section is “The Proper Use of Denial,” and this is it: denying the ability of anything not of God to affect us.

Paragraph 2

² This is the *proper* use of denial. ²It is not used to hide anything, but it *is* used to correct error. ³It brings all error into the light, and since error and darkness are the same, it abolishes error automatically. ⁴True denial is a very powerful protective device. ⁵You can and should deny any belief that error can hurt you. ⁶This kind of denial is *not* a concealment device but a correction device. ⁷The right mind of the mentally healthy depends on it.

So there is a “*proper* use of denial.” We are used to the notion that denial is something to avoid. “Denial is not a river in Egypt.” We’ve already been told to avoid denial of the truth, denial of our true holiness, and denial of God as our Creator (replaced with ourselves as creators). But here is the only way denial can serve a positive purpose.

The recommended cure for the mental sickness of fear is “the proper use of denial,” which means to deny “the ability of anything not of God to affect you” (1:8)). This form of denial does not hide or cover up; it actually brings error into the light where it can be corrected. Instead of denying the existence of the error, it denies the power of that error to hurt me. True denial negates my fear the ego’s madness (in others or in myself), and happily brings it to the light.

True denial is the same as bringing our fearful thoughts into contact with the truth, or bringing the darkness to the light, which is the same as the process mentioned in T.50.2 (CE).. True denial “brings all error into the light” (2:3), which is how it gets corrected. We expose our fears to the truth that we cannot be hurt by anything not of God. Our willingness to submit our beliefs to this practice dispels the darkness of fear, just as light dispels physical darkness.

This is a specific practice, something we are meant to actually do. The Workbook contains many examples of this kind of practice, for instance, in regard to sickness:

Give instant remedy, should this occur, by not allowing your defensiveness to hurt you longer. Do not be confused about what must be healed, but tell yourself:

I have forgotten what I really am, for I mistook my body for myself. Sickness is a defense against the truth. But I am not a body. And my mind cannot attack. So I can not be sick (W-pl. I 36.20:1–7).

True denial can help us protect ourselves from fear and remain in God's peace (2:4). It is a very powerful defense. I remind you again of the “all-purpose denial” I mentioned in my Overview of the section above. This idea is repeated in a slightly different form in 10:1: “Denial of error is a very powerful defense of truth.” This theme of denying error, the proper use of denial, runs through the next few sections. Don't dismiss it lightly; it should become a central part of our daily practice. Do we truly believe that we can deny any error that can hurt us (2:5)? This does not mean we should push our errors out of our conscious mind. Rather, we use denial to *correct* our thinking (2:6). It's really important! If we want to be mentally healthy, our right mind *depends* on our denial of error (2:7).

True denial is what can undo, or correct, the steps outlined in Section II that led to projection, because we deny, or negate, the errors. When the mind is freed from its errors it has no need to project. When we believe that we have distorted God's creation, including ourselves, we are driven to project something to fill up our emptiness and lack. True denial counteracts that and reminds us we have not changed ourselves because God's creations cannot be distorted. That eliminates the cause for our projection entirely. This is exactly the same process that was outlined in T-1.50.2:4–8. True denial and accepting the Atonement are different sides of the same coin.

Paragraph 3

3 You can do anything I ask. ²I have asked you to perform miracles, and have made it very clear that these are *natural, corrective, healing, and universal*.⁴ ³There is nothing good they cannot do. ⁴But they cannot be performed in the spirit of doubt. ⁵You have asked yourself why you cannot really incorporate my words. ⁶But remember my own question before you ask yours: “O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou *doubt*?”⁵

I like the notion that I can do anything Jesus asks of me. Come to think of it, if Jesus is an enlightened being who can speak of his “complete awareness of the whole plan” (T-1.III.8:4 (FIP), T-1.45.3:3 (CE)), he would not ask us to do anything unless he were *certain* we could do it. A bit later in the Text, he says:

I would not ask you to do things which you cannot do, and it is impossible that I could do things you cannot do. Given this, and given this quite literally, there can be nothing which prevents you from doing exactly what I ask, and everything argues for it. (T-8.VIII.10:1–2 (CE), T-8.IX.8:2–3 (FIP)).

When he asks me to perform miracles, he is absolutely sure that I am capable of doing so. Therefore, I have no excuse. I cannot say, “Sorry, Jesus, you ask too much of me.” What he asks for is, as he says, *natural* (3:2)—consistent with my nature. I do not need to be afraid of the obstacles to my performing miracles. This applies equally well to anything Jesus asks me to do, not just to miracles. It applies to daily spiritual practice, for instance. If he asks it, I can do it. Miracles correct my thinking. They heal my mind and my body. And miracles apply to everyone, universally. They can do *anything* that is good (3:3). The only thing that limits and prevents them is *doubt* (3:4). When Peter attempted to replicate Jesus’s miraculous walking on water, he failed and began to sink. Jesus, while stretching out his hand to save him from sinking, asked, “O you of little faith, why did you doubt?” (Matthew 14:31 ESV). It was Peter’s doubt that prevented the miracle. Helen, it seems, had been asking herself why she could not incorporate Jesus’s words. I’m sure the same question has occurred to us all. We *should* be asking ourselves, “Why have I doubted?” Jesus seems to be asking a lot of us in the Course, but we need to remember that he would never ask us to do anything we cannot do.

⁴ T-1.5.1:1: “Miracles are natural.” T-1.37.1:1: “A miracle is a correction factor introduced into false thinking by me.” T-1.7.1:1: “Miracles are a form of healing.” T-1.27.1:1: “A miracle is a universal blessing from God through me to all my brothers.”

⁵ Matthew 14:31 (KJV). Peter sees Jesus walking on the water and tries to walk on water himself. However, he then begins to sink as he becomes afraid. He cries out, “Lord save me.” Then comes the quoted verse: “And immediately Jesus stretched forth his hand, and caught him, and said unto him, O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?” The point above is that the same doubt that stopped Peter from walking on water keeps us from incorporating Jesus’ words and performing miracles.

Paragraph 4

4 The idea of cannibalism in connection with the Sacrament is a reflection of a distorted view of sharing.⁶ ²I told you before that the word “thirst” in connection with the Spirit was used because of the limited understanding of those to whom I spoke. ³I also told you *not* to use it.⁷ ⁴The same holds for expressions like “feeding on.” ⁵Symbiosis is misunderstood by the mentally ill, who do use it in that way.⁸

As Robert suggests in his footnote, the seemingly incongruous subject of cannibalism and the sacrament of the Eucharist (or communion, as it is known in many churches) probably stems from Jesus’s use of the word “incorporate” in 3:5, which can be defined as “embody.” We don’t make Jesus’s words into our bodies in the sense that we do that with food, but we *can* embody them in this world by living them out. He links it with his earlier denigration of the word “thirst” in regard to the Spirit, as well as “feeding on.” They can be misunderstood.

I can see why Jesus didn’t want these images in his book, but for myself, I happen to love them. I have always loved the verses in the Psalms such as:

“As a deer pants for flowing streams, so pants my soul for you, O God.”

(Psalm 42:1 ESV)

“How sweet are your words to my taste, sweeter than honey to my mouth!”

(Psalm 119:103 ESV)

When Jesus says “I told you not to use it,” meaning the word, “thirst,” I believe he was speaking to Helen specifically, telling her not to use thirst or similar imagery in his book. For the line about “symbiosis,” see the footnote in CE.

⁶ This sentence about the Eucharist being cannibalistic (a charge made by critics of Christianity since its earliest days) seems to take off from the comment in the previous paragraph, a comment which originally came right before this sentence, about *incorporating* Jesus’ words, since a literal meaning of “incorporate” could suggest making his words part of one’s body. The comment about “a distorted view of sharing” means that sharing does not mean taking another’s body (in this case, Jesus’ body) into one’s own.

⁷ T-2.I.13:5: “The term was used only because of humanity’s limited comprehension and is probably better dropped.” John 7:37-39 (KJV): “In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)”

⁸ “Symbiosis” is an intimate, prolonged association between two different living things, which is usually one of mutual dependence and benefit, but may be parasitic. The problem with the terms “thirst” and “feeding on” here is that they imply a parasitic relationship with the Spirit, in which we in some way consume the Spirit.

Paragraph 5

5 But I also told you that you must recognize your total dependence on God, a statement which you may not have liked.⁹ ²God and the Sons He created *are* symbiotically related. ³They are *completely* dependent on each other. ⁴The creation of the Son himself has already been perfectly accomplished, but the creation *by* Sons has not. ⁵God created Sons so He could depend on them *because* He created them perfectly. ⁶He gave them His peace so they would not be shaken and would be unable to be deceived.

Despite what seems an effort to downplay the idea of symbiosis, Jesus goes on to say that we *must* recognize our total dependence on God (5:1). Symbiosis refers to two beings living in mutual dependence, benefitting both, such as some birds who eat insects off of cattle, who disturb the insects while eating grass. We receive everything from God, and at the same time, we complete God. It *is* a kind of symbiosis,(5:2). It astonishing to think that, just as we are completely dependent on God, God is completely dependent on us (5:3). In order to depend on us, God created us perfectly (5:5). That is why He can depend on us to carry out His creative process (5:4). This is precisely why we can do anything that Jesus asks of us! He created us unshakable and unable to be deceived by giving us His peace (5:6).

Paragraph 6

6 Whenever you are afraid, you *are* deceived. ²Your mind is not serving your soul. ³This literally starves the soul by denying its daily bread.¹⁰ ⁴In this connection, there is a poem about the Holy Family that says:

When we allow fear to take hold on us, we *are* deceived (6:1). But we were created “unable to be deceived.” I think we need to read that as “able not to be deceived” because we *have* deceived ourselves whenever we are afraid. More specifically, our *mind* is deceived, but not our soul (our true Self) (6:2). Our mind is denying the soul its “daily bread, the peace of God. Jesus then quotes a poem about “the Holy Family,” which would include Father and Son (us & all our brothers and sisters), in Course terms:

⁵Where tricks of words are never said,
And Mercy is as plain as bread.¹¹

⁹ T-1.48.5:6: ““Except you become as little children’ means unless you fully recognize your complete dependence on God, you cannot know the real power of the Son in his true relationship with the Father.”

¹⁰ Matthew 6:11 (RSV): “Give us this day our daily bread.” In the Course allusion, the “bread” is the peace that God gave the soul.

¹¹ From “The Wise Men,” by G.K. Chesterton. In the poem, the home into which Christ is born is a place where there is no deception and where mercy is absolutely ordinary and commonplace. Applied to Jesus’ topic of the soul, this means that the soul is a place where there is no deception and where the truth of mercy *is* its daily bread.

The next paragraph takes off on the topic of mercy.

Paragraph 7

7 God offers *only* mercy. ²Your own words should always reflect only mercy, because that is what you have received and that is what you should *give*. ³Justice is a temporary expedient, or an attempt to teach you the meaning of mercy. ⁴Its judgmental side arises only because you are capable of injustice if that is what your mind makes.

When we deal with others in our lives do our words always reflect mercy, and never “tricks of words,” or lies and deception? God, on His part, “offers only mercy” (7:1–2). We have been offered mercy by God and should offer the same to all our human family. Justice, he says, is only a temporary expedient that attempts to teach us the meaning of mercy (7:3). But justice only serves this function when it rewards innocence. When our minds choose to perceive guilt in someone and *judge*, believing that justice requires their punishment in some way, we are misusing justice. (See Manual for Teachers, 20.5:1.)

Paragraph 8

8 You are afraid of God's will because you have used your own will, which He created in the likeness of His Own, to miscreate.¹² ²What you do not realize is that the mind can miscreate only when it is not free. ³An imprisoned mind is not free by definition. ⁴It is possessed, or held back, by *itself*. ⁵Its will is therefore limited, and not free to assert itself.

Why are we so often afraid of the will of God? When Marianne Williamson was confronted with the idea of giving her life to God, she says, “I was afraid that meant wearing gray for the rest of my life!” One reason for our fear is that we know how we have used our own will, and it isn't pretty! (8:1). We don't trust God because we suspect he will use His will like we use ours, and probably will judge us as sinners. But God's mind is free, unlike ours. Mind only miscreates when it is *not free* because it is held back by itself (8:2–4). When mind is free, as God's is, it can only extend love, because that is all God ever wants to do. A free mind is at last “free to assert itself” by being the love that it is (8:5).

¹² Genesis 1:26 (RSV): “Then God said, ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.’”

Paragraph 9

9 It is all right to remember the past, provided you also remember that *anything* you suffer is because of your own errors. ²As an analogy, imagine a very young child who falls down the stairs when an adult has her arms open in welcome at the bottom of the stairs, and who then develops a totally unwarranted fear of that adult. ³The misstep which causes the child's fall has nothing at all to do with the adult, just as your own missteps have nothing at all to do with me.

At first, this paragraph seemed like an unexplained sidetrack, but I think now I see a connection. The preceding paragraph addresses our fears that God is angry with us because of our past mistakes. Here, Jesus assures us that remembering the past, even our mistakes, is okay as long as we *also* remember that any suffering we undergo is not because *God* is punishing us. Anything we suffer is because of *our* errors (9:1). This reminds me of the saying of Ernest Holmes, the founder of Religious Science, who once wrote, "There is no sin but a mistake, and no punishment but an inevitable consequence."¹³ Blaming God for our suffering would be like the child who trips on the stairs while looking at her welcoming mother blaming the mother and developing a fear of the mother.

This idea is, perhaps, a corollary of the Course's statement of what we must realize to find happiness: "I am responsible for what I see" (T-21.II.2:3 (CE & FIP)).

Paragraph 10

10 Denial of error is a very powerful defense of truth. ²We have slowly been shifting the emphasis from the negative to the positive use of denial. ³Remember, we have already stated that denial is not a purely negative device; it results in positive miscreation.¹⁴ ⁴That is the way the mentally ill *do* employ it. ⁵But remember this thought: Never underestimate the power of denial. ⁶In the service of the right mind, the denial of *error* frees the mind and reestablishes the freedom of the will. ⁷When the will is really free it *cannot* miscreate because it recognizes only truth.

Denial of the power of error, the "all-purpose denial," as Hasbrouck called it, is a powerful way we can defend truth in our minds against the attacks of our egos (10:1). There is a great difference between the negative and positive uses of denial, which is why the Course has been attempting to focus our attention on the positive use (10:2). *Negative* denial, the denial of reality or truth, always "results in positive miscreation," or projection (10:3). It makes illusions. Neurotic and psychotic people use denial in this way (10:4), and to the extent that we deny the truth, we are equally insane.

Sentence 5 is one of the lines left out of earlier editions of the Course, but I heard it long ago, I think I heard it from Ken Wapnick, who had access to the Urtext and used it

¹³ *Science of Mind*, Page 111.

¹⁴ T-1.49.3:2-3: "Denial is not mere negation. It is a positive miscreation."

because it is such a potent statement: “Never underestimate the power of denial.” It applies equally to negative and positive denial. As used here, it emphasizes the immense benefits that our right mind can derive from the denial of *error*: it “frees the mind and reestablishes the freedom of the will” (10:6). It has the reverse effect of negative denial. In positive denial, instead of miscreating, our minds “*cannot* miscreate because it recognizes *only truth*” (10:7). (I have italicized where the original notes showed emphasis.)

Paragraph 11

11 False projection arises out of *false denial*, not out of its proper use.
²My own role in the Atonement is one of true projection; that is, I can “project” (or extend) to you the affirmation of truth. ³If you project error to me (or to yourself) you are interfering with the process. ⁴My use of projection, which can also be yours, is not based on faulty denial. ⁵But it *does* involve the very powerful use of the denial of error.

The discussion of true versus false denial continues. “False projection” or illusion “arises out of *false denial*, not out of its proper use” (11:1). In Sentence 2, we can substitute the word “creation” for the words “true projection” if we wish. The original wording preserves the contrast between false projection and true projection, which result from false denial and true denial. Jesus defines true projection as “I can ‘project’ (or extend) to *you* the affirmation of truth” (11:2).

What does he mean about projecting error to himself or to ourselves in 10:3? To project an error is to make an illusion. Therefore, I think projecting error to a person means making a false image of them in our minds. Common examples include seeing Jesus as angry or as superior to us in some way and seeing ourselves as guilty, weak, or beyond the reach of the Atonement. Clearly, this interferes “with the process,” presumably the process of Atonement (10:3). We aren’t locked into denial only in the negative sense. We are as capable of true denial as Jesus is (11:5). We can extend the affirmation of truth to our brothers and sisters and bring about the same liberating effects in their minds. But our denial must be true denial, the denial of error, just as Jesus’s denial is. We must deny the other person’s guilt, self-judgment, belief in their weakness, and view of themselves as no longer in favor with God, or any contradiction of the truth—whether the denial is in their mind or our own (11:5).

Paragraph 12

12 The miracle worker is one who accepts my kind of denial and projection, unites his own inherent abilities to deny and project with mine, and imposes them back on himself and others. ²This establishes the total lack of threat anywhere. ³Together we can then work for the real time of peace, which is eternal.

The proper use of denial is what makes a miracles worker a miracle worker. We unite our inherent ability to deny and project (extend) with Jesus’s similar ability, and we direct

that denial and extension back on ourselves and others (12:1). Remember, true denial denies the power of anything not of God to affect us (1:8); therefore, it “establishes the total lack of threat anywhere” (12:2). It extends the liberation of mind we have experienced to others. This is how Jesus can work with us “for the real time of peace, which is eternal” (12:3).

To review and make this practical: True denial is to deny the power of anything not of God to hurt you. It can apply equally well to yourself or someone else. Most of the time, the “error” is some form of lack of love, which can range from outright attack to disrespect or inattention. Notice that you are *not* pushing the error under the rug but confronting it! You look it in the eye and declare, “You have no power to hurt me.”

It’s clear to me that all this is another way to look at forgiveness. But when I realize that “error” can also include bodily sickness, automobile problems, and other worldly problems, even to the extent of global warming and racial prejudice, it calls for a whole new dimension of forgiveness. These things can certainly arouse fear in me. As long as I have fear, I am not at peace. I am judging something, and that calls for forgiveness. How do I forgive global warming? How do I deny its power to hurt me? Really, true denial should be applicable to *everything* that arouses fear in me.

The Workbook has this to say about fear:

The presence of fear is a sure sign that you are trusting in your own strength.
²The awareness that there is nothing to fear shows that somewhere in your mind—not necessarily in a place which you recognize as yet—you have remembered God and let His strength take the place of yours. ³The instant you are willing to do this, there is indeed nothing to fear. (W-48.3)

Our true denial does not have to be perfect as we begin to use it. It can be little more than an *awareness* that there is nothing to fear. Somewhere in our minds, perhaps in a place we don’t yet recognize, we have remembered God and have become willing to let His strength replace our own. We don’t need to understand how we can be invulnerable to the object of our fears, but we don’t need to. Eventually, we will know and be consciously certain of safety. But for now, it is enough to affirm true denial. Our willingness to do so shows that a shift in our mindset has begun.

You may also want to read through Lesson 160, “I am at home. Fear is the stranger here.”

Legend:

Light underscoring indicates emphasis that appears in the Urtext or shorthand notes.

The Text is taken from the Circle of Atonement's Complete and Annotated Edition (which I refer to as the "CE" for "Complete Edition" or "Circle Edition"). Please be aware that, even when the wording is identical to the FIP version, the division into paragraphs is often entirely different in the CE, which restores the paragraph breaks found in the original notes. This results in different reference numbering as well. I will indicate for each paragraph the corresponding sentences in the Foundation for Inner Peace (FIP) edition. You should be able to locate specific sentences in that edition if you need to, with a minimum of visual clutter in the commentary. References to quotations are from the CE unless another version is being quoted, in which case that version is indicated.

Footnotes by the commentary author are shown in this font and size. Other footnotes come from the Complete Edition itself.

Effects of Differing Editions of the Course

There were significant changes made in the CE, although for the most part there was no alteration in the meaning of the text, and the *Manual for Teachers* had far fewer changes. There are some changes in section and paragraph breaks and sentence structure that result in different numbering in references to the same text in the two editions. When there is a major difference I will indicate it with a footnote.

I have attempted for all references to add a separate FIP reference if it differs from the CE reference, but I may have missed some. If so, I apologize. Please let me know of any referencing problems you find.

I have also tried to edit my commentary so as to reflect any wording changes in the CE. For instance, the CE Text restored the plural use of "you" where the FIP had substituted the phrase "you and your brother." One such instance will illustrate the kind of change, significant in actual words but nearly identical in overall meaning:

FIP: Thus you and your brother but shared a qualified entente, in which a clause of separation was a point you both agreed to keep intact.

CE: You shared a qualified entente, in which a clause of separation was a point which you had both agreed to keep intact.